OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA.

FIRST SESSION—SEVENTH PARLIAMENT.

54-55 VICTORIÆ, 1891.

VOL. XXXII.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TENTH DAY OF JULY TO THE TWENTIETH DAY OF AUGUST, INCLUSIVE.

OTTAWA:
PRINTED BY BROWN CHAMBERLIN, PRINTER TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

1891.

MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

OF THE

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

AT THE OPENING OF THE

FIRST SESSION OF THE SEVENTH PARLIAMENT.

1891.

Minister of Railways and Canals (Premier)	*Right Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, G.C.B.,&c.
Minister of Public Works	†Sir HECTOR LOUIS LANGEVIN, K.C.M.G., C.B.
Minister of Customs	Hon. MACKENZIE BOWELL.
Minister of Militia and Defence	Sir ADOLPHE P. CARON, K.C.M.G.
Minister of Agriculture	Hon. JOHN CARLING.
Minister of Inland Revenue	Hon. JOHN COSTIGAN.
Without Portfolio	Hon. FRANK SMITH.
Secretary of State	Hon. JOSEPH ADOLPHE CHAPLEAU.
Minister of Justice	Sir JOHN SPARROW DAVID THOMPSON, K.C.M.G.
Minister of Finance	Hon. GEORGE EULAS FOSTER.
Without Portfolio	‡Hon. JOHN JOSEPH CALDWELL ABBOTT.
Minister of Marine and Fisheries	Hon. CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.
Postmaster General	Hon. JOHN GRAHAM HAGGART.
Minister of Interior	Hon. EDGAR DEWDNEY.
President of the Council	

Clerk of the Privy Council — JOHN JOSEPH MCGEE, Esq.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS:

Hon. PETER WHITE	*Speaker.*
JOSEPH G. H. BERGERON, M.P.	*Deputy Speaker.*
JOHN G. BOURINOT, Esq.	Clerk of the House.
DONALD W. MACDONELL, Esq.	Serjeant-at-Arms.
FRANÇOIS FORTUNAT ROULEAU, Esq.	Clerk Assistant.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS:

GEORGE B. BRADLEY	Chief Reporter.
STEPHEN A. ABBOTT	Reporters.
E. JOSEPH DUGGAN	
ALBERT HORTON	
F. R. MARCEAU	
J. O. MARCEAU	
THOS. JOHN RICHARDSON	
THOS. P. OWENS	
JNO. CHAS. BOYCE	Assistant to Chief Reporter.

*Died 6th June, 1891.
†Resigned Portfolio, 7th September, 1891.
‡Accepted Portfolio (President of the Council and Premier) June 16th, 1891.

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

CONSTITUENCIES AND MEMBERS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

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

1891.

ADDINGTON—George W. Dawson.
ALBERT—Richard Chapman Weldon.
ALBERTA—Donald Watson Davis.
ALGOMA—George Macdonell.
ANNAPOLIS—John B. Mills.
ANTIGONISH—Hon. Sir John Thompson, K.C.M.G.
ARGENTEUIL—Thomas Christie.
ASSINIBOIA, East—Hon. Edgar Dewdney.
ASSINIBOIA, West—Nicholas Flood Davin.

BAGOT—Flavien Dupont.
BEAUCE—Joseph Godbout.
BEAUHARNOIS—Joseph Gédéon Horace Bergeron.
BELLECHASSE—Guillaume Amyot.
BERTHIER—Cléophas Beausoleil.
BONAVENTURE—William Le Boutillier Fauvel.
BOTHWELL—Hon. David Mills.
BRANT, N. Riding—James Somerville.
BRANT, S. Riding—William Paterson.
BROCKVILLE—John Fisher Wood.
BROME—Eugene A. Dyer.
BRUCE, E. Riding—Reuben Truax.
BRUCE, N. Riding—Alexander McNeill.
BRUCE, W. Riding—James Rowand.

CAPE BRETON—Hector F. McDougall. David McKeen.
CARDWELL—Robert Smeaton White.
CARLETON (N.B.)—Newton Ramsay Colter.
CARLETON (O.)—William T. Hodgins.
CARIBOO—Frank S. Barnard.
CHAMBLY—Raymond Préfontaine.
CHAMPLAIN—Onésime Carignan.
CHARLEVOIX—Henry Simard.
CHARLOTTE—Arthur Hill Gillmor.
CHATEAUGUAY—James Pollock Brown.
CHICOUTIMI AND SAGUENAY—P. V. Savard.
COLCHESTER—William A. Patterson.
COMPTON—Rufus Henry Pope.
CORNWALL AND STORMONT—Darby Bergin.
CUMBERLAND—Arthur R. Dickey.

DIGBY—Edward Charles Bowers.
DORCHESTER—Cyrille Emile Vaillancourt.
DRUMMOND AND ARTHABASKA—Joseph Lavergne.
DUNDAS—Hugo H. Ross.
DURHAM, E. Riding—Thomas Dixon Craig.
DURHAM, W. Riding—Robert Beith.

ELGIN, E. Riding—Andrew B. Ingram.
ELGIN, W. Riding—George Elliott Casey.
ESSEX, N. Riding—William McGregor.
ESSEX, S. Riding—Henry W. Allan.

FRONTENAC—Hon. George Airey Kirkpatrick.

GASPÉ—Louis Zéphirin Joncas.
GLENGARRY—Roderick R. McLennan.
GLOUCESTER—Kennedy F. Burns.
GRENVILLE, S. Riding—John Dowsley Reid.
GREY, E. Riding—Thomas S. Sproule.
GREY, N. Riding—James Masson.
GREY, S. Riding—George Landerkin.
GUYSBOROUGH—Duncan C. Fraser.

HALDIMAND—Walter Humphries Montague.
HALIFAX—Thomas E. Kenny. John Fitz-William Stairs.
HALTON—David Henderson.
HAMILTON—Alexander McKay. Samuel S. Ryckman.
HANTS—Alfred Putnam.
HASTINGS, E. Riding—Samuel Barton Burdett.

HASTINGS, N. Riding—Hon. Mackenzie Bowell.
HASTINGS, W. Riding—Henry Corby.
HOCHELAGA—Alphonse Desjardins.
HUNTINGDON—Julius Scriver.
HURON, E. Riding—Peter Macdonald.
HURON, S. Riding—John McMillan.
HURON, W. Riding—Malcolm Colin Cameron.

IBERVILLE—François Béchard.
INVERNESS—Hugh Cameron.

JACQUES CARTIER—Désiré Girouard.
JOLIETTE—Urbain Lippé.

KAMOURASKA—Henry George Carroll.
KENT (N.B.)—Edward H. Léger.
KENT (O.)—Archibald Campbell.
KING'S (N.B.)—Hon. George Eulas Foster.
KING'S (N.S.)—Frederick W. Borden.
KING'S (P.E.I.)—Augustine Colin Macdonald. John McLean.
KINGSTON—Rt. Hon. Sir John Macdonald, G.C.B.

LAMBTON, E. Riding—George Moncrieff.
LAMBTON, W. Riding—James Frederick Lister.
LANARK, N. Riding—Joseph Jamieson.
LANARK, S. Riding—Hon. John Graham Haggart.
LAPRAIRIE—Louis Conrad Pelletier.
L'ASSOMPTION—Joseph Gauthier.
LAVAL—Hon. Joseph Aldric Ouimet.
LEEDS AND GRENVILLE, N. Riding—Charles Frederick Ferguson.
LEEDS, S. Riding—George Taylor.
LENNOX—David Wright Allison.
LÉVIS—Pierre Malcolm Guay.
LINCOLN AND NIAGARA—William Gibson.
LISGAR—Arthur Wellington Ross.
L'ISLET—Louis George Desjardins.
LONDON—Charles Smith Hyman.
LOTBINIÈRE—Côme Isaïe Rinfret.
LUNENBURG—Charles Edwin Kaulbach.

MARQUETTE—Robert Watson.
MASKINONGÉ—Joseph Hormisdas Legris.
MÉGANTIC—Louis J. Côté, *alias* Fréchette.
MIDDLESEX, E. Riding—Joseph Henry Marshall.
MIDDLESEX, N. Riding—William H. Hutchins.
MIDDLESEX, S. Riding—James Armstrong.
MIDDLESEX, W. Riding—William Frederick Roome.
MISSISQUOI—George Barnard Baker.
MONCK—John Brown.
MONTCALM—Louis Dugas.
MONTMAGNY—Philippe A. Choquette.
MONTMORENCY—J. Israël Tarte.
MONTREAL, Centre—John Joseph Curran.
MONTREAL, East—Alphonse Télesphore Lépine.
MONTREAL, West—Sir Donald Smith, K.C.M.G.
MUSKOKA—William Edward O'Brien.

NAPIERVILLE—Dominique Monet.
NEW WESTMINSTER—Gordon E. Corbould.
NICOLET—Joseph Hector Leduc.
NORFOLK, N. Riding—John Charlton.
NORFOLK, S. Riding—David Tisdale.
NORTHUMBERLAND (N.B.)—Michael Adams.
NORTHUMBERLAND (O.) E.R.—Edward Cochrane.
NORTHUMBERLAND (O.) W.R.—John Hargraft.

ONTARIO, N. Riding—Frank Madill.
ONTARIO, S. Riding—James I. Davidson.
ONTARIO, W. Riding—James David Edgar.
OTTAWA (City)—Charles Herbert Mackintosh. Honoré Robillard.
OTTAWA (County)—Charles Ramsay Devlin.
OXFORD, N. Riding—James Sutherland.
OXFORD, S. Riding—Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright, K.C.M.G.

PEEL—Joseph Featherston.
PERTH, N. Riding—James Nicol Grieve.
PERTH, S. Riding—James Trow.
PETERBOROUGH, E. Riding—John Burnham.
PETERBOROUGH, W. Riding—James Stevenson.
PICTOU—Hon. Charles Hibbert Tupper. John McDougald.
PONTIAC—Thomas Murray.
PORTNEUF—Arthur Delisle.
PRESCOTT—Isidore Proulx.
PRINCE (P.E.I.)—Stanislaus F. Perry. John Yeo.
PRINCE EDWARD—Archibald Campbell Miller.
PROVENCHER—Alphonse A. C. LaRivière.

QUEBEC, Centre—François Langelier.
QUEBEC, East—Hon. Wilfred Laurier.
QUEBEC, West—Hon. Thomas McGreevy.
QUEBEC (County)—Jules J. T. Frémont.
QUEEN'S (N.B.)—George Gerald King.
QUEEN'S (N.S.)—Francis Gordon Forbes.
QUEEN'S (P.E.I.)—Louis Henry Davies. William Welsh.

RENFREW, N. Riding—Peter White.
RENFREW, S. Riding—John Ferguson.
RESTIGOUCHE—John McAllister.
RICHELIEU—Hon. Sir Hector Langevin, K.C.M.G.
RICHMOND (N.S.)—Joseph A. Gillies.
RICHMOND AND WOLFE (Q.)—Clarence C. Cleveland.
RIMOUSKI—Hon. Sir Adolphe Caron, K.C.M.G.
ROUVILLE—Louis Philippe Brodeur.
RUSSELL—William Cameron Edwards.

ST. HYACINTHE—Michel E. Bernier.
ST. JOHN (N.B.) City—Ezekiel McLeod.
ST. JOHN (N.B.) City and Co.—J. Douglas Hazen. Chas. N. Skinner.
ST. JOHN'S (Q.)—François Bourassa.
ST. MAURICE—François Sévère L. Desaulniers.

SASKATCHEWAN—Day Hart Macdowall.
SELKIRK—Thomas Mayne Daly.
SHEFFORD—John Robbins Sanborn.
SHELBURNE—Nathaniel W. White.
SHERBROOKE—William Bullock Ives.
SIMCOE, E. Riding—Philip H. Spohn.
SIMCOE, N. Riding—Dalton McCarthy.
SIMCOE, S. Riding—Richard Tyrwhitt.
SOULANGES—Joseph Octave Mousseau.
STANSTEAD—Timothy Byron Rider.
SUNBURY—Robert Duncan Wilmot.

TÉMISCOUATA—Paul Etienne Grandbois.
TERREBONNE—Hon. Joseph Adolphe Chapleau.
THREE RIVERS—Hon. Sir Hector Langevin, K.C.M.G.
TORONTO, Centre—George Ralph R. Cockburn.
TORONTO, East—Emerson Coatsworth, jun.
TORONTO, West—Frederick Charles Denison, C. M. G.
TWO MOUNTAINS—Jean Baptiste Daoust.

VANCOUVER ISLAND—David William Gordon.
VAUDREUIL—Henry Stanislas Harwood.
VERCHÈRES—Hon. Felix Geoffrion.
VICTORIA (B. C.)—Edward Gawler Prior. Thomas Earle.
VICTORIA (N.B.)—Hon. John Costigan.
VICTORIA (N.S.)—John Archibald McDonald.
VICTORIA (O.) N. Riding—John Augustus Barron.
VICTORIA (O.) S. Riding—Charles Fairbairn.

WATERLOO, N. Riding—Isaac Erb Bowman.
WATERLOO, S. Riding—James Livingston.
WELLAND—William M. German.
WELLINGTON, Centre Riding—Andrew Semple.
WELLINGTON, N. Riding—James McMullen.
WELLINGTON, S. Riding—James Innes.
WENTWORTH, N. Riding—Thomas Bain.
WENTWORTH, S. Riding—Franklin M. Carpenter.
WESTMORELAND—Josiah Wood.
WINNIPEG—Hugh John Macdonald.

YALE—John Andrew Mara.
YAMASKA—Roch Moïse Samuel Mignault.
YARMOUTH—Thomas Barnard Flint.
YORK (N.B.)—Thomas Temple.
YORK (O.) E. Riding—Hon. Alexander Mackenzie.
YORK (O.) N. Riding—William Mulock.
YORK (O.) W. Riding—N. Clarke Wallace.

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

BÉCHARD, Mr. François *(Iberville)*.
BEAUSOLEIL, Mr. Cléophas *(Berthier)*.
CAMERON, Mr. Hugh *(Inverness)*.
CHARLTON, Mr. John *(North Norfolk)*.
DAVIN, Mr. N. F. *(West Assiniboia)*.
DESJARDINS, Mr. Alphonse *(Hochelaga)*.
INNES, Mr. James *(South Wellington)*.
LARIVIÈRE, Mr. Alphonse A. C. *(Provencher)*.
PRIOR, Mr. Edward Gawler *(Victoria, B.C.)*
SCRIVER, Mr. Jules *(Huntingdon)*.
SKINNER, Charles N., *(St. John City and County.)*
SOMERVILLE, Mr. James *(West Bruce)*.
TAYLOR, Mr. George *(South Leeds)*.
WELDON, Mr. R. Chapman *(Albert)*.
WHITE, Mr. Robert Smeaton *(Cardwell)*.

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

LIST OF PAIRS DURING THE SESSION.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON's amendment (six month's hoist) to Mr. Cameron's (Huron motion for second reading of Bill 8 (Franchise Act Repeal) 20th May :—

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Mr. CORBOULD.	Mr. CASEY.
Mr. KENNY.	Mr. LIVINGSTON.
Mr. GRANDBOIS.	Mr. SCRIVER.
Sir DONALD SMITH.	Hon. ALEX. MACKENZIE.
Sir JOHN MACDONALD.	Hon. Mr. LAURIER.
Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds).	Mr. BORDEN.

On Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN's motion (to adjourn debate) to Mr. Davin's proposed resolution (*re* Second Homesteads, N.W.T.) 1st June :—

Mr. CLEVELAND.	Mr. CARROLL.
Mr. DESAULNIERS.	Mr. LEGRIS.
Mr. JONCAS.	Mr. CHOQUETTE.
Mr. CORBY.	Mr. GIBSON.
Mr. DYER.	Mr. LAVERGNE.
Mr. PELLETIER.	Mr. LANGELIER.
Mr. STEVENSON.	Mr. SCRIVER.
Mr. WOOD (Brockville).	Mr. HARGRAFT.
Mr. COATSWORTH.	Mr. FEATHERSON.

On Sir JOHN THOMPSON's amendment (six months' hoist) to Mr. Edgar's motion for second reading of Bill 4 (Electoral Franchise Act) 4th June :—

Mr. TAYLOR.	Mr. TROW.
Mr. O'BRIEN.	Mr. BARRON.
Hon. Mr. DEWDNEY.	Mr. MULOCK.
Mr. PRIOR.	Mr. HYMAN.
Sir JOHN MACDONALD.	Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE.

On Mr. LAURIER's proposed resolution (Censuring the High Commissioner) in amendment to motion for Committee of Supply, 5th June :—

Mr. O'BRIEN.	Mr. BARRON.
Mr. SKINNER.	Mr. KING.
Mr. IVES.	Mr. FRÉMONT.

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Mr. DESJARDINS (Hoch.)	Mr. AMYOT.
Mr. CURRAN.	Mr. DEVLIN.
Mr. MACDOWALL.	Mr. CHARLTON.
Mr. COATSWORTH.	Mr. FEATHERSTON.
Mr. McKEEN.	Mr. LIVINGSTON.
Sir JOHN MACDONALD.	Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE.
Hon. Mr. DEWDNEY.	Mr. MULOCK.
Mr. PRIOR.	Mr. HYMAN.
Mr. RYCKMAN.	Mr. McMULLEN.
Mr. STEVENSON.	Mr. EDGAR.

On Mr. LAURIER's motion (to adjourn the House : Want of Confidence in Government) 22nd June :—

Mr. IVES.	Mr. FRÉMONT.
Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland)	Mr. FLINT.
Mr. STEVENSON.	Mr. SCRIVER.
Hon. Mr. CHAPLEAU.	Mr. JONCAS.
Hon. Mr. FOSTER.	Sir R. CARTWRIGHT.
Sir DONALD SMITH.	Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE.
Mr. REID.	Mr. CASEY.
Mr. BAKER.	Mr. BERNIER.
Mr. POPE.	Mr. LEGRIS.
Mr. BURNHAM.	Mr. PRÉFONTAINE.
Hon. Mr. OUIMET.	Mr. BOURASSA.
Mr. WILMOT.	Mr. GIBSON.

On Mr. MULOCK's proposed resolution (Repeal of Duty on Binding Twine) 6th July :—

Hon. Mr. TUPPER.	Mr. DAVIES.
Mr. IVES.	Mr. HYMAN.
Mr. McCARTHY.	Mr. PRÉFONTAINE.
Sir DONALD SMITH.	Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE.
Mr. STEVENSON.	Mr. SCRIVER.
Mr. BERGIN.	Mr. LISTER.
Hon. Mr. CHAPLEAU.	Mr. SIMARD.
Mr. DESAULNIERS.	Mr. LEGRIS.
Mr. MASSON.	Mr. McMULLEN.

On Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT's amendment (Reduction of Duties) to Mr. Foster's motion to concur in resolutions reported from Committee of Ways and Means, 28th July :—

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Mr. BARNARD.	Mr. WELSH.
Mr. McCARTHY.	Mr. PREFONTAINE.
Sir DONALD SMITH.	Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE.
Mr. McGREEVY.	Mr. GIBSON.

On Mr. DESJARDIN's resolution (Commercial Union between Canada and the United States) 4th August :—

Mr. BARNARD.	Mr. WELSH.
Mr. McCARTHY.	Mr. PRÉFONTAINE.
Sir DONALD SMITH.	Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE.
Mr. ADAMS.	Mr. COLTER.
Mr. McKEEN.	Mr. BORDEN.
Mr. KENNY.	Mr. FORBES.
Mr. MONCRIEFF.	Mr. LISTER.
Mr. BURNS.	Mr. GERMAN.
Mr. PATTERSON (Col.)	Mr. EDGAR.
Mr. TISDALE.	Mr. ARMSTRONG.
Mr. WILMOT.	Mr. BURDETT.
Mr. SKINNER.	Mr. CARROLL.
Hon. Mr. CHAPLEAU.	Mr. CHOQUETTE.
Mr. MACKINTOSH.	Mr. SPOHN.

On Mr. CHARLTON's proposed resolution (Timber Licenses, &c.) in amendment to motion for Committee of Supply, 5th August :—

Mr. BARNARD.	Mr. WELSH.
Mr. McCARTHY.	Mr. PRÉFONTAINE.
Mr. ADAMS.	Mr. COLTER.
Mr. McKEEN.	Mr. BORDEN.
Mr. KENNY.	Mr. FORBES.
Mr. MONCRIEFF.	Mr. LISTER.
Mr. BURNS.	Mr. GERMAN.
Mr. ROSS (Lisgar).	Mr. EDWARDS.
Mr. McLEAN.	Mr. YEO.
Sir DONALD SMITH.	Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE.
Mr. SKINNER.	Mr. CARROLL.
Hon. Mr. KIRKPATRICK.	Mr. HYMAN.
Mr. BERGERON.	Mr. EDGAR.
Mr. PATTERSON (Col.)	Mr. BURDETT.

On Mr. CAMERON's (Huron) proposed resolution (Tay Canal Construction) in amendment to motion for Committee of Supply, 12th August :—

Mr. BARNARD.	Mr. WELSH.
Mr. McKEEN.	Mr. BORDEN.
Mr. McDOUGALL (C.B.)	Mr. FAUVEL.
Mr. KENNY.	Mr, FORBES.
Sir DONALD SMITH.	Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE.
Mr. SKINNER,	Mr. BRODEUR.
Mr. McALLISTER.	Mr. BARRON.

On Mr. LAURIER's proposed resolution (British Columbia Settlers' Grievances) in amendment to motion for Committee of Supply, 18th August :—

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Mr. BARNARD.	Mr. WELSH.
Sir DONALD SMITH.	Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE.
Mr. EARLE.	Mr. FAUVEL.
Mr. IVES.	Mr. FRÉMONT.
Mr. CORBY.	Mr. CHARLTON.
Mr. McKAY.	Mr. BOWMAN.
Hon. Mr. CHAPLEAU.	Mr. CHOQUETTE.

On Mr. AMYOT's proposed resolution (The Bancroft Tender, Kingston Graving Dock) in amendment to motion for Committee of Supply, 20th August :—

Mr. BARNARD.	Mr. WELSH.
Mr. EARLE.	Mr. FAUVEL.
Mr. CORBY.	Mr. CHARLTON.
Mr. McKAY.	Mr. TRUAX.
Sir DONALD SMITH.	Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE.
Mr. MONTAGUE.	Mr. CAMERON (Huron).
Mr. TISDALE.	Mr. MULOCK.

On Mr. DAVIES' (P.E.I.) proposed resolution (West Indies Steamship Subsidies) in amendment to motion for Committee of Supply, 25th August :—

Mr. BARNARD.	Mr. WELSH.
Mr. EARLE.	Mr. FAUVEL.
Mr. RYCKMAN.	Mr. DELISLE.
Sir DONALD SMITH.	Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE.
Mr. WOOD (Westml'd).	Mr. KING.
Mr. POPE.	Mr. PATERSON (Brant)
Mr. MACDOWALL.	Mr. SUTHERLAND.
Mr. McLEAN.	Mr. YEO.
Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds).	Mr. SPOHN.
Mr. McCARTHY.	Mr. BURDETT.

On Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT's proposed resolution (Governor General's Warrants) in amendment to motion for Committee of Supply, 27th August :—

Mr. BARNARD.	Mr. WELSH.
Mr. EARLE.	Mr. FAUVEL.
Mr. MACDOWALL.	Mr. PATERSON (Brant).
Mr. McKEEN.	Mr. KING.
Mr. POPE.	Mr. FRÉMONT.
Mr. CURRAN.	Mr. DEVLIN.
Mr. KIRKPATRICK.	Mr. SUTHERLAND.

On Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT's proposed resolution (Census) in amendment to motion for Committee of Supply, 3rd September :—

Mr. BARNARD.	Mr. WELSH.
Mr. EARLE.	Mr. FAUVEL.
Mr. McKEEN.	Mr. BOWERS.
Mr. ROSS (Lisgar).	Mr. PATERSON (Brant).
Sir DONALD SMITH.	Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE.

On Mr. PATERSON's amendment (Sugar Duties) to Mr. Foster's motion for third reading of Bill 155 (Customs Act) 10th September:—

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Mr. BARNARD.	Mr. WELSH.
Mr. EARLE.	Mr. FAUVEL.
Mr. CURRAN.	Mr. MURRAY.
Sir DONALD SMITH.	Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE.
Mr. WELDON.	Mr. BEAUSOLEIL.
Mr. MARA.	Mr. LANGELIER.
Mr. JONCAS.	Mr. TARTE.
Mr. McKEEN.	Mr. BORDEN.
Mr. MONCRIEFF.	Mr. LISTER.
Mr. DYER.	Mr. SCRIVER.
Mr. DUGAS.	Mr. DELISLE.
Mr. LEGER.	Mr. BOWERS.
Mr. ROSS (Lisgar).	Mr. BOWMAN.
Mr. CORBOULD.	Mr. BURDETT.
Mr. MACDOWALL.	Mr. DEVLIN.

On Mr. CAMERON's (Huron) amendment (Minority Report *re* Mr. Cochrane, M.P.) to Mr. Skinner's motion to concur in the Majority Report of Sub-Committee on Privileges and Elections, 17th September:—

Mr. BARNARD.	Mr. WELSH.
Mr. EARLE.	Mr. FAUVEL.
Mr. WHITE (Shelburne).	Mr. FORBES.
Mr. MACKINTOSH.	Mr. HYMAN.
Mr. McKEEN.	Mr. BORDEN.
Sir DONALD SMITH.	Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE.
Mr. McCARTHY.	Mr. EDGAR.

On Mr. LISTER's motion for Select Committee (*re* Charges against the Postmaster General) and Sir John Thompson's amendment (to proceed to the Orders of the Day) 23rd September:—

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Mr. BARNARD.	Mr. WELSH.
Mr. EARLE.	Mr. FAUVEL.
Mr. WHITE (Shelburne).	Mr. FORBES.
Mr. McKEEN.	Mr. BORDEN.
Mr. MONCRIEFF.	Mr. LISTER.
Mr. POPE.	Mr. PRÉFONTAINE.

On Mr. DAVIES' (P.E.I.) amendment (Minority Report *re* Public Works Contracts) to Mr. Girouard's motion to concur in the Majority Report of Committee on Privileges and Elections, 24th September:—

Mr. BARNARD.	Mr. WELSH.
Mr. EARLE.	Mr. FAUVEL.
Mr. WHITE (Shelburne),	Mr. FORBES.
Mr. McKEEN.	Mr. BORDEN.
Mr. MONCRIEFF.	Mr. LISTER.
Mr. McDOUGALL (C.B.)	Mr. FRASER.
Mr. TISDALE.	Mr. CHARLTON.
Sir DONALD SMITH.	Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE.
Mr. CORBOULD.	Mr. BURDETT.
Mr. MACDOWALL.	Mr. DEVLIN.
Mr. MARA.	Mr. FRÉMONT.

House of Commons Debates.

FIRST SESSION—SEVENTH PARLIAMENT.

The SIXTH PARLIAMENT of the DOMINION, which had been prorogued from the 16th day of May, 1890, and thence from time to time, was dissolved by Proclamation on the 3rd day of February, 1891, and, Writs having been issued and returned, a new Parliament was summoned to meet for the Despatch of Business, on Wednesday, the 29th day of April, 1891, and did accordingly meet on that day.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 29th April, 1891.

On which day, being the first day of the meeting of the First Session of the SEVENTH PARLIAMENT, for the Despatch of Business,—JOHN G. BOURINOT, Esquire, Clerk of the House of Commons, DONALD WILLIAM MACDONELL, FRANÇOIS FORTUNAT ROULEAU, and HENRY HARTNEY, Esquires, Commissioners appointed by *Dedimus Potestatem* for administering the Oath to Members of the House of Commons, all attending according to their duty;—SAMUEL E. ST. O. CHAPLEAU, Esquire, Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, delivered to the said JOHN G. BOURINOT a book containing a List of the Names of the Members returned to serve in this Parliament.

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

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

Gentlemen:

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

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

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

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

And the House being returned,

ELECTION OF SPEAKER.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. BOURINOT, I rise to move:

That PETER WHITE, Esquire, the member representing the Electoral District of the North Riding of the County of Renfrew, do take the Chair of this House as Speaker.

To those hon. members who have sat in previous Parliaments I need not say one single word as to the merits of Mr. White, or as to his fitness to perform the duties of this office, this high and important office, with due dignity, and not only with dignity of manner but with impartiality and ability. Mr. White has been in Parliament for fourteen or fifteen years, and from the time he first entered it he took a very considerable position, even when a very young man; and we all know the assiduity and ability with which he performed his part and his duties as a member of the House of Commons of Canada. He was always in his place, always ready for his work, enjoying and earning at a very early period the respect and esteem, and, I may say, the friendship of his associates in Parliament, whether sitting on the right or left of the Speaker; and he vindicated the judgment of his constituents in electing him as their representative, for we all know how well he performed his duties as a member of this House. I do not know on either side of the House any hon. member who would prove, from his demeanour, conduct and ability, more acceptable, without reference to political questions, than my friend the member for the North Riding of Renfrew. Without further remark, I move the resolution, seconded by Sir Hector Langevin.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. BOURINOT, it is the privilege of the Administration, at the opening of every new Parliament, to suggest a member whom they believe to be worthy of presiding over the deliberations of this House and competent to discharge the important duties of the office of Speaker. It is not unnatural to expect that the Administration, in seeking for such a person, will look exclusively into the ranks of their own followers, however attenuated, diminished, decreased, thinned or decimated they may have been by the verdict of the people. It would be the right, nay, it would be the duty also, of the Opposition, if the person thus offered to the House did not meet with their approbation, to express their dissent by their words, and, if necessary, by their votes. In the present circumstances, I cannot say that I am altogether disappointed at the choice of the right hon. gentleman, and, for reasons obvious, I am rather disposed to agree with his choice. But the right hon. gentleman has developed of late such a sense of loyalty to British institutions, such a deference for British precedents, that I supposed he would be glad to agree to come back to British practice and to follow British precedents, by suggesting to this House the continuation of the late Speaker as the present Speaker of this Parliament. The right hon. gentleman is aware, and more aware than I am myself, that, according to British precedents, my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Ouimet), who was the incumbent of the office of Speaker during the last Parliament,

should be the choice of the House on the present occasion. But, Sir, I knew before to-day that Conservative loyalty to British institutions shines and glows at election times, and when the elections are over it is put under a bushel to serve again when the occasion arises. If, however, British precedents are to be discarded, I would have suggested that with great propriety my hon. friend from Brockville (Mr. Wood), who was Deputy Speaker for the last Parliament, and who had discharged the duties of the office with admirable skill, as everyone will agree, would have been worthy of the honour of being Speaker of this House. I do not say this, Mr. BOURINOT, with any intention of impugning the qualifications of the hon. gentleman who is now suggested to the House as the future Speaker. I am disposed to say on behalf of the Opposition—of the Loyal Opposition of Her Majesty: loyal, Sir, in every sense of the word, loyal to the Crown, loyal to the people, loyal to this House; even loyal to the majority of this House, and ever ready to accept a good suggestion from the majority when on the few and rare occasions a good suggestion comes from them—I am disposed to agree with everything that has been said by my right hon. friend in reference to the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White), the nominee for the office of Speaker. Everything the right hon. gentleman has said is fully endorsed by his colleagues in this House. From past experience of the hon. gentleman (Mr. White) I am sure that he is endowed with a thorough knowledge of the practice and business of this House, and we know from experience that he is also endowed with a sound judgment, a firm spirit, and I should say, a great independence of character. My hon. friend will pardon me, I hope, if I remind him that perfection is not of this world. He would not be of the human race if he did not allow me to tell with perfect candour that he cannot be altogether free from fault. I must, however, say that the only fault I have ever found with him was that I believe that he is endued, nay saturated, with a certain political heresy which at one time was very prevalent in this country, but which under the lessons of a sad experience is now fast disappearing, and which will be long remembered by a long-suffering people as the National Policy. I am glad to say that I am sure that this heresy which would impair the usefulness of the hon. member on the floor of this House, if he had a seat in common with all of us, will not affect him at all while he is sitting in the Speaker's chair. I am sure that when he ascends to the chair he will leave aside all party proclivities and all political professions, and that in the high station to which he shall be called by the unanimous choice of the House he will stand upright and impartial, holding the scales evenly between contending parties without fear of any one, with favour to none, and with fair play to all.

The motion being put to the House,

Mr. BOURINOT declared the motion carried in the affirmative, *nemine contradicente;* and PETER WHITE, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of North Renfrew, duly elected to the Chair of the House.

Mr. WHITE was conducted from his seat in the House to the Speaker's Chair by Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir Hector Langevin.

Mr. LAURIER.

Mr. SPEAKER ELECT. I have to tender my grateful acknowledgment to this House for the high honour it has conferred upon me in electing me to the position of Speaker. It will always be my earnest hope to deserve the confidence that has been reposed in me, and I shall endeavour to discharge the duties of the high position to which you have elected me, with firmness and impartiality. I am fully sensible of my unfitness for the position, but I shall rely upon the co-operation of the hon. gentlemen upon both sides of the House to assist me in maintaining our Rules and Orders, in vindicating our rights and privileges, and in preserving the freedom and dignity of debate according to established usages.

The Serjeant-at-Arms then placed the Mace on the Table of the House.

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

Motion agreed to: and House adjourned at 3.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 30th April, 1891.

The SPEAKER Elect having taken the Chair,

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

MR. SPEAKER,—

His Excellency the GOVERNOR GENERAL desires the immediate attendance of this Honourable House in the Senate Chamber.

Accordingly the House went up to the Senate Chamber.

Then the HONOURABLE PETER WHITE, SPEAKER ELECT, said:

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY:

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

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

The Honourable the SPEAKER of the Senate then said:

MR. SPEAKER,—

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

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

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

And the House being returned,

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to state that the House having attended on His Excellency

the Governor General in the Senate Chamber, I informed His Excellency that the choice of Speaker had fallen on me, and, in your names and on your behalf, I made the usual claim for your privileges, which His Excellency was pleased to confirm to you.

CONTROVERTED ELECTION.

Mr. SPEAKER laid before the House a judgment bearing date the 8th November, 1890, of the Hon. Mr. Justice Armour, one of the judges selected for the trial of election petitions pursuant to the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, 1874, in the matter of the election petition for the Electoral District of the County of Halton, by which the then sitting member was declared duly elected.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATHS OF OFFICE.

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

Bill read the first time.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

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

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I am glad to welcome you to the duties of the first Session of a new Parliament, which I hope will be memorable for wise deliberations, and for measures adapted to the progress and development of the Dominion.

The season in which you are assembled has opened auspiciously for the industries of our people. Let us hope that their labours may be crowned with fruitful returns from land and sea, and that the great resources of Canada may continue to reward the toil and enterprise of its inhabitants.

My advisers, availing themselves of opportunities which were presented in the closing months of last year, caused the Administration of the United States to be reminded of the willingness of the Government of Canada to join in making efforts for the extension and development of the trade between the Republic and the Dominion, as well as for the friendly adjustment of those matters of an international character which remain unsettled. I am pleased to say that these representations have resulted in an assurance that, in October next, the Government of the United States will be prepared to enter on a Conference to consider the best means of arriving at a practical solution of these important questions. The papers relating to this subject will be laid before you.

Under these circumstances, and in the hope that the proposed Conference may result in arrangements beneficial to both countries, you will be called upon to consider the expediency of extending, for the present season, the principal provisions of the protocol annexed to the Washington Treaty, 1888, known as the *Modus Vivendi*.

A disposition having been manifested in the United Kingdom to impose on sea-going ships engaged in the cattle trade increased safeguards for life and greater restrictions against improper treatment, a careful enquiry has been made as to the incidents of that trade, in so far as this country is concerned. The evidence elicited on this enquiry will be laid before you. While I am glad to learn that our shipping is free from reproach in that regard, your attention will be invited to a measure which will remove all reasonable apprehensions of abuses arising in the future in connection with so important a branch of our commerce.

The early coming into force of the Imperial Statute relating to the Vice-Admiralty Courts of the Empire has made it necessary to revise the laws in force in Canada respecting our Courts of Maritime Jurisdiction, and a measure will therefore be laid before you, designed to reorganize those tribunals.

A Code of the Criminal Law has been prepared in order that this branch of our jurisprudence may be simplified and improved, to which your best attention is invited.

Measures relating to the Foreshores of the Dominion and to the obstruction of its navigable waters, will be submitted to you, and you will also be asked to consider amendments to the Acts relating to the North-West Territories, to the Exchequer Court Act, and to the Acts relating to Trade Marks.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

The Accounts for the past year will be submitted to you. The Revenue, after providing for the services to which you appropriated it, has left a surplus for the works which you designed to be carried on by Capital expenditure.

The Estimates for the coming year will be laid before you at an early date.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I pray that in the consideration of these matters, and in the performance of all the labours which will devolve on you, your deliberations may be Divinely aided, and that your wisdom and patriotism may enlarge the prosperity of the Dominion, and promote in every way the well-being of its people.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the Speech of His Excellency the Governor General to both Houses of the Parliament of the Dominion of Canada be taken into consideration to-morrow.

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

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

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

That a Special Committee of seven members be appointed to prepare and report with all convenient speed, lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees ordered by the House this day, and that Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir Hector Langevin, Sir Richard Cartwright, Sir John Thompson, and Messrs. Bowell, Laurier and Mills (Bothwell) do compose the said Committee.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT.

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

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

REPRESENTATION OF CHICOUTIMI.

Mr. LAURIER. I would call the attention of the Government to the fact that the returning officer for the County of Chicoutimi has not yet made his report to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and the present member elect, Mr. Savard, is deprived of his seat. The election took place on the 5th of March, and there can be no reason why the report should not have been in a long time ago.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Clerk informs me that it is on its way. It has been telegraphed for. I do not know the cause of the delay.

Motion agreed to: and House adjourned at 3.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 1st May, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that the Clerk of the House had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, a certificate of the election and return of PAUL VILMOND SAVARD for the Electoral District of Chicoutimi and Saguenay.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. BOWELL. With the consent of the House, I desire, before the Orders of the Day are called, to move the usual motion for the appointment of a Joint Committee to supervise the Report of the Debates. There are but few changes. I propose to substitute Mr. LaRivière for Mr. Vanasse and Dr. Cameron of Inverness for Mr. Tupper, who wishes to be relieved of the duties pertaining to this committee, and to place Mr. Skinner on the committee instead of Mr. Ellis. The motion is as follows:—

That a Select Committee be appointed to supervise the Official Reports of the Debates of this House during the present Session, with power to report from time to time; to be composed of Messrs. Béchard, Cameron (Inverness), Charlton, Davin, Desjardins (Hochelaga), Innes, LaRivière, Prior, Scriver, Skinner, Somerville, Taylor, Weldon, and White (Cardwell).

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman was kind enough to mention this matter to me, and at the moment I saw no objection to the names he proposed, but, on hearing the changes he proposes, I find that the proportion of the two parties on this committee is somewhat altered from the proportion last year. I find that the Opposition has one member less on the committee than it had last year, and it seems to me that if any change were made, it ought to be made in the other direction.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would, therefore, suggest that the motion should be left over until to-morrow.

Motion postponed.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

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

Mr. HAZEN. In rising to move the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne with which His Excellency the Governor General has been pleased to open the First Session of the Seventh Parliament of the Dominion of Canada, I feel that, as a young member of the House, and as a member without experience in parliamentary matters, I may well be pardoned if I follow in the well-worn footsteps of gentlemen who, in previous Sessions, have preceded me in this duty, and pursue the time-honoured custom of asking the kind indulgence of the House in the remarks which I am about to make. It is well understood that the formality of a Speech from the Throne—a formality which, like many of our institutions, is derived from the mother country—is intended to enable a brief reference to be made to matters of administration and to convey to Parliament an idea of the important measures which will be submitted for their consideration, and though, in the Speech with which His Excellency opened this Parliament yesterday, the subjects referred to were not very numerous, they have yet, I feel, so important a bearing and so comprehensive a view in regard to the welfare of this country of ours that of this Speech it cannot be said, as has been said in criticism of others in the past, that it is more remarkable for its omissions than for what it contains. With the two first paragraphs of that Speech I feel satisfied that hon. members of this House, sitting on either side of your Honour, will agree, and that the sentiments expressed in them will strike a responsive chord in the hearts of all who have heard them. It is very important indeed in all legislative bodies that the deliberations should be carried on wisely, harmoniously and in a spirit of fairness, and it is especially important in a young country like this Canada of ours, standing, as I may say, on the very threshold of its career of welfare and prosperity, that the legislation should be not only of a progressive character, but should be along the lines which have characterized the legislation of this country for the past twelve years, and which have resulted in the development of its industries and natural resources and the amelioration and the betterment of its people. It is pleasing to know that the season which has just opened has opened so auspiciously for the interests and industries of the people of this country. It is pleasing to hear the reports made from every part of this Dominion, from the north and the south, from the east and the west, that there is every prospect that the farmers and the husbandmen of Canada will have their labours abundantly rewarded by the yield of a splendid harvest. With us in this country, as in every other country where agriculture is the mainstay of the population and the true basis of the nation's wealth, the quality of the harvest is the guarantee of the wealth of the people, and it is of the utmost importance that the crops should be successful. It is, therefore, to be hoped that this season will justify the hopes expressed

by His Excellency, and that its result will be as beneficial as its opening is auspicious. We will all agree, no matter on what side of the House our fortune, or our misfortune, may have placed us, in the wish that the labours of the manufacturers, the farmers, the fishermen, the miners and the lumberers of our country, the men whose labour and toil really make the country and produce its prosperity, may have their labours crowned with success, and that their endeavours may generously rewarded. The policy by which the North-West Territories were acquired by this Dominion and were subsequently opened up by the building of a splendid line of railway extending from ocean to ocean, has been the means of allowing civilization to spread its beneficent arms over the great West, and has added vastly to the area of our agricultural and settlement lands and has added very much to the greatness and the prestige which this country enjoys to-day in the eyes of the world. In view of this, I think that the visit of the tenant farmers to this country, whose admirable reports have been printed and published throughout England and Scotland, will be of great benefit to this country, as these practical men who came here to view the country for themselves and to give the result of their examination to the people of the country in which they live, will have the result—they being practical men and known to be such, and their reports being scattered broadcast amongst the people—of doing great service to Canada, and their visit will do more good than a hundred paid immigration agents, and, I think, will prove to be no small factor in attracting to our shores the population of the old world who are thinking of making for themselves a prosperous home in the new. I think we will find, as the result of this visit, our great western country peopled by men of good means, and becoming, as it ought to be, the happy home of many millions of prosperous freemen in the near future. I have read the pamphlets which have been cast broadcast on this subject, and I have read them with a great deal of pleasure. There is one report written by Mr. J. T. Wood, a tenant farmer who lives near Liverpool in Great Britain, and this is a sample of what he finds as illustrating what energy and intelligence can accomplish in this great Dominion. He says :

"One of the best managed farms in the neighbourhood of Brandon is that of Mr. Sandison; and although his success must be taken as much above the average, it nevertheless shows what is possible in a good district when a farmer is thoroughly master of his work, and understands the management of the soil. It is Mr. Sandison's pride to relate how, in 1884, he, as a farm labourer, entered the North-West, hiring himself as a servant at Carberry, and saving money until he was in a position to gradually and quietly acquire land; how, in 1886, he commenced farming on a half-section (320 acres), and being fortunate with each succeeding crop, has added annually to his area, until in 1890 he has 2,000 acres under cultivation, the purchase price of which is nearly all paid; he has 70 men who are housed and fed on the premises, and during the harvest season just completed had 40 horses and 14 self-binding machines. Mr. Sandison's crop of wheat, oats and barley (principally wheat), aggregated 60,000 bushels, and he estimates the value of his present property at £10,000, giving quite as much credit to the wonderful soil and climate as to his own pluck and clear head. Mr. Sandison maintains that Manitoba compares more than favourably with Dakota, and that its superior advantages will soon be universally recognized.

In the face of these facts can we have the slightest doubt about the prosperity and the success which will, in the near future, attend the western part of this Canada of ours? It was, I think, most expedient and very proper that the advisers of His Excellency, late last year, should have reminded the Government of the great Republic to the south, of our willingness to join with them in developing the trade between the two countries. In doing this the Government of the day were simply following out the policy which we have pursued in this country ever since the year 1879, when they caused that policy to be embodied in an Act which was then placed upon our Statute-book. Now, Sir, it must also be very gratifying to this House to know that, our Government having reminded the Government of the United States of their willingness to treat with them, a time has been fixed in the month of October next for holding a conference for the purpose, not only of considering trade matters, but for the purpose, also, if possible, of arriving at an amicable settlement of all matters in dispute between the two countries, including the fishery quesion and the Behring Sea dispute. That conference, I believe, will be watched with very great interest by the people of the whole of this North American Continent. The relations and the interests of the people of the two countries which compose the northern part of this continent, are, in a commercial way, in a social way, and in a friendly way, closely interwoven in many respects, and I believe that if a fair reciprocity treaty can be effected along the lines of the old Treaty of 1854, it will be of considerable benefit to both countries, and that it will meet with favour from all parties in the Dominion of Canada. But while I say that, and while I believe that the people of this Dominion are willing to go a considerable distance for the purpose of negotiating a reciprocity treaty on terms fair and honourable to Canada, and on terms fair and honourable to the United States, at the same time I think I am voicing the sentiments of a great majority of the electors of Canada, as was shown by the recent election, when I say that so long as we maintain our British connection—as I trust we will continue to do for all time to come—as long as we continue under the protecting ægis of the British flag, as we have been for the past 200 years, as long as we have the strong right arm of England at our back, and enjoy the protection of her army and navy—as long as that is the case, I think, as I said before, that the people of this great Dominion will not approve of an arrangement which would hand over the control of our tariff to the American Congress at Washington, and which would discriminate against the mother land in favour of a foreign country, however much we may esteem the people of that country. As this conference is to consider, not only the trade relations between the two countries, but the other outstanding difficulties between them as well, it is only fit and proper that the provisions of the *modus vivendi* should be continued in operation for another year. That *modus vivendi*, as, of course, the hon. members of the House all know, was agreed upon for the purpose of giving the Senate of the United States time to ratify the Treaty of 1888. That treaty, as we know, Sir, has not been ratified by the Senate of the United States; but I feel that at the present time, in view of this conference to be held at Washington, nothing should occur which would in the slightest degree cause any friction, or which would mar in any way the friendly relations existing between the two coun-

tries. Therefore, I think that hon. members on both sides of the House, seeing that this conference will shortly take place, will appreciate the importance of continuing the operations of the *modus vivendi* for another year, in order to prevent the possibility of anything occurring which would mar the friendly relations which at present exist between the two countries, or which would present any increased difficulty to the representatives of the two countries when they meet at Washington to consider the different matters that are in dispute. A consideration of the *modus vivendi* reminds me of the question affecting the fisheries of this country; and as I come from a maritime constituency in which there are many hardy fishermen, I know that the House will excuse me for devoting a few moments to that subject. We, living in the Maritime Provinces, probably appreciate the fisheries of the Dominion of Canada more highly than do the people of the western Provinces. These fisheries are of great importance, and are a great source of employment to a very large number of men, and yield to this country every year the sum of—in round numbers, I believe—about 17 million dollars. Now, it is only right and proper that we should in every way protect and preserve for our own people that magnificent heritage which Providence has placed upon our shores and in the sea surrounding our country. It is of the utmost importance that the people of a foreign country should not be allowed to come into our waters and take our fish unless they pay an equivalent, or give something in return for the privilege of doing so. It is, moreover, it seems to me, the duty especially of the Marine and Fisheries Department of this country, so to watch over and protect those fisheries that there may be no danger of their being lessened at any time, and that they may continue to yield the magnificent return, the magnificent harvest, if I may say so, which they have yielded in the past. In this connection, I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to a condition of things which exists, as I am informed by fishermen in my own locality, in regard to the herring fishery in the Bay of Fundy. Along the islands in Charlotte County, in the Province of New Brunswick, in Grand Manan, Campobello and other islands, and along the coast, large weirs, called brush weirs, are erected for the purpose of catching small fish, which are then taken across to Eastport, in the State of Maine, and sold there to sardine factories for the purpose of being manufactured into sardines. I am told by the fishermen along that part of the coast, that this practice is doing great injury to the herring fishery in the Bay of Fundy, that this wholesale destruction of small fish is not only endangering the herring fishery, but is also injuring the larger fish, the cod, haddock and hake, which follow these small fish and live upon them as food. In this way, the practice which I have referred to is doing an injury to the general fisheries of the Bay of Fundy, and I wish, on this occasion, to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to these facts, and to ask that they may receive, in the future, his most careful consideration. The next matter which is referred to in the Speech of His Excellency, is one of very deep interest to the people of the Maritime Provinces and to all those in Canada who are interested in the shipping of our country; it refers to what may be called the load-line legislation of the Imperial Parliament in the year 1890; and as there are some hon. gentlemen here who may, perhaps, not thoroughly understand this question, I may take a few moments to explain the legislation now existing on that subject. In 1890 a Bill was introduced into the Imperial Parliament to amend the Merchants' Shipping Act regarding load-lines, which Act was passed in 1876. That legislation provided for a compulsory load-line, to be arbitrarily fixed for all vessels sailing the British flag by the Board of Trade, either by their own officers or by the officers or surveyors of any other corporation—such, for instance, as Lloyds. It is felt in the Maritime Provinces especially that that legislation would militate against the interest of our ship-owners. Our tonnage in Canada is made up principally of wooden vessels, entirely different in model and construction from the iron and steel vessels which make up the tonnage of Great Britain. Our vessels are shorter, of deeper hold and broader beam, and better dead weight carriers, and few, if any, casualties have ever occurred to them from over-loading, and it was felt that they were likely to be affected, prejudiciously, by any load-line arbitrarily fixed by the surveyors of the Board of Trade or of Lloyds, who would apply to them the same rule that they apply in fixing the load line on the steam and iron ships of Great Britain; and so great injury would be done to the shipping interest of the Maritime Provinces. Consequently, petitions were sent up from all the principal ports in the Maritime Provinces—from Halifax, Pictou, St. John and other places, asking the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to endeavour to have that legislation changed in the interest of the ship-owners of Canada. The Minister of Marine corresponded with the High Commissioner, the High Commissioner corresponded with the British Government, and after considerable correspondence between the High Commissioner and the British Government, and between the High Commissioner and the Minister of Marine, as a concession to Canada a clause was inserted in the Bill providing that if in any British possession enactments were framed for the marking, fixing and registering of the load-line on vessels owned and registered in such British possession, such legislation would be satisfactory to the Board of Trade, providing the enactments were based upon the same principle as was the enactment contained in the Imperial Act. In consequence of such condition of affairs, a Bill will be submitted for our consideration during the present Session, providing for the fixing of a load line on our Canadian vessels; and I confidently hope and expect that such legislation will be so framed as not to prejudicially interfere with our vessels or place them at a disadvantage in competition with the soft-wood vessels sailing under the flags of other countries which have no such restriction, because, if they were placed at a disadvantage in that regard there would be danger that our vessels might be forced under the flags of nations where no such restriction exists. So, coming from a constituency where many of the people are interested in vessels employed in the coasting trade, I desire to express the hope that, in the load-line legislation to be submitted, our vessels engaged in that trade will be exempt from its provisions. Hand in hand with the legislation concerning the load-line is the legisla-

tion concerning the Admiralty Courts of the country. This legislation becomes necesary in consequence of Imperial legislation. On 25th July, 1890, a Bill became law in Great Britain, entitled "An Act to amend the law respecting the exercise of Admiralty Jurisdiction in Her Majesty's Dominions and elsewhere, out of the United Kingdom." Clause 3 proves as follows :—

"(3). The Legislature of a British possession may by any Colonial law—

"(a.) Declare any court of unlimited civil jurisdiction, whether original or appellate, in that possession, to be a Colonial Court of Admiralty, and provide for the exercise of such court of its jurisdiction under this Act, and limit, territorially or otherwise, the extent of such jurisdiction; and

"(b.) Confer upon any inferior or subordinate court in that possession such partial or limited Admiralty jurisdiction under such regulations and with such appeal (if any) as may seem fit:

"Provided that any such Colonial law shall not confer any jurisdiction which is not by this Act conferred upon a Colonial Court of Admiralty."

Under these conditions of the Imperial Act a Bill will be introduced into this House conferring jurisdiction on certain of our courts which will act as Courts of Admiralty and try suits arising out of collisions and otherwise, which are now dealt with by the Vice-Admiralty Courts of the country. At present there is an appeal from the Vice-Admiralty Court to the Privy Council. Under the Bill to be introduced there will be an appeal from the Admiralty Court to our appellate courts and also to the Privy Council; and I trust, in framing the Bill, due regard will be had to the convenience of the different localities in which the Vice-Admiralty Courts are situated at present, and in which the shipping interests are centred. Another piece of legislation of importance that will come before the House is a Bill for the codification of the Criminal Laws of the Dominion. The codification will be along the lines of the Sir James Fitzjames Stephen's Code, which has given such great satisfaction to the members of the bench and the bar, and all interested in criminal matters in Great Britain. It will contain the common law relating to criminal law and procedure, as well as the provisions of existing statutes. This will be a matter of very great importance to the community, and will act very beneficially in like manner as the consolidation of the different Acts relating to bills of exchange and promissory notes which took place last Session, and we know what great convenience has resulted from that Act in its present form. I do not wish in any way to anticipate the remarks which the hon. the Minister of Finance will address to this House when he comes to deliver his Budget Speech, and, therefore, as regards the finances of the country, I will content myself by simply expressing the opinion that when the accounts for the past year are laid before the House it will be found that the finances of the Dominion are in an exceedingly healthy condition. It will be found, among other things, that during the year the revenue of the country has been ample to meet the ordinary expenditures, and also to carry over a large amount to capital account as well; that during 1890 we paid in interest $8,904,944.61 as against $9,192,995.44 paid in 1889; and also that during the year ending 1st July, 1890, we paid in interest a sum less than in any of the four preceding years. It will be gratifying to the House to know that the average rate of interest for the past year was 3·75 per cent., or a less rate than has been paid by this country since the days of Confederation. It must be a matter of supreme pleasure to hon. members to find that the credit of the country stands so high in the money markets of the world, that we are able to borrow money at a less rate than ever before, and our credit, placed side by side with that of other countries of the world, does not suffer by comparison. Concerning the finances of the current year, I will confine myself to stating that it will be found that the trade of the country has been well maintained, that the credit of the country has been sustained, that the various services have been generously supplied, that the different sources of revenue have provided not only for the ordinary expenditures but have furnished a handsome surplus to be carried to capital account. Now that the great trunk lines of railway have been completed, now that the canal system has been almost completed, now that the greatest expenditures for public works necessary to be undertaken for more than half a century have been made, we may congratulate ourselves that the addition to our permanent debt from year to year will not be a large amount, at least not more than we may reasonably expect in years to come, with our increased population, to be able to bear without burdening the tax-payers of the country. There is a matter outside of the four corners of the Address to which I wish to refer before I take my seat. It may not be the usual course to follow, but, coming from a constituency of the Maritime Provinces, which have been most grossly and most unjustly assailed by an hon. gentleman who occupies a high position in this House, and a leading place in the councils of his party, I feel, as a representative of the Maritime Provinces, I should not be doing my duty to the people I represent did I not, on the floor of Parliament, take the first opportunity afforded me of denying and resenting the statements which that hon. gentleman hurled broadcast through the country, to the discredit of the people of the Maritime Provinces. In a letter addressed to his constituents by that hon. gentleman, who for many years has occupied a conspicuous place in the political history of the country, in an address signed by the hon. gentleman and sent broadcast throughout the Dominion by means of the newspapers, as the clouds of the recent election were clearing away, I find the people of the Maritime Provinces have been most grossly insulted and most unfairly dealt with. In that letter, written by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), the following appears :—

"Our opponents' array, on the other hand, is mostly, literally, a thing of shreds and patches, made up of ragged remnants from half a dozen minor Provinces, the great majority of whom do not even pretend to be actuated by any principle save that of securing a good slice of boodle for themselves and the sections or constituencies they respectively represent, and who know besides that popular feeling in those very provinces is strongly and distinctly in favour of our policy, though actual cash in hand or in the shape of railway subsidies has proved too much for the virtue of a majority of the voting population in many instances."

The hon. gentleman nods his head in assent to that statement. I might have made excuses for the hon. gentleman, considering the state of his feelings just after the recent elections, for we know that "hope deferred maketh the heart sick," and I, for one, would be glad to know that in his cooler moments he should be ready to repudiate such a

gross slander on the people of the Maritime Provinces. When I first read that address, had I not known that the hon. gentleman was a man of education, and a man who understood the full force and meaning of his language, I would have believed he could not have understood the full import, the full meaning, and the full insult to the people, that are contained in the paragraph I have just read. I wish now to say from my seat in this House, that the people in the Maritime Provinces—the Province of New Brunswick for whom I specially speak—have just as much regard for principle, just as much regard for the right, and just as much respect for what is honourable in political matters as the hon. gentleman, who speaks of them as if they were dirt beneath his knightly feet, himself has for those principles. During the recent elections in the Province of New Brunswick there was never a mention made of a railway subsidy, from one end of the country to the other. I speak with special reference to the Province from which I come, and I speak for the largest and most important constituency in that Province, the City and County of St. John, which I have the honour to represent. In the recent contest in that constituency there was, from beginning to end, but one question discussed before the electors on the public platform, by the different candidates and in the public press, and that question was: Is unrestricted reciprocity, as defined by the hon. gentleman himself, as defined by the hon. leader of the Opposition, as defined by the leaders of the Liberal party, and as defined by Mr. Wiman in the *North American Review*, is that policy of unrestricted reciprocity in the best interests of the country, or is it not? That, Sir, was the sole question at issue. We asked the electors: Are you in favour of unrestricted reciprocity, when the logical results of such a policy must be as they are defined to be by its authors; or are you in favour of attempting to obtain a modified form of reciprocity while still cherishing our British connection? That was the one question discussed on every platform and in the columns of every newspaper in the Province of New Brunswick. I venture to say that the gentlemen who were our opponents in the constituency during the recent contests—one of whom is a gentleman who was for many years in this House, and who held the esteem and personal good-will of the hon. members on both sides of the House—I say that our opponents in that contest will not contend that there was a single side issue introduced; they will not say that the constituency was bribed; they will not say that the people had cash in hand or promises of railway subsidies, but they will admit that the contest was fought fairly and squarely on the question before the electorate, even though their votes were contrary to the wishes of our opponents. In the City and County of St. John the majority for the successful candidates was so large that it is simply idle talk to speak about cash in hand and railway subsidies. In the county represented by the hon. member on my right (Mr. Wood, Westmoreland), who came back with a majority of nearly 2,000 votes, it is idle to speak about the offer of bribes and railway subsidies. Taking the Province as a whole, the popular majority, fairly and freely given by the people, amounted to over 5,000 votes, the largest popular majority ever obtained in the Province by any political party. In view of these facts, I need say but little in repudiation of the slanderous statement the hon. gentleman has published in the other provinces concerning the Province of New Brunswick. In order that I may show the proper lesson to be drawn from the result of the election in the Maritime Provinces, I wish to read a statement of a leading Liberal in my constituency: the statement of a gentleman who is a personal friend of my own, but who, I regret to say, does not see eye to eye with me on political questions,—I speak of Mr. Allan Jack, the Recorder of the city of St. John. That gentleman was one of our strongest opponents on the platform during the recent campaign, and on the 27th day of March, he wrote a letter to the Toronto *Week* giving his views on the elections in the Maritime Provinces. That letter concluded as follows:—

> "Upon the whole, and entirely outside of party considerations, the result of the elections in the Maritime Provinces may be regarded as significant proof that the various sections of Canada are becoming more consolidated, and that some description of British connection with the Dominion is strongly desired."

That, Sir, is the fair opinion of a gentleman who was one of our most active, vigorous and able opponents in the campaign. I ask you to place it side by side with the letter addressed to his constituents by the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and to take your choice as to which statement you will approve of. Now, Sir, I feel I have taken up the time of the House for too long a time in dealing with this matter, for it may be considered outside the four corners of the Address, but I feel it my duty as one of the representatives of the Maritime Provinces to avail myself of the first opportunity to show how actually destitute of foundation in fact is this statement which has been circulated by the hon. gentleman in the Province of Ontario. As a young man coming to this House, desirous of forming right ideas on the models of the leaders of parties, I did regret to find that a man who aspires to be the leader of a great party in this country, instead of attempting to solidify the different Provinces of the Dominion, instead of attempting to draw us all together and to make us feel, as we do feel in the Province of New Brunswick, that we are the people of a common country,—I regretted to find that he should endeavour to raise sectional cries and to make reference to certain provinces of this great Dominion, repudiating us and insinuating that those provinces have not the same rights as a part of this Dominion, which our larger provinces have. It appears to me, that true statesmanship in this country should be directed along the lines of healing up any differences that might have existed at the time of Confederation, and of enabling our people (whether we belong to the wealthy Province of Ontario, to the historic and populous Province of Quebec, to the Prairie Provinces, to the Maritime Provinces, or to British Columbia), to be able to say with heart and soul upon all occasions, that we are citizens of this our common country, and that we are proud of the distinction of being Canadians. I am glad to say, Sir, that this is the spirit which is actuating the young men of the Province of New Brunswick to-day; the young men to whom we owe the recent great victory at the polls. These young men are forgetting the battle of Confederation, they are forgetting the differences of the past, and they are realizing that

they are citizens of a country of which they are proud, and a country of which they will be prouder in the future, as it prospers and grows great, along the lines of nationality within the British Empire of which we form a part. I desire, Mr. Speaker, to thank the members of the House for the very attentive and patient hearing they have given me. I desire on my own behalf, and on behalf of my constituency, and especially on behalf of the young men of that constituency, to thank the Government for having done me the honour of asking me to move the Address to-day. That Address is moved by one who represents a constituency, the boundaries of which are washed by the blue waves of the Atlantic Ocean, and it will be seconded by an hon. gentleman who represents a constituency 4,000 miles away on the shores of the peaceful Pacific. Could any greater demonstration be afforded, could anything more clearly show the vast extent, the vast resources, and the vast capabilities of the Dominion of Canada? In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I think I may be allowed to quote the concluding paragraph of His Excellency's Address, and to express the hope that our "deliberations may be Divinely aided, and that our wisdom and patriotism may enlarge the prosperity of the Dominion and promote in every way the well-being of its people."

Mr. CORBOULD. Mr. Speaker, in rising to second the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, I fully appreciate the honour which the right hon. the First Minister has conferred upon me in requesting me to do so. I am fully aware of my unfitness and inability to perform that important duty, and I must, therefore, crave the indulgence of the hon. members of this House, and depend upon their generosity in extending to me that kindly consideration which is usually shown to new and inexperienced members. I observe in the Speech from the Throne that His Excellency has caused the Administration of the United States to be reminded that the Government of Canada are willing to open negotiations for the extension of our trade relations with that country. Canada for the last thirty-six years has been trying to obtain a satisfactory trade treaty with the United States. I am aware, Sir, that Canada was very prosperous under the Treaty of 1854—so much so that the United States Government thought proper to do away with that treaty. Since that time Canada has always been willing to enter into a treaty based upon the terms similar to those set forth in the Treaty of 1854, but all her efforts have met with refusal upon some pretext or pretension on the part of the Washington Government. I think, Sir, we may congratulate ourselves upon the firm stand our Government has taken on this question; for although Canada has always been willing to enter into a reciprocity treaty with the United States, still the Government of Canada has not been willing to barter away our political independence and our British connection to obtain it. I am sure, Sir, that both sides of this House will read with pleasure that part of His Excellency's Speech in which it is stated that the differences of an international character between Canada and the United States are to be speedily settled. As to the Behring Sea question, it is one in which the province in which I have the pleasure to reside is, perhaps, more interested than any other province in the Dominion. A larger amount of capital has been invested in the sailing fleet of British Columbia, and it is somewhat hard for the gentlemen engaged in that business to stand by and see their ships, their furs and their all seized and taken from them without the slightest cause by a foreign power upon the high seas, and not resort to force to maintain their rights. This House and the people of this Dominion ought to give great credit to those hardy sailors for the good sense they have shown and the patience and forbearance they have exercised, in waiting for an amicable settlement of this question. I may, therefore, venture to hope, Sir, that with the prospect of a speedy settlement of this question in view, this House may see proper to adopt the measures to be brought forward dealing with it. Whatever measure is brought before us relative to the jurisdiction of the Admiralty Court, I hope, with the honourable mover of the Address, that due regard will be shown to the various circumstances existing in the different provinces. I am also particularly glad to see that the Government intend to bring down a measure to simplify and improve the criminal law of Canada. There have been many miscarriages of justice, particularly in connection with proceedings before justices of the peace, and any measure that will simplify the law in this direction will be welcomed by those people who have charge of the administration of justice in country places, where books and legal advice are hard to obtain. One of the most important measures promised in His Excellency's Speech is that relating to the foreshores of the Dominion. I hope to see the property in these foreshores vested in the provinces, so that they may have the control and management of the surveys which it will be absolutely necessary to make in the near future. Unless those foreshores are placed in charge of the provinces, I am sure that a great deal of litigation will arise, and the decisions given may not always be satisfactory. I notice that His Excellency has made mention of proposed amendments to the Acts relating to the North-West Territories. It is to be hoped that the promised measure will effectually deal with the liquor question, for I think it is of vital importance to the people residing in those territories, surrounded as they are by Indians, that effective legislation should be at once adopted on this question. I have no doubt that the proposed amendments will also deal with the question of the dual languages, upon which a resolution was passed by the late Parliament last Session, and I venture to hope that that question will be dealt with in a manner satisfactory not only to those territories, but to the country at large. I would like, Sir, to say a few words relative to the Province of British Columbia. I would like to see the members of the Government pay more frequent visits to that Province. I would like to see every member of this House pay a visit to British Columbia. It requires a personal knowledge of that province to realize its beauties and its richness, and to understand what a prize the Dominion of Canada secured when British Columbia came into the Confederation. I think I may safely say that that province is to-day the most prosperous in the Dominion. Our lumber business, our coal mines, our fishing and agricultural industries, are all in a flourishing condition, and year by year are increasing in prosperity. The people of my own district would particularly welcome a visit from the hon. Minister of Marine

and Fisheries, so that he might obtain personal knowledge of the salmon-canning industry, and judge for himself what rules and regulations are necessary to govern that important business. It has been said by the Opposition press that the Government is losing power in this country. I think that remark does not apply to the Province of British Columbia, for out of the six representatives returned by that Province to this honourable House, two were returned by acclamation, the opponents of three lost their deposits, and the sixth was opposed by a Conservative. I think that British Columbia did her duty, and she will be prepared to do it again when the occasion arises. I have much pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in seconding this motion.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentlemen who moved and seconded the resolution, Mr. Speaker, now in your hands, might well have dispensed with claiming the indulgence of the House, because they certainly stood in no need of it. The hon. the mover of the resolution, though young in years, displayed all the art, and, I might perhaps add, all the agressiveness of an old stager, and I have much pleasure in extending to him, as well as to the seconder of the Address, my very hearty congratulations on the manner in which they have both discharged the duties they undertook. The "manner," I say advisedly. The language, the delivery, the patriotic effusions with which their remarks were suffused, were all very enjoyable and thoroughly enjoyed by the House. I am sorry, however, that I cannot extend the same encomium on the matter of their speeches or the facts—rather what were given and accepted by the other side as facts—and the arguments drawn from those facts, or rather the long stretches of imagination which supplied the place of arguments and facts. I do not say this in any spirit of disparagement—far from it. It seems to me the hon. gentlemen deserve great credit for the manner in which they contrived to build upon such slender material; I appeal to the right hon. gentleman to admit, as I am sure—if he has not lost all sense of right—he must admit, that this verbose document, known as the Speech from the Throne upon the present occasion, is a very dry skeleton. The right hon. gentleman, on a former occasion, characterized the Speech from the Throne as shining in omissions. I think if there ever was a Speech which shone by omissions, it is the present one. It is literally bristling with omissions. I fail, for instance, to see in it any reference to the causes of the dissolution of the late Parliament. So far, we have never had any explanation from a responsible Minister, why Parliament was dissolved, and we naturally expected that, at least on the present occasion, this omission would be supplied, and some of the reasons given which were urged upon His Excellency as excuses for dissolving the late Parliament. I submit to the House, that this keeping the country in ignorance as to why Parliament was dissolved, is a breach of the constitutional law. I fail likewise to see any reference to the repeal of the Franchise Act, the uselessness of which has been thoroughly demonstrated, since it has been made clear that an election can take place without an annual revision. I fail likewise to see any reference to an amendment of the electoral law, which would prevent a recurrence of outrages such as those which have disgraced the late election. I fail likewise to see any reference to the conveyance of mails from this country to Europe. For the last forty years until now, the mails have been carried from this colony to the mother land in Canadian bottoms. Two years ago the Minister of Finance told us that this system was antiquated, and that he was about to provide us with a better system—with a system as good as any then in existence—and the result of his efforts has been that the antiquated system has ceased but has not been replaced by any system at all. Would the House believe it, the hon. the Postmaster General is today sending the mails of this loyal country, this country bristling with sentiments of loyalty, to the mother land, through the United States *viâ* the port of New York. I denounce the Postmaster General as a traitor, whether veiled or unveiled I shall not say, for I am not sufficiently posted in the ethics of loyalty, as they are understood by the Conservative party to do so; but, according to my blunt judgment, and according to the views laid down by hon. gentlemen themselves, the Postmaster General is a traitor whom I denounce to the indignation of the loyal men and true who stand around him. By way of compensation, however, we are promised measures—for what? For the transfer of the jurisdiction formerly belonging to the Vice-Admiralty Court to some other court; for the codification of the Criminal laws; for legislation concerning the foreshores of the Dominion, the North-West Territories, the Exchequer Court and Trade Marks. Well, with the exception of the Bill relating to the North-West Territories, which is a very important measure indeed, all the other measures are very dry bones; and it would be almost useless for the right hon. gentleman, as it was useless for the hon. gentlemen who moved and seconded the Address, to clothe with flesh, sinews and veins such bones as these and to breathe into them the breath of life. But the hon. gentlemen early took the opportunity to depart from the four corners of the Speech, as was said by one of them, and to launch at once into the sea of Conservative exultation and Conservative laudation. When the debate was opened, I was prepared for much, but I did not expect that the hon. gentleman from St. John (Mr. Hazen) would have had the courage to boast of the continued confidence of the country in the present Administration as exhibited in the late election. The continued confidence of the country in the present Administration—where is it?

Mr. WELDON. Right here.

Mr. LAURIER. Certainly not in this House. When this House last met the Ministerial ranks were not only filled up on the opposite side but also on this, so as hardly to leave us a small corner. But where are now the serried ranks of the Ministerial party? Where are they? Battered, shattered, crushed, simply from their contact with the will, the mind, and the heart of the people. Why, it seemed to me, when I heard the paean of the hon. the mover of the Address in praise of the Conservative triumph, that he must have felt, as did King Pyrrhus, when congratulated on a victory by his troops over the legions of Rome, and could say with him: Another such victory and we are undone. Hon. gentlemen opposite may applaud any reference

to the continued confidence of the people in the present Administration, but they know full well, every man of them, that such boasting is simply sound and nothing else. Why, there is not a supporter of the Government who would dare to lay the policy of his party—that hazy, misty, undulating, fluctuating, shifting mass of contradiction, which constitutes the policy of the Conservative party—before the people, unless the people had been in advance gagged, as gagged they were in the last election—yes, gagged, shackled and manacled—gagged, shackled and manacled by iniquitous laws—gagged, shackled and manacled by laws which have mutilated the boundaries of counties so as to swamp the voice of the people therein, by laws which left the preparation of the lists of voters in the hands of the Government, by laws which left the printing of the lists in the hands of the Government, by laws which have allowed the Government to appoint the revising officers of those lists, by laws which allowed the Government to appoint most unblushing partizans to that office, by laws which allowed them to perpetrate the most disgraceful frauds in favour of the Government from whom they have received their appointments. The hon. gentlemen speak of the continued confidence of the country in the Government. That confidence to which they refer is only expressed by the aids of such iniquitous measures as those to which I refer, supplemented by other iniquitous modes of bribing constituencies, worse than ever known in any country, and that is what they call receiving the continued confidence of the people, but they have never received the continued confidence of the people of the country. If the hon. gentleman is sincere in his belief that he had at the late elections the continued confidence of the people of the country, let him repeal these iniquitous Acts,—let him repeal the Gerrymander Act, let him repeal the Franchise Act, and then dissolve Parliament, and we will meet him face to face before the country on even ground, and then, I venture to say, his majority of to-day will be wiped out and not even enough will be left to form a corporal's guard. Then again, I ask, why was there a dissolution? The power of dissolution is one which should at all times be sparingly exercised, and should only be exercised for cause. The duration of Parliament is fixed by law, and, while the power to dissolve Parliament is certainly left to the Crown, it is not left to the whim or the caprice of the Crown, but has to be exercised on the advice of the Ministers, and those Ministers are responsible to the people of this country. The reasons which are given to His Excellency, advising him to dissolve Parliament, should be communicated at once to Parliament. That is the spirit of the Constitution; that is the spirit of the British Constitution for which hon. gentlemen opposite profess so much admiration, and to which they profess so much devotion, but they never hesitate to stab it if, by stabbing it, they can gain a party advantage. But I ask, of all the reasons which were urged upon the Governor General to induce him to dissolve Parliament, did we ever hear any reason given to Parliament, did we ever hear any reason coming from the lips of a Minister of the Crown? Never, to this day. It is true that we have had some reference made to it in the Ministerial press. For instance, in the month of February last, the Montreal *Gazette*, one of the leading organs of the Administration, had this despatch, which was evidently inspired from Ottawa:

"Ottawa, February 2nd.—The Sixth Parliament of Canada is at an end. Acting on the advice of his responsible Ministers, His Excellency the Governor General has been pleased to dissolve the House of Commons and issue his writs for a new Parliament. Nominations will take place on Thursday, February 26, polling on Thursday, March 5. The writs are to be dated February 4, and made returnable on April 25.

"In view of the foregoing important statement the question will naturally be asked, what are the reasons which has induced the Government to appeal to the country at the present time? It is understood that the Dominion Government had, through Her Majesty's Government, made certain proposals to the United States for negotiations looking to an extension of her commerce with that country. The proposals have been submitted to the President for his consideration, and the Canadian Government is of the opinion that if the negotiations are to result in a treaty, which must be ratified by the Parliament of Canada, it is expedient that the Government should be able to deal with a Parliament fresh from the people rather than with a moribund House."

We have some reason to believe, though everything stated here is not true, that the bulk of the statement is true, and that the advice tendered to His Excellency to dissolve Parliament was because the Government desired to obtain power in order to obtain a renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854. We have also been favoured with a communication which consists of the correspondence between His Excellency the Governor General and the Imperial authorities, and we find there a document dated the 13th December last, as follows:

"Government House,
Ottawa, 13th Dec., 1890.

"My Lord,—I have the honour to send to your lordship to-day a telegraphic despatch in cipher of which the following is the substance:

"With reference to my telegram of the 10th inst., the Government is desirous to propose a joint commission, to deal without limitation and to prepare a treaty representing the following subjects:

"(1) Renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854."

But even if the reason urged upon His Excellency for dissolving the existing Parliament was this, we find immediately that there was a change of front, because, a few days afterwards, the hon. gentleman issued a manifesto to the people of Canada, and in that manifesto there is not a word to be found in regard to that reciprocity treaty. I have the manifesto here, and this is the first part of it:—

"*To the Electors of Canada:*

"Gentlemen,—The momentous questions now engaging public attention having, in the opinion of the Ministry, reached that stage when it is desirable that an opportunity should be given to the people of expressing at the polls their views thereon, the Governor General has been advised to terminate the existence of the present House of Commons and to issue writs summoning a new Parliament."

Sir, you will see that not a word from the first to the last, if you read that manifesto through, is used about any conference with regard to obtaining a new reciprocity treaty, how limited soever it might be. What was the reason given to His Excellency for dissolving Parliament? It is stated that it was to negotiate a treaty, and yet, in the manifesto, not a word was said of the treaty, but the whole argument to which the hon. gentleman devoted himself was one of favour of the continuance of the National Policy. The reason for this is clear and obvious. There are two principal classes in the Dominion of Canada. There are farmers on the one side and manufacturers on the other. The hon. gentleman will pardon me for the

simile which I am about to use, of the bat who one day fell among the birds and the other day fell among the rats. When he fell among the birds he said: Look at my wings, I am one of your tribe. When, the next day, he fell among the rats he said: Look at my claws, I am one of your tribe. So the hon. gentleman says, when he is among the farmers: I want to soar like the birds to reciprocity—here is the correspondence which I have brought down. But when he gets among the manufacturers, and particularly among the monopolists, he says: Look at my claws, I am one of your tribe; and, like you, I have still the people of this country to prey upon. There was another argument produced in the manifesto of the hon. gentleman. In that he appealed to the people of this country on their prejudices, and on the worst prejudices that could possibly be used against an Opposition. The only plea, the only argument he had was to say, that the policy of the Opposition was a disloyal policy, that it was likely to lead to annexation, and it was hostile to Great Britain. Loyalty? I am reminded here of the words of Madame Roland when she was led to the scaffold. She was one who had contributed to the French Revolution, and she fell a victim to the passions she had aroused but could not control. When she was led to the scaffold and was compelled to bow to the statue of Liberty, she exclaimed: "Oh, liberty, how many crimes are committed in thy name?" We in Canada have to ask how many crimes are committed in the name of loyalty. But, if the reason given to His Excellency for dissolving Parliament was the reason given in the ministerial press, namely, to obtain power from the people to initiate a new treaty on the grounds of the Treaty of 1854, that was merely a pretence and nothing else. It was certainly no good reason. There never was a minute since the year 1866, when the late treaty was terminated, when every Government in this country had not ample power to negotiate another such a treaty. There never was a public man in this country, whether on that side of the House or on this side, who was not prepared at any moment to negotiate a treaty on that line. Yes; there was one exception, the late President of the Council, Mr. Colby, who has just paid the penalty for such unpatriotic opinions. Why, Mr. Speaker, there is more than that. The National Policy even was a means to an end, that end being the renewal of the reciprocity treaty. The resolution has been quoted more than once in this House, but the memory of hon. gentlemen opposite is so treacherous, it is so defective, that I feel bound to repeat the language of the right hon. gentleman himself. The famous motion upon which the appeal to the country was made in 1877, after having recited what the National Policy would do, went on as follows:—

"That this House is of opinion that the welfare of Canada requires the adoption of the National Policy which."——

And so on. And then it states:

"In moving as it ought to do in the direction of a reciprocity of tariff with our neighbours, so far as the varied interests of Canada may demand, will greatly tend to procure for this country eventually, a reciprocity of trade."

It has been contended by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House that this policy had been endorsed three times over by the people of Canada—in 1878, 1882 and 1887. If that is the case, was it not simple mockery, was it not an insult to the Crown, to ask for power to dissolve Parliament on that issue, when the policy of the Government had been endorsed again and again, and affirming the necessity of such a treaty? Sir, it was a mere pretence. The true reason was that the policy of the Opposition was gaining ground and the Government took fright. The only reason was that the sense of what the country needs is developing in this country in favour of greater freedom of trade, in favour of the view that however satisfactory unrestricted reciprocity might have been at one time, it would be more satisfactory at the present time. Sir, the right hon. gentleman is a good judge of weather; he can scan the political horizon as well, and perhaps better, than any man living. He foresaw that the tide was rising, impetuous, irresistible, in favour of greater freedom of trade. He saw that his only hope of reaching port, if he wanted to reach port again, was to put to sea at once, for if he were to wait till the tide had reached its height, he knew very well that his leaky craft would be shattered to pieces under the surging indignation of a long, long-suffering people. I say that is the reason, and the only reason. Sir, I do not give my own statement alone on this point, I have the authority of hon. gentlemen opposite. I speak by the book, because I speak after Sir Charles Tupper himself. In an interview with the London correspondent of the Toronto *Globe* had lately with Sir Charles Tupper, that hon. gentleman was reported to have made the following statement:—

"If the Liberal party in Canada had adhered to Mr. Blake's Malvern speech, and the election had been postponed for another year, the Liberals would have gained a majority in the House of Commons. The Government had triumphed from their opponents' blunders."

You have it here stated by Sir Charles himself, that if the election had been postponed for another year the Liberals would have triumphed. It is true that Sir Charles Tupper stated immediately afterwards that the Government triumphed through the blunders of their opponents; but I think we all know Sir Charles Tupper sufficiently well to understand that when he speaks of the blunders of his opponents, he means exactly the reverse. The Opposition blundered, but still it was necessary to prevent these blunders from having their effect upon the country, but if the Government had allowed the Opposition to blunder one year longer, the former were undone, and it was to prevent the effect of the Opposition's blunders that the Government charitably came to their rescue and ordered the elections at once. Sir, if the Opposition were blundering, what shall we say of the policy of the hon. gentleman who, with all the blundering of the Opposition, with the iniquitous Franchise law at his disposal, only triumphed by the skin of his teeth? I would not object to a dissolution in itself. If I object to this dissolution, it is simply because there was no fair play in the dissolution at that time. A dissolution would have been welcomed at any time, but there was treachery in the dissolution at the time it took place. More than that, not only was there treachery in the dissolution, but I have no hesitation in saying that, coming as it did, it was an outrage, nay, a crime against the dignity of the Crown, against the rights of the people. It was an outrage against the dignity of the Crown, because

we had had the pledge of the Crown that no election would take place until the lists had been revised according to law. Sir, if there is one thing which ought to be sacred, and is sacred to-day, it is the pledge of the Crown to the people of the country. The hon. gentleman knows better than I do that if there was one thing more than another which alienated from King James II the heart of his subjects, it was the duplicity with which, again and again, he broke his word to the people; and since the flight of James, the word of the Sovereign of Great Britain has always been held to be as immovable as the rocks upon which the Island of Great Britain rests. That is true in England to-day, but it is no longer true in Canada: it is not true in Canada so long as the word of the Crown is in the keeping of the present Ministers of the Crown. Sir, we have a Franchise Act and it is not a jewel; on the contrary, it is a monster. That Act was framed and revised for the benefit and advantage of the Conservative party, but although it was framed for the benefit of the Conservative party, it is so cumbrous, it is so expensive, that it has been a nightmare to every member of the Conservative party. Everyone wants to get rid of the annual revision of the list, because it is so cumbrous and so expensive: and last year the hon. gentleman anticipated the wish of his followers, and he proposed a measure to dispense with the annual revision of the list. The measure was in the hands of the Secretary of State, and I will remind the House of the language he used on that occasion:

"Nobody will deny that a revision devolves a great deal of anxiety, trouble and expense, both to the members already representing constituencies and to the would-be candidates for those constituencies. If we had a revision this year it must be admitted that it would take place in very unfavourable circumstances * * * * * But is there no other reason why that revision should not take place? We have not yet reached the end of this Parliament: according to law this Parliament will cease in the beginning of 1892."

Then the hon. gentleman goes on to speak about the census, which is taking place now:

"If in July, 1891, the census shows that the representation must be changed it will become necessary to have new elections soon after the census; and those elections should take place at the beginning of 1892, by the natural death of this Parliament according to the constitution. The question which presented itself to me was this: By the experience of the past, could a revision beginning in June, 1891, be satisfactorily made, and would it be ready for the eventuality of elections in 1892. There is no reason to doubt it."

Here is, therefore, the pledge of the Crown that there would be no election till the list had been revised in the present year, according to the terms of the law. Of course we know very well that it is always open to the Crown to advise a dissolution, and I do not suppose that at that time the hon. gentleman contemplated a dissolution; therefore, I saw that it was his duty at that time to say: "Gentlemen, remember that there may be a dissolution at any time, therefore you must be ready to take the consequences." If the hon. gentleman had used that language of course every man would have said: "There must be a revision of the list at once, because we must have a perfect electorate." When the hon. gentleman introduced that Bill and carried it with the sanction of the Crown, it was a pledge to the people that there would be no election until the list had been perfected. But six months afterwards the Government decided to have an election, and they did not scruple to trample upon the dignity of the Crown in order to gain party advantage over their opponents. But the elections have taken place. And now I ask, what is the policy of the Government with respect to the main issue of the double issue which was submitted to the people of the country? If the elections meant anything, they meant this: that a delegation, an official delegation, was to go to Washington immediately after the elections. Yet nothing of the kind has been done, because I count for nothing the officious, not the official delegation, which visited Washington, comprising two important members of the Administration, chaperoned by Sir Charles Tupper. Like Cæsar they went, they saw; but, unlike Cæsar, they did not conquer. They came back without having achieved anything. It has been asserted in some quarters that those gentlemen were treated with discourtesy by the American authorities. I do not believe it, and hon. gentlemen opposite have taken care to say that the delegation were received with every courtesy; but I do not hesitate to say that, even if they had met rebuffs, those gentlemen would only have received the treatment for which they seemed to be yearning, because nothing could be so offensive to international courtesy as the language used by some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, and I am sorry to say that in this respect the right hon. gentleman, who is usually cautious and prudent in matters of international import, set his followers a very bad example. The language used by that hon. gentleman in a speech delivered at Halifax last fall was unpardonable. Speaking of our relations with the Republic to the south of us, the right hon. gentleman said:

"It is a great country, and will be greater, but like all young countries it will have its vicissitudes, its reverses and its revolutions. Do not we see already from the mass of foreign ignorance and foreign vice that has poured into the United States, how uneasily the working population move in the great labour centres? Do not you see communism, and socialism and atheism, and every other ism there? That the United States will rise superior, and out of these heterogeneous particles form one great people, I have no doubt."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAURIER. I commend the hon. gentleman for that charitable sentiment; but listen to what follows. The hon. gentleman continues:

"But depend upon it they are going to have their revolutions and upheavals, while we shall sit calmly under the protecting flag of Great Britain and enjoy the magnificent country that God has given us and look with philosophic eyes at the struggles of a fierce and discordant democracy."

Nothing could be more contrary to the amity which we owe to the neighbouring Republic. There was hostility in this, as there was hostility in the relations of the Canadian Government towards the American authorities during the Civil War. At that time also we looked with "philosophic eyes at the struggles of a fierce and discordant democracy" and the result was that we lost the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, and we wish to Heaven that our similar action now will not cost us another treaty. But after all that has taken place we should have been told in the Speech from the Throne not only that the Government is about to send commissioners to Washington, but the basis on which they are going to treat with our neighbours. Will it be unrestricted reciprocity, will it be restricted reciprocity, or reciprocity at all; or will the negotiations be confined

only to the fishery question, whether in Behring Sea or the Atlantic? We do not know, and, if I speak my own mind, I do not believe at the present moment hon. gentlemen opposite know their own minds on this subject. They may agree on the question of retaining office, but when they come to deliberate on this question, confusion worse confounded will arise in their councils. A confusion of tongue will prevail, because we have heard all sorts of language from members of the Administration on this subject. We have heard the Secretary of State at one election speak of unrestricted reciprocity in a manner which cheered and delighted the heart of every patriotic Canadian. We have heard the Minister of Finance upon the floor of this House declare that the only policy of the Government was the National Policy: and, as regards the Prime Minister, sometimes he advanced and then receded, then he advanced again and again receded. We know, for instance, that during last summer he offered reciprocity in coal, but, at the remonstrance of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, he had to swallow that offer; and if members of the Administration cannot agree even on an offer of reciprocity in coal, it is not surprising that they should fail to agree upon any programme to be submitted to their Commissioners. But whatever may be the policy of the present Government upon this question, I assert that the people of Canada to-day want a change, and a change there must be. In 1878 the hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald), in the most emphatic manner denounced the Government of my hon. friend to my left, because at that time there were 500,000 Canadians in the United States. He declared it was a shame, a burning shame, that with our good climate, equitable laws and fertile soil, the Government could not retain our own people. I believe the hon. gentleman on that occasion did not speak mere empty, idle, unmeaning words. I hold that he spoke the sentiment of his heart, and if he was not speaking simply as an intellectual device, I wish him to look at the record of his work for the last ten years and see whether it has borne good fruits or not. The evil of which he complained then has been intensified tenfold. Sir, we must have a change, and it must be in the direction of greater freedom of trade. This is admitted on all sides, by all parties, and it is admitted even by the staunchest of all Tories—the Imperial Federationists. While they commit the mistake of basing their trade policy upon uniformity of allegiance and a mere sentiment, we of the Liberal party maintain that the policy of this country must be based not upon sentiment but upon business principles; and, fresh as we come from the people, I say that the only policy which will benefit this country is unrestricted reciprocity and continental freedom of trade. Sir Charles Tupper says in an article published a few days ago in the *North American Review*, that the delusion, as he calls it, of unrestricted reciprocity was dead and buried. Dead and buried! I am as good an authority on this subject as is Sir Charles Tupper, and I say it is more alive than ever. I am prepared to say much more. I am prepared to say that when Sir Charles Tupper went to Washington a few days ago, in company with the Minister of Justice and Minister of Finance, he was ready to offer the American Government unrestricted reciprocity. Sir, I am going to break the hearts of men who are loyal and true, who have been led to believe that the Liberal party want to give up this country to the Americans by carrying out a policy of unrestricted reciprocity; but they must be prepared for a greater shock still, because this abomination of desolation has entered the holy of holies. The hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald) shook his head a moment ago when I said Sir Charles Tupper was ready to offer unrestricted reciprocity. Does the hon. gentleman not read the Montreal *Gazette*? I read it every day. On 10th April, the *Gazette* published an article, in answer to the *Globe*, which had asserted that the visit to Washington had been a failure. The *Gazette*, the organ of the hon. gentleman opposite, spoke as follows:—

"The Toronto *Globe* speaks of the failure at Washington as though the Canadian delegates were in some unexplained way responsible for it, and asks: 'How could the Canadian Ministers hope to negotiate a treaty of reciprocity with the Washington Administration?' But the failure was on the part of Mr. Blaine. No negotiations were afloat; the matter had not yet reached that stage. Indeed, Mr. Blaine flatly objected to the appointment of a formal Commission until he learned upon what basis the Canadians proposed to treat, and it was to assure the American Secretary of State that the Canadian Government is willing to discuss the question on the broadest lines, even on the basis of unrestricted reciprocity, that Sir Charles Tupper returned to Washington with Sir John Thompson and Hon. Mr. Foster."

Have the pure fallen from grace? Here is treason rampant, and who is to indict the traitors when the Minister of Justice himself is either a traitor or connives at treason? Reciprocity dead and buried! It is only three years ago since we commenced this agitation, and already we have triumphed in the two leading provinces of the Dominion. Already we have the fact that many American statesmen are prepared to treat with us upon that basis. We have the opinion of Mr. Blaine, we have the opinion of Senator Sherman, we have the opinion of Mr. Hitt, and we have the endorsation of the Boards of Trade of New York city, of Boston city, of Chicago city, and of several others of the northern cities in the United States. Reciprocity dead and buried! Why, Sir, we never yet have been met with arguments from the Government against reciprocity. The right hon. gentleman has never himself dared to offer any argument against us. In the manifesto which he issued he never discussed the question, but simply appealed to the prejudices and passions of the people. He appealed to their prejudices and passions, and he stated that unrestricted reciprocity would lead to annexation. I deny that proposition. Of course, Sir, I know very well that there are men in this country who believe, and who honestly believe, that, perhaps, unrestricted reciprocity would be the first step towards annexation. I do not dispute any man's conviction; but I ask these men to exert their reason. If we have reciprocity at any time, as we shall have it, I believe, before very long, these men will not then be denied the right of suffrage, for they will have the right to vote against annexation, if annexation is proposed by any person, the same as they would have the right to vote against annexation, if it were proposed to-day. Shall we be so diffident of our manhood that we dare not do what we think best for our interests, because, forsooth, some one might be dragged away from his allegiance to his country in favour of American citizenship? Whatever may be the fears of the Conservative party on

this question, I have no fears for the Liberals of Canada. We do not boast of our loyalty, but we have it in our hearts, and not upon our lips as the hon. gentlemen opposite have it, and we do not fear that we shall be seduced away from what we believe to be right in principle. The right hon. gentleman said that this policy was hostile to Great Britain. Again I deny it; but, Sir, I am free to admit, that I, for one, when I made up my mind in favour of this policy, looked up first and last to the interest of Canada and not to the interest of England. I am a British subject and I never forgot it yet; but while I am a British subject I remember that I am also a Canadian and I sit in the Canadian Parliament. Let the British subject who sits in the British Parliament look after the interests of England. When this Confederation was organized (and no one knows it better than the right hon. gentleman himself), it was organized with a view of forming a nation of this United Canada. The hon. gentleman must have foreseen, since this was to be a nation, that some day or other the interest of this young nation would come in contact with the interest of the motherland. It is absurd to suppose that, situated as we are, the interest of Canada will always be identical with the interest of Great Britain. Some day must come when these interests will clash, and whatever the hon. gentleman may be, for my part whenever it comes to that, and, however much I must regret the necessity, I will stand by my native land. Let me ask, Sir, why did your ancestors, and why did my ancestors, leave their native land? Nothing is so dear to the heart of man as the land where he first saw the light of the world, the land which is associated with his family ties; but, Sir, did your ancestors leave their motherland in Great Britain and Ireland, and did my ancestors leave France, because they loved their motherland less? No, Sir: the truth is they were not satisfied with the condition of their own country, and, therefore, to make their condition better, and for the happiness and comfort of their families, they parted from their native land, not because they loved it less, but because they loved Canada more. Now, Sir, we are agitating, and we have agitated this policy of unrestricted reciprocity, because we believe it is in the best interests of the country, and not because we love England less, but because we love Canada more. I have again and again affirmed for my part that I am as fondly attached to British institutions as any man of English blood, but I have never hesitated to say, and I again repeat, that whether for ill or for good, whether for my condemnation or my justification, whether for right or for wrong, as long as there is in me the breath of life, my guiding star, and my only guiding star, shall be: Canada first, Canada last, and Canada forever.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest to the speech of my hon. friend. It has much of his eloquence, much of his facility of language and much of his happiness of expression, but it has a tone of bitterness and a tone of exasperation which is not usual in the speeches of the hon. gentleman. I can, however, quite pardon the feeling which has induced and prompted that speech. If there ever was a party disappointed, and if there ever was an hon. member or a public man disappointed in the result of the late election, it is my hon. friend. The certainty which he had in his own breast, the confidence which he had that the country was with him—a confidence in which his party all joined—was so great, that the disappointment must have been dreadful. The hon. gentleman went to bed on the night of the 4th of March confidently believing that he would be sent for in a few days to form a Government, but the illusion disappeared by nine o'clock on the following morning. I can pardon, therefore, the feeling the hon. gentleman has, and the only thing that I feel personally aggrieved at is his assertion that there was on the part of the Government a dishonourable abandonment of the statement in this House on the subject of dissolution. It was known by everybody, it was stated by myself, it was stated by my colleagues, that we had no intention of dissolving—that to all appearances Parliament would last for its whole term; and, therefore the postponement of revising the lists was announced. But, if the hon. gentleman will follow up the debate, he will find that, after my hon. friend the Secretary of State made his speech, I stated distinctly to the House, that I would make no pledge that there would not be a dissolution; I stated that it would be unconstitutional to make any such pledge. One thing, however, is clear, that the hon. gentleman and his friends did not like the dissolution: and it is strange that they should not like it when he was so confident that the result would be a triumph of his party, and the defeat forever of the Liberal-Conservative clique that had so long misgoverned the country. But the hon. gentleman, perhaps, has not the advantage, or the happiness rather, of bringing all his friends with him. I think the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) stated on two separate occasions that he had no objections to a dissolution, because the voters' lists were all on his side. Is it not so that that statement was made? And it is the fact, Mr. Speaker, that if either party has suffered from the delay in the revision of the voters' lists, it is the party of which I have the honour just now to be the leader. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have won; it is a Pyrrhic victory to be sure: it is the forerunner of defeat, so the hon. gentleman says. Well, I think my friends and the country can put up with a prognostication of that kind, which is to be fulfilled five years hence unless there is to be another dissolution. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well, because I can see that he has been looking into the authorities, that it is quite understood among public men that the propriety or impropriety of a dissolution is not discussed in Parliament: the prerogative of the Crown is admitted. While a dissolution is threatened, if Parliament is sitting, there can be remonstrance against the proposed dissolution, but when once it is granted, the prerogative of the Crown is admitted, and admitted without a remark.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Legally?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As Todd says:

"By general consent the alternatives of resignation of office or of dissolution of Parliament are now left to the discretion and responsibility of Ministers,"—

And so on. The whole tenor of modern parliamentary decisions is this: that an appeal to the

people is always in order. The hon. gentleman says he does not say that the country was taken by surprise, but I say this, that if any party were taken by surprise, it was the Conservative party: because they never had any intimation, or an inkling of any kind from any member of the Government that there would be a dissolution. But according to my hon. friend, we were going to postpone the dissolution to the Greek calends. He says there ought not to have been a dissolution until the Franchise Act was repealed. That Franchise Act was an Act of the Canadian Parliament, and does the hon. gentleman mean to say that there should be no dissolution until the party in power, the party having the majority, should repeal the Act which they themselves laid before the country, and which Parliament and the country have approved of? Then the hon. gentleman says there should have been no dissolution until the law respecting the elections was altered, and until the frauds, the disgraceful frauds, which were practised under that law were made impossible. Who passed those laws, Mr. Speaker? It was the Government of Mr. Mackenzie; and if there were any frauds under them, those frauds were in consequence of the imperfections of the Act introduced for the purpose of preventing the occurrence of any such frauds. Now the hon. gentleman is very much pleased to ring the changes upon the word "loyalty." He says we are very loyal men in phrase, but look what we do: We have actually sent the mails by way of New York. We have, utterly regardless of our position as British subjects, utterly regardless of our oaths of allegiance, utterly regardless of our pretension of being the loyal party—and we do pretend and contend that we are the loyal party—forgetful of all our pretensions, we have sent the mails by way of New York. Well, the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the lines running from Canada are rather antiquated; they are too conservative in their practice: and the Government of Canada have spared no pains, and have run some risk in asking Parliament to vote half a million of money, in order to get a line to run from the St. Lawrence in summer and the Maritime Provinces in winter that will equal in every respect those lines which are the glory and the pride of New York; and if we have failed in carrying out that arrangement it is not our fault. We did make a provisional arrangement, but the state of the money market in England has been such that we have hitherto not been able to succeed in getting a contract. But that is going to be, I hope and believe, of very short continuance: and with the vote that Parliament has already given us, I hope and believe—I might almost say I know, although that is too strong a word—but I hope, and believe, and trust, that we shall have a line of which we may be proud, and which will relieve us of the charge of disloyalty brought by the hon. gentleman. The fact is that the steamers, which were originally equal to any of the lines which ploughed the Atlantic, have become antiquated, and the owners of those steamers did not feel themselves able to undertake the work of competing with the lines running into New York. The consequence is that for some time a large proportion, somewhere near two-thirds of the mail matter, going from Canada and coming to Canada, went *viâ* New York, and we were actually throwing away the money which we had been paying year by year to the Allan line, because it did not, and was unable from its lack of speed to perform the duties for which it was originally subsidized. That, Mr. Speaker, is our disloyalty. But, returning for a moment to the question of dissolution, the hon. gentleman says that we never announced what our policy was, and he says that our policy is a shifting policy. If ever there was a permanent and fixed policy it is that of the party of which I, for the present, am the leader. We went to the country, Mr. Speaker, on that policy,—the old flag, the old policy, aye, and the old chief. And with all my sins of omission and commission of twenty years, the country responded to the call. The hon. gentleman says that we are a minority in the larger Provinces. We are not a minority in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. LAURIER. Not much to boast of.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the Province of Ontario, of which I am a representative in this Parliament and in the Government, we are in a majority; and if some of my friends—and I regret, deeply regret the fact—have fallen in the field of battle, most of them believe and know that they will have a joyful resurrection. The hon. gentleman says that in my manifesto I did not say a word about unrestricted reciprocity. Why, there was no necessity for me to say a word about it. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said enough about it. The whole country knew that the attention of the next session of Parliament would be absorbed in the consideration of that great question. Hon. gentlemen opposite travelled from one end of the Dominion to the other announcing unrestricted reciprocity as their policy. They called the attention of the country to the necessity of an immediate change to save this country from ruin and all the rest of it. They announced from every hustings, on every platform, on every stump they could find to stand upon, that unrestricted reciprocity was a matter to be considered in Parliament and in the next session of Parliament. And, Mr. Speaker, we knew that; and we knew also that a door had been opened for a friendly series of communications with the American Government on that subject, and that, for the first time in many years, we would have an opportunity of discussing the various questions—not only the trade questions but the various other questions which disturb the harmony between the United States and Canada. So long ago as November last we had the first intimation; and upon that—trying to open communication and knowing that all those communications would be fruitless if held in the last days of the last Parliament—we took the course of appealing to the people, and the people responded to our appeal. It is true that in some of the constituencies of Canada we have been defeated—not by the National Policy, but by the McKinley Bill. Some of our agricultural friends were naturally alarmed at the exclusion of their products from the American market; and through their not being fully instructed on this question, we, and not hon. gentlemen opposite, lost by the dissolution. Some of our agricultural friends fancied that in consequence of the McKinley Bill they would suffer greatly in the sale of their agricultural products; and it is said that in one or two places, the day after the elections, when the defeat of unrestricted reciprocity was assured, some of the

farmers hurried across the boundary with their hay and other products in the belief that they could sell them free of the McKinley duty. The hon. gentleman denied—and from his point of view, I dare say he was right in denying, as far as his intention is concerned—that unrestricted reciprocity will cause any political change in Canada. He therein differs from his late great leader, Mr. Blake, the gentleman whom he followed most—I was going to say blindly—but most completely and without any shadow of dissent, without any appearance of variance of opinion until that gentleman resigned the leadership. Mr. Blake held a different opinion and consequently deserted the party. He retired from public life, of which he was an ornament, and retired, apparently forever, into private life, because he could not follow a course which he believed, in its logical consequence, to use the expression of my hon. friend, must lead to annexation to the United States. The hon. gentleman talks about our shifting policy. Why, he will find, if he ever comes to press his policy in the manner he has announced just now it is his intention to press it, supported as it will be by the speech of the hon. member for South Oxford, that it will not receive the support of all those who are nominally the supporters of the hon. gentleman, and really his supporters on most questions, but certainly not on that. The hon. gentleman says we ought not to have had any dissolution until we repealed the Gerrymander Act. Why, what would have become of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) if there had been no Gerrymander Act. He would have been non-existent; he would have been wiped out of existence. But even in the benighted riding he represents, believed to be hopelessly Grit—so hopelessly Grit that it was charged against the Government that it was made a Grit hive—even there the light has begun to penetrate; and the majority of the hon. gentleman is but half what it was at the last election. So you see, Mr. Speaker, even in the darkest localities, the deepest dens of Grit—I was going to say ignorance—Grit obstinacy, the light is beginning to penetrate. We have achieved a Pyrrhic victory which will last five years. The hon. gentleman had better take care that the Pyrrhic victory in South Oxford will not become a defeat at the end of that period. The hon. gentleman did, in the first portion of his speech, rather sail around the question of unrestricted reciprocity; but at last he mustered his courage up. I could see he had to stiffen his nerves when he came out with the expression that he was in favour of continental free trade. That is another term for unrestricted reciprocity. He did not like even to use the expression "unrestricted reciprocity." He knew it was unpopular. He knew it was unpopular in this House and in the country. He knew he could not stand up with any hope of carrying the country if he acted upon the term in its naked deformity of unrestricted reciprocity. So he calls it "continental free trade." Very well. That policy, the shifting policy which the hon. gentleman attributed to us, I can cast across the floor to him. Now, in regard to "commercial union," which is the term they have used as they have used "unrestricted reciprocity," and lastly "continental free trade." After all, no matter what name you give it, it is merely, as Mr. Farrar said, hiding behind a mask—it all means annexation to the United States, as we all know. The three names with which they have adorned their policy will not conceal or hide what the policy is, and the fact of their changing the name so frequently reminds me of the fellows who are brought up in the police court and are found to have a number of aliases; so the hon. gentlemen have a great many aliases. The hon. gentleman has stated that my language at Halifax was unfriendly and impolitic, with reference to the Government of the United States. I adhere to every word I said then. I said then, as I say now, that the United States is a great nation and will be a greater nation, that there is no limit to its future greatness, but I spoke in the same sense as the best and the ablest and the most patriotic citizens of the United States now speak. Look at any of the writings of their political men; look at the writings of their literati; look at the opinions expressed by all those men who ought to be more than they are, I am sorry to say, leaders of public opinion in the United States, and you will find that they have all the one cry of the approaching danger to the United States from the various circumstances to which I very shortly alluded. But I said I knew that country would overcome all those difficulties. Was it not a patriotic and also a common-sense expression of opinion of mine that, if history is of any value, if history is anything more than a mere almanac, the United States, like all democracy, must pass through the perturbances which are incidental to all democracies. Look at the history of the world, and you will see that all democracies have had to pass through a period of perturbance. I believe that, with the manliness of the vast majority of the races who inhabit the United States, they will overcome all their difficulties, but my common-sense statement was this: Why should we who are free from these dangers, why should we who have not the same causes of apprehension as the people of the United States have, why should we who are as yet free not only from the cause of socialism brought from Europe, anarchy brought from Europe, atheism brought from Europe, mix ourselves up in these questions—above all, why should we mix ourselves up in the consequences of the negro question, to which I did not allude at that time? All their writers agree that they are in great danger, and they are using their best intellects to see how they are to avoid the great dangers which are so imminent, and from which, under the flag of England, we have been free. We have no Carbonari here, we have no Mafia here, we have no sewerage from European countries, we have not here the hordes from Europe who fly from the majesty of the law; we have not the Hungarian, who is semi-civilized, though he belongs to a fine race. While we find these men convulsing the whole of the United States, we do not find them coming to Canada as yet, and, if they do, I hope they will come in small numbers and under strict supervision and investigation as to their previous character. I have nothing to take back of the language I used at Halifax, and I could tell the hon. gentleman that I have had sympathy and support from great men in the United States in regard to the expressions I then used. There is one other statement of the hon. gentleman to which I object. He stated that there was a great hostility in Canada to the

Northern States during the civil war. I say there never was a more unfounded statement made. I say there is no evidence of hostility to the United States. So far as our population went, it was proved by the fact that from 20,000, at the minimum, to, as some say, 40,000 men went from Canada to fight the battle of the North. Some few men, some way or other, got through the Northern States and joined the South, but from 20,000 to 40,000 Canadians joined the ranks, and fought and fell and died in the ranks of the Northern Army: and I undertake, now that the statement has been made, to bring down to the House and to show to Parliament the repeated thanks which the United States Government gave for the way in which Canada behaved during that war. Secretary Seward said Canada had behaved well, and he wished to God that the mother country had behaved half as well as Canada. I can say that Canada was painfully anxious to perform her duties and to preserve her neutrality during that unhappy war. I can show that we went beyond the obligations imposed by the law of nations. We had to spend our money in order to prevent Canada from being made the basis of operations along the frontier. We had 10,000 volunteers watching the frontier in warlike array, men taken from their homes for months and months, and we cannot be charged with having been neglectful of our duties. I speak with knowledge on this subject, and I know that we, members of the Government, were determined, that by no action or sympathy on the part of Canada should the mother country be brought into a conflict, or into a hostile or semi-hostile position with regard to the United States. That I avow, and that I can prove. Now, Mr. Speaker, I can only say, with respect to the statement that it is a disastrous victory, that we are satisfied. I ought to be satisfied, because at the end of this present Parliament, if it lives, I shall be some eighty-two years of age: and I can say that we are going to last that time, unless we dissolve. I tell my friends and I tell my foes: *J'y suis, j'y reste.* We are going to stay here, and it will take more than the power of the hon. gentleman, with all the phalanx behind him, to disturb us or to shove us from our pedestal. I omitted to make the usual compliment to the mover and seconder of these resolutions. There is no necessity for my doing so. They have at once stamped themselves as men that this House will be proud of—men that have a great political future.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I had supposed when the First Minister took the floor, that he would at least, as a matter of common parliamentary etiquette, have deemed it right to give something like an intelligible and satisfactory answer to the objections which were raised by my hon. friend to the very extraordinary use of the prerogative which led to the dissolution of the last Parliament and the assembling of the present one. I certainly expected, still more, that the hon. gentleman who devoted the one important paragraph of his speech to a description of the hopes which the Government entertain of a speedy settlement of the question that so long engaged the attention of the country, the hope of obtaining extended trade relations between Canada and the United States—the hon. gentleman who has deemed it right through the mouth of His Excellency, to congratulate us on the fact that six months from the present date, or thereabouts, an audience will be accorded to the Ambassadors of Canada, if they go to Washington, would have been kind enough to have shed a little light on a certain recent trip which was made by prominent members of his Cabinet to the same city of Washington—or possibly it may be, Sir, that in the mind of the hon. gentleman, trips to Washington are so associated with treason of the extremest dye, that he is afraid to tell the House that two distinguished members of his Cabinet made a trip to Washington—an officious, not an official visit as my hon. friend will say; that they went one thousand miles down to interview these pestilent Yankees, and returned the next day, one thousand miles from Washington to Ottawa. Sir, I think that under the circumstances it was the duty, and is the duty, of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues, to tell us why and wherefore this visit was planned and made. To the best of my recollection the hon. gentleman did not even allude to the fact with which all Canada was ringing, with which all North America was ringing, that a few days ago he sent two members of his Cabinet and my Lord the High Commissioner down to Washington, and that these hon. gentlemen were obliged to return here, having achieved and effected—what?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Nothing.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Oh, yes, they did. Let not my hon. friend take away from them what they did. They achieved and effected an appointment six months hence, or an interview, an informal interview, apparently, with the hon. Secretary of State of the United States. Sir, I think the hon. gentleman owes it to the House to state the nature of the circumstances and how these things came about. I was surprised, for my part, to find that the hon. gentleman steered entirely clear of that subject. We understand the hon. gentleman's position. We understand that he stands between three fires on this question. We know quite well that the hon. gentleman found it very hard indeed, after sending that mission to Washington, to account to his taskmasters and paymasters of the "Red Parlour," and to explain what he was doing at Washington with his ambassadors. Why, Sir, we know it was reported, from one end of this country to the other, that Sir Charles Tupper had rushed in fiery haste from Ottawa to Washington—had bulldozed the Cabinet, and had taken with him two of his trusted friends and gone back to Washington—and we know enough of Sir Charles Tupper's previous action, we know enough of what occurred in this House: we know enough of the reasons which severed him from his colleagues on a certain memorable occasion, to know that Sir Charles Tupper—and I say it to his credit and not to his discredit—was determined, if he went down to Washington, not to return with empty hands, manufactures or no manufacturers. But these gentlemen were suspicious, as well they might be, as soon as they knew of the approaching mission to Washington, and there was a flight of vultures from all parts of the Dominion, there was a flight of those gentlemen here to tell the Government that they brought them in—no, Sir, they bought them in—and they were not disposed to be de-

prived of their pound of flesh; that they knew their interests were imperilled, and that if the Government receded from enforcing the sacred right of taxing the people of Canada to the bare bone, then they would have to account to the men who put them there, and I may say to the honest votes of the people of Canada.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh!

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman had another very important reason for not dealing with the question. The hon. gentleman has had his lesson, and I hope it was not entirely thrown away upon him; he knew right well that it would be a very perilous thing indeed for him to give an account, or to make the pretence, of the negotiations going on at Washington, which may not have squared strictly and exactly with the facts. The hon. gentleman knows, and the House knows, how certain extraordinary statements made—if not by himself, at any rate on his authority, and through his subsidized press—were dealt with almost immediately on their delivery by some of the authorities at Washington. The hon. gentleman knew in the third place, and hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House know, that it would be an extremely dangerous thing for him to allow it to be understood, after what had passed during the late elections, after the promises which were made by many of the hon. gentleman's supporters, after the statements made by his press—it would be an extremely dangerous thing for him, on the other hand, to state honestly and candidly to these men—what he knows perfectly well in spite of all his gasconade—that if free trade with the United States or extended trade relations with the United States, are to be obtained at all by the people of Canada, it is only on the lines laid down by my hon. friend—as laid down by the Liberal party of Canada. All those things the right hon. gentleman knew right well, and, therefore, although he knows, and none better, how earnestly the people of Canada are looking for a distinct and plain exposition of what the Government meant by their recent trip to Washington, of what the Government meant and propose to do on their return to Washington a few months hence, the hon. gentleman took right good care to indulge in a few specious generalities, and, as usual when hard pressed, to take refuge in assertions about his loyalty and his devotion to British connection. Well, Sir, I have designated the value of the hon. gentleman's loyalty on other occasions. His is the loyalty that pays, and so long as it pays Her Majesty Queen Victoria will have no more faithful subject than the right hon. gentleman. But I can recollect, aye, I have seen in old times communications from the hon. gentleman which show that when he sat on the Treasury benches his loyalty was, to say the least of it, of a very much cooler description than it is at present. The hon. gentleman talks and has talked elsewhere of the Liberal party of Canada as the party of annexationists, and elsewhere I have told the hon. gentleman, as now on the floor of the Parliament of Canada I tell him, that his chosen friends from his youth up have each and everyone been annexationists. Never in all his life did this super-loyal gentleman form a Cabinet, and he has formed many Cabinets, in which he did not have one, but usually two or three specimens of the annexationists foremost in the ranks of the Cabinet; and even at this day, forty or fifty years afterwards, he possesses one or two still. The hon. gentleman says my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) is a disappointed man. My hon. friend stands in the proud position that for the first time I believe since Confederation, he, the Liberal leader, stands at the head of a Liberal majority from the Province of Quebec. As regards the Province of Ontario, the right hon. gentleman did succeed in obtaining a bare majority by as many votes as you can count on the fingers of one hand, and as many individual votes as you can count on the fingers of one hand to form the right hon. gentleman's majority. But did he secure a popular majority? Not a bit of it: the records go to prove that there was a clear popular majority of all the voters of the great Province of Ontario arrayed behind my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier), and on behalf of free trade with the United States. The right hon. gentleman declares that a door was opened in November last for friendly communications with the United States. There is a difference of opinion on that point, which I will come to presently. Certain men as likely to know what the opinions of the United States are, certain men at least as well advised as the First Minister of Canada is, as to the views of President Harrison and his Cabinet, have expressed an opinion which I think the hon. gentleman will find very hard indeed to reconcile with that statement. But he brings it as a charge against my hon. friend beside me that he differs from his former leader, Mr. Blake. Now I have noticed, and I dare say the House has noticed, that as soon as it comes to pass that a Liberal leader, whether my hon. friend who usually sits beside me (Mr. Mackenzie) or Mr. Blake or any other hon. gentleman is dead and gone or practically away from the political arena, then all at once the right hon. gentleman discovers great virtues in him: then all at once the right hon. gentleman is prepared to say to those of us who remain alive supporting the Liberal party: Well, these men have fallen away from the high and lofty principles which their leaders in former times possessed. Such is the kindness of the hon. gentleman that I verily believe if I myself were translated from this sphere he would not hesitate to canonize me, always providing I was well out of his way and I could not do any mischief. If the hon. gentleman and his friends desire to know what Mr. Blake thinks about the causes which may lead to the annexation of Canada I recommend him to read certain pregnant and powerful paragraphs in the letter which has been quoted, in which Mr. Blake shows with the greatest possible perspicuity that the continuous corruption, misgovernment and mismanagement of the right hon. gentleman and his Government have all but rendered it absolutely impossible to carry on government in Canada. It may be that our friend put a a little too strongly his view of the case; but I commend to my hon. friends around me these paragraphs, and I suggest, and I hope they will act on the suggestion, that on all occasions when hon. gentlemen opposite choose to allude to opinions as those of Mr. Blake, but which he says he did not express on this subject, will give them *in extenso* the full benefit of the valuable and true facts which Mr. Blake has set forth touching the corruption and misconduct of hon. gentlemen op-

posite. The right hon. gentleman goes on to declare that he adheres to his language used at Halifax. The hon. gentleman, however, went on to apologize for it, after a fashion. I am very sorry, indeed, for his sake, and for the sake of the people of Canada, that the hon. gentleman did not take this opportunity at once, and manfully to apologize for, and retract, the extremely indiscreet and mischievous language he was guilty of using on that occasion. I have no doubt whatever that the language used by the First Minister has had a very prejudicial effect in the United States and on the Government of the United States. It is not in accordance with international comity, it is not in accordance with common prudence and discretion, for the chief Minister of a friendly power to declare that the people of Canada, forsooth, will "look with philosophic eyes at the struggles of a fierce and discordant democracy." Does not the First Minister know that to-day in the United States there are more than 1,000,000 of the best blood of Canada to be found? Does not the hon. gentleman know that in almost every portion of Canada there is hardly a family to be found which has not a son, brother, or near relative in some portion of the United States? And can the First Minister tell us that we can look with philosophic eyes on revolutions which will tear and convulse the United States? I have a better doctrine to preach than that. I tell the hon. gentleman this, and every true Canadian, whether of the Liberal party or of the Conservative party, will endorse my sentiment, that the prosperity of the United States is, and ought to be, next to that of our own country, dear to every true Canadian, for the reason I have stated: and I tell him more, and hon. gentlemen beside me know it well, that no great misfortune can overtake the people of the United States, circumstanced as the two countries are to one another, without greatly injuring the general prosperity of the people of Canada, too. I suppose the hon. gentleman is sincere, although I am not certain, looking at his acts and the language used by his followers, in saying that he and his Government desire the prosperity and success of the people of the United States: but they have taken a very curious way of showing it.

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

After Recess.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, before the House rose I had taken occasion of calling attention to the very remarkable omission on the part of the leader of the Government to offer an explanation to this House of the reason which had induced him to send several prominent members of his Government to Washington. I had intimated some of the difficulties which appeared to my mind to have presented themselves to the hon. gentleman and which probably prevented his giving these frank explanations to the House of the reason of that remarkable mission, which no doubt he would otherwise have been glad to do. I may say that for my own part it appears to me utterly and absolutely impossible: I cannot for one moment believe, I refuse for my part to believe, unless there be positive documentary evidence in the hands of the Government to the contrary, that these hon. gentlemen went to Washington, under the circumstances which I have described, on the invitation of the American Government: I cannot believe that such a thing is possible. I would be very loth indeed to think that any Government, much less the Government of the United States of America, should have invited a deputation from our Government to confer on important matters, and who on their arrival found it utterly impossible to obtain any audience on the subject-matter for which they were invited to go to Washington. It appears to me that these hon. gentlemen must, to say the least of it, have gone there self-invited: and, further, it appears to me, when we come to consider certain correspondence which we have seen, that if they were invited at all they had been invited to stay away, unless they were prepared to discuss the subject on certain conditions, by no manner of means obscurely intimated to them, or to the British ambassador either, by the American authorities. I take it that the real position of the matter was this: the Government, as was admitted by the First Minister during his speech, and as was stated by his press, had committed themselves to the assertion that they had good reason to believe that they would be allowed to enter into negotiations with the Government of the United States. For that assertion I am sorry to say there appears to have been no warrant whatever. Nevertheless, having made the assertion, having to a very considerable extent conducted their campaign on the assumption that they were warranted in declaring that they were prepared to deal with the American Government, it was impossible for them to face Parliament, under these circumstances, without having made some attempt to show that these assertions of theirs were justified. It appears to me very much indeed as if these hon. gentlemen had hoped to entrap the Government of the United States into a discussion which would give an excuse for saying to the people of Canada and to the Parliament of Canada that, as there were negotiations going on with the United States, it would be highly inexpedient for us to discuss the question of the trade relations on which these negotiations in future were mainly to turn. Here is the statement which these hon. gentlemen are good enough to make to the House and to invite the House to acquiesce in:

"We are pleased to be informed" —

They ask us to say—

—"that His Excellency's advisers, availing themselves of opportunities which were presented in the closing months of last year, caused the Administration of the United States to be reminded of the willingness of the Government of Canada to join in making efforts for the extension and development of the trade between the Republic and the Dominion, as well as for the friendly adjustment of those matters of an international character which remain unsettled. I am pleased to say that these representations have resulted in an assurance that, in October next, the Government of the United States will be prepared to enter on a Conference to consider the best means of arriving at a practical solution of these important questions."

Sir, it does appear to me that the hon. gentlemen are to be commended upon one point: it appears to me that taking into consideration the character of their utterances as to the Government and the people of the United States during the late campaign, and on many other occasions, they are to be commended for having shown such a cheerful disposition to acquiesce in the treatment which they seem to have received at Washington. I shall give them as much credit as they deserve, but I have got to say this: A new question, and an important

question, is opened for us in consequence of this identical mission to Washington. My hon. friend beside me told the House, and he told it truly, that the Ministers themselves, in their proper persons, had utterly and wholly failed to assign any substantial reason of any kind whatever for the dissolution of Parliament. Although the Ministers may not in so many words have said so, there is no doubt whatever that they communicated to their subsidized press throughout the country a statement in which, and by means of which, they endeavoured to induce their supporters all over the Dominion to believe that they had entered into negotiations with the United States; that they had ground to believe that these negotiations would result favourably, and that if only their hands were strengthened, if only the people would give them a reasonably strong mandate, there was every reason to believe that they would succeed in coming to satisfactory terms with the United States. What they stated was as follows,—and they stated this, be it remembered, on the very day, I believe, on which the dissolution was announced:—

"Sir John Macdonald's Government not long ago, made a definite proposal to the Washington authorities for the settlement of all existing differences between the two countries on a basis of an extension of the trade between the two countries. It involves partial reciprocity, the enumerated articles to include quite a number of natural products. But the proposition discards any idea of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity. Moreover, these propositions were invited and suggested by the Washington authorities. Commissioners from Canada and Great Britain will start for Washington on 4th March the date of the opening of the new Congress."

The House will observe that these proceedings, according to this communication, had gone so far that the British Government were to send commissioners along with ours; and they were to start on the 4th of March—

"The result of the Canadian elections will be known on 6th March, the day the commissioners reach Washington. In order that this commission may have no uncertain sound, Sir John Macdonald has decided to appeal to the country and ask for judgment on these proposals of his to the Washington authorities."

He had made definite proposals, of which not one person outside of his Cabinet, either friend or foe, knew one word; and he had decided to ask the opinion of the electors on these proposals, which they could neither approve nor condemn, because none of us had the slightest idea of what they were. Well, Sir, unfortunately, communication is quick, and communication is free as yet after a fashion between Canada and the United States: and these statements having been circulated in the United States, had, as was natural, attracted considerable attention there; and whereas the First Minister told us to-night that a door for friendly communication had been opened as far back as November last, I notice that a person, who presumably knows as much as he does about the intentions of the United States Government, writes in the following fashion to a member of the United States Congress:—

"DEAR MR. BAKER,—I authorize you to contradict the rumours you refer to. There are no negotiations whatever on foot for a reciprocity treaty with Canada, and you may be assured no such scheme for reciprocity with the Dominion, confined to natural products, will be entertained by this Government. We know nothing of Sir Charles Tupper's coming to Washington.

"Very truly yours,
"JAMES G. BLAINE,
"*Secretary of State for the United States.*"

Now, Sir, which is to be believed, the statement that we have heard that there was a door of friendly communication opened as far back as November last, or the assurance of Mr. Blaine over his own signature that there are no negotiations whatever on foot with Canada? Let the hon. gentlemen reconcile these two statements as best they may. Let them, if they dare, either the hon. First Minister or his colleagues, singly or collectively, contradict the statement of Mr. Blaine. Let them dare on the floor of this Parliament to state that the Secretary of State of the United States put his name to a false declaration. Sir, in view of the fact that the statement, which was the only reason assigned for the dissolution, has been flatly contradicted by the highest authority in the United States, it appears to me that there can be hardly any room for doubt that a very grave fraud was committed both on the people of Canada and on His Excellency if he was induced to grant the dissolution on the grounds set forth in the memorandum I have just read. As to the people, we who took part in the last election all know that, whatever may have been done in certain individual cities, in scores and scores of constituencies the argument was used that if the people would only sustain the First Minister on the present occasion, he had the best possible reasons for believing that he would negotiate a treaty with the United States, and obtain, in particular, a repeal of the obnoxious clauses of the McKinley tariff. I say this dissolution was obtained on false pretences. There were strong reasons against it, plain and palpable on the surface. There is no doubt that the House, when it refused a revision of the voters' lists last year, did so on the implied understanding that there was no reasonable chance or prospect of a dissolution being had until there was an opportunity to revise those lists. Then, it was perfectly well known that the census of this country must be taken at or about the 1st of April this year. It was known that under our constitutional act, if there is to be any material change in the representation to be given to the several Provinces, there is the strongest possible ground for requiring a new election to be had in order that the people may be properly represented. It was known perfectly well to the hon. gentleman, and to every member of the House, that the lists on which we voted were notoriously defective, many of them being based on assessment rolls three or four years old. It was known that many of the young men of this country, probably one-eighth, and certainly one-tenth of all the electors, would be disfranchised by the use of those lists. The Government, we were told, desired to obtain a full, free and unequivocal expression of the opinion of the people, and they undertook to obtain it under circumstances that made it physically impossible that all of the people should vote, and under circumstances which rendered it certain that there would be found on those lists an enormous proportion of men who had quitted this country, and who if brought back would have ceased to feel any vital interest in the good government of Canada. Neither is it a trifling consideration that it was well known, too, that there was at least one Minister of the Crown resting under grave suspicion, and liable when Parliament met to be indicted for grave malversation in office: and there was pretty

good reason on the part of the hon. First Minister and his colleagues, at any rate, for striving to avoid incurring an expression of the opinion of the House on the conduct of that hon. gentleman. And lastly, Sir, and this goes to the root of the whole matter, it is notorious that there was a serious division in the Cabinet. It is notorious that one member was opposed to reciprocity, even in natural products, and to do him justice, I regard his position as the only logical and consistent position of the whole of them; while it is equally well known that another member of the Cabinet belonging to the same Province, believed that it was in the highest degree in the interest of the country, and especially of his own Province, to obtain reciprocity in those same natural products. How was the country, under these circumstances, to ascertain what the position of the Government was on this question? Sir, if ever there should have been another Session of Parliament, and if ever the Government should declare distinctly where they stood on these questions, and should give us an opportunity to appeal to the people at a time when their will could be clearly expressed, it was under the circumstances which existed at the time this dissolution took place. Now, I say that, in this condition of things, only in case of downright overpowering necessity could a dissolution be granted at all. What was the overpowering necessity? It was, according to the statement made at the time, that these hon. gentlemen should go to Washington on the 6th of March, in order to confer with the British Ambassador and the American Government. But the fact is, not only did they not go on the 6th of March, but there is not the least chance of their obtaining an audience with the American Government at all until late in the autumn. We cannot refrain from believing that His Excellency was very grievously deceived by his advisers, and that a most gross abuse of his prerogative took place when he granted a dissolution without any better reason than has been assigned either by the First Minister or the press which usually supports him. More, I say that the conduct of the Government in sending this embassy or delegation, or whatever you please to call it, to Washington, requires a pretty considerable deal of explanation. The Government had been notified expressly of what the United States Government would not accept. They knew perfectly well that if they went to Washington to offer reciprocity in natural products only they would not obtain a hearing. Now, if those hon. gentlemen adhere to the position, whatever it was, they originally laid down; if they adhere to the position laid down by Mr. Colby last Session on the floor of this House, and which I understood the right hon. gentleman to indicate this afternoon he is disposed to maintain; if they have no intention of offering to the United States anything but that meagre limited reciprocity which the United States Government have declared they will not entertain, then to send delegates to Washington to confer with the United States Government was a piece of mockery, under the circumstances, little short of a deliberate and premeditated farce. But if, on the other hand, they have altered their position; if, as there is considerable reason to believe, they found themselves compelled to

abandon that, and made up their minds to propose a wider measure of reciprocity, then what grounds have these hon. gentlemen for attacking and slandering hon. gentlemen on this side of the House for proposing to do precisely what the Government knew they would have to do if they wanted to obtain anything at all? What have these hon. gentlemen done? To all practical intents and purposes they have succeeded only in making themselves the laughing-stock of the United States. Two of those hon. gentlemen who went to Washington are present. The other, for satisfactory reasons, I fancy, has found it convenient to retreat on London, where, by-the-bye, I am rather pleased to hear he is getting the warm reception such as some of his conduct and speeches deserve. Let these gentlemen, however, who are here, explain why it was they went to Washington. Various pretexts have been put forward by their press to explain the reception they met. One day we were told, forsooth, that a message postponing the conference was, by some inexplicable misunderstanding, or owing to some unaccountable confusion or delay, not telegraphed from Washington or not received here in time. Then we were told that this was precisely what the Government desired—that they did not want to meet at all; that all they wanted was to have an excuse to prevent discussion on the floor of this House. And I saw some conjectures, both in a portion of the United States press and our own, that the treatment accorded to the Canadian envoys was dictated by a desire of Mr. President Harrison to snub Mr. Blaine. It reminded me of the custom we are told existed in the olden days, when a whipping-boy was always provided for royalty who would receive on his person the castigation for the offences committed by the youthful prince, and thus the ends of justice would be served and the privileged skin of the original offender saved. If it be true that the cause of this somewhat unceremonious reception and the retirement of our commissioners was due to the fact that President Harrison wanted to snub Mr. Blaine, I congratulate our delegates on the lofty and elevated position which they attained. I notice another explanation, so ingenious that it really deserves a word of passing attention. We are told that the whole business was a collusion, a put-up job between Mr. Blaine and our High Commissioner. Our High Commissioner was wanted in London to deal with these rebellious Newfoundlanders; and it was intimated to Mr. Blaine that it would be highly convenient to our High Commissioner to bring the business to an abrupt termination, so that he might be enabled to transfer himself to London and there protect the interests of Canada against the Newfoundlanders. I say it is time for us to consider the situation, which is a grave one. I cannot accept, for my part, either the silence of the right hon. the leader of the House or the excuses made by his friends and supporters. What has happened, to my mind, is this: The Government of Canada have been told emphatically, in a way no man can pretend not to understand, and to which it is idle for us to affect to shut our eyes, that they are not wanted at Washington. And they have been told more; they have been told that they will have to learn their own minds, that they will have to learn to submit a reasonable and fitting proposal before they are likely to meet with any consideration at

all. In looking at the way in which this business has been conducted, we are obliged to consider what has been the conduct of the Government of Canada with regard to its relations to the United States. The Government have told us, through the mouth of His Excellency, that they have caused the Administration of the United States to be reminded of the willingness of the Government of Canada to join in making efforts for the extension and development of the trade between the American Republic and the Dominion. That is a most extraordinary statement. It will sound very extraordinary, indeed, in the minds and the ears of those who have paid the slightest attention to the conduct and policy of this Government during the last five years. What has been their course ever since 1885? I am not going to enter to-night into a discussion of the technical merits of their conduct in respect of the fisheries, but I have to say that, whether that conduct was right or wrong, if they had any desire or the slightest hope or intention of making any friendly reciprocity with the United States, their conduct in 1886 was ill-advised to a degree. We know, from the testimony of their own colleagues and the Ministers themselves, that it had the effect of exciting and annoying the whole people of the United States to an extreme degree. It had the effect, according to Sir Charles Tupper himself, of bringing us to the verge of non-intercourse with the United States—of bringing us within a few hours of commercial war with that country. And one would have thought that the knowledge that Canada had escaped so great a peril and injury would have brought these men to a better mind. But how did these men, who have dared to tell us that the Government of Canada have reminded the United States of their willingness to treat with them, meet the proposition from this side of the House, inviting, begging, praying the Government to endeavour to ascertain on what terms we could obtain reciprocity with the United States? How was this proposition met? Why, in 1888, I myself moved that it was highly expedient we should enter into negotiations with the United States. It was open to these gentlemen, if they thought my proposal too broad, to have amended it. Did they commence negotiations with the United States to see what could be done? Did they raise their little finger or make the slightest exertion to obtain reciprocity? No; they met us with the explicit declaration that they would have no reciprocity with the United States unless the interests of the small minority of protected manufacturers were first considered. That was their *sine qua non*—to protect our good friends the monopolists and the combines. Do not let our paymasters be disturbed. Do not let those worthy gentlemen who supply the funds for election purposes in disputed counties be disturbed. We must be sure that these worthy gentlemen are not in the slightest degree to be interfered with. Then there is also our policy as enunciated in 1889. They met us at that time with a blunt negative, and they backed up that negative by even refusing to entertain our proposition that we should have a representative of our own at Washington who might save us from such intolerable and disgraceful fiascoes as those in which those hon. gentlemen have taken part lately. In 1890 what did they do when I brought forward for the third and last time a proposition of that kind? They voted it down, and they appended to their vote a declaration which was made on the floor of the House by Mr. Colby, the President of the Council, who appeared as the spokesman of the Government, for whose utterances they are responsible, for they did not disown them—a statement made by him that reciprocity in natural products would be the greatest misfortune that could befall the people of Canada. These are the evidences of the desire of the Government of Canada to develop our trade relations with the United States. I ask this House, I ask especially hon. gentlemen who have not had seats in this House before—for those of us who have had seats before do not need to be told—to look at the records of the debates of the past few years and then to look at the tone of the speeches and at the language used by Ministers and by their supporters. They will find that, all through their speeches, there was, to say the least of it, a tone of veiled hostility towards reciprocity with the United States, that they considered it in any case a matter of insignificance for the people of this country, that it was almost unnatural, if not wicked and disloyal, for us to trade with a people whose boundary line runs for three thousand miles along our own. What was their attitude when the McKinley Tariff Bill was introduced, which they profess to deplore? They were warned from this side as to the result. They were told that there was a party in the United States opposed to the provisions of that Bill. They were told that, if they chose at that moment to inflict increased taxation on agricultural products coming into this country, they would destroy all chance of that party succeeding in ameliorating the terms of that Bill and would simply rivet the chains on the people of Canada. What was the result? Before the Bill became law, more than six months before that Bill received the President's sanction, our Minister of Finance, our Government, and our Parliment, enacted a tariff inflicting very heavy duties on large quantities of American produce which previously had come into Canada at moderate rates or free, and by that act they told all the friends of moderate tariffs in the United States that they could not count upon them for assistance, and they rendered it impossible for that party in the American Republic to obtain any modification of that McKinley Bill. If that Bill is on the United States Statute-book to-day, if any of the people of Canada suffer from its provisions to-day, they have more reason to thank the Government of Canada for that result than any other cause. This action was taken against repeated warnings which were given to the Government from this side of the House. Everyone knows how the English Government responded to the assurances that these hon. gentlemen had not feared to give to us that they were in perfect line with them in the action they took in regard to the fisheries. We know very well why Mr. Chamberlain was sent across the Atlantic, and we know very well what he did on the commission to which he was appointed. He made it evident that his instructions were that, *coûte que coûte*, whether the Canadian Government chose, or whether it did not, some such measure was to be adopted as was indicated in the *modus vivendi* which was put in force. I do not object to the *modus vivendi*; I never did object to the *modus vivendi*; but, if it was proper for the

Government to accept that, and it involved no loss to the people of Canada, then the conduct of this Government in 1886 was most impolitic and unstatesmanlike. It is only necessary to call the attention of the House to what their own High Commissioner had to tell us as to the action of these hon. gentlemen who, mind you, have always been anxious to cultivate trade relations with the United States. Here is what Sir Charles Tupper had to say in regard to his worthy colleagues:

"I would like to draw the attention of the House to what has been accomplished by this (Fisheries) Treaty. I told you in what position Canada stood in with regard to the United States of America before the initiation of these proceedings. I told you that we stood face to face with an enactment which had been put on the Statute-book by a unanimous vote of Congress, ratified by the President, providing for non-intercourse between the United States and Canada. I need not tell you that that Bill meant commercial war, that it meant not only the ordinary suspension of friendly feelings and intercourse between the two countries, but that it involved much more than that. If that Bill had been brought into operation by the proclamation of the President of the United States I have no hesitation in saying that we stood in the relation to that great country of commercial war, and the line is very narrow which separates a commercial war between two countries from an actual war. * * *

"Yesterday we stood face to face with a non-intercourse Bill sustained by the united action of the Senate and House of Representatives, sustained by almost the whole press, Republican and Democratic, of the United States, sustained, with few exceptions, by a prejudiced, irritated and exasperated people of sixty millions lying on our borders."

There is the testimony of their own colleague, their own trusted colleague, the man who, to do him justice, twice saved them from ruin, as to what these wise statesmen who desire free intercourse with the United States brought on this country a few years ago. One would have thought that an experience of this kind would have deterred those hon. gentlemen from the foolish and mistaken policy which they have since followed; but what was their whole policy and conduct and argument during the elections? It consisted of one prolonged series of slander of the Liberal party as being traitors to their country, and the First Minister himself was not ashamed to declare to many public audiences that it was not possible for any man to advocate free trade with the United States without desiring to obtain political separation from the mother country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I find his friends here are willing to endorse that. I wish him and I wish them joy of it. I find they went further; I find that in State papers these hon. gentlemen used language very nearly as improper, very nearly as unfounded and unwarranted, as they chose to use during the campaign. Now, I am willing to make reasonable allowances for words which are used in the heat of a political contest, but when I find in grave despatches from the Privy Council statements like these, which appear to have been made no longer ago than the 9th December:

"The McKinley Tariff Bill is in force and is avowed to be designed to teach Canadians that they cannot avail themselves of the markets of the United States while they continue their allegiance as British subjects."

When I find them repeating:

"That this would be a most effectual method of impressing on the minds of the Canadian people the lesson that they cannot be British subjects and enjoy the American markets."

When I find them further going on to say:

"That the Confederation which was effected in accordance with the strong desire of Her Majesty's Government in 1867 had always been viewed with unfriendly feelings by a large portion of the people of the United States, who continue, with great reason, to regard it as a means of consolidating British power in North America."

When I find statements of that sort made in a State paper, statements for which these hon. gentlemen have no sort of foundation, statements which are made absolutely and entirely, I believe, without one particle of basis—when I find statements like that, I cannot fail to see that all this is part of a premeditated plan on the part of these gentlemen—a premeditated scheme and design on their part, entirely to conceal from the people of Canada the real position in which they stand, and to prevent, so far as misrepresentation can prevent it, an honest verdict being given by the people on the questions which are really at issue before them. Now, Sir, what has all this effected for these hon. gentlemen? Well, I will tell them. In the first place, if they have any sense of self-respect left they must feel humiliated and disgraced by the reception they experienced lately, and by the knowledge that they have deserved it. But they have done worse than that; they have been inflicting great injury upon Canada, and have prejudiced the success of future negotiations by the course they have been ill-advised enough to pursue. Incidentally I may observe that in this, as in other cases which have come recently to our notice, there appears to me to be the clearest proof of the wisdom of the proposition long ago advanced by the Liberal party, that the time had come in the interests of Canada when we should have a resident of our own at Washington responsible to Canada, responsible to the Canadian Government, who should keep them advised of the changes and mutations of American sentiment, who should be able to keep them in touch, as they ought to be kept in touch, with what is going on in that great country beside us. I tell the hon. gentleman that, until and unless that is done, it is idle for them to expect to maintain such friendly relations as ought to be maintained between ourselves and our neighbours on the other side of the line. Now, I say there is only one way for these gentlemen to get out of their difficulty. I say their language, and notably the language used by the First Minister in the speech quoted by my hon. friend—and which was only one of a very considerable number of similar expressions used by himself and others in the course of the campaign—I say that, as these words contain, in my judgment, a public insult to the United States, it was his duty who had made them—and he admitted making them this afternoon—it was his duty to have retracted them as publicly as he made them. But what do we find him doing? We find him justifying, defending them, maintaining that there was nothing in the slightest degree out of the common course in the Minister of a friendly state daring to express the hope—because it amounted to that—that the United States, that fierce democracy, would be torn by revolution, while we would sit looking philosophically on. Then his second duty, and a very important duty it is, in my opinion, was to state clearly and distinctly to the House what they proposed to do with the Government at Washington. I do not ask for minute details, but we have most assuredly a right to know

the general lines of their policy, what they propose to do on this mission, what they propose to do in any mission they may hereafter send to Washington. So far, the policy of the Government is only one mass of contradictions. We find one policy was announced in one Province, that even one policy was preached in one part of one Province and another policy preached in another part of the same Province. We have the President of the Council, formally and publicly, in the most emphatic manner, in reply to my own speech on the question, saying that he was opposed to reciprocity in natural products. We had the Secretary of State, a very influential member of the Government, also coming from the same Province, on the public hustings, severing himself from his colleagues and declaring that the McKinley tariff was a calamity to our country, declaring strongly in favour of reciprocity in natural products, and I believe he went further, and declared that if that could not be got in any other way, he was prepared to consider a proposition for the freest possible trade. Then we had the First Minister himself, aye, the First Minister, venturing to hold friendly communication with American citizens; we had him addressing a private letter to an American citizen, desiring this private American citizen to lobby individual members of Congress on this behalf, desiring him to tell them that the Canadian Government were prepared —I will read what he said:

"That the Canadian Government is fully assured that the Parliament of Canada would be ready to take off all Customs duty of coal, ores and lumber imported from the United States, whenever Congress makes those articles free of duty."

Now, Sir, we have a very pleasing proof of the harmony which prevails among the Cabinet, of the permanent and fixed character of their policy—that is what the hon. gentleman calls it. We have the Minister of Marine taking the First Minister to task publicly, and declaring that he was bound to reconstruct him, and that he would teach him not to trifle with the great interest of coal. Apparently the Minister of Marine did reconstruct him, for apparently the Minister is still in the Cabinet. Sir, we know perfectly well all over this country that there were private assurances made to men in almost every rural constituency, that the Government desired reciprocity. I have pointed out the language which was used in the press, and I have pointed to the excuse which was made by the Government for dissolving Parliament. We find them giving private assurances to certain men that they desired reciprocity, and making other private assurances to other gentlemen that they did not want reciprocity at all. We have the word of a gentleman well known to my hon. friends here, it was Mr. Cockshutt, I believe, of Brantford, who stated in my presence that he had assurances from six Cabinet Ministers that the Government would not have a reciprocity treaty at any price. Then we had statements made that the United States would not treat. Why, Sir, I suppose on twenty hustings I was interrogated to know whether there was any chance that the United States would treat. I was told by the friends and supporters of the hon. gentleman that there was no chance whatever of obtaining a treaty on any terms with the United States; yet these gentlemen declare that they dissolved the House in order that they might treat with the United States. We were told by some of these hon. gentlemen that they were sure to get the McKinley tariff repealed. I have seen that assertion made in at least a score of the Conservative newspapers. And we were told by others, and, I think, we were told on the floor of the House, that the McKinley tariff was the best possible thing for Canada, that it would teach our people self-reliance, that it would open new markets, markets in the West Indies more particularly, and it was likely to redound in the highest degree to the benefit of this country. Lastly, we were told by the First Minister on several occasions that he was determined to stand by the old policy; and yet at the same time the aforesaid First Minister sends an embassy to Washington, which I have repeatedly stated will be an outrage, farce and mockery, if he is going to stand by his old policy. Then there is another result of this attitude which I commend to the attention of hon. gentlemen. The First Minister declared over and over again that all persons who favoured free trade with the United States were annexationists, he would make no exceptions whatever; no one could oppose his policy, no one could oppose him, I suppose, without incurring the pains and penalties of high treason. I recollect that the First Minister was good enough to intimate at Toronto that he was about to bring to trial certain persons who had presumed to contravene or interfere with the policy he was about to carry out; but the hon. gentleman did not find it convenient or expedient to carry that threat into execution. I called his attention to the matter on more than one occasion, but I fear he did not read my speeches with the attention they deserved, and the references escaped him. But what is the result? According to the First Minister all who favoured unrestricted reciprocity are annexationists. Well, if that be correct, the hon. gentleman knows that to-day a decisive majority in the Province of Quebec favour unrestricted reciprocity and support my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier), and, consequently, they are annexationists. If he will take the trouble to add the figures of the returns of the Province of Ontario, he will find a clear popular majority of the people of Ontario supported unrestricted reciprocity, and, therefore, according to the hon. gentleman's showing, they are annexationists. So, according to the hon. gentleman's logic and theory, he has brought things to this pass: that in the two great Provinces which constituted Old Canada, there is, to-day, a clear majority of annexationists. Now, I have this to say: I have probably quite as great objection to altering our form of government for the American form as has the First Minister; but if annexation should unhappily become a live issue, if annexation should become a question in the politics of this country, it is just such ill-advised language, such reproaches shamefully flung against others quite as good as ourselves, which may, and I should regret it extremely if it does, give life and substance in Canada to any such movement. I always felt, and I felt it from the first when the hon. gentleman and his friends adopted a slavish copy of the American high-protective system, that they had gone a long way to create an annexation feeling in this country; and I say this, if there be one mode more likely than another to prevent such a result coming about, if there be one mode to remove any temptation existing on the part of some

persons to unite ourselves politically with the United States, it is by adopting just such a policy as we on this side of the House advocate, which might give us, what we have a right to ask and to obtain if we can secure it, the advantage of free commercial intercourse with the United States, without in any way disturbing or altering our own form of government. There is another act which the hon. gentleman did, but which no hon. gentleman with the slightest respect for British institutions would have presumed to do. What is the ground work on which the hon. gentleman bases his support of the National Policy, under which various vile monopolies were empowered to tax the people for their own private and individual benefit? The hon. gentleman has dared to trail the British flag in the dust and to flaunt the British flag as the flag under which these same monopolists are protected. If there is one thing settled in the United Kingdom more than another it is that they shall have free trade. That is a settled part of British policy; I may say it is almost part of the British Constitution, and all leaders of the great parties without exception have declared again and again that so far as Great Britain is concerned the policy of free trade is fixed and will remain forever. But, unfortunately, there are no doubt among us, as there are elsewhere, ignorant men who may be led to connect the protection of these vile monopolies with allegiance to the British flag, and if in the future evil consequences should result they will be due to this cause more than any other that the First Minister sought to use as a justification for maintaining a policy which is as un-British as it is possible to conceive the improper allegation that it was in the interest of Great Britain that this policy which has enormously reduced British imports, that this policy which was deliberately designed to prevent British merchants having free intercourse to our markets is, forsooth, necessary in order to maintain our connection with the mother country. The hon. gentleman is face to face with the fact that he has made no progress whatever in his negotiations with the United States. The hon. gentleman cannot even get an audience with the United States Government. What suggestion has he or his friends to make? They know right well that the people of this country at the present moment are suffering very materially from the effects of this same McKinley tariff to which I have alluded, and for which we have largely to thank the present Government. What do they propose? They propose simply this: To maintain these monopolies, to impose more taxes on the people, to further burden the farming and other producing classes; and having done so, and having driven hundreds of thousands out of the country, then, perchance, they will endeavour to negotiate what they are pleased to call fair extended trade relations with the United States. Our duty is clear. It is first and foremost to unmask these deceptions, to show to the people of Canada how utterly false were the pretences on which the late decision was given. We are also bound to make the people of Canada understand the situation, to make them see clearly and distinctly that it is utterly impossible, and the Government know it is utterly impossible, to obtain material modifications in our present strained relations with the United States, except on a vastly wider basis than the hon. gentlemen appear in the least degree disposed to offer. If the hon. gentleman is disposed to adopt the policy which we, on this side of the House, have advocated, I can assure him we will support him in carrying out such a proposition. He has nothing to fear from this side of the House, if he only comes out and declares boldly and frankly that, having found that there is no possibility of obtaining reciprocal trade relations with the United States, except on the basis I have indicated, he feels it his duty in the interest of the country to accept it. We do not care whether the hon. gentleman remains in office for three, or four, or five, or six years longer; but we do care a great deal that the policy we have advocated, and which we believe to be the sole and only policy which can really relieve the people of this country, should become the law of the land. Now, Sir, it is idle talk about interrupting negotiations; there are no negotiations to interrupt; there have been no negotiations to interrupt, and I tell the hon. gentleman that, so far as the trade policy is concerned, there will be no negotiations to interrupt, unless and until he is prepared to accept the policy which is laid down from this side of the House. However this may be, I maintain that the country at any rate has the clearest right to know where these gentlemen really stand on this question. Our position is plain enough; our position has been thrice defined and thrice enforced by vote on the floor of this Parliament. The hon. gentleman knows it: the hon. gentleman has had the assurance of the leader of the Opposition and as it was so it is to-day; but where are the Government? Are the Government to be found with my hon. friend the President of the Council; are they determined to have no reciprocity at all; are they disposed to declare as he does that reciprocity in natural products is the worst thing that could happen to the farmers of Canada; are they with the Secretary of State, who declares that he is disposed to go to the very utmost limits for the purpose of obtaining a repeal of the McKinley tariff; are they with the First Minister in his offer to exchange free coal, or are they with the Minister of Marine in his declaration that no such thing shall be done, First Minister or not to the contrary notwithstanding. Are they with Sir Charles Tupper, who, according to his own statement, was willing to make an unrestricted offer of reciprocity to Mr. Bayard, as long as four years ago, and who could not be induced, although he was Minister of Finance at the time, to appear in this House and argue for one moment against the proposition which I brought forward in 1888. Are they with him, or where in the world are they? This I have got to point out to the Government. If they really only desire reciprocity in natural products; if that is their policy, if they are not prepared to include manufactures, then what business have they sending embassies to Washington at all? They have had the emphatic declaration of Mr. Blaine that the present Government of the United States will not listen and have not the slightest intention of listening to any proposition for reciprocity in natural products only. That has been reinforced by the authoritative declaration of Senator Carlisle, who, the First Minister well knows, is a very prominent leader of the Democratic party which now control the House of Representatives. For the matter of that, Sir, if time permitted me to quote, I have the authority of the First Minister himself, announced several years

ago, that he was perfectly well aware that there was no use, no chance, and no hope for negotiating a treaty for reciprocity in natural products with the United States. I repeat that if the hon. gentlemen are ready to include manufactured goods, if that is part of their policy—and without that it is idle and useless for them to go to Washington to discuss trade relations—then, Sir, how dare they presume to attack us, who from the first, seeing and knowing the necessity of this, have had the courage of our convictions, and have told the people of Canada that if they wished to have reciprocity with the United States they must perforce and by necessity include all United States manufactures. If the hon. gentlemen, at this present moment, find themselves in an unhappy position, if they find that the United States Government entertain very great distrust of their proposals, if they find that even their own supporters entertain a great distrust of their proposals, who on earth have they to blame, when hardly two of their own selves can be found at one and the same time making the same statement on this important question? I desire the House to consider the position. It is perfectly idle to imagine that we can stand still in our present situation; it is perfectly idle to imagine that we will be able to remain as we are now. One of two things is certain to occur: Either on the one hand you will have free trade with the United States, you will have free trade all over this continent, or, on the other hand, what Sir Charles Tupper has predicted is extremely likely to occur, and you will have, sooner or later, in one form or another, a practical suspension of intercourse between this country and the United States. We know well on what terms the first great boon can be obtained by the people of this country, and we have the right, I think, to ask a plain "yes" or "no." That is all we demand as to the policy of the Government of Canada on this question. There can be no doubt whatever, for it is plain to every man who has bestowed a second thought on the question—no man knows it better than the First Minister himself—that if you want to have free trade relations or extended trade relations with the United States you must be prepared to admit their manufactures free. Unless you are prepared and ready to do this it is worse than waste of time, it is merely exposing Canada to needless humiliation and disgrace to send messengers to Washington who are known to be predestined to fail. The manufacturers of this country—at any rate the protected manufacturers—know this just as well as we do, the Government know it, their parliamentary supporters know it, and it will be our business and our duty on the floor of Parliament, through the public press, on the hustings, and in every possible shape and way, to take care that from this time out the people of Canada are also made aware of the real facts of the case; that they shall know how, and how only, reciprocity with the United States can be obtained; that they shall know how, and how only, they can be relieved from the extreme pressure which is now being inflicted on many parts of the country by the injudicious McKinley tariff to which the hon. gentleman has alluded. I must say that I can conceive no reason nor no ground why hon. gentlemen should shift and evade on this question. Most assuredly they will not escape discussion in this House, most assuredly we will take care that whether they like it or not so soon as the forms of this House will permit they will be compelled to make some sort of an explanation, they will be compelled to make some definition, if it only be a negative one, of their position on this question. They certainly will not conciliate the United States by their present conduct, nor will they conciliate their own followers. If the issue were one less important, if there were any less grave questions at stake, I would say that the whole position and attitude of the Government was simply a subject for ridicule, but as it is I must admit that it is a matter for profound regret to me, profound regret to every member of this House who cares for the dignity and honour of Canada, to see the position in which we have been placed by the lack of straightforwardness and the lack of statesmanship exhibited by these gentlemen. At this present moment there can be no doubt whatever that the position of our country in the eyes of the people of the United States is very far indeed from what it should be. Our self-respect is very gravely injured by such proceedings as these to which the hon. gentlemen have recently been parties. More than that, Sir, they did material injury to a cause which might, by proper management on their part, have been in a fair way to be redressed, and this injury is likely to be perpetuated for a very unnecessarily long time. So far as it is possible for us to judge, from their own recorded declarations, and from the statements they have made in various places throughout the country, what the Government are now doing is continually wavering and halting between two opinions. One day the High Commissioner gets the better of the situation and succeeds in persuading the Government to send envoys to Washington: the next day a representation from the "Red Parlour" convinces the First Minister that of two dangers or evils he had better choose what he considers the least, and continue to support those gentlemen to whom he owes his position here; and, finally, we find that when those hon. gentlemen do go down to Washington, they are to all intents and purposes denied an audience. We find that they are even told to go and learn their own mind, and within six months afterwards when they have made up their minds what they are going to propose, they may, perchance, be permitted to state it to the Secretary of State of the United States. I have never been blind, Sir, to the difficulties of carrying out such a measure as this; I know that they are neither few nor slight; but I am bound to say that however difficult the position may be, in my judgment it will be infinitely more difficult of remedy unless the Government of Canada are prepared to make up their mind to accept the only terms on which it is possible for them to obtain relief for the people of this country. One thing I must say, and that is this: If it were the object of the Government of Canada during the last five years to destroy all chance of a reasonable settlement or of making a fair treaty with the United States, I cannot conceive that they could have acted in any other way than they have done. I cannot conceive that they could have taken any other steps to prevent the people of the United States from accepting the propositions made by them other than they have seen fit to take. Twice, Sir, within the last four years, they have brought things to such a pass that we have been in imminent peril of seeing our inter-

course with the United States practically suspended. Twice they have been warned very emphatically of the danger of the course they have been pursuing. I would be glad to believe, even at this hour, that the hon. gentlemen had awakened to the real sense of the situation, and were prepared to take the only step which, as I have said, can be taken with any reasonable chance of success for the purpose of doing what they declare in the Speech from the Throne they have always been desirous of doing, namely, establishing our relations with the United States on such a footing that they are not likely hereafter to be disturbed, There can be no doubt whatever that the line which the hon. gentlemen have chosen to pursue, through their press and their advocates in Parliament, is of all others the one most calculated to destroy all chance and opportunity of obtaining such a treaty. They all know right well that the people and the Government of the United States are singularly well informed of all that occurs on this side of the line. Our language is the same; our press is freely exchanged with theirs; they have a whole army of consular agents in this country; and I can tell them that every jingo speech, every jingo article, every foolish sneer by the hon. gentleman or his friends at the people of the United States, is of necessity re-echoed in the press of that country, and will of necessity exercise a most prejudicial influence on any negotiations which he or others may originate. I hold any man in this country, be his place or position what it may, who chooses to foster that foolish and silly prejudice which exists in the minds of some portion of our people against our kinsmen in the United States, is in the highest degree a traitor—a traitor to Canada, a traitor to the British Empire, a traitor to the British race. Those are my opinions on that subject, and I think I have a far better ground for stigmatizing as traitors those who for the last few years have been for their own party purposes creating bad blood between the people of this country and the people of the United States, than those hon. gentlemen have had to so stigmatize myself and my hon. friends on this side of the House because, forsooth, we desire to trade freely with our neighbours, and to bring back as far as we can the people of the United States into that friendly and cordial union with Canada and the British Empire, on the furtherance of which object I venture to say the best hopes of humanity depend. That is my view of the relation that ought to exist between the two countries. I have said for the last twenty years that there is but one real and important service which Canadian statesmen can render to the British Empire, and that is in every possible shape and way they can to bridge over the gulf which for the last hundred years has unfortunately subsisted between the two great divisions of the English race. Sir, I believe that if the hon. gentleman even now were to apply himself to that noble end he might, in spite of all he has done in the other direction, in spite of all the mistakes he has made and the foolish language in which he and his friends have indulged, establish a much better claim than he has ever done to the thanks of his country and the thanks of the people of the British Empire whom he professes a desire to consolidate; and I commend to him and his Government the consideration I now offer, whether there is or can be any one step which he or any man can suggest which is more likely to bring about that desirable result than the policy which the Liberal party, through my hon. friend and myself, has often propounded, namely, the fullest, freest and most friendly relations that can be obtained with the people of the United States.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has given us the intimation very early in the session that whatever may be the wishes or the thoughts of members on this side of the House, we are not going to escape full discussion. I think the speech of the hon. gentleman, and the discussion upon the Address, which has taken place upon that side of the House to-day, is sufficient evidence of that without an express declaration in so many words. But if the discussion to which we are to be treated throughout the length of this session, be it long or short, is to be so discursive and iterative as the speech of the hon. gentleman for the last hour has been, I think we shall not be very heavily hit or very badly hurt thereby. I have listened to the hon. gentleman when he has been happy in his remarks —I mean happy from his point of view—strong, crisp, connected and terse; but the boundless iteration, the going round and round and the coming back to the only three points he has urged in the two or three hours he has been speaking, has been somewhat surprising, and has shown that the labours and toils of the election have not yet been fully recovered from. Well, Sir, what has been the burden of the two speeches we have heard from the other side? First, that the Government and their party have been badly shattered; secondly, that we—that is the Opposition—have been beaten; thirdly, that we have been beaten unfairly; fourthly, that the proposed negotiations have been a sham from beginning to end, His Excellency has been imposed upon, the people of Canada have been treated to a fraud, and that there is only one way out of this humiliation which the Government have brought upon themselves in Canada, and that is by adopting "our" policy; and, Sir, I leave it to the members of this House who have listened to the hon. gentleman's long speech to say whether he has by any one sentence intimated cleary and definitely what is the policy which he invites us to adopt—what are its main essentials; what are even its principles? With regard to the statement that the Government have come back badly shattered, any way we are here, and if hon. gentlemen will turn up the records of the election of 1887, they will find that the Government to-day has come stronger out of the last contest than it did out of the election of 1887. And I think they will also find—although this is a little in the line of prophecy—that as the years roll on, the same process will be repeated from 1891 to 1895, which had place from 1887 to 1891: and the only basis on which I rest that prediction at present is this, that the grounds hon. gentlemen opposite have for appealing to the people are not a whit stronger to-day than they were in 1887, but, on the contrary, are weaker. The hon. the leader of the Opposition declared that his party was beaten by unfair tactics. He bewailed the fact that dissolution took place. He has bewailed that fact ever since the order went forth for an election, on every platform where he has taken his stand. He

has attributed his defeat to the enactment known as the Gerrymander Act. Is that the case? There has been no Gerrymander Act passed since 1882. The very same Act is on the Statute-book to-day defining the limits of the various electoral districts which was on the Statute-book in 1882 and 1887.

Mr. MULOCK. Was that a fair one?

Mr. FOSTER. From 1882 to the present there has not been a day in which political speeches have not been made by hon. gentlemen opposite challenging us to go before the people, and in no case did they insist on a previous repeal of the Gerrymander Act. But the astounding fact is this, that the very places in which they have been most badly routed are those sections of the Dominion—shreds and patches some may call them, but integral and important parts as I think—where the Gerrymander Act of 1882 has no footing. How do the Opposition account for their overwhelming defeat in British Columbia, the North-West and Manitoba? How do they account for the break made in their hitherto solid ranks in the little Island of Prince Edward? How do they account for the thirteen to three which New Brunswick sends up against them? How do they account for the strong contingent which Nova Scotia has sent against them? Can they account for all this by the Gerrymander Act? Not at all, because that Act had no force or effect in those sections. This, Sir, is simply a pretence to break their fall, to enable them to ease down, if possible, before the country the defeat which they experienced, instead of the triumph they so confidently asserted they would achieve at the polls. No, Mr. Speaker, you are not to look to the Gerrymander Act for the cause of their defeat. It lies deeper than that. You have to con their policy for the last five or ten years; you have to look to their so-called statesmanship; you have to consider their vacillating, wavering policy from 1878 to the present; you have to consider the stone which they vainly offered to the people instead of bread. These, and not the Gerrymander Act, are the causes of their defeat at the polls. The hon. gentlemen who have spoken have given as another reason of their defeat that the lists were not revised. Why, if any are entitled to complain of that they are the Conservative members. It is well known that the Conservatives had not attended to the lists, and if there was one cause for the boasted confidence of the Opposition before the elections it was, as they openly stated, that the lists were in their favour. Neither were they taken at any disadvantage. In 1887 they began their propaganda; and from 1887 to the time of the election not a month rolled by which did not find their members at work, in which their pamphlets were not circulated throughout the country, in which their orators were not holding forth on the stump, and in which their friends on the other side of the line were not keeping them provided with sinews of war. Taken at a disadvantage! Why, the hon. member for South Oxford was busy running through this country from one end of it to the other, six months before the election, and assuring his friends in the cities, as he came back from one country constituency after another, that there was a revolution abroad, that the whole people were up in arms against the Government policy, and that all the Liberal party had to do was to stand together and they were certain of victory. Let the Government, he said, bring on the elections as soon as they please. Well, the elections were brought on, and the hopes of hon. gentlemen opposite have faded away; and now they seek for some paltry excuses to tone down their defeat. Well, I can tell hon. gentlemen opposite that so long as they cling to those methods they will not meet with success. I can tell them that until they meet in solemn, sensible conclave, and decide on a rational policy to lay before the people, a policy which will have the flavour of common sense and Canadian independence, they will remain where they are. Another ground of attack to-night on the Government has been the Washington negotiations. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has not scrupled to say deliberately that a fraud was perpetrated upon His Excellency the Governor General and the Canadian people. On what does he base that charge? When you come to think of it, Sir, is it not one of the most absurd spectacles that could be imagined? My hon. friend is a statesman of many years' standing and of long experience, and, when he speaks, he is supposed to speak for his party. It is a historic party, a party which has a future before it of one kind or another, and you would think, Sir, that the hon. gentleman, before committing himself to so serious a public statement, would have had some definite information on which to base it. But what is the information on which he speaks? Mere suppositions, a bundle of extracts from various newspapers. Hour after hour he consumed in concocting possibilities, in devising imaginings, in seizing what this one and that has said, when, in the Speech from the Throne, there is the promise that if he will wait a day or two he will have the very papers and documents which will make all this matter plain. Is the hon. gentleman afraid of his case? Was he afraid that if he waited three or four days until these papers came down he would not be able to make the speech he has just made, and so decided to forestall the papers and get his surmises spread throughout the country before they could have a chance of being confronted by documentary truth. It does seem to me that a statesman of the experience of my hon. friend, a leader of his party, should have contained himself for a day or two until the documents were before him, when he could read them and base his criticisms on truth, and not on surmises and rumours gathered here and there. This he neglected to do, but rather of all possible odds and ends he has concocted a very nice theory, and he has come to the conclusion that we were all wrong, that we had no invitation to Washington, that we were kicked out, that we were humiliated, that we have prejudiced Canada in the face of the United States, and that, as I said before, nothing is left for us but to take his policy; and he is so kind and considerate as not to overwhelm us with any definite statement as to what that policy really is. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I will say to him that it would be well for him to cultivate some faith in Canada and in the Canadian people. I know there is no man on the floor of this House, I do not think there is a man in public life in Canada to-day, who has said harder things of the yeomanry of Canada than that hon. gentleman. He distrusts them. He has no faith

in their intelligence. He has no confidence in their virtues. He distrusts them altogether, and he is not content with distrusting them, but he flaunts his distrust in the face of the people of Canada. Consequently, when there is an alternative, when the Minister of Justice makes a solemn statement in Toronto, when he gives official utterance, speaking as a Minister of the Crown, as to how these negotiations were commenced and how they were carried on, and on the other hand there is a letter sent by Mr. Blaine to a Mr. Baker saying some things that were true and not stating others, the hon. gentleman says: "I believe Mr. Blaine and not the Minister." A similar statement was made in the city of St. John by a late colleague of the hon. gentleman who is no longer in this House, who referred to the same matter and said, I prefer to believe Mr. Blaine. He believed Mr. Blaine, and he stays home with a majority of nearly a thousand against him. I think, if my hon. friend will allow me to tell him so, it would be well for him to trust the Canadian people a little more, and even to trust the Canadian Ministers when they make grave statements on their responsibilities as Ministers of the Crown. The position of the Government is consistent throughout. My hon. friend may go back in the history of trade negotiations with the United States from earliest times, and he will find that the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party has been entirely consistent. There has been no period when the Conservative Government has not been in favour of a fair and equitable reciprocity treaty, such, for instance, as we believe the treaty of 1854 to have been. We stand still on that platform. Attempt after attempt has been made to obtain such a fair and equitable arrangement. Since the abrogation of that treaty of 1854 attempts have been made—I suppose half a dozen of them—to get the United States to discuss with us the question of trade relations on the ground of what we believed to be fair and equitable. With the exception of the George Brown Reciprocity Draft, which met with an ignoble fate in the Senate of the United States, from that time to the present the United States Government has not intimated any desire to make arrangements of a satisfactory nature for trade relations with the people of Canada. In 1887-88, when the plenipotentiaries were in Washington to negotiate a treaty in regard to the fisheries, the proposal was made by Sir Charles Tupper to settle all difficulties on the basis of an equitable trade arrangement, and it was rejected. The papers will show that last November an opportunity did arise, a door was opened, no matter what my hon. friend has said to-night to the contrary, by which Canada had the opportunity to remind the United States, not simply that it was in favour of reciprocity, but that it always had been in favour of reciprocity, and that it had not changed its mind; and, if my hon. friend had studied the official papers as he seems to have studied the emanations from the party press, he would have seen a document passed by the Government of Canada, the Order in Council which was sent home to Great Britain, which was sent by Great Britain to the United States Government, which was the basis upon which we proposed to enter upon the negotiations for trade arrangements. I think that has appeared in almost every newspaper in the country.

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. CHARLTON. When was that document laid before the United States Government?

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will contain himself a little, he will get still more information than he has now, and which, if he follows the lines followed by my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) this evening, he seems to be in need of. That document embodies the basis upon which the Government of Canada proposes to enter upon negotiations with the United States. That has been before the Government of the United States for months, and upon that have followed the other steps in the negotiations. I wish to say, without going into particulars as to what the papers will show, that, notwithstanding all the pleasantries of my hon. friend, we did not go down to Washington without invitation, but we went on the very day and at the very hour when we were invited to go there by the Secretary of State himself. Whatever may have arisen afterwards, however it may have been thought desirable to postpone the negotiations to the 12th October or any other date, the Canadian Government is not responsible for that and the Liberal-Conservative party cannot be blamed for it. The Government showed itself consistent, in the first place, by declaring that there was a door open for negotiations, and that a delegation would be sent to Washington after the 4th March, and, furthermore, by sending a delegation and being prepared to go again on the 12th October to do what no Canadian Government has been asked to do from 1866 to the present time, that is, to talk over the trade matters and relations existing between this country and the United States, with a view to their better and final settlement. This statement which I make will be borne out by the papers, and I cannot see where we have been inconsistent or where we have prejudiced the interests of Canada or have done aught which any Government in favour of reciprocity ought not to have done. Wherever the door has been opened we have entered it. If the negotiations have not progressed so far as to show tangible results, the Government is not at fault. There may be some reasons behind, which may be brought out later, why such negotiations have not been more quickly brought to a successful conclusion. Now, my hon. friend evidently had before his mind the fact that a large number of the members of this House are here for the first time, and he also appears to remember that they had probably never read one of his speeches, and consequently he thought it was his duty to-night to retail the better parts of some four or five speeches that he had made in this House in order to fortify their minds. These have been answered, it is not necessary to answer them again. He has taken up the course of Canada with reference to the United States, and has striven to show from his standpoint, from his place of grave utterance, from his position which commands the attention of the people here and of people in the United States and in other parts of the world—he has tried to show that Canada, that the Canadian Government, has been the aggressor, has been in fault, has tried to prejudice the relations between the United States and Canada, and has done so almost with malice prepense and aforethought, and has by that means made it impossible for the United States to meet us in nego-

tiations for trade relations on anything like terms that can have a successful issue. Sir, the doings in 1866, in which I had some share, and the doings from 1866, in which other members of this Government have had more nearly a share than myself, have been plain and patent to this House and to the country. Not only in discussions here, but in public documents and through the press, they have been patent and open to the observation of all. Sir, I stand here to make the assertion to-night that no unprejudiced man can study the course of negotiations and the dealings of the Canadian Government regarding them, without coming to the conclusion that the British Government came to, and came to heartily, that in all these things Canada had done her simple duty, and had not exceeded her rights and responsibilities, and the duty which, under those rights and responsibilities, she owes to herself. It was no evidence of animus against the United States that we allowed them one season's free fishing, and gave it to them cordially for the sake of the prospect of an agreement upon this matter. All through that issue, and in the protection of the fishery rights guaranteed to us by the treaty of 1818, the care and forethought, the spirit of courtesy and forbearance, and the general lack, on so long a coast and over so wide an area, of any acts which ought fairly to irritate or to annoy, are evidences of the spirit with which this Government carried out its dealings in that critical and important time, so that, while not abating anything of the rights of our country, and keeping that for the country which was justly its due, she has not given any reasonable cause for irritation to the great country to the south of us. Now, Sir, there has been a good deal of criticism of the Government's policy. May I just go back and ask a question in return? Will the Opposition be kind enough to tell us what their policy is? We are anxious to learn. If there is only one way out, we want to know what it is. If you have got that way do not lock it up and keep it, but let us have it, and let us have it in all its plainness and fulness of detail. A good deal has been said about divisions on the question in the Conservative ranks. Is there no division in the ranks of the Opposition? My hon. friend has stated that that policy should be unrestricted reciprocity, free trade with the United States, involving discrimination against every other country. He does not deny it to-night. My hon. friend who sits a little behind him and who is just now coming to his seat (Mr. Scriver), declares in a public assembly before the electors in his county that if it means discrimination against Great Britain, he for one does not believe in that policy. Is there not a chance for a friendly conference between the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and the leader of the Opposition, and the member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) to know what shall be the outcome, and how they are going to bring this thing out exactly? Sir, they talk about changes and shifting in the canvass. I know what took place in the Maritime Provinces, I know what took place in the city of St. John. I know that in the city of St. John, before the contest had been three days on, the candidates, in Opposition, were going about from store to store, from place of business to place of business, saying to the affrighted merchants "don't be frightened, we don't believe that all those fellows up there say, you are not going to be hurt, we will look after your interests, and there is to be no discrimination against Great Britain." You will find Mr. Weldon's statements in point. He declared over and over again that the party did not intend to discriminate against Great Britain, and if he had not done it, and if the leaders in the Province of New Brunswick had not put out several different planks for their followers to stand upon, they would not have sent back here even their corporal's guard from the Province of New Brunswick. That same thing is true in the Province of Nova Scotia, I have not the least doubt. But, Sir, we are told that they have a majority from the Province of Quebec. Well, now, Mr. Speaker, they have a majority from that Province, and they have well up to a majority, but not quite, in the Province of Ontario; they have a majority in the Province of Prince Edward Island, and that ends it. But will they consider the facts and say whether in any Dominion contest that has ever taken place since Confederation, the Dominion Government had such an aggregation and combination of powers, as it had to deal with in the Province of Quebec and in the Province of Ontario? Has it ever been known before that the Premier of one of the strongest Provinces unites hands with the Premier of the second strongest Province, and that they were leagued with the Premiers in two other Provinces, and these all together, with their immense political patronage, united in a sworn endeavour to oust the Dominion Government and put their friends in power? It is well that their former leader is not here to-night, if he were he would certainly rise in his seat and condemn the degenerate remnants of his party who have gone so far back on his teachings, when he pleaded most eloquently, when he argued most cogently and laboriously against the iniquity and against the wrong of Provincial Governments and Dominion parties uniting together in Dominion contests. Yet, Sir, you find what? A majority in Quebec, got at what expense? An alliance with the Premier of the Province of Quebec who, if he be noted for many other things, is not noted for his economy in public expenditure; a Premier who, wishing to float a loan of ten millions, wanted a leverage to do it with; and when the Dominion elections were announced, was happy to believe that he had found the leverage with which he could go over to Europe and float the loan, and tell the financiers that he had whipped the Liberal-Conservative party and got a promise from my hon. friend opposite for an addition of $400,000 a year subsidy, and so he could go to the money markets of Europe and show how he expected to meet the interest on his new loan. And yet the leader of the Opposition boasts of a majority from the Province of Quebec. I would not boast of that if I were the leader of an Opposition, who has inveighed during all these years of opposition against the extravagance of the Dominion Government against piling up the debt, who has bemoaned the burdens of the tax-payer, and who has promised his best endeavours for a tunnel in one Province and an increased equalized subsidy in all the Provinces, if he got back into power, terms which, if carried out, would have entailed millions of dollars of interest upon this country, many millions of permanent debt, and would have weighed

down the country, and, worse than all, would have been a perpetual *mandement* and promise to the Premier of the Province of Quebec to go on with lavish expenditure to whatever extent he pleased, and when it was piled up too high to make a combination with a Dominion party and get it saddled on the General Government. If a majority of four or five in a Province had been obtained at such a terrible expense of consistency and right I would not have the face to stand in Parliament and boast of such a majority and so unworthily obtained. I think I have occupied all the time that is necessary, although I might take up other points and make remarks upon them. For instance, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) assails the manufacturers. He has always called them monopolists: he has learned another term, and now he calls them vile monopolists, and he declares it is un-British to have a protective policy in Canada, the result of which is to foster those vile monopolists. And yet he has been urging throughout the length and breadth of the country a tariff twice as high, which will breed vile monopolists twice as large and numerous. It is said to be un-British to have a tariff of 30 per cent. which does not discriminate against British manufacturers an iota——

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Not at all.

Mr. FOSTER—but it is thoroughly British when you allow the United States manufacturer in free and raise the tariff up to 40 or 50 per cent. against Britain. The British manufacturer now makes woollen goods and brings them to Quebec, where he pays a certain duty upon them; and the American manufacturer, making the same grade of goods, brings them to Montreal and pays precisely the same duty on them. There is no discrimination. But there is a discrimination which is mischievous, which is unnatural besides being un-British, when you allow the American manufacturer free ingress, and place against the British manufacturers' duties of 40, 50 or 60 per cent. There are some great difficulties for hon. gentlemen opposite to reconcile before we can take their policy of unrestricted reciprocity plus continental free trade. They have to show us where the revenue is to come from. They have never done so. They have to show what kind of a tariff we are to have, and who are to make it. They have never shown that either. They have to show us whether or not the inevitable tendency of such a state of things would not be to drift us into political union with the United States. I give my opinion diffidently on that point. But Mr. Blake says that a rift commenced between him and his party in 1887, and it rapidly widened year by year until after repeated admonitions, when the elections were ordered on, he thought it his duty to give vent to his feelings and to express his views, but from the sympathy he had with the old men of the party who had worked with him and acted under his leadership, he left the performance of what he considered to be his duty to his country until he should see whether his party carried the elections or not. Then his statement appeared, and these three points to which I have referred were made by Mr. Edward Blake with a terseness and force which has not been answered and cannot be answered by hon. gentlemen opposite. So they have to reconcile these difficulties. These have to be cleared away before they can hope that the people or hon. members on this side of the House will accept their nostrum of unrestricted reciprocity and continental free trade. If hon. gentlemen opposite want to know what the Government will not do or will do, I can tell them in a few words. The Government will not negotiate a reciprocity treaty with any country, which treaty would shut us out from every other country in the world, Great Britain included. The Government will not negotiate a treaty which would place the framing of its tariff in the hands of a more powerful and greater country, and would enable that country to place upon us a tariff entirely inordinate and entirely unfitted to our needs. But as regards the people of the United States and their institutions, together with the continuance of the peace, the prosperity and progress of the American people, no member on this side of the House who thinks, and we all think on this side of the House, has any other hope or wish than that they may become consolidated and stable as a people, that their prosperity may be great, and that they may continue to thrive and grow and become an increasing factor in aid to the general civilization of the world. But alongside of that wish is the thought of hon. members on this side of the House, and of the people of the country largely, that we are now in too strong a position, that we have sacrificed too much to gain it, and have too great prospects in the future, to be willing to prejudice it, and, moreover, that we are not in a position to necessitate a choice as between Canada and Great Britain and the interests of each, but in a position where the best interests of Canada can be most wisely and constitutionally maintained in connection with the best interests of the mother land.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is not my intention to closely follow the observations addressed to the House by the hon. Minister of Finance. The hon. gentleman has discussed a number of topics that can more appropriately be discussed at a later period of the session, and these I propose to pass by this evening. The hon. gentleman has complained of a combination between a Local Government and the Liberal party in this House. I am not aware any such combination existed. But I do remember that a short time ago the hon. gentleman's predecessor, who was a member from the same Province as himself, took an active part in the provincial elections in another Province. That course, I think, no other hon. member of this House, much less an hon. gentleman while a member of the Government, ventured to pursue. The Minister of Finance says the Government are here. I dare say the Government as a corporate body are present in this Parliament, but I think there were two colleagues of the hon. gentleman who sat in the House of Commons in the last Parliament, immediately before dissolution, who are not present this evening, and it was hardly in good taste on the part of the Minister of Finance to indulge in the boasting which characterized a very considerable portion of his speech. The hon. gentleman has told us that it is true the Government may not be quite so strong at the present time as it was in the Parliament that immediately preceded this one, and he invites us to wait and see how strong the Government may become. The hon. gentleman predicts that four or five years hence the Government will become quite a strong

one. In that respect we will let the future speak for itself. I may say to the hon. gentleman that I do not attach much faith to his predictions, for I think I have often heard him in this House indulge in predictions which have not been verified. The hon. gentleman says that we are asking for unrestricted reciprocity with the United States and that this is the chief plank of our platform. He says that we are asking the support and confidence of the country upon that ground, and yet after that declaration he tells us that he does not know what our policy is, and he asks us to define for his information the policy to which we adhere. He says the country is against our policy, but he does not know what it is. The hon. gentleman told us that, a few years ago, Sir Charles Tupper made an attempt to negotiate a treaty of reciprocity with the United States, and that Mr. Bayard, the predecessor of Mr. Blaine in office, refused to entertain any proposition for negotiation. I do not think that the hon. gentleman in making that statement was quite candid with the House. The hon. gentleman knows very well that when Sir Charles Tupper proposed what he called an unrestricted offer of reciprocity, he proposed it as part of a scheme for the settlement of the dispute with regard to our fisheries, with regard to the extent of these fisheries and the interest that the American people had a right to claim under the Convention of 1818. The Government of the United States on that occasion informed him, as we all well understood, that they would not undertake the negotiation of any commercial arrangement in connection with any part of that settlement instead of dealing directly with the question, and interpreting by mutual agreement if possible, the right of the respective Governments under the Treaty of 1818. That was a wholly different proposition from the one which the hon. gentleman would lead us to suppose that Mr. Bayard had made. Mr. Bayard did not say that he would not undertake negotiations with regard to the commercial arrangements between the two countries, but he did say that he would not undertake them as the means of putting in abeyance a dispute between the two countries with reference to the fisheries. Now, Sir, the right hon. gentleman has told us that we have not faith in the future of Canada and that this is one of the reasons of our failure. That is not the fact. We have faith in the future of this country; we think it a great misfortune that the affairs of our country have not been in more competent hands; we believe that the condition of the country shows what it has suffered in this particular, but it is not a want of faith in the country we have exhibited, it is a want of faith in the gentlemen who sit on the Treasury benches, a want of faith in the capacity and zeal and fitness of the hon. gentlemen for the positions which they hold. The hon. gentleman has said that we have bewailed the dissolution. We have not done so. We have said that the dissolution of Parliament was a gross violation of the principles and conventions of the constitution. We still adhere to that proposition, and I think there will be very little difficulty in showing to this House, and in convincing the country, that when hon. gentlemen advised His Excellency to dissolve Parliament they advised a course which was entirely at variance with the spirit of the constitution under which we live. We have only to look at the 50th article of the British North America Act to see that it is declared that the Commons of Canada shall be elected for a period of five years. It is true that this is subject to the prerogative of the Crown to dissolve Parliament; it is subject to a power which in its terms is absolute, but the power of dissolution is not arbitrary; it is a power that is to be exercised according to the rules and principles of our constitution. The hon. gentleman knows that in this respect it does not differ from any other prerogative possessed by the Crown. It is in the power of the Crown to refuse assent to, or to reserve for the assent of Her Majesty, every measure that is carried through this House, but if His Excellency the Governor General, acting under the powers conferred upon him as representative of the Crown under the 55th article of the British North America Act, should disallow every Act or reserve every Act that is carried through this Parliament, every one knows that if such a course were adopted it would be a gross violation of our constitutional rights and privileges, although it would be in strict accordance with the letter of the constitution. When we look at the provisions of our constitutional system and the practices that have occurred under it, we find that the power of dissolution is a harmonizing power. It is conferred for a special purpose. It is conferred for the purpose of bringing into harmony the different powers of the State when the powers of the State differ from each other. Take, for instance, the differences which may arise between the Crown and the House of Commons. If differences should arise the power of dissolution may be exercised for the purpose of bringing the advisers of the Crown and the House of Commons into harmony again. But I would ask any hon. gentleman upon the Treasury benches to mention in the whole history of England where there has been a single case of an Administration dissolving Parliament when that Administration enjoyed the confidence of the House of Commons and when no conflict had arisen between the two Houses of Parliament. Let us take the instances which have occurred in English parliamentary history. In 1784 the Crown, upon the advice of Mr. Pitt the younger, dissolved Parliament. Under what circumstances was Parliament dissolved? Pitt did so when the House of Commons refused supplies, when the India Bill was defeated, and when a large number of the House had again and again voted against him, but when he was defeated by a majority of one he appealed to the country and the country sustained the dissolution. There was in this case a difference of opinion between the advisers of the Crown and the House of Commons, and it was for the purpose of bringing these two into harmony again that the dissolution took place. Take again the case of 1834 when William IV dismissed the Melbourne Administration and formed a Government under Peel. A dissolution took place then, and why? Because the Government that the King had constituted was in a minority and did not enjoy the confidence of Parliament. The election was brought about for the purpose of bringing the House of Commons into harmony with the Administration for the time being. We find in every case that the prerogative of dissolution is exercised for this purpose. It is not a fact that the Crown has an arbitrary discretion in this matter. It is true that if the Crown dissolves Parliament upon the advice of the Administration the Administration is responsible for

the dissolution, the constitution makes that dissolution effective, but it is not the less a violation of the principle of the constitution when the Crown is so advised, if there is no difference between the House of Commons and the Government of the day. Why, Sir, the right hon. gentleman was not defeated in the last Parliament. He had not proposed any measure which he had failed to carry; there was nothing which he had suggested or asked at the hands of that Parliament which he could not have succeeded in carrying. Then, I say that there was no precedent for the course the hon. gentleman took. It is true, in 1859 the Government of Lord Derby dissolved Parliament, and he appealed to the country, not for the purpose of ascertaining the opinion of the country on any legislative or administrative measure of the Government, but he had been called into office by Her Majesty. He formed a Government which existed by forbearance; and he gave as a reason for dissolution that if he resigned his opponents would be unable to form an administration that would command the majority of the House. So he appealed to the country, asking the country, under the existing circumstances, to give to Her Majesty an administration which might be able to carry on the government effectively. Sir, the principles upon which Parliament may be dissolved and an appeal had to the country are very well set out by Professor Dicey in his recent work on the English constitution. I will read a paragraph or two from that work, the effect of which is this: That in every instance where a dissolution is had, it is for the purpose of harmonizing differences that exist between the Government and the House of Commons—a condition of things that did not exist in the circumstances of this country when the recent dissolution took place. Professor Dicey says:

"The discretionary power of the Crown occasionally may be, and according to constitutional precedents sometimes ought to be, used to strip an existing House of Commons of its authority."

Assuming that the House of Commons may have so far gone wrong—may have so far exhibited a spirit contrary to the best interests of the country, and so much at variance with the popular sentiment, as to justify the Crown in its dissolution—

"But the reason why the House can in accordance with the constitution be deprived of power and of existence is that an occasion has arisen on which there is fair reason to suppose that the opinion of the House is not the opinion of the electors."

Do the Government say that that was the case here, that the late House of Commons did not fairly support the policy or opinion of the Administration or reflect the popular sentiment, and that they dissolved the House for the purpose of ascertaining what the popular sentiment really was, and for the purpose of fairly and honestly giving expression to that popular sentiment in a new House? That I apprehend the hon. gentleman cannot fairly argue. Prof. Dicey goes on to say:

"A dissolution is, in its essence, an appeal from the legal to the political sovereign. A dissolution is allowable or necessary whenever the wishes of the legislature are, or may fairly be presumed to be, different from the wishes of the nation."

Did the hon. First Minister ever argue that, according to his view, the opinions and sentiments of the recent House of Commons were at variance with the sentiments and opinions of the nation, and that on that ground the dissolution took place? Professor Dicey again says:

"Admit that the electors are the political sovereigns of the state, and the result appears naturally to follow that an appeal to them by means of a dissolution is constitutional, whenever there is valid and reasonable ground for supposing that their parliamentary representatives have ceased to represent their wishes."

Now, who has argued that the late House of Commons ceased to represent the wishes and sentiments of the people of this country? And if the Government did not think so, it ought not to have dissolved; it had no constitutional right or authority for advising dissolution: and I say that in the political history of England it will be found in every instance that differences had arisen between the two Houses, or the House of Commons and the Government, and the dissolution was for the purpose of correcting those variances, and once more restoring harmony between the House of Commons and the Administration. Let me next read an observation made on this subject by Sir Robert Peel, whom the hon. gentleman will admit to be a high constitutional authority. No one in his day knew better what the principles and spirit of the constitution were, and perhaps no one in his day adhered more strictly to what he believed to be the principles and the spirit of the constitution than he did. Now, Sir Robert Peel says with regard to the advice to be given to the Crown on the subject of a dissolution:

"We have advised Her Majesty to accept our resignation at once without adopting that alternative to which we might have resorted, namely, recommending to the Crown the exercise of its prerogative and the dissolution of the present Parliament. I do not hesitate to avow, speaking with a frankness that I trust will offend no one, that if Her Majesty's Government had failed in carrying, in all their integrity, the main measures of commercial policy which it was my duty to recommend, that there is no exertion that I would not have made—no sacrifice that I would not have incurred—in order to ensure the ultimate success of those measures, or at any rate to give the country an opportunity of pronouncing its opinion on the subject. For such a purpose, I should have felt justified in advising dissolution: because I think the continuance of doubt and uncertainty on such important matters, would have been a greater evil than the resort to a constitutional mode of ascertaining the opinion of the nation. But there has been fortunately no necessity for a dissolution of Parliament upon that ground. Those who dissented most strongly from our commercial policy, withdrew all factious and unseemly opposition, and, protesting against our measures, they have finally allowed them to pass. Those measures having thus become the law, I do not feel that we should be justified, for any subordinate considerations, for the mere interests of Government or party, in advising the exercise of the prerogative to which I have referred, and the dissolution of Parliament. I feel very strongly that no Administration is justified in advising the exercise of that prerogative, unless there be a reasonable presumption, a strong moral conviction indeed, that after dissolution they would be enabled to administer the affairs of the country through the support of a party sufficiently powerful to carry their measures."

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Hear, hear.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear," but what is the point of the whole speech? That the Government make this appeal because in the existing House of Commons they cannot get on, and because they believe the sentiment of the country differs from the sentiment of the House. It is for the purpose of reconciling the variation that exists between two powers in the State, here between the Government and the House of Commons, and for no other purpose whatever. There is no instance in English history of a dissolution such as that which the Government advised on this occasion, and no

misuse of the prerogative could be more gross than that under which that dissolution took place. Sir Robert Peel goes on to say :

"I do not think a dissolution justifiable for the purpose merely of strengthening a party. The power of dissolution is a great instrument in the hands of the Crown; and it would have a tendency to blunt the instrument if it were employed without grave necessity. If the purpose were to enable the country to decide whether ministers had been justified in proposing the measures of commercial policy brought forward at the beginning of the session, those measures having passed into a law, I do not think such a purpose alone would be a sufficient ground for a dissolution. There ought also to be a strong presumption that after a new election there would be returned to this House a party with strength sufficient to enable the Government, by their support, to carry that system of public policy of which it approved."

Now, some years later, another dissolution took place, a dissolution under the Government of Lord Derby; and on that occasion, Lord John Russell expressed his opinion upon the subject of that dissolution. Lord Derby's Government had been defeated. The dissolution was not for the purpose of simply strengthening his party but for the purpose of restoring harmony between the Administration and the House of Commons. The House of Commons had defeated a weak Administration; it had defeated the Government of Lord Derby, and he said that as his political opponents were divided it was impossible to constitute a government in a House so divided, which could be assured of the continued support of the Commons, and so a dissolution took place for the purpose of furnishing Her Majesty with a government and a House of Commons whose sentiments would be in accord. Lord John Russell on that occasion made this statement :

"It appears that the right hon. gentleman told his constituents that if a majority of this House had voted a censure upon Her Majesty's Government they would have to defend their opinions upon the hustings. Now, I beg leave to remind the House what have been the maxims on this subject of other statesmen while possessing the confidence of the Crown. They have thought where there was a great question depending, upon which no satisfactory conclusion would be obtained in this House—when the House and the Ministers of the Crown were decidedly at variance, such as was the case upon the Great India Bill of 1784, upon the Reform Bill of 1831, upon the question of free trade in 1841—that the solution of any such question should be sought in an appeal to the electors of the United Kingdom. But it is quite another matter when the question is whether a particular prime-minister, or a particular party should remain in office. And when Sir Robert Peel in 1846, explained his conduct in this House on resigning office, he stated that he had declined to propose to, or to advise Her Majesty to dissolve this House, because it was his opinion that that was a most delicate and sacred prerogative of the Crown, and ought not to be exercised for the purpose of any individual who might be at the head of affairs or for the purpose of any party. Now that entirely agrees with my opinion, and when I offered my resignation to Her Majesty in 1852 I declined to offer any advice to Her Majesty to dissolve the then Parliament. But there seems to be an opinion acquiring weight, which I am sorry to observe, that upon any occasion when a ministry has not a majority he may have recourse to that which Burke called, and I think truly called, a penal dissolution that is to say, he may not only put the members of this House to the great trouble and expense of an election, but may expose them to the dangers of any misrepresentation to which they may be subject in the performance of their duty. Now that, I think, ought not to be the relation between the Crown and the members of the House of Commons."

It appears that the right hon. gentleman told his constituents that if a majority voted a censure upon Her Majesty's Government they would have to defend their opinions on the hustings. Now, I beg leave to remind the House what have been the maxims on this subject of other statesmen while possessing the confidence of the Crown. They have thought when there was a great question depending, upon which no satisfactory conclusion could be obtained in this House, when the House and the Ministers of the Crown were decidedly at variance, such as was the case upon the great India Bill of 1784, or when the House of Lords defeats the measures supported by the House of Commons, as upon the Reform Bill. The House will see by this quotation that Lord John Russell, on that occasion, assumed that even then dissolution would only be advised in case a difference had arisen between the majority in the House of Commons and the Administration. I have already alluded to the circumstances under which Lord Derby advised the dissolution of Parliament in 1859 upon the defeat of his Administration on the proposed Reform Bill : and lest it might be supposed that the sentiments which he expressed in any way support the Government here on this occasion, I will read a sentence or two from his speech in the House of Lords, in defence of the advice he had given, and also a sentence or two from the speech of Mr. Disraeli, who was then Chancellor of the Exchequer and leader for the Government in the House of Commons. It will be seen from both these extracts that neither Minister supposed for a moment, that there could be any advice given pointing to a dissolution except there was a difference between the Government and the majority in the House of Commons, which made it impossible that the work of administration and legislation could be sucessfully carried on. Lord Derby, on the occasion I have referred to, said this:

"We do not appeal to the country on the subject of Parliamentary Reform, still less do we appeal to the country on the particular provisions of that Bill. We appeal to the country on a much larger and broader question, whether the present state of the House of Commons, split up as it is into hundreds of petty parties, any one of which is unable to conduct the business of the country, but which are able by combining together, to obstruct any Government that may be formed, shall receive the continued support and countenance of the people of England. We appeal to them as men who have endeavoured faithfully to discharge the duties of our office, who have endeavoured to deserve the confidence which the House of Commons has withheld and the confidence which our Sovereign has been pleased to renew to us."

That was the ground upon which Lord Derby, in 1859, based his appeal to the country, and defended the advice in favour of the dissolution which he gave Her Majesty on that occasion. And Mr. Disraeli, in speaking to the House of Commons on the same occasion, said :

"Believing that this state of affairs is prejudicial to the repute of Parliament and injurious to the best interests of the country, and believing, too, that it is of the utmost importance at this moment that the authority of the Government should be supported by the authority of Parliament, and not being conscious that during the time we have exercised power we have done anything to forfeit the good opinion of our fellow-countrymen, we have thought it our duty to advise Her Majesty to exercise her prerogative and to dissolve this Parliament."

Here you see again the ground of dissolution is a difference which existed between the House of Commons and the Administration for the time being. In 1868, the Government of Mr. Disraeli was defeated upon Mr. Gladstone's motion for the Disestablishment of the Irish Church; and on that occasion Mr. Disraeli intimated to Parliament that he would advise the dissolution of the House. Mr. Gladstone, in speaking against the proposition of dissolution, said that there was a majority of sixty or sixty-five against the Administration on the two motions upon which they had been defeated, and

that, in the face of so large a majority, it was, in his opinion, contrary to constitutional practice to advise Her Majesty to dissolve Parliament. He also went on to state the circumstances under which he thought an Administration would be justified in advising the Crown to dissolve. He expressed his opinion as follows:—

"There are two conditions, as it appears to me, which are necessary in order to make an appeal to the country by a Government whose existence is menaced, a legitimate appeal. The first of them is that there should be an adequate cause of public policy; and the second of them is that there should be a rational prospect of a reversal of the vote of the House of Commons."

The Government must be menaced—that is his first proposition. Was the Government of Canada menaced here? What measure did the Government propose to the late Parliament which they felt assured they could not carry? Upon what question were they here defeated? The Government were not menaced and there was not a rational prospect of a reversal of the vote of the House of Commons, because there was no question of difference between the House of Commons and the Administration. I say, then, that there is not a particle of ground for the course the Government have taken. There is no constitutional precedent. There was nothing whatever to warrant the Administration in advising His Excellency to dissolve the late Parliament. The law says that Parliament shall last for five years. The law has entrusted to the Administration a great power—a power which, in their hands, is a great trust. They have the power of shortening that period of five years when the necessity arises. What is that necessity? The principles, the practices and the maxims of parliamentary government point out when that necessity arises and when that advice may be constitutionally given. It may be given when the Government are defeated in the House of Commons. It may be given when they find it impossible to get on in the House of Commons. It may be given to obtain from the political Sovereign a mandate to the Upper House when it has stood in the way of necessary legislation. But that was not the condition of the Administration here, and the dissolution of Parliament on their part was a most unwarranted exercise of power. It is not to be supposed that because certain power is vested in the Crown, there is no restraint upon the exercise of that power. Every power possessed by the Crown is to be exercised in a particular way. We know perfectly well under what circumstances the power of disallowance will be employed. We know perfectly well what measures are likely to be reserved for the consideration of the Imperial authorities. The power is not limited in point of law, but it is limited in point of convention, and in this country the conventions are as forcible as the law itself. What does our constitution begin with? It begins by declaring that we have a constitution similar in principle to the constitution of the United Kingdom. If, therefore, there is anything in the constitution of Canada which agrees with the constitution of the United Kingdom, the strength and binding character of the rule is in favour of our constitution, because the preamble gives the force of law to the conventions themselves, and this makes it less excusable to depart from the well-settled principles here than it would in the United Kingdom. Look at the well-settled conventions in regard to the Government itself. I find that by law each department has for its head a particular Minister who is appointed by commission under the Great Seal, whose duties are specified by law, and who is sworn to discharge those duties. Yet we know that he is interfered with by his colleagues. We know that the Prime Minister may override his judgment, or he may be interfered with in Council, and his opinions may have to give way to those of his colleagues in office. That is not from the force of any law; but the conventions of the constitution make it so, and those conventions rule. The hon. gentleman himself fills the office of First Minister, but that is an office not under the law. His office is unknown to the law. The hon. gentleman assents to that proposition. Yet he knows that his power is paramount to that of his colleagues. He may dismiss anyone of his colleagues, or he may advise the Crown to do so. If anyone of his colleagues resigns, that does not break up his Government; but if he resigns the Ministry is at an end. According to law each of his colleagues is as much an adviser of the Crown as he is, but the conventions arrange the matter so that his power is superior to theirs. There is no convention or rule by which the Crown can dissolve Parliament under the circumstances which existed under which our dissolution took place. The hon. gentleman said he was appealing to the people for the purpose of ascertaining their opinions, upon what? I listened to his speech and I could not ascertain. I listened to the observations addressed to the House by the Minister of Finance, and he did not tell us. It was not for the purpose of condemning our policy, for he did not know what it was, and, if he did, that would be irrelevant to the issue. It was not to sanction the negotiation of a scheme between the United States and this country, because we do not know to this hour what that scheme is, or what negotiations have taken place. But he says that this House is summoned to decide on the policy, the papers in reference to which are to be submitted a few days hence. The hon. gentleman assents to that statement. But that policy and the papers were as much concealed from the country as from us. Then what did the elections take place for? The hon. gentleman has always held it to be a most unconstitutional proceeding to dissolve Parliament in order to decide upon a question which is in the future. Does he remember what he said in 1874, in regard to Mr. Gladstone's appeal to the country? Does he remember reading and approving an article from the *Spectator* which accused Mr. Gladstone of having proposed a bribe to the country by proposing a change of taxation, and declared that it was improper to ask the public to decide, not in regard to the past but in regard to the future? Does he remember that he did not appeal to the country in regard to our present constitution on the ground that there was then a Parliament that had no mandate from the people? Does he remember that the question of the Union of the Provinces was never submitted to the people in any shape? It is true that on that question many eminent English statesmen have differed from the ground taken by the hon. gentleman. It was on different ground that important changes in the constitution ought not to be made without popular sanction, that Mr. Disraeli justified the dissolution of Parliament on the question of the Separation of Church and

State in Ireland. I have in my hand an extract from a speech of Mr. Disraeli on that occasion, maintaining that Parliament had not a right to deal with this question without an appeal to the country, because, he said, you might change the whole constitution or the whole basis of society without an appeal to the people at all. These are his words:

"This is one of the gravest questions which can be brought before the consideration of public men. You are public men; you are men all of great intelligence and many of you of eminence. You make a Senate that the world speaks of with pride, while it recognizes your attributes with consciousness that your conduct elevates the general character of human nature. But remember that you are something more than Senators. You are representatives of a nation, and of an ancient nation, and I deny your moral competence to come to a decision such as that which the hon. member for Birmingham has recommended, and such as the right hon. gentleman, the member for South Lancashire, is prepared practically to carry out—I deny your moral competence to do that without an appeal to the nation. I say it is a question upon which the country can alone decide, particularly under the circumstances at which we have now arrived. You cannot come on a sudden, and without the country being the least informed of your intention, to a decision that will alter the character of England and her institutions."

That was a declaration in reference to radical changes in the constitution, in reference to altering the constitution which had stood for centuries, and in regard to an appeal for obtaining the sanction of the nation to a change of very grave and great importance. There was nothing of that sort here. There was no great proposition submitted by one party and opposed by another, which the hon. gentleman was not able to carry through the House of Commons, and upon which he thought it necessary to take the opinion of the country. And so there is not in the whole history of England, in the whole history of parliamentary government in England, a single precedent for the course which the hon. gentleman has taken. Why, if any one will look at Professor Hearne's book on the English system of Government, he will find there a chapter on the means provided under the English constitution for harmonizing the different powers of the State. Now, he deals with this subject of dissolution in that chapter, and he makes the exercise of the power of dissolution subservient to one purpose, that is, the purpose of bringing the House of Commons into harmony with the advisers of the Crown, or with the Crown itself, or with the House of Lords where that body has rejected an important measure; and when a difference has arisen we can see a rational reason for the exercise of that power. But what reason was there for a dissolution here? Why, Sir, simply the reasons assigned by my hon. friend to my left—the Government saw that the current of public opinion was setting in against the policy which they had advocated, and they thought to anticipate it and obtain a verdict from the country before opinion was formed irretrievably against them. The hon. the Minister of Finance has referred to negotiations that he stated were begun in November. Why, Sir, we remember a visit of the hon. gentleman in November to Halifax. We remember the hon. Minister of Justice was feeling his way in the Province of Nova Scotia, and when the Minister of Finance visited the Province of New Brunswick, many of us anticipated a violation of the constitution by a dissolution of Parliament. The Government were feeling their way. The documents to which the hon. gentleman referred, and which I have no doubt, as he says they existed, did exist, were documents prepared with a view to dissolution, as an excuse or pretext for dissolution. The dissolution was not for the purpose of seeing whether the people approved what the documents contained, but they were prepared to assist the Government in successfully appealing to the country, if it was thought safe to make the appeal at all. The Government seem to have changed their minds, to have given up the idea of dissolution. Their intention was to call Parliament together again, but many things had transpired to further alarm them, and instead of calling Parliament together they reverted to the original proposition and issued a new manifesto, which the hon. gentleman for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has read here to-night, and appealed to the country. All the time they were hesitating between the question of the National Policy and the question of reciprocity—whether they should support reciprocity or whether they should support the National Policy. They were not very sure. The right hon. gentleman asked that the old flag, and the old policy, and the old gentleman himself, should be supported. Now we understand all that. That was not reciprocity, that was the National Policy, it was the adherence to the old policy: that was the appeal made. But when the hon. gentleman and his friends came amongst the electors, they found that that was a very unsafe ground upon which to stand, and so they issued a new proposition and reciprocity was added. The hon. gentleman's policy reminds me of the cartoons that appeared years ago in *Punch*. I think it was in 1851 or 1852, in which Disraeli was represented as a chameleon upon whom free trade and protection were written, but written so intermixed that it was impossible to tell whether it spelled free trade or whether it spelled protection. And so it became impossible in many constituencies to say whether the right hon. gentleman and his friends were in favour of reciprocity or whether they were in favour of the National Policy. That they could not favour both, everybody can understand. The hon. gentleman says that he is in favour of free trade in coal. Why, I learn in the west that he has also made a proposition in favour of free trade in petroleum.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not yet.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is one of the things that is to come.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will see.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, we shall no doubt see precisely what the policy of the Government will be. An hon. friend near me says the country will have no opportunity of passing upon the policy. The Government do not intend that they should. We do not know, the Government do not know, what their policy will be. They tell us now they will know some time after the 12th October, and so when we meet here again, if the Government survive until that time, then we on this side, and the hon. gentlemen on that side who support the Administration, will be able to tell what the policy of the Administration upon the industrial and fiscal affairs of this country will really be. At present no one knows. Ministers cannot say; yet we are told the country has given a verdict in favour of this unknown thing. Now, the hon. gentleman has said that he

is in favour of a measure of reciprocity. He is in favour of free trade in natural products, and, perhaps, *plus X*. He thinks that will not endanger British connection, but he thinks if we have free trade in manufactured articles, it would endanger British connection, it would interfere with our political relations with our neighbours to the south and with the mother country. Why, then, was the mission to Washington undertaken? The hon. gentleman says that you may raise a horse and sell him to an American, you may send him across the border, and the institutions of this country, as British institutions, will not be impaired: but if you manufacture a harness and put it on that horse and send the horse and harness together across the border, without either being taxed, there is danger of the constitution being pulled down. You may send a hide across the border and no political injury will follow, but if you convert that hide into leather and send it across the border irreparable mischief will be the consequence. You may send wool and no harm is done, but if it is spun and manufactured into cloth and sent across the border, what?—it will wear down the constitution. That is the argument that the hon. gentleman, with a good deal of vehemence, addressed to the electors of this country, and he seriously asks this House to accept it as conclusive on this question of our political relations with our neighbours. Sir, I do not hold the right hon. gentleman's views. I have greater faith in the common sense of the people of this country. I say that from the course the Government have pursued during the last twelve years, property has greatly depreciated in value, the income of the population has largely diminished, the people have become discontented, and, in my opinion, poverty and discontent are more powerful contributors towards revolutionary changes than are any of those important fiscal changes which we have spoken of from this side of the House. The hon. gentleman knows that one-fifth of the population of this country has crossed the boundary line, and so far as they are concerned, annexation is an accomplished fact. They have not taken the territory, but they have taken what is more valuable than territory, they have taken the brains, and the muscle, and the sinew, and the energies which would serve to build up and contribute to the greatness of this country; they have taken them abroad and made them a part and parcel of a neighbouring nation. The hon. gentleman should also bear in mind another thing that flows from what has taken place: he should bear in mind that when you have one-fifth of those born in Canada on the American side who have become citizens of the United States, you have done a great deal towards making the two peoples one people: you have associated them in personal interest, as they are associated in personal affection and in all those feelings that relationship creates. It is of all the more consequence, and the impression is growing stronger in this country that it is of great consequence, that we should become commercially, as far as possible, one people, as we have become one in blood, and in kin, and in domestic association. Then there is another thing that should be borne in mind: that while commercial relations, extended as they would be under a system of free trade, would do a great deal towards the abolition of ill-feeling and national rivalry between this country and the United States, and would so far contribute towards union, they also, by increasing the prosperity of our people, would contribute to their contentment, and contentment is never a powerful instrument in the production of revolutionary changes. When the people are more contented revolutionary changes are more difficult. We are far less likely to alter our political relations if we become more prosperous in consequence of our more intimate relations with the United States, than we would by remaining in a condition of isolation and a condition of poverty. There is much force in the observation made some years ago by Prof. Goldwin Smith, that Canada was, to some extent, the ragged edge cut off from the American Republic. We are not a continuous country as is the United States; we are of very much less depth; the chances of our people east and west trading with one another are far less than are the chances of their trading with the people of the United States in their own immediate vicinity, if no impediment were placed in the way of trade. The assiduous attempts made during the past ten years to prevent trade between the two countries, so far from creating in this country a distinct nationality, have tended to create discontent and to favour those conditions which must contribute towards those political changes which the hon. gentleman thinks are not desirable. I believe our constitutional system, fairly carried out, is a more satisfactory system of government than theirs, but I should like a more satisfactory Administration than has been given during the past twelve years. I do not think the First Minister has made the best impression that could be made in favour of our political system; but if he wishes that system to be maintained, he should not desire to impose on the people a condition of perpetual inferiority, of poverty and isolation. The people will follow their material interests, and those who contribute to the creation of a state of prosperity for the people, will do most to bring about political contentment, and place an impediment in the way of great and radical changes. For these reasons, I am opposed to the policy which the First Minister has seen proper hitherto to pursue, and I think the proposition made by my hon. friend near me should be accepted as the easiest way out of the difficulty, and the one most conducive to the public interests. It may be one humiliating for the Government to adopt, but that is their fault, and their fault should not be made a public misfortune. It is of the first importance to this country, that we should have extensive trade relations with the neighbouring Republic, and we can only have them on the condition of granting free trade. I do not believe that the question of revenue is such a difficult one as the Minister of Finance endeavours to make it appear. I say this: that if he finds it impossible to promote the best interests of the country in this way, he must give place to those who can, for if hon. gentlemen on this side of the House cross to the Treasury benches, I can promise there will be no difficulty whatever in meeting the ordinary requirements of the country, and at the same time establishing unrestricted trade with the neighbouring Republic.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would ask my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Laurier), whether it is the intention to divide the House on the motion?

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman is aware that we have not moved an amendment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am quite aware of that.

Mr. CHARLTON moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.05 .m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 4th May, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House do now proceed to the Orders of the Day.

Motion agreed to.

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

Mr. CHARLTON. A trifle over three months ago the country was startled by a proclamation dissolving the Sixth Parliament of Canada, we are here to-day in the First Session of the Seventh Parliament of Canada, and we are considering just now why we are called here in that capacity. The dissolution was a very sudden one, a contest was precipitated upon the country without a moment's warning; it was a very bitter contest, and we are now assembled here at about the date when we should have been dispersing for our various homes, engaging in a Session which promises to last during the last of the spring months and possibly—probably, indeed—during the three summer months, a time of the year very inconvenient to all the members assembled here; and unless there is some reason for the action the Government has taken, in prematurely dissolving the Sixth Parliament and calling the Seventh Parliament together at this unseasonable season of the year, it is natural, at least for the members of the Opposition, to entertain feeling towards the Government the reverse of complimentary or grateful. The reasons assigned by the Government for this dissolution, in my opinion, will hardly, upon investigation, prove satisfactory to the country.

On the third day of February the Government organ, the Toronto *Empire*, contained the following:—

"REASONS OF THE APPEAL.

"In view of the foregoing important statement,"—

That is, the statement of dissolution—

—"the question will naturally be asked: What are the reasons which have induced the Government to appeal to the country at the present time? It is understood that the Dominion Government have through Her Majesty's Government made certain proposals to the United States for negotiation looking to an extension of our commerce with that country. These proposals have been submitted to the President for his consideration, and the Canadian Government is of the opinion that if the negotiations are to result in a treaty which must be ratified by the Parliament of Canada, it is expedient that the Government should be able to deal with a Parliament fresh from the people rather than with a moribund House."

"A CANADIAN COMMISSION.

"It is understood that Canada will send a delegation to Washington after March 4, the date on which the life of the present Congress expires, for the purpose of discussing informally the question of the extension and development of the trade between the United States and Canada and the settlement of all questions of difference between the two countries. This delegation will visit the United States, it is said, as the result of a friendly suggestion from Washington."

And on the following day, in the same journal, we have additional reasons given for this step which the Government of Canada thought fit to take on the third day of February last.

"NATURE OF THE GOVERNMENT'S PROPOSALS—WHY THEY WERE MADE.

"In view of the importance of the reasons which have induced the Government to appeal to the country at the present moment, the *Empire* was privileged to publish a copy of the despatch from His Excellency the Governor General to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, showing the nature of the Government's proposals to the United States, and indicating the earnest desire of the Administration for the development of trade between the United States and Canada. The despatch is as follows:—

"'GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
"'OTTAWA, 13th December, 1890.

"'MY LORD,—I have the honour to send to Your Lordship to-day a telegraphic message in cipher of which the following is the substance:—

"'With reference to my telegram of the 10th instant, this Government is desirous of proposing a joint commission, such as that of 1871, with authority to deal without limitation, and to prepare a treaty respecting the following subjects:—

"'1. Renewal of the reciprocity treaty of 1854, with the modifications required by the altered circumstances of both countries, and with the extensions deemed by the commission to be in the interests of Canada and the United States.

"'2. Reconsideration of the treaty of 1888 with respect to the Atlantic fisheries, with the aim of securing the free admission into the United States markets of Canadian fishery products, in return for facilities to be granted to United States fishermen to buy bait and supplies and to transship cargoes in Canada, all such privileges to be mutual.

"'3. Protection of mackerel and other fisheries on the Atlantic Ocean and in inland waters: also

"'4. Relaxation of seaboard coasting laws of the two countries.

"'5. Relaxation of the coasting laws of the two countries on the inland waters dividing Canada from the United States.

"'6. Mutual salvage and saving of wrecked vessels.

"'7. Arrangements for settling boundary between Canada and Alaska.

"'The treaty would, of course, be *ad referendum*.'"

And then the Government organ at Toronto proceeded to show the nature of the proposed treaty, the proposed movement, and the reasons for undertaking it. It proceeded to draw a contrast between the arrangements the Government proposed to make, and the Brown draft treaty of 1874, and asserted that the purpose of the Government was to negotiate a treaty upon the lines of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, in natural products only; and concluded:

"An offer of this kind is as different as the poles asunder from the unrestricted arrangements which the Grits are advocating, as seemingly they are anxious to hand Canada over, body and bones, to the United States. The result of their policy, as well-known reformers like Mr. E. W. Thomson admit, would inevitably lead to direct taxation, which this country never would submit to. The Government's offer differs also from the one made by the Hon. George Brown in 1874, the proposals embracing, in addition to natural products, agricultural implements

and thirty-seven branches of manufactures. It will, therefore, be seen that the position that the Government takes is entirely borne out by the speech made by Sir John Macdonald in Toronto last week, when he said that the Government would stand by the policy introduced by the Conservative party in 1878. It is believed, however, that it is possible for a fair reciprocal arrangement to be arrived at which might be conducive to, not subversive of, the interests of our manufacturers."

Now, Sir, subsequent events, I think, point clearly to the fact that the Government were not actuated, in the dissolution of this House in February last, by any such motives as they claim. I think, when we come to examine the facts, we will see that the dissolution of the last House, even in view of the initiation of reciprocity negotiations, was entirely unnecessary. The Government tell us that they intended to appoint a commission to proceed to Washington, and their organ makes a statement of the fact that Congress ceased to exist on 4th March last, and it wished to send a delegation to Washington for the purpose of an informal conference with the American authorities. Now, Sir, this dissolution took place one year in advance of the time that the life of this Parliament would expire, and more. The Government, on three successive occasions, has trampled upon the constitutional rights of this House in cutting short the life of Parliament. The last three Parliaments have aggregated a period of twelve years, when they should have aggregated a period of fifteen years, and the Government, on these three occasions, has allowed political expediency to override the constitutional privileges of the people. Its action upon the last occasion was peculiarly aggravated, for the reason that the constitution provides that at the end of every decennial census there shall be a redistribution of seats in this House, and if this House had been allowed to run its natural term of days the Government could have held a session last winter, they could have held a short session after the population returns were received from the census now being taken, they could have assembled the House and have made a redistribution of seats, and then dissolved the House, and still they would have been in ample time for the negotiations at Washington; because the term of the last Congress ceased on 4th March last, and the next session of Congress will meet on the first Monday of December next, and during all the coming summer and autumn the Government could have pursued its informal negotiations with the Government at Washington. The submission or ratification of a treaty could not be proceeded with, or even formal negotiations entered upon, before Congress assembles, for the President of the United States has not the power to appoint commissioners without the consent of Congress, and only after Congress met on the first Monday of December would the President be able to appoint commissioners to meet our commissioners, and after a treaty had been negotiated it would have to be submitted to the Senate of the United States for ratification, as well as to the Canadian Parliament, so that, months after the meeting of Congress, we would have had an opportunity of passing upon a treaty with a new Parliament elected according to the constitution, and after the expiration of the time of the old Parliament, which was cut short of its life by the action of the Government.

The reason, then, assigned by the Government for this dissolution is not the true reason. It is an insult to the intelligence of the country to tell the people that Parliament was dissolved in order to have a Parliament elected that could deal with reciprocal arrangements, in view of the fact that nothing could be formally done until after the meeting of Congress next December and the appointment of commissioners by the United States. Subsequent events strengthened this conclusion. The elections were held on 5th March. The House met here on 29th April. In the meantime commissioners had been sent to Washington. They did not proceed there exactly in an official character, at all events they were not received in an official capacity; they could not have been received in an official capacity. Of course, they might go there and talk over matters informally with Mr. Blaine, or with anyone they chose to talk with in Washington; but they could not act as formal plenipotentiaries, as commissioners charged with negotiating a treaty with the representatives of the United States. They were powerless to do so and had no such function. So this was merely a by-play, another act in this drama of sham for the purpose of convincing the country that the Government meant something when it dissolved Parliament; that it was for the purpose of appealing to the people on this question of reciprocity and laying the result of its negotiations before a Parliament that was not a moribund Parliament. No, Sir; the object of this dissolution was simply to forestall public opinion. We had in Canada a question of momentous importance under discussion. It was being considered by the people, the people were interested in the discussion, it was a matter of vast importance to the people. And if the Government of the day had had due care for the interests of the people, if it had desired to promote their interests and consult their will, it would have allowed full time to consider definitely and fully the important proposition before them. But the Government chose not to permit the people of Canada to examine into the arguments *pro* and *con* with respect to this policy that it was proposed to adopt to further the interests of the Dominion; on the contrary it proceeded to dissolve Parliament abruptly, and appealed to the people for the purpose of securing a snap judgment, and for the purpose, as I have said, of forestalling public opinion.

So now we are here to consider this question; we are here if possible to probe this matter to the bottom, to examine as to what the actual motives of the Government were, and to ask the Government what it intends to do in the premises. Those hon. gentlemen have pretended to be in favour of reciprocity and have gone to the country on the question. On this side of the House there are a certain number of gentlemen in favour of reciprocity, elected as favourable to reciprocity—reciprocity of the unrestricted character. On that side of the House there are a number of members elected on a sort of *quasi*-reciprocity platform. They adopted that platform, and they led their constituents to believe that the Government meant to obtain reciprocity, that the Government was honest in its desire to obtain reciprocity, and that if elected, the Government were as likely to obtain it as would be the Opposition if they were placed in power; and thus in this House there is a great majority of members elected either directly as supporters of reciprocity or as supporters of the Govern-

ment and who yet favour reciprocity. I do not doubt that the Government is in favour of reciprocity of a certain kind. Those hon. gentlemen have been in favour of a kind of reciprocity for a great number of years: it is only fair to admit that such is the case. The question is: What kind of reciprocal treaty can the Government obtain? If the Government is only in favour of a certain kind of reciprocity, if it will stop short in the negotiations on the ground that beyond that point reciprocity will not be acceptable, then the question before the people is this: Is that kind of reciprocity which the Government will not accept of that character which they should agree to accept in the interests of the country rather than fail to secure any treaty whatever? The Government will find, in my opinion, that if they are ever successful in any negotiations, they will have to come to the position occupied by the Liberal party. They can get a treaty of reciprocity—we shall be glad to aid them in getting it—simply on the terms the Liberal party propose and on no other terms; and if they are not willing to accept the terms we have outlined, they may try to secure a treaty, but they will fail. There is no reason for believing that a treaty can be obtained on any other grounds than those set forth by the Liberal party.

Mr. BOWELL. Tell us what they are.

Mr. CHARLTON. It might not be complimentary, and I will not do so. I do not believe that hon. gentlemen opposite are themselves agreed as to what they are willing to accept. The Secretary of State is more advanced in opinion than is the Minister of Customs, and no doubt there are different phases of opinion in the Cabinet, so that perhaps the Government is fishing just now for information. I am inclined to think they will know their opinion better after they receive returns to their circular sent to the manufacturing establishments all over the country, asking how far free trade with the United States would affect their particular lines of goods.

Mr. BOWELL. Perhaps you will say what you are.

Mr. CHARLTON. I will tell the hon. gentleman what we are before I get through, but he may not believe it. I assure the hon. gentleman and the hon. Minister of Finance that they will find on this side of the House an honest desire to aid in securing any kind of a treaty that will improve our commercial relations with the United States. We will be glad to aid the Minister of Finance. We will sink party and all considerations of party advantage to aid him in securing that which is best for the interests of the country; but we will ask the hon. gentleman to meet us in a like spirit, to forget party predilections and be governed by the same consideration we profess to be governed by, namely, that of advancing the best interests of the country. We ask him to secure a reciprocity treaty, and if he is unable to do so on his own ground, to make concessions and compromises, to go beyond that point where he considers he should stop, for the purpose of securing for this great country the almost inestimable privilege of free trade relations with the nation to the south of us.

This being the case, our disposition being to help forward this work, I think, perhaps, we had better look over the ground and take stock and see where we stand, see what can be done, deliberate in a friendly spirit what is best to be done, as to how far we can go, and as to the point where we must stop. The hon. Minister of Finance told us in his speech the other night, a very able speech made almost impromptu, an energetic speech in which the hon. gentleman brought out his points very well and made a good defence of his side of the case, that this Government has at all times been in favour of a renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854. There is not a sane man in Canada who would not have been in favour of a renewal of that treaty; but there is another party that is not in favour of its renewal. While we are in favour of it, the United States Government have been opposed to its provisions, and are now opposed to a renewal of it. So we cannot meet on common ground in regard to that treaty. When this Government declared to the country, time and again, that they favoured a renewal of the Treaty of 1854, they were simply deluding the people, for they knew that the United States would not grant them a renewal; and so we might just as well dismiss that part of the case, for there is no use talking about anything impracticable. We may be willing to take something we cannot get, but if we cannot get it it is folly for us to talk about it. The Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 was abrogated by the American Government in 1866 for reasons which they considered quite sufficient. During the twelve years that treaty was in operation we sold to the Americans $246,000,000, in round numbers, worth of free goods, and they sold to us $125,000,000, in round numbers, worth of free goods. In that list was included the raw cotton and the raw tobacco which we bought of them, and which we never dreamt of taxing. The Americans seeing this, said: "This treaty is not working advantageously to us; it is neither a reasonable nor a just treaty for us; it gives you the opportunity to sell to us everything you have to sell, but it deprives us of selling to you many articles which we desire to sell; we receive from you twice as many free goods as we sell to Canada." The Americans saw this and they consequently abrogated the Treaty of 1854. Now, Sir, have we reason to suppose that the American Government will accede to the proposal the Canadian Government intends to make, for reciprocity in natural products only? Let us for a moment look at the facts of the case. We sell to them such natural products as barley, horses, cattle, sheep, potatoes, hay, wool, pease, eggs, beans, lumber and a hundred other articles, not one of which they sell to us in return. This trade is, therefore, all in the one direction. They do not sell to us the kind of articles they buy from us, and consequently a treaty in natural products only, is not only not advantageous to the United States but it is, in their estimation, disadvantageous to them. The Americans ask that we shall have a truly reciprocal treaty and that they shall buy from us all the products of our labour, which are largely natural products, while we shall buy from them the products of their labour, including manufactured goods. They ask that we shall exchange the products of our labour for the products of their labour on just and equitable terms, and unless we make such a treaty as that we will never make one at

all. When my hon. friend talks about reciprocity in natural products he is talking nonsense; he is deceiving the country, and although probably he is not deceiving himself, yet such talk is calculated and designed to deceive the people. We have before us very satisfactory evidence as to what the Government of the United States will consent to in this direction.

My hon. friend, in the course of his speech the other night, said: "Mr. Blaine said a little and left a great deal unsaid." Let us examine for a moment what Mr. Blaine did say on the subject, and although the letter which I am about to read has been quoted before, it will be necessary to read it again. Mr. Baker, a member of the House of Representatives from a district close upon the border, in which Rochester is situated, wrote as follows to Mr. Blaine on the 29th January, 1891, just three or four days before the dissolution of our House:

"WASHINGTON, 29th Jan., 1891.

"MY DEAR MR. BLAINE,—It is reported in the newspapers of Canada and along the northern border of my State, where my constituents are deeply interested in the subject, that negotiations are going on between this country and Great Britain with a view to partial reciprocity with Canada, including natural products only and not manufactures, and it is stated that Sir Charles Tupper is on his way here as a commissioner to negotiate for such modifications of our tariff. I should be very glad if you would enable me to answer my constituents.

"Very truly yours,

(Signed) "CHAS. S. BAKER."

Mr. Blaine was kind enough to enable Mr. Baker to answer his constituents and wrote him upon the same day the following answer:—

"WASHINGTON, D. C., 29th Jan., 1891.

"DEAR MR. BAKER,—I authorize you to contradict the rumours you refer to. There are no negotiations whatever on foot for a reciprocity treaty with Canada, and you may be assured no such scheme for reciprocity with the Dominion confined to natural products will be entertained by this Government. We know nothing of Sir Charles Tupper's coming to Washington.

"Very truly, &c.,

(Signed) "JAS. G. BLAINE."

My hon. friend stated that Mr. Blaine said a little, but he said enough to cover the ground. He told Mr. Baker that there were no negotiations whatever on foot between the two Governments—a statement which does not square very well with the assertions made by the Canadian Government that negotiations had been opened and that they wanted to get a new Parliament, as they did not wish to refer the legislation on these negotiations to what they called a moribund Parliament. Mr. Blaine distinctly states, in opposition to this assertion of the Canadian Government, that no such thing was the case, and he says further, that the Government of Washington will not entertain any proposition for reciprocity in natural products only. If the Canadian Government do not intend to go further than reciprocity in natural products, what is the use of their fooling the people; if they are not going further than such reciprocity they might as well keep their commissioners at home, for it is unnecessary to go to Washington on the 12th October next, and it is unnecessary to make a single move in the matter other than those they have already made. Then, Sir, when the news of the dissolution of this House reached Washington, we have the statement made of the position occupied by the other political party in the United States. The letter to Mr. Baker announces the position of the Republican party and the Government of the United States. In the action taken by the Hon. Mr. Carlisle, leader of the Democratic party in the Senate of the United States, we have a declaration of the policy of that party. For the purpose of understanding thoroughly the ground upon which we stand, I shall read to the House a resolution introduced into the United States Senate on the 29th day of December by Mr. Carlisle, and which is as follows:—

"Whereas there are existing between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Dominion of Canada, certain controversies with reference to their trade and commerce and concerning the interpretation of treaty stipulations; and, whereas, it is desirable that the most friendly relations should obtain between the people of the two countries, and that a more extended trade and commerce be established and promoted by such friendly legislation by both countries as will remove all causes of irritation and every obstacle to the healthful growth and development of such trade and commerce between them; now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that for the purpose of carrying out the spirit and intent embodied in the foregoing preamble the President of the United States be and is hereby authorized and directed to invite the Government of the Dominion of Canada to appoint three commissioners to meet a like number of commissioners to be appointed by him on behalf of the United States.

"Such joint commission shall consider all questions relating to the commercial relations of the two countries under existing treaties, concurrent legislation or otherwise, and agree upon and recommend to their respective Governments such legislation as will settle all differences and controversies between the two countries, and which will, in the judgment of said joint commission, best tend to promote the growth of trade and commerce between the United States and said Dominion of Canada."

This resolution, as I have said, was moved by Senator Carlisle upon the 29th day of December, and on the 4th day of February, when the news was received at Washington of the dissolution of the Canadian House of Commons and of the pretension of the Government of this country that they had in fact instituted negotiations for a treaty in natural products on the lines of the Treaty of 1854, Mr. Carlisle thought it proper and necessary to further define the position of the Democratic party upon this question. We see that Mr. Blaine had already defined the position of the Government on the 29th January, and on the 4th day of February, Mr. Carlisle, as leader of the Democratic party, defines the position of his party on the question by moving this amendment to his resolution:

"Such joint commission shall consider all questions affecting the commercial relations of the two countries under existing treaties and statutes, and agree upon and recommend to their respective Governments such reciprocal legislation as will settle all differences and controversies between the two countries, and in the judgment of said joint commission best tend to promote the speedy and permanent establishment of unrestricted commercial reciprocity between the United States and the said Dominion of Canada."

We have, therefore, the position of both political parties in the United States clearly defined. Mr. Blaine, for the Government of the United States, says he will entertain no proposition for reciprocity in natural products only, and the position of the Democratic party, which controls the incoming House, is defined in the amendment of Mr. Carlisle to his resolution which proposes to empower the President of the United States to appoint commissioners to treat with Canada for unrestricted commercial reciprocity only. In view of all these facts, Sir, it is sheer nonsense to talk about

the negotiation of a treaty which shall be in conformity with the policy of the Government as it existed in 1878, which shall leave the National Policy untouched, which shall not permit the United States to import manufactured goods into this country free of duty in return for the privilege we ask of importing the natural products of Canada into the United States free of duty.

Now, Sir, the hon. Minister of Finance tells us that last November a door was opened for negotiations. Well, I doubt whether it was the kind of door St. Paul refers to when he speaks of a great and effectual door being opened. I do not think it is a very effectual door. I would like to see what kind of door it is that has opened for the negotiation of a treaty with the United States on the line of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854. The hon. gentleman did not tell us what that door was, and I think we shall have to look for it with a microscope. I do not believe there is any prospect or possibility of such a treaty. I do not think the Government have any assurance upon which they can base a hope of negotiating such a treaty with the United States.

The other night when the hon. Minister of Finance was speaking of the Order in Council of the 13th of December last which had been sent to Lord Knutsford, I asked him whether at the time Mr. Blaine wrote the letter of the 29th of January, that proposal had been received at Washington. I would like to ask that question now: Whether the proposals sent by this Government to the Colonial Secretary to be forwarded to Washington had at that time been received there? We will assume that they were not received at the time the Government dissolved this House, and that the Government were guilty of an act of gross deception on the people of this country.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you take the responsibility of that assumption?

Mr. CHARLTON. I take the responsibility of saying I imagine that is the case, and I think I have reason for supposing it to be the case, from the silence of the Government when I asked them to assure me that that proposition was in the hands of the authorities at Washington at the time of the dissolution of this House. Well, the upshot of it all is that the Government decided to dissolve Parliament for purely party reasons of the most selfish character, and, having carried out their purpose, they next proceeded to exercise much ingenuity in finding plausible reasons for the course taken. It need hardly be said that they have not succeeded in finding good reasons up to the present day. We had this contest sprung upon us; and what kind of a contest was it? One of the Government's first acts was to call into requisition sneak thieves to steal correspondence, which they paraded before the country in their organs for party purposes. I think that was a kind of conduct beneath honourable men. Then we had charges of treason and disloyalty; we had a wholesale resort to calumny and detraction; we had a river of gall and malignity—all these things characterize this contest, which had been sprung on the country by this Government in order to stifle a fair expression of popular opinion on questions of paramount importance—in order to snatch a verdict before the people, after an investigation of these matters, would have been prepared to give an intelligent verdict upon them. Then, we had many personal charges. We had personal charges against my hon. friend the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). He is said to have gone to Washington. Well, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance once went to Washington. The hon. Minister of Justice went to Washington. My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance went to Washington. In the one case it is treason; what is it in the other case? I was charged with going to Washington, and I stand up to-day to admit that the charge was true. I went to Washington very much in the same capacity that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance went there. I went on official business, as Chairman of the Mining Commission of Ontario, to visit the Geological Survey Department and the Smithsonian Institute. We went further; we actually penetrated to the South, visiting Birmingham, Alabama, to examine a process in operation there for the reduction of phosphoric and sulphureous iron into steel; and we also visited Cleveland, Pittsburg and other places. We were very disloyal, if travelling about that country is a disloyal act. On another occasion since then, when I went to New York on business, having a few days' leisure I visited Washington to renew old acquaintance, to see the capital of a great country, to witness mighty interests contending for the mastery, and to feel the pulse beat of a great nation of 65,000,000; there is something inspiring in it. Now, I did not imagine that it was treason to go there. I do not think much of that feeling that considers it a crime for Canadians to make the acquaintance of American statesmen or to talk over with them the mutual relations of the two countries. I was treated in Washington as a member of any foreign legislature, Canadian or otherwise, would have been treated—with the greatest courtesy. I would like to see more members of this House visit Washington. I would like to see American congressmen come here; I would like to see the people of the two countries make the acquaintance of each other. I do not think any evil results would happen from the better acquaintance of the members of this House with the members of the United States Congress.

My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries asserted at St. John that I had modelled and passed the McKinley Bill. Well, it is rather a large amount of power to ascribe to one man; but I can assure the hon. gentleman that I have not the influence in the United States that would enable me to control their legislation. I presume he made that statement as an election story; but if he meant anything serious by it, this is the occasion on which to repudiate it.

On Friday afternoon we had the pleasure of hearing the old chieftain, the leader who went to the country with the old flag, the old policy and the old voters' list; and he was called to account by my hon. friend at my right for certain injudicious language which he had used at Halifax, and which had had a very irritating effect in the United States; and to my great regret, and I believe to the regret of everyone in this House who desires to see the establishment of friendly relations between these two countries, he refused to retract that language, and I fear he actually put his foot in it deeper. Now, in view of the fact that public men of Canada have been branded as disloyal and traitors because they have

visited the capital of the United States, such language as that held by the First Minister of the Crown, must have a very unfavourable influence upon the minds of the American people. The Americans will ask: "Well, what kind of a jaundiced, malignant, dyspeptic, jealous creature is the Canadian Tory, who would not permit a Canadian citizen to visit the United States without charging him with treason?" Such language as that used by the hon. First Minister in his Halifax speech, in which he characterized the American people as a fierce democracy, was not flattering to that people; and worse than that, it was not just. The Americans are a peaceable people; they are not a very fierce democracy. That fact was well shown on the occasion of the rebellion in that country. A very bitter feeling existed in the United States towards England on account of the Alabama depredations, and the United States had, at the close of the rebellion, a million soldiers under arms and the most powerful navy in the world.

Mr. BOWELL. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, because just at that period the change was made from wooden vessels to ironclads, and the United States had then a very powerful navy; and both France and England were behind her in efficiency of their navies. At that juncture the United States had a million trained soldiers under arms and the most powerful navy in the world. The proposition was made that the Federal troops should attack Canada and thus punish England by seizing her greatest colonial possessions, but the proposition was not entertained by the better portion of the people, and utterly failed. Among other charges he made against the people of the United States, the right hon. gentleman, while he charged them with being a fierce democracy, made representations reflecting on the foreign portion of that population. Why, Sir, we have been spending in our Immigration Department large sums annually to secure the introduction of the very class of people whom the right hon. the First Minister talks of as being a menace to the institutions of the United States. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) shakes his head, but what is the character of the American nation? Since 1820, the United States have received over 14,500,000 immigrants, the great majority of whom are Scotch, German, Scandinavian, English and Irish. It is only during recent years that Hungarians and Italians have been added to the population in any considerable number. In addition to all these, there are in the United States, forming a part of the choicest portion of their population, 1,000,000 Canadians, the very best of our people, the enterprising, the young, and the vigorous. Of the foreign element of the population of the United States, eight out of ten belong to the desirable class; and when the right hon. the First Minister spoke of that population as he did, he insulted the English, the Irish, the Scotch, the German and the Canadian foreign residents of the United States. There are not in the United States, at the present moment, probably over 7,000,000 of these foreign-born immigrants out of the 65,000,000 inhabitants, or but a small proportion relatively of the entire population.

The First Minister then went on to fill the *role* of a political Jeremiah, and predicted that the United States would in the near future suffer from revolution. All republics, he said, in the past had been subjected to revolutions from time to time, and a like fate awaited the United States; and he felicitated himself on the fact that we, in Canada, would dwell in peace in the midst of all these revolutions and dissensions which would shatter, or at least imperil, the institutions of the United States. Now, the United States have passed through some trying difficulties. They passed through a fierce struggle when the two irreconcilable principles of slavery and freedom were brought face to face, and one or the other had to be overcome; but I do not see any reason why further revolutions or troubles should occur in the near future. The federal system is the most elastic system in existence, a system never tried by any nation before, and the best authorities believe that the practical results of its operation will be to give stability to the institutions of the great country governed by it. I do not know if we can felicitate ourselves here on being entirely removed from all danger of internal trouble. We have not had, it is true, a revolution yet, but we have the discordant elements likely to create trouble in the future. We have the North-West troubles, which are not yet ended; we have the infamous policy of a bad Government; we have the Gerrymander Act, the Franchise Act; we have the revising barristers practically controlling the elections of the country, and a Government with power to exercise, in connection with the elections, any kind of rascality they please. We have our Senate not representing the country at all; we have fraudulent returning officers; we have corruption. In fact, we have, in the political elements of Canada, the materials for an explosion; and I do not think it is wise to felicitate ourselves on our total exemption from all danger in the future and to indulge in offensive predictions with regard to our neighbours.

The hon. the Finance Minister took exception to the expression "vile monopolies," used by my hon. friend for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright); but, when my hon. friend spoke of vile monopolies, he did not refer to the individuals belonging to monopolies, but to the system—that system which has been built and fostered by the tariff of this country. The system is a vile one, and it is a fortunate thing that the life of that system is drawing to a close, and that the National Policy cannot be maintained very much longer in Canada. With regard to the attitude of our manufacturers, it need not be denied that they control this Government, and that the Government is, at this moment, endeavouring to ascertain whether the manufacturers will permit it to proceed further in negotiating for reciprocity than reciprocity in natural products. This need not be denied. The manufacturing association of this country practically controls this Government. It exercises a dangerous power, it entrenches itself behind its privileges, and now probably will dictate to the Government that the masses of this country are not to be permitted to enjoy the advantages which will result from free trade with the United States, because, forsooth, such advantages may diminish the profits of that small clique which fattens on the millions of this country. So, I repeat, the manufacturers control this Government, and my hon. friend, in speaking of their monopoly as a vile monopoly was quite within the mark. I have

nothing against the manufacturer further than this, that I do not wish him to have exclusive privileges. I desire that he should succeed and prosper, but I do not want him to enjoy greater privileges than the farmer, the lumberman, the fisherman and the miner. Let each prosecute his industry, relying on his own economy, industry and foresight, and work out his way to prosperity without the aid of Government and without special privileges. I believe the people of this country will denounce this system, which makes all these great interests tributary to the manufacturing interest, when it is brought properly before them again.

With regard to the manufacturer there is one feature of the burdens imposed upon the people of this country in consequence of the policy conceived in the interest of that class, to which I wish to call the attention of the House. In the investigation made by the Hon. Robert J. Walker, the Hon. Wm. Burchard and the Hon. Wm. Springer, three high authorities in the United States, they gave, as the outcome of their inquiries, this result: that the incidental taxation in the United States—that is the increased cost of domestic goods in consequence of the increased duty as compared with the cost of these goods laid down if no duty existed—is fourteen as compared with five. That is for every five dollars of duty levied under the protective system, there are fourteen dollars of indirect taxation, in the shape of enhanced cost of the domestic product which the consumer has to pay; so that for every five dollars duty the Government collected, the consumer had to pay an extra fourteen dollars to the manufacturer. That has been shown by a very interesting table made up by Mr. Springer. He took twelve classes of goods, and showed that the importations in one year amounted to the sum of $433,173,000, the duty on which amounted to $194,464,000. The domestic manufacture of these goods in the United States amounted to $2,440,502,000; the hands employed numbered 1,327,000; the wages paid $463,606,000; and the increased cost of these goods, in consequence of protection, was $556,938,000; so that this incidental tax or the increased cost over the entire amount of wages paid in the production of these goods was $93,322,000. Now, if we take the production of domestic goods in Canada and attempt to arrive at a conclusion as to what the incidental tax is, we will find that the burdens placed upon the people of Canada by the customs duty is small as compared with that placed upon them by the enhanced cost or the incidental taxation. From the year 1881 to the year 1889-90 the customs taxation amounted to $213,510,000. If the American tables are to be relied upon we will find that an enormous amount has been contributed by the Canadian consumer in the shape of incidental taxes paid the manufacturer. We will suppose the amount, as compared with the customs duties paid, to be two to one instead of fourteen to five, and the result will be that we have had to pay during those years from 1881 to 1890, $213,510,000 in customs duties, and our incidental taxation has amounted to $427,000,000. We paid over $213,000,000 in duties, and over $427,000,000 in enhanced cost more than the goods could have been laid down for in Canada if the duties were abolished. That is to say, that there has been an average for a population of 4,500,000 of $47.44 *per capita* for customs duties, and for incidental duties of $94.89, or a total of $143.33, making an average of $14.24 *per capita* per annum. Is it any wonder that we have hard times? Is it any wonder that we have depression in this country? Is it any wonder that trusts and combines exercise great power upon this Government? I suppose they were brought up to the point when they were ready to contribute in the first place by my right hon. friend, who is said to have met a deputation of these gentlemen in the "Red Parlour," and he said he required some funds, but the amount asked for was rather large.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When?

Mr. CHARLTON. I think that was in the year 1882. The manufacturers told him that his demands were unreasonable, and that they could not contribute so large a sum. The reply of Sir John was that the Government had fixed the duties to suit them and now they must respond. Why, gentlemen, said he, you remind me of a drove of hogs under the trees picking up apples: each hog desiring to have more than the other hog, and none of them having sense enough to look up and see the beneficent hand above that shakes the apples down to them; you contribute and I will shake the apples, but if you don't put up I will quit shaking down: and ever since these gentlemen have been agreed with the First Minister, and have put up upon demand, and the apples have been shaken down in great abundance.

In the course of the speech of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, I find that he has taken up certain stock objections to the policy of the Liberal party of Canada, and the first objection which he advances is to accuse my hon. friend on my right (Sir Richard Cartwright) of advocating a policy which would leave us under the control of the American Government in the arrangement of tariff, and double our rate of duties. The American customs duties are less *per capita* than our own, but the hon. gentleman's statement shows an entire misconception of our policy. It is not proposed that our tariff against foreign countries shall be regulated by the American Government. That is not the policy of the Liberal party. The policy of the Liberal party is the free admission of the products of the United States into Canada, and the free admission of the products of Canada into the United States, but we propose, while admitting all American products free, to impose such a tariff as we choose on the products of any other country. We propose to be our own master in that respect, and to retain our power to impose such duty as we may see fit on every importation from any other country. The argument of my hon. friend the Finance Minister is founded on a false assumption. Canada will not negotiate any treaty which puts our tariff under the control of any other power. That is his statement and in that he is perfectly correct. We do not propose to negotiate any such treaty. Even if we were to adopt commercial union, we would not negotiate any such treaty, because we would not enter into commercial union without having all the features of the scheme definitely settled. In that scheme we would decide what the common tariff should be, and, unless we could agree as to the features of that common tariff, and the mode of making changes, we would not enter into that arrangement and would not give to the United

States the power to make a tariff for us. The duty upon every article would have to be consented to by the commissioners appointed by Canada before it became law, and, if it were not consented to, the negotiation would fall to the ground. So, even under a possible treaty of commercial union, it cannot be assumed that Canada would allow any other country to make her tariff.

Then the hon. gentleman says it has never been shown where the revenue would come from if we adopted unrestricted reciprocity. One thing is certain, that a salutary degree of economy would be imperatively necessary, and it is certain that that would be a benefit to this country whenever it was adopted. It might be as well to devote a few moments to the consideration of the statement that the revenue cannot be provided if we were to adopt unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. Our expenditure is upon a ridiculously extravagant scale for a country of our population. The United States in 1840, when it had a population of 17,000,000, had an expenditure of $24,000,000. In 1850, when it had a population of 23,000,000, its expenditure was $41,000,000. Our expenditure, with about 5,000,000 inhabitants in 1890, less than a quarter of theirs in 1850, was $36,000,000. If we adopt unrestricted reciprocity, the first thing we have to face is the loss of revenue on goods imported from the United States. Taking the returns of last year, the duties on American imports amounted to $8,220,000. Can that deficiency be made up by provisions made in other directions, by the exercise of proper economy and by a diminution of our expenditure? To meet that loss of revenue, we have last year a surplus of $3,885,000. In other words, we extracted from the pockets of the tax-payers of Canada that amount more than we required to pay our expenses, so we have that amount to apply to the loss of $8,220,000. Then, if we scan the controllable expenditure we find that, under the Administration of my hon. friend the member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), the controllable expenditure was actually reduced by over $1,700,000 during his Administration. That can be done again, and more than that can be done if we have as honest and economical a man as the hon. member for East York controlling our affairs. In 1874, the cost of Civil Government was $883,000; in 1878, it was $60,000 less, or $823,000; last year, it was $1,308,000. If we adopted the plan of making our civil service employés do a day's work for a day's pay in the same way as the farmer and the artizan and the merchant have to do, that expense could be reduced by $300,000. Then there is an expenditure for the supervision of fisheries. In 1875, it was $108,000; in 1878, $82,000; and in 1890, $328,000. For the militia, there was an expenditure in 1873-74 of $1,122,000; in 1878, $618,000; and in 1890-91, $1,287,000. Now, when we have reciprocity with the United States we shall have friendly relations; we shall have no need of a standing army to keep them in order: we can cut down our militia expenses largely, to the extent of at least $500,000. In respect to public works a very large reduction was made during the Mackenzie Administration—from $1,800,000 to $998,000; we can reduce that amount, which last year was $1,972,000, by the sum of $750,000. We can readjust the sugar duties, without having sugar cost the consumer any more, by adjusting the duties so that the money would go into the pockets of the Government instead of the maws of the refiners, and we can save a million and a quarter more on that article: we can save $150,000 in the cost of the excise. The Intercolonial Railway was run last year at a loss of $553,000, and the Prince Edward Island Railway was run at a loss of $105,000—we can make those roads pay their running expenses surely. Of the $2,358,000 capital expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway last year, we can fairly assume over half a million of that is chargeable to working expenses; we should save that amount, and we can, it is believed, save, by the economical management of these roads, $250,000 more. These items sum up $8,543,000, to meet the loss of revenue from the taking off of American duties to the amount of $8,222,000. Now, there might be —there probably would be—temporary derangements in case of a great fiscal change, such as unrestricted reciprocity would involve. We might have a temporary deficiency of revenue; we might be under the necessity of meeting a deficit for one or two years. We have known what that was before. Since 1884 we have had deficits to the amount of $8,840,000. We must remember that this policy is to confer great benefits upon the people of this country, is to give them free access to the American markets for all their natural products, is to permit them to import free from the United States, goods which now pay $8,200,000 of a duty. I say that this great advantage would be secured cheaply, if it was secured at the cost, for a year or two, of slight deficits. But, Sir, a great and rapid increase of prosperity would give greatly increased tax-paying resources to the people of this country, and any deficiencies that might occur would be only temporary, and the policy that increased the wealth, increased the population, increased the resources of Canada vastly more rapidly than they have been increased heretofore, would be a policy that would adjust the revenue difficulty very speedily indeed.

Then, Sir, the Minister of Finance tells us that unrestricted reciprocity, plus continental free trade, leads to annexation. Well, Sir, why does it do so? I see the hon. gentleman has enlarged upon that point a little. Has not the hon. gentleman conceded more in making that assertion than he would wish to acknowledge? Could a policy lead to annexation with the United States that did not make the people of this country desire still more intimate relations with them? If a policy did not result in great benefits to Canada, if it did not increase our population, our wealth and our resources, how would it lead to annexation with the United States? When my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, asserts that unrestricted reciprocity will lead to annexation, he concedes the principle that unrestricted reciprocity will confer great benefits upon Canada, so great as to enamour Canadians of American institutions, so that they would desire to enjoy more of them. Now, I do not know but what my hon. friend may have been looking over the annexation question. He may, perhaps, have had his mind impressed with some of the arguments used by annexationists; he may have looked into the future and imagined that the benefits that Canada would derive from the breaking down of the barriers between the two countries, from the cessation of all danger of collision, or tariff war, from the necessity of maintaining armies and armaments no longer existing because the continent was under one flag—he might have

looked forward and imagined that these were reasons that would induce this country to desire annexation. But I cannot see why reciprocity with the United States should have the influence upon the sentiments of this country that the hon. gentleman imagines. I do not see anything in the experience of this country from 1854 to 1866 to warrant such a conclusion. We had an annexation party in Canada in 1849, and, as my hon. friend at my right (Sir Richard Cartwright) said, the leader of this Government has shown his approval of that sentiment by taking care never to have a Cabinet without having one or more signers of that manifesto in his Cabinet. We had, I say, an annexation party in 1849, but did reciprocity, which began in 1854, encourage that sentiment and make annexationists more numerous? On the contrary, we lost sight of annexation sentiments entirely. When we got the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, the annexation party ceased to exist and never gave evidence of life during the continuance of that treaty; and so I believe it would be now. I believe that the reason why the people of Canada desire annexation is simply because they desire to have the advantage of free access to the American markets. Can we suppose that the average Canadian is enamoured of American institutions, that he considers their laws better than ours, their school system better than ours, their form of government better than ours? No, Sir; none of these things. These points do not enter into the thoughts of the annexationist. He is merely an annexationist because he wishes free access to the American market, wishes to see the barriers broken down that separate the two countries. Give him that free access, and what inducement is there for him to continue to be an annexationist? He has got all he wants. There are no reasons for supposing that the adoption of this policy would lead to annexation, and there is no warrant for saying that intimate commercial relations and distinct political autonomy are incompatible with each other. Why, Sir, the various members of the American Confederacy lived together on terms of commercial union from the organization of that Government down to 1860. But did commercial union, or unrestricted reciprocity, with intimate commercial relations, bind the two sections of the American people together? On the contrary, they were just as distinct in their sentiments, just as distinct in their views and aspirations when the rebellion broke out in 1861, as they were when the United States Constitution was framed in 1789. It had no influence, no effect in bringing these two sections of the United States together and making them one political autonomy although the commercial union of the two sections was perfect and complete for well-nigh seventy-five years. And so perhaps it would be with us. We may have intimate commercial relations with the United States, but they need not tend to break down our political autonomy, or our desire to maintain the political autonomy of the provinces of this Dominion. At all events, Sir, we do not need to drag in the question of annexation; what we want is greater commercial freedom—unimpeded access to the markets of our own continent—peace, good-will and friendly relations with our brethren to the south of us, and a marked and desirable improvement in our own condition. The political union question is probably not a practical question of our generation. We do not need to trouble our minds about it, and we may safely leave it to take care of itself and give our attention to the question of great, immediate and practical importance—the question of free access to our national markets,

Then, Sir, another objection that is raised is that unrestricted reciprocity will ruin our manufacturers. Well, I suppose that when the hon. gentleman gets all the circulars that have been addressed to the manufacturers, he will know better what they think about that. I have conversed with many manufacturers and I do not believe it will have any such result; but even if it did, are the great masses of the people of this country to submit to exactions, to submit to undue taxation, to submit to the loss of their natural market, because the giving to the great producing classes of this country greater prosperity may prove a little detrimental to the small manufacturing classes? We might say the manufacturers are ruining us, but whether our policy would be calculated to promote their interests or not—and I believe it will promote their interests in the main—but whether it did so or not, still I am in favour of a policy that will benefit ninety-nine hundredths of the population of this country.

My hon. friend the First Minister, in the course of his speech, made reference to a recent letter from the Hon. Edward Blake, and he quoted certain sentiments advanced by that hon. gentleman, who recently held a seat in this House, with very great approval. I wish to read to the First Minister something Mr. Blake said which is applicable to himself and to his party. He says in that letter:

"The Canadian Conservative policy has failed to accomplish the predictions of its promoters."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have heard it before.

Mr. CHARLTON. The House has not; and, if it has, the House shall hear it again. Their admiration for Mr. Blake, I am sure, will lead hon. gentlemen opposite to desire that his words with respect to themselves shall be given again. I am really afraid the hon. First Minister has not read that portion of Mr. Blake's letter to which I am about to call attention. Mr. Blake says:

"Its real tendency has been as foretold twelve years ago, towards disintegration and annexation, instead of consolidation and the maintenance of that British connection of which they claim to be the special guardians. It has left us with a small population, a scanty immigration and a North-West empty still; with enormous additions to our public debt and yearly charge, an extravagant system of expenditure, and an unjust and expensive tariff; with restricted markets for our needs, whether to buy or to sell, and all the host of evils (greatly intensified by our special conditions) thence arising; with trade diverted from its natural into forced and therefore less profitable channels, and with unfriendly relations and frowning tariff walls, even more and more estranging us from the mighty English-speaking nation to the South, our neighbours and relations, with whom we ought to be, as it was promised we should be, living in generous amity and liberal intercourse. Worse, far worse. It has left us with lowered standards of public virtue and death-like apathy in public opinion; with racial, religious and provincial animosities rather inflamed than soothed; with a subservient Parliament, an autocratic executive, debauched constituencies and corrupted and corrupting classes; with lessened self-reliance and increased dependence on the public chest and on Legislative aids, and possesses withal by a boastful jingo spirit far enough removed from true manliness, loudly proclaiming unreal conditions and exaggerated sentiments, while actual facts and genuine opinions are suppressed. It has left us with our hands tied, our future compromised, and in such a plight that, whether we stand or move, we must run

some risks which else we might have either declined or encountered with greater promise of success."

That is what the hon. gentleman for whom the First Minister has so much admiration says of himself and his Government. Let us hear what Mr. Blake says with respect to the policy which the Liberal party has been advocating during two or three years past, the policy on which the Liberal party went to the country and the policy which they are advocating at this moment:

"While that free market which the United Kingdom, on a just conception of its own interest, opens permanently with all the world is to us of very great value, and while every prudent effort should be made to enlarge our exports there and elsewhere beyond the seas, yet the results of all such efforts must be far below those to overflow from a free market throughout our own continent.

"The United States tariff will, (and indeed unless high sugar duties be reimposed, must) for a long time remain, like our own, decidedly protective; still there is a fair expectation, based on the last election there, that sounder economic views than those of the sitting Congress will very soon prevail, and that their tariff will be readjusted on a basis much more moderate and favourable to the consumer than that which preceded the McKinley Bill; and eventually approach what is known as a revenue tariff, incidentally, though still substantially, protective.

"Having regard to this expectation, unrestricted free trade with the United States, secured for a long term of years, would (even though accompanied by higher duties against the rest of the world than I for one admire) give us in practice the great blessing of a measure of free trade, much larger than we now enjoy or can otherwise attain; it would greatly advance our most material interests, and help our natural, our largest, most substantial and most promising industries; it would create an influx of population and capital, and promote a rapid development of forces and materials now almost unused; in three words, it would give us men, money and markets.

"Thus it would emphatically be for the general and lasting good. And this, although it would produce, as all great changes do, temporary derangement of business and local losses, would strike hard some spindling and exotic industries, wholly tariff born, tariff bred and tariff fed, and would put upon their mettle a good many manufacturers unaccustomed to the keen breath of competition, and others who would be obliged to adopt the specialization, and the improved methods of production and distribution, which, to the signal advantage of the general consuming public, a large market allows and demands."

These, Mr. Speaker, are the sentiments of the Hon. Edward Blake—first, with respect to the Government of the day; second, with respect to the results likely to follow the adoption of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, and from neither of these points dwelt upon by the late leader of the Opposition can members on the Government benches, in my opinion, draw any satisfaction.

Mr. FOSTER. Why did he not support your policy?

Mr. CHARLTON. You hear his words, and you can account for the matter yourself. The hon. gentleman has asked a question, and the hon. gentleman can answer it himself. It is not my business to say why Mr. Blake did not support the policy of our party; he certainly did not support the policy of the Government.

I notice in the *North American Review* for this month an article written by the High Commissioner for Canada, entitled "The Wiman Conspiracy." I am at a loss to understand how a movement entered upon and advocated publicly, both in the press and on the platform, how a policy that became the policy of a great party and commanded that degree of support in Canada which this policy did command, can be characterized as a conspiracy.

The High Commissioner evidently seeks to placate American opinion. He says, in effect, to the Americans: Have nothing to do with the naughty Grits; they have condemned the Government for their liberal conduct towards you on the fishery question; they have taken the Government to task on every occasion when they have made concessions to the United States; they are not your friends, we are your friends, give your confidence to the Conservatives and have nothing to do with the Grits. The article of the High Commissioner is calculated to produce very little result. I repeat that the charge that unrestricted reciprocity is a conspiracy movement is essentially false. It has not a single character of a conspiracy. It was discussed year after year, it was deliberately adopted by the Liberal party as the platform upon which the party should appeal to the people of Canada. It is the policy on which the Liberal party stands to-day; it is the policy upon which the Liberal party will yet achieve victory. It is not a conspiracy, but it is a general movement in the interests of the great mass of the people, with a view to secure better relations between all English-speaking peoples on this continent. The characterization of this movement as a conspiracy is sheer nonsense.

Then, we have in the same review an article from a late Governor General of the Dominion—the Marquis of Lorne; and the Marquis tells us that the result of the election proves that Canada desires to pursue her own path. Although a very humble individual, I take leave to differ with His Lordship the Marquis. I think the result of the last election in Canada proves the power of slander, the power of misrepresentation, the power of gerrymander, the power of the revising barrister, the power of the Printing Bureau in the hands of the Government, with the power to stuff the voters' lists, the power of the decision to give insufficient time for the consideration of a great public question. This is what the result of the last election contest proves; all these things were factors to produce the result in that election.

Mr. IVES. The power of greenbacks.

Mr. CHARLTON. If any man insinuates that we have had any aid from Texas cattle ranches, or from Montana cattle ranches, or from American railways, or from any other influences in the United States, he asserts that which is false; but we were confronted by a Government which controls a great railway which ran special trains to carry its voters to the polls, and which threw the whole weight of its influence in favour of the Government. We were confronted with a Government which commands vast corruption funds through agencies it would not be fit for me to speak of upon the floor of this House. We stood face to face with a political party which controlled these elections by influences, the reverse of what are fair, and honourable, and patriotic; while the Liberal party fought the battle upon its own resources, and with its own means, and to the best of its own ability. We may have had the sympathy of some people in the United States as men advocating a broad policy and liberal, but further than their sympathy we had no aid.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The Canadian people in the United States sympathized with us; not the cattle ranchers in Texas.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, that is so. Now let me come back for one brief moment to the question of reciprocity. The First Minister and the Minister of Finance, and, so far as I have heard, every other Minister of the Government, express themselves in a spirit of undisguised and bitter hostility to the only form of reciprocity obtainable with the United States. I may do my hon. friend the Finance Minister an injustice, but I take it from his speech the other night that he still proposes to stigmatize the advocacy of unrestricted reciprocity as treason, and that he had not the slightest idea of accepting a treaty upon the basis of unrestricted reciprocity. Let me tell him that if he proceeds upon any other lines than those of unrestricted reciprocity he will, in my opinion, inevitably fail, and I shall regret, in the interest of this country, if the opinions expressed by the Minister of Finance represent the opinions upon which the Government propose to act. I shall regret if the Government refuse to modify in any degree the position which the Finance Minister states they occupy.

I will give the hon. gentleman the credit of having made an effort to provide us with a substitute for this great boon which the Liberal party of Canada seeks to obtain for this country. I do not know to what extent the hon. gentleman may have supposed that this substitute he sought to obtain would answer the purpose of an actual substitute for the American trade, but he did go last fall to the West Indies, and the result of his mission can hardly be called very brilliant. We find that the desire for reciprocity with the United States is so potent that Guiana and other dependencies of the Crown will have nothing to do with our proposal for reciprocity, as they wish to get admitted to the American market under the provisions of the McKinley Bill. I suppose this West Indian trade must be considered important; far more important than it would seem to be from any statistics which I have been able to obtain. I am rather surprised indeed at the slender amount of our business relations with these countries. The Minister of Finance is perhaps aware—although he might have been before he went on his mission to the West Indies—that the average mulatto or black of the West Indies is a being whose wants are few and easily supplied. I understand that about five yards of cotton is all the clothing he requires in a year, and that a quarter acre patch of bananas, which only requires renewing once in five years will support a family, while during the interval the darky can swing in his hammock. These individuals do not want our barley, they do not want our horses, or cattle, or sheep, or potatoes, or wool, or hides, or eggs, and they have no money to buy them if they did want them.

Mr. FOSTER. They eat cotton down there.

Mr. CHARLTON. They do not have a great deal of it to eat after having supplied themselves with five yards for clothing, if the returns for their labour are as small as represented. I thought I would look up the records to see how much the trade was with these countries, and what the probability was as to the capacity for developing that trade, and I find that last year we sent to the West Indies, including the British, Danish, French and Spanish Islands, and Hayti, agricultural exports to the value of $229,882 and to South America $27,452 worth. Our exports of agricultural products to all other countries, except to the United States, Great Britain and Newfoundland, amounted to $236,919. With the exceptions I have referred to the export of our agricultural products to all the rest of the world amounted to $494,193, while to the United States alone we sent $7,519,000 worth of agricultural products, or over fifteen-fold more than we sent to all the rest of the world excepting Great Britain and Newfoundland. I find that in animals and their products, we exported to all the West Indies $23,382 worth, to South America $843 worth, and to all other countries except the United States, Great Britain and Newfoundland, $260,920. This gives us a total export in animals and their products of $285,145 to all the world with the exceptions of the countries I have named, while we exported to the United States animals and their products to the value of $5,966,000, or twenty-one-fold as much as we sent to all the world with the exception of Great Britain and Newfoundland. Even in manufactured goods we exported to the United States $2,667,282, or nearly 47 per cent. of all the manufactured goods we exported to all the world. Our export of manufactures to the United States exceeded our export to all the world except Great Britain by the sum of $686,000. How are you going to provide a substitute for that trade? It cannot be done. Even with the restrictions existing at present, by which every effort is being made by the Governments of both countries to kill the trade between Canada and the United States stone dead, the United States furnishes us with a market which we cannot dispense with.

There is a great deal of talk about discriminating against England, but what troubles me is the danger of discriminating against ourselves. We have carefully avoided submitting to the imposition of taxes in this country for the benefit of England. We pay nothing except the salary of the Governor General, and we would not allow England to impose upon us tribute in any shape, either stamp duty, customs duty or income tax. We would not pay a dollar of such taxation. We would revolt before we would submit to give England power to tax us in any way, and yet we talk about discriminating against England. We talk about depriving ourselves of advantageous markets, we talk about adopting a policy which injures ourselves, injures our growth and our prosperity. We talk about doing this because it is going to injure somebody else. We are charged with the duty of taking care of Canadian interests: it is our duty to promote the prosperity of Canada, and England can take care of herself. We must take care of ourselves, and if we can secure vast advantages by a trade treaty with the United States, it is our duty and our privilege to do so.

We have a political Jeremiah in the person of my hon. friend the First Minister, who gives us lugubrious predictions as to revolutions in the United States, and so forth, and we have a political Pharisee in the person of my hon. friend the Finance Minister. A great many years ago there was a man who thanked God he was not as other men were; and the hon. Finance Minister, the other night, in effect, took to himself great credit for not being as bad as these Grits. He said he would advise the gentlemen on this side of the House to cultivate some faith in Canada, some faith in things Cana-

dian. Why, Sir, we have faith in Canada; we have faith in things Canadian. We desire to promote Canada's interest; we desire to make things Canadian present a better appearance to the world than they present to-day; and in the promotion of this desire we take the liberty to point out mistakes that have been made. Is there anything wrong in that? We take the liberty to condemn blunders that have been perpetrated. Is there anything wrong in that? We take the liberty to denounce the recklessness of this Government, in piling up our debt and raising the scale of our expenditure to such a point as to tie our hands and prevent the country expanding and developing as it should. We lament and denounce the bad government of this country; and in doing all these things we do what the interests of this country demand should be done by an honest and faithful Opposition. We do these things through loyalty to Canada, through a desire to have things Canadian brought into a more prosperous condition than they are to-day; and when my hon. friend stands up as the exponent of all that is true, and just, and honest, and advises us to have more regard for things Canadian, and more faith in Canada, we cast back the advice in his teeth, and we advise him and his colleagues to adopt a policy that will make things Canadian more prosperous, and conducive to the best interests of this country in every way. In pursuance of this desire to promote the interests of Canada, we think we have discovered, and we point the people of this country to a new road to prosperity. We may be mistaken; we do not claim infallibility; but we do claim that our motivesare good. Now, let us for a moment examine our ground, and if we are mistaken let it be shown; but if we have reason to believe that we are not mistaken, it is our duty to give the reasons.

In dealing with reciprocity, we are not dealing with a question which belongs purely and entirely to the realm of speculation and theory, but with a question of which we have practical knowledge. This country at one time had reciprocity, partial reciprocity, for twelve years, though not the full measure of benefit was derived from it that would be derived from unlimited reciprocity. We commenced the first year with exports from all the Provinces which constitute this Dominion amounting to $10,473,000; in the last year they had increased to $39,950,000, an increase of $29,027,000 in twelve years. Since the abrogation of that treaty twenty-four years have elapsed, and last year the exports from the same provinces of Canada to the United States amounted to $40,522,000, an increase over 1866 of only $572,000. While we had an average annual increase under reciprocity of $2,418,000, we had an average annual increase without reciprocity during the twenty-four years from 1866 to 1890 of only $23,800; or the increase of our exports under reciprocity were one hundred-fold greater than they have been since reciprocity has been denied to this country. You cannot get over that argument. If our exports had continued to increase in the same ratio that they did from 1854 to 1866, they would be to-day $98,000,000, instead of $40,000,000; and, under the new order of things which have been brought about by the McKinley Bill on the other side, and the policy of restriction adopted on this side, we are likely to find our exports to the United States falling below the limit of 1866; we are likely to have a smaller export of our productions to that great country of 65,000,000 inhabitants than we had in 1866, when it had only 35,000,000 inhabitants.

Now, let me ask the question: Would unrestricted reciprocity be desirable? I might combine that with the question: Would tariff lines between all the provinces of this Dominion be desirable? Would it be desirable to have a tariff line between Ontario and Quebec, another between Quebec and New Brunswick, another between New Brunswick and Nova Scotia? No man of common sense would say so; every man would say no. Well, if the United States, when they became a nation, had divided their country into groups of states and had established tariff lines between those groups, would the development of that country have been as great as it has been? Suppose the New England States, the Southern States and the Western States had all been formed into groups of states with tariff lines separating them, no man would suppose that that country would have attained the greatness it has. Well, I would ask what difference would there be in nature, in geography, in commerce, between tariff lines drawn between the various provinces of this Dominion and a tariff line between these provinces and the United States? What difference is there between a tariff line between Ontario and Quebec and one between Ontario and New York? This difference: that the tariff line between Ontario and New York is twenty times more disastrous than would such a line be between Ontario and Quebec, because the market of New York is twenty times more important to us than the market of Quebec. If we group the provinces of this Dominion, we shall find that the different groups show geographical and business affinities with groups of states. The natural market of the Maritime Provinces is with New England and the seaboard states, and any policy that deprives these countries of free intercourse with each other is disastrous to both. We find that Ontario and Quebec naturally belong commercially to the New England and the Middle States group, and any policy that prevents them freely trading with each other is disastrous to both. So Manitoba and the North-West Territories are naturally a part of the Mississippi Valley, and anything that impedes free intercourse between those sections is disastrous to both. British Columbia on the west and the States of the Pacific slope naturally constitute a geographical group, and any restriction in trade between those sections is disastrous to either section. Therefore I maintain, and the Liberal party maintain, that if free trade between forty-four commonwealths works well, it will work better if extended to fifty-one commonwealths; it will confer equal advantages on the seven provinces of Canada than it has conferred upon the forty-four States of the American Union. I might go on to expand this subject still further, but I forbear, because I have already consumed a great deal of time.

Now, what is the issue before the people of this country to-day? It is an issue between protection and dry-rot on a small scale on the one hand, and enlarged continental free trade between all the English-speaking commonwealths in America on the other hand. That is the issue, Sir, and I wish to impress, if I could do so, upon the mind of the hon. Minis-

ter of Finance the vast importance to Canada of obtaining free access to these great markets of 65,000,000 people, with 6,000,000 congregated in cities almost at our door, for the supply of which we possess advantages superior to those of the North-Western States. We are at the parting of the ways. I remember, Sir, reading of a certain custom which the Chinese have of trying to prevent the dragon from swallowing the moon, at the time of an eclipse, by beating gongs, shouting, and yelling; and our friends opposite have adopted the Chinese method in this question of reciprocity. Here we are standing at the roadway that leads to greater trade and prosperity, and the proposition to follow that road is met with a fusillade of yells and howls of disloyalty, veiled treason, annexation; and appeals to the prejudices and passions of the masses for the purpose of preventing the dragon from swallowing the people, for the purpose of preventing the people of this country from adopting that policy which is most conducive to their interests. Is it disloyal to seek for growth? Is it disloyal to labour for the prosperity of Canada? Is it disloyal to endeavour to obtain for Canada expansion? Is it disloyal to wish to confer upon the people of this country greater wealth, greater development for their resources, and to make them more powerful and wealthy? If these objects are disloyal, then the Liberal party is disloyal to a man. Is it loyal to sow the dragon teeth of discord? Is it loyal to plunder the millions for the benefit of the few? Is it loyal to lend the aid of the law to further the designs and purposes of monopolies? Is it loyal to deny the people of this country access to their best markets because that may interfere with the prosperity of a comparatively few individuals? Is it loyal to imperil the peace of England and America by senseless jingoism, and to blast the future of this young country? If it is, then, on that side of the House, sits the loyal party, for they are doing all these things, and they have every prospect of accomplishing them. Sir, we on this side are loyal to Canada. Why? Because we wish to promote the best interests of Canada, because we wish to bring back to Canada scores of thousands of her sons who have left her; because we wish to draw to Canada the better class of immigration of the Old World; because we wish to open the lock to Canada's treasures in her fields, her forests, her mines, her seas, because we wish to dot her prairies with farms and towns and cities. We are loyal to Canada because we wish to make of her the power she is capable of becoming. We are loyal to Canada because we wish to develop her resources, and we believe we are advocating the policy which will lead to that result. We assert fearlessly that we are loyal to Canada. Sir, we are loyal also to England. We wish to promote that policy of amity and goodwill which will bind the commonwealths belonging to the Anglo-Saxon race together. We wish to sweep away all those difficulties that threaten the peace of these two great nations; we wish to smooth away every cause of friction that threatens the peace of England and America from any cause originating in Canada. And if our policy can be adopted, if this Dominion and the great Republic to the south can be brought into more friendly relations, if these vexed questions can be settled and an era of unrestricted trade be inaugurated, the party which will accomplish that result is a party thoroughly loyal to England and to England's interests. And we are loyal to the whole English-speaking race, because whatever tends to make the relations between the Dominion and the United States more cordial and friendly, is a policy which will benefit every English commonwealth, either in the Eastern or the Western hemispheres. Why, Mr. Speaker, in the world to-day there are a hundred and ten million people who speak the English tongue; and that race has in its possession more than half the wealth of the civilized world. It has three-fifths of the world's commerce; it has three-fifths of the world's shipping; it manufactures three-fifths of the world's iron; it manufactures three-fifths of the world's steel; it manufactures 65 per cent. of the world's manufactures; and any policy which is calculated to sow dissension among any of the branches of this race is a policy every man should condemn. Dissension means disaster; union and friendship will confer peace and safety.

Europe bristles with armaments; her soil echoes with the measured tread of great armies; and sooner or later a contest will be precipitated more bloody than any of the wars of the past. The Anglo-Saxon commonwealths have interests in common, and any policy which binds together the various Anglo-Saxon countries of the world is a policy conceived in the best interests of civilization, and a policy that a great danger may at any moment force upon these commonwealths. The Liberal party of Canada has a mission, and that mission is to promote more cordial, more friendly relations between the two great branches of the Anglo-Saxon family upon this continent; and that party believes and knows that unrestricted reciprocity is the talisman which will bring peace and amity upon this continent and prove a powerful factor in producing the same results among all the Anglo-Saxon commonwealths upon the face of the globe.

Paragraphs one to ten agreed to.

Resolution read the second time and agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

That the said resolution be referred to a select committee composed of Sir Hector Langevin, Mr. Hazen and Mr. Corbould, and the mover, to prepare and report the draft of an Address in answer to the Speech of the Governor General to both Houses of Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, from the committee appointed to prepare and report the draft of an Address in answer to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor General to both Houses of Parliament, reported the draft of an Address, which was read the first and second times, and ordered to be engrossed, and to be presented to His Excellency by such members of the House as are of the Honourable the Privy Council.

SUPPLY.

Mr. FOSTER moved:

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

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Mr. FOSTER moved :

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

Motion agreed to.

REPORTS.

Public Accounts of Canada, for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1890.—(Mr. Foster.)

Governor General's Warrants.—(Mr. Foster.)

Report of the Auditor General on Appropriation Accounts, for the year ended 30th June, 1890. —(Mr. Foster.)

Annual Report of the Minister of Public Works, for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1890.—(Sir Hector Langevin.)

Annual Report of the Department of Marine, for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1890.—(Mr. Tupper.)

Steamboat Inspection, Harbour Commissioners, &c., &c.—(Mr. Tupper.)

Deck-loads—Report of Evidence.—(Mr. Tupper.)

Evidence on the Export Cattle Trade of Canada. —(Mr. Tupper.)

Annual Report of the Department of the Interior, for the year 1890.—(Mr. Dewdney.)

Annual Report of the Department of Indian Affairs, for the year ended 31st December, 1890.— (Mr. Dewdney.)

Summary Report of the Geological Survey Department, for the year 1890.—(Mr. Dewdney.)

Report of the Postmaster General, for the year ended 30th June, 1890.—(Mr. Haggart.)

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 5.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 5th May, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORTS.

Report, Returns and Statistics of the Inland Revenues of the Dominion of Canada, for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1890.—(Mr. Costigan.)

Report on Weights and Measures and Gas Inspection, for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1890.—(Mr. Costigan.)

Report of the Secretary of State for Canada, for for the year ended 31st December, 1890.—(Mr. Chapleau.)

Report of the Board of Examiners for the Civil Service of Canada, for the year ended 31st December, 1890.—(Mr. Chapleau.)

Civil Service List of Canada, 1890.—(Mr. Chapleau.)

Report of the Minister of Agriculture for the Dominion of Canada, for the calender year 1890.— Mr. Haggart.)

Report of the High Commissioner for Canada, with Reports from Agents in the United Kingdom, for the year 1890.—(Mr. Haggart.)

Report of the Director and Officers of the Experimental Farms, for the year 1890.—(Mr. Haggart.)

Annual Report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, for the year 1890.—(Sir John Macdonald.)

Tables of the Trade and Navigation of the Dominion of Canada, for the fiscal year ended the 30th June, 1890.—(Mr. Bowell.)

BETTER OBSERVANCE OF THE LORD'S DAY.

Mr. CHARLTON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 2), to secure the better observance of the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Is it the same Bill as that of last year?

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, with some modifications. The Bill is substantially the same as that introduced last Session. It was then introduced at a late day, not with the intention of pressing it at the time, but that the members of the House and the country at large might become acquainted with the provisions of the Bill. Some modifications are made in the present Bill in the direction of greater freedom for the operation of railways. I do not think it necessary to enter into a discussion on the merits of the Bill until it is printed and in the hands of members.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

Mr. CHARLTON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 3) to amend the Dominion Elections Act, Chapter 8 of the Revised Statutes. He said: The provisions of this Bill will be best understood by reading them. They are as follows:—

"Section eighty-four of the Dominion Elections Act, chapter eight of the Revised Statutes, is hereby amended by adding the following paragraph thereto immediately after the paragraph lettered (e):

"(f.) Every candidate who, either by himself or by his agent, at any time during an election, promises that the Government will make, or will be solicited by him to make, any grant of money for any railway, road, bridge, harbour, pier, public building, or other public work, to be expended within the bounds of, or for the benefit of, the constituency for which he is a candidate, such promise being calculated to influence the result of the election in his favour:

"2. Any promise of a grant of money, made by any Cabinet Minister or any official in the employ of the Government for any railway or public work or building within any constituency where an election contest is pending at the time of the making of such promise, and calculated to influence the result of such election in the interest of any candidate, is a corrupt practice within the meaning of the said Act.

"3. Any indirect or inferred promise, made by any Department of the Government sending engineers to make a survey for a railway or public work of any kind, not under contract, and for which a grant of public money has not previously been made, within any constituency where an election is pending, or within two months of the time of issuing the writs for an election in such constituency—the impression being thereby created that such railway or public work is to be proceeded with, and the result of the election being thereby influenced in the interest of any candidate—is a corrupt practice within the meaning of the said Act."

Mr. IVES. I would like to ask the hon. member, whether he provides for the case of a provincial Premier threatening to discontinue the construction of a railway unless a certain candidate were elected?

Mr. CHARLTON. I presume my hon. friend from Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives) will be at liberty, at the proper time, to suggest any amendment to this Bill which he may desire.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would ask my hon. friend if he will add to his Bill a clause providing the same penalties against any candidate who says if he succeeds in his election, and if his party succeeds in coming into power, they will assist railways by subsidies?

Mr. CHARLTON. I have no objection to make the Bill more stringent in its provisions. When the Bill comes under discussion, I will be most happy to receive the suggestion of the hon. the leader of the Government.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has attached to his Bill certain penalties on account of promises, when they emanate from members of the Cabinet. Very high officials of the Government are employed to make these promises, and I would suggest that the names of these officials be included.

Mr. CHARLTON. That is provided for by the Bill.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Would the provisions of this Bill refer to the High Commissioner? I think it would be very necessary to have a clause especially referring to that gentleman.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think you will need to have a special Act, pure and simple, for the benefit of the High Commissioner.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

Mr. EDGAR moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 4) to amend the Electoral Franchise Act. He said: Whether we decide to retain the present Dominion Franchise law or whether we decide to abandon it, as I hope we shall, I propose to test the feeling of the House upon introducing the principle of a franchise based upon "one man one vote." Of course, if Parliament decides to abandon the Dominion Franchise Act we shall, at least so far as the Province of Ontario is concerned, have this principle in operation in that Province. I think the members of the Local Assembly in the Province of Ontario, on both sides, are very well satisfied, indeed, with the practical character of that system of voting. Not discussing it any further, I beg leave to move the first reading of the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 5) to amend the Dominion Elections Act. He said: The Bill proposes to amend the Act in two particulars—first, as regards the oath of qualification. At present, as I construe the law, a person living in the United States can very well, though an American citizen, take the oath that he is a British subject by birth, and thus become a voter in this country. I propose, therefore, to amend the second paragraph of the oath of qualification in such a way as to require the voter to swear that, in addition to being a British subject, he is not a subject of any foreign power. The other particular in which the Bill proposes to amend the Act is, to my mind, very important. The instructions given to deputy returning officers in the 45th and 46th sections of the Act are clear enough; but the rules given in the schedule for the guidance of voters at elections, to which, I think, deputy returning officers pay more attention, are so confusing that I do not hesitate to say that any deputy returning officer who is not a lawyer or a law student might very well make the mistake, which many deputy returning officers made in the last election, of putting the number as well as his initials on the back of the ballot paper. The two sections which I have mentioned make it very plain that the deputy returning officer shall number the counterfoil and place his initials on the back of the ballot paper; but the instructions contained in form "M" of the first schedule state:

"The voter will then fold the ballot, so as to show a portion of the back only, with the number and the initials of the deputy returning officer."

I submit that any lawyer reading these words might make the mistake which many deputy returning officers made in the last election. I would ask the Government, on the second reading of this Bill, to refer it to a special committee, in order that anything else which may be found confusing in the Act may be done away with. We must not forget that the Act provides for a very large number of polling sub-divisions—I think thirty or forty would be the average in a constituency—thus necessitating a very large number of officials. It is impossible to get lawyers or people versed in the law to act as revising officers; we are compelled to ask farmers' sons, clerks and others to undertake that work; and I think both sides of the House will agree that it is our duty to make the provisions of the Act as clear as possible.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether, in case a deputy returning officer fails to place his initials on the back of the ballot and the number on the counterfoil, his conduct should affect the seat of the member?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I should be glad to receive any suggestion from the hon. member when the Act comes to its second reading, because my only object is to make the Act as clear as possible.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ALIEN LABOUR ACT.

Mr. TAYLOR moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 6) to prohibit the importation and migration of foreigners and aliens under contracts or agreement to perform labour in Canada.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

MILITIA ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. MULOCK moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 7) to amend the Militia Act. He said: The object of the Bill is to make it lawful for officers of the Militia of Canada to be appointed to the position of Officer Commanding Her Majesty's Forces in Canada—in other words, to remove the disqualification imposed upon them in the present Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

REPEAL OF ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 8) to repeal Chapter 5 of the

Revised Statutes of Canada, entitled: An Act respecting the Electoral Franchise, and all amendments thereto. He said: This is not a Bill to amend the Electoral Franchise Act. That Act cannot be amended. It is vicious in principle, and it is bad in detail, and all the powers of this Parliament cannot amend it. I propose to deal more summarily and effectually with it: I propose to abolish it, lock, stock, and barrel.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ELECTION ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 9) to amend the Acts respecting the election of members of the House of Commons. He said: The Bill is not a very long one, and does not contain many clauses; but in my estimation it is an important Bill. The first clause goes back to the old system that we had before the Government, in my judgment with a high hand, assumed the responsibility of appointing returning officers. I go back to the English rule—I believe in English precedents and English rule—and make the sheriffs *ex-officio* returning officers in the various constituencies: and, where there are subdivisions of a county, the sheriff and registrar are returning officers *ex-officio*, and if there are more than two sub-divisions, then I give the Government power to appoint a person to act as returning officer. The second clause of the Bill deals largely with corrupt practices. Acts which do not now come under the law, I make corrupt practices by this Bill, and I punish every corrupt act by imprisonment or fine, or both, imprisonment to the extent of two years and a fine of $500. Then I endeavour to surround with every possible safeguard the ballot boxes while in the hands of deputy returning officers and returning officers; and I deal with a species of bribery largely prevalent during elections—that is betting as to how a man shall vote or that he shall not vote, or as to the majority in a parish or community, or the aggregate majority all over the Dominion—more effectually than it is now dealt with. I also deal not only with members of the Government, although they are the principal sinners, but with any private individual, who shall hold out, as an inducement for its support, to a constituency indebted or under obligations to the Government, that if it will support any particular candidate or party such indebtedness or obligation shall be discharged. I also make provision that no person, be he member of the Government or not, be he high functionary of the Government or other employee or other individual, shall use any influence with any public body or corporation in order to coerce that corporation into forcing their employees to vote for or against any candidate. I also make the bribee as well as the briber punishable by fine or imprisonment. I also make every violation of the election law by Government officials a misdemeanour punishable by fine of $1,000 or imprisonment for two years, at the discretion of the judge, and in the case of those who are not officials, by six months in jail or a fine of $500. I also endeavour to prevent a practice, which I am sorry to see prevails to some extent, namely, the swopping of election petitions. If a man files an election petition, he ought to be compelled to go on with it, as a good many petitions now filed are no doubt purely speculative: and I propose that no swopping of petitions be allowed except under the sanction of the court, which sanction must be based on the affidavit of every party to the petition, both solicitors and agents. And then, Sir, I hold out a little bit of comfort, a little balm of Gilead to the First Minister, the Finance Minister, the Minister of Public Works, and the Minister of the Interior, and, I believe, another Minister who had the misfortune to have a petition against him for misconduct in the last election. Under the law, as it now stands, a man may be unseated for an isolated act of corruption. A candidate may endeavour to conduct his political campaign with clean hands. He may instruct his agents to conduct it with clean hands. He may do his level best to have a pure election: and yet some over-zealous friend may spend a dollar bill in corrupt practices, and the candidate will be unseated, and saddled with all the costs: or perhaps some secret enemy may do something that will constitute him an agent of the member elect, and commit an act of corruption which may cause the sitting member to be unseated. I adopt the English law, and, to some extent, the law of Ontario, by providing that, in the case of trifling and unimportant acts, although proved before the courts, unless the acts were of an extensive character affecting to some extent the whole constituency, the member shall not be unseated.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is the Bill retroactive?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). No: but if the Minister of Finance desires it I am prepared to make it so. The next question I deal with is the question of the time for presenting petitions against sitting members. As the law now stands, a petition has to be presented within thirty days after the member is gazetted. Sometimes the gazetting is irregular. I do not blame the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, for I think he has done his duty in that respect; but I do blame the returning officers, wherever they, within thirty days, get their instructions, for the irregular manner in which the returns are made. I provide that every petition shall be presented within thirty days after the polling day. That will put members on both sides upon a footing of perfect equality, and surely the Government cannot want more than that. I also provide that any counter petition shall be presented within fifteen days after the presenting of the petition. These are the main features of my Bill, and I hope they will commend themselves to the approval of the House.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FISHING VESSELS OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 10) respecting fishing vessels of the United States of America. He said: It will be recollected that, in pursuance of the protocol annexed to the draft of the Treaty of Washington of 1888, legislation was enacted in this Parliament, under which American fishing vessels were permitted, during two years, the time proposed to be required for the consideration of that treaty, to obtain certain privileges in Canadian ports, granted them under the provisions of the Treaty of 1818. That Act

having expired in 1889, Parliament, for special reasons, re-enacted last year the main provisions of the Act of 1888, and continued these privileges to the fishing vessels. In December that term expired, and, as mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, it has been deemed expedient and wise to re-enact those provisions for this year, and for this year only, in view particularly of the conference which has been arranged to take place at Washington for the discussion and consideration of matters and questions between this country and the United States. The Bill I ask leave to introduce is substantially the Bill of last year, known as an Act respecting fishing vessels of the United States.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. BOWELL. After consultation with hon. gentlemen opposite, we have come to the decision that the committee should remain as it is, with the addition of Mr. Beausoleil. I, therefore, move:

That a Select Committee be appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates of this House during the present Session, with power to report from time to time: to be composed of Messrs. Béchard, Beausoleil, Cameron (Iverness), Charlton, Davin, Desjardins (Hochelaga), Innes, LaRivière, Prior, Scriver, Skinner, Somerville, Taylor, Weldon, and White (Cardwell).

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I thought my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition had requested that two names should be added from this side of the House. As far as I can see, the proportion now is an unreasonable one. There appear to be nine or ten hon. gentlemen from the other side of the House to five or six from this side.

Mr. BOWELL. The proportions are the same as they were last year. The objection made was to the substitution of a supporter of the Government for Mr. Ellis, and I understood that the addition of one name from the Opposition would be satisfactory. That is simply adding one from each side of the House, making the committee fifteen.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think the proportion is according to the proportion in the House, but, if the hon. gentleman came to such an arrangement with the leader of the Opposition, I shall not offer any objection to it, though I must say that I do not admit the correctness of the proportion at all.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not make the arrangement with the leader of the Opposition myself, but I was informed that the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) had made the arrangement.

Mr. SCRIVER. I spoke with the leader of the Opposition on this subject last evening, and he consented to the arrangement suggested.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

On the Orders of the Day being called,

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I desire to ask if it is the intention of the Government to adjourn from to-morrow until next Monday? I believe it is the wish of a very large number of members on both sides of the House that that should be done.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Sundry representations have been made in favour of an adjournment from Wednesday night until Monday, on the ground that Thursday is a holiday, and that, in the present state of the business of the House, this being in the beginning of the session, there will be very little business on Friday, and that for those hon. gentlemen who can get away it would be an advantage, while there would be no substantial loss of time. That is the representation made to the Government. The Government are, of course, in the hands of the House, and will do whatever appears to be the wish of the majority in that regard.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I respectfully suggest to the Government that this adjournment should not take place. We have hardly been sitting here a week, and it is impossible, as experience has shown, that any progress of a marked character can be made with the public business during the first week of the session, but it is expected that during the second week we should make some progress. We have been called together at a late period of the year, at a period very inconvenient to a large majority of the House, and I suppose, irrespective of politics, there is no member of this House who does not desire to get through the business as quickly as proper attention to his parliamentary duties will permit. I, therefore, look upon this proposed adjournment for a week as being a prolongation of the session for that length of time. I have seen this same proposition made on other occasions with the same results.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Of course, hon. gentlemen who come from short distances desire to have the opportunity of returning to their homes. That is quite reasonable. But it is not reasonable that hon. gentlemen who come from a distance of 1,000 or 1,200 miles should be asked to consent to such an adjournment, and to kick their heels around here doing nothing. It means that, when the 1st July approaches, this session will be prolonged a week longer, to the infinite loss of so many members. There is no reason why we should adjourn over a week. I hope the Government will not agree to adopt this course. Not one of the Maritime Provinces members would be in favour of it, and I am confident that it will not promote, but will rather retard the progress of public business.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If an adjournment is made as proposed, I trust it will be until Tuesday, because it would be inconvenient for those who go away and cannot get here again on Monday morning if the adjournment were simply till Monday.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Monday.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Monday will, of course, suit those who live near here, but we from a distance cannot get back by Monday.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I venture to state, for the members from the Maritime Provinces supporting the Government, or the majority of them, that they are in favour of an adjournment until Monday.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the public business mentioned in the Speech from the Throne is not ready, we will lose nothing by the adjournment, for we will be doing nothing whether we are here

or away; but if the Government are ready to go on with the public business, if the Minister of Finance can make his Budget statement, I think we should make the most of our time. However, the Government has the responsibility for an adjournment if it takes place. It is a prolongation of the session, and they must be held responsible for it.

Mr. CHARLTON. If an adjournment is to take place, it is to be regretted that the Government did not call Parliament together next week instead of last week. I agree with the expression of opinion of my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), that it appears to be unreasonable to members from a distance that this adjournment should be insisted upon, and I think it is selfish on the part of those who insist upon it, having regard to the interests of those who come from a distance. If the Government can meet the House with any business, we ought to go on and not adjourn.

Mr. TROW. There seems to be a general feeling on the part of members that the House should adjourn till Monday, for their own convenience. I am surprised that the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), should remark that a week would be lost, because Thursday and Saturday being holidays, only one day could possibly be lost.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move, with the consent, of course, of the House, that when this House adjourns on Wednesday, it stands adjourned till Monday at 3 o'clock.

Motion agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons an approved Minute of Council, appointing the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, G.C.B., Minister of Railways and Canals, the Hon. Sir Hector Langevin, K.C.M.G., Minister of Public Works, the Hon. John Costigan, Minister of Inland Revenue, and the Hon. George Eulas Foster, Minister of Finance, to act with the Speaker of the House of Commons, as Commissioners for the purposes and under the provisions of the 13th Chapter of the Revised Statutes of Canada, entitled: "An Act respecting the House of Commons."

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 1st May, 1891.

TIMBER CUT ON INDIAN RESERVE No. 6.

Mr. BARRON asked, What quantity of timber or other wood has been returned to the Government of Canada as having been cut up to the present time from off Indian Reserve No. 6, of the Robinson Treaty, by the licensees or vendees of the Government of the timber thereon, since the sale thereof to Mr. Honoré Robillard? What amount of revenue or amount in dues has been paid to the Government, since the sale thereof, from the vendees or licensees, on account of timber or other woods cut thereon?

Mr. DEWDNEY. In answer to the first portion of the hon. member's question, I beg to say, that 474 cords of cord wood, 5,046,319 feet board measure, and 369,390 feet cubic measure, were cut, all of pine timber; the amount of revenue being $13,992.99 for ground rent, renewal fees and timber dues.

GAZETTING MEMBER OF BELLECHASSE ELECTION.

Mr. AMYOT asked, Why the receipt of the return to the writ of election for the County of Bellechasse was not gazetted until the 11th April? If the delay be due to the fact that the returning officer, Solyme Forgues, Esq., did not sooner transmit his return to the writ of election to him addressed, what reason does he give? In how many Dominion elections has the said Solyme Forgues already acted as returning officer?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The reason why the return of the writ of the election for the County of Bellechasse was not gazetted until the 11th day of April, was because the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery did not receive it until the 6th of that month. The reason offered by the returning officer for not declaring it sooner than he did who was the elected member for the county, was the absence of the required statement on the part of the deputy returning officer for polling division No. 10, giving the number of votes cast for each candidate, the production of which caused some delay. Solyme Forgues, who was the returning officer for the County of Bellechasse at the last election, was also returning officer for the county at the general elections in 1878, 1882 and 1887.

TIME WITHIN WHICH ELECTIONS MAY BE CONTROVERTED.

Mr. AMYOT asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce, during the present Session, a measure to render uniform time within which elections may be controverted, and to deprive returning officers of the power of extending that time at pleasure by neglecting to make returns to the writs of election to them addressed?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There is no such intention at present on the part of the Government.

VALIDITY OF PROVINCIAL ACTS.

Mr. WATSON asked, Has the Government, directly or indirectly, paid or agreed to pay any costs of expenses incurred in testing in the courts the constitutionality or validity of any Acts passed by any Legislative Assembly? If so, what Act or Acts are thus being contested? Is it the intention of the Government to bear the costs, or any portion thereof, or to be incurred, in obtaining a final judicial opinion as to the constitutionality of the Act of the Manitoba Legislature, passed in 1890, relating to Public Schools?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In answer to the first question—Yes. As the second portion seems to call for a statement of the Acts, the validity of which may be indirectly as well as directly affected by the contestations going forward, I give the hon. gentleman a list as follows:— "For Ontario—Statutes, 51 Victoria, chapter 5, 'An Act respecting the Executive Administration of the Laws of this Province.' Revised Statutes, 1887, Chapter 32, 'An Act to regulate the Fisheries of this Prov-

ince and amendments. Chapter 124, 'An Act respecting Assignments and Preferences by Insolvent Persons.' For Quebec—52 Victoria, Chapter 12, 'An Act respecting the Executive Administration of the Laws of this Province.' Revised Statutes, 1374 to 1378, inclusive, relating to Fisheries in non-navigable rivers and lakes, and amendments. Articles 5952 to 5965, inclusive. For New Brunswick—52 Victoria, Chapter 7, 'An Act respecting the Executive Administration of the Laws of this Province.' 'The Fisheries Act of 1884,' and amendments. For Manitoba—49 Victoria, Chapter 45, 'An Act respecting Assignment for the benefit of Creditors,' and amendments thereto. 53 Victoria, Chapter 15, 'An Act respecting the Executive Administration of the Laws of this Province.' Chapter 37, 'An Act respecting the Department of Education.' Chapter 38, 'An Act respecting Public Schools.' For British Columbia—Consolidated Acts, 1888, Chapter 52, 'The Game Protection Act, section 13.'"

NEWFOUNDLAND BAIT ACT.

Mr. KAULBACH asked, What measures have been taken to induce the Government of Newfoundland to suspend the operation of the Newfoundland Bait Act against our Canadian fishermen during the present fishing season, pending the answer of the Colonial Office through the delegation now in London?

Mr. TUPPER. I shall have to ask my hon. friend the member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) not to press this question or the one standing next on the Order Paper in his name. The subject alluded to, which my hon. friend has constantly pressed on my attention on behalf of the fishermen of Nova Scotia, is a large one, and to answer the question on the paper satisfactory would require the preparation of a return. I may say to my hon. friend that I will accept these questions as notices of motions, or as motions for the papers, and returns will be prepared and laid on the Table as soon as possible.

CROSS POINT AND PASPEBIAC MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. JONCAS asked, What is the name of the contractor entrusted with the carrying of the mail between Cross Point and Paspebiac, in the County of Bonaventure? What is the amount paid yearly to the said contractor? At what date does his contract terminate?

Mr. HAGGART. The name of the contractor entrusted with the carrying of the mails between Cross Point and Paspebiac, in the County of Bonaventure, is Mrs. Annie Searle. The amount paid yearly to the said contractor is $3,880. The contract terminates at the pleasure of the Postmaster General.

CROSS POINT AND GASPÉ BASIN MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. JONCAS asked, What is the sum paid yearly by the Government for the carriage of the mails by land between Cross Point and Gaspé Basin? What is the total amount received from the several post offices between Cross Point and Gaspé, including the receipts from the said two offices?

Mr. HAGGART. The sum paid yearly by the Government for the carriage of the mails by land between Cross Point and Gaspé Basin is $8,880. The total amount received from the several post offices between Cross Point and Gaspé, including the receipts from the said two offices, is $6,695.70.

Mr. JONCAS asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to take the necessary steps, this year, to secure a better mail service between Cross Point, in the County of Bonaventure, and Gaspé Basin?

Mr. HAGGART. The Department is at present considering the advisability of making the change suggested.

AMERICAN CHEESE SHIPPED THROUGH CANADIAN PORTS.

Mr. MARSHALL asked, Have any steps been taken by the Government during last Session or since that time to prevent American cheese being shipped through or from Canadian ports, and branded as Canadian? If so, what are now the instructions to the proper authorities or preventive officers?

Mr. BOWELL. I shall have to ask my hon. friend to allow this question to stand as a notice of motion, or I will accept it as a motion, and will bring down the papers. There is a good deal of correspondence, and the preparation of a return will be necessary in order to make the answer intelligible.

THE FRENCH LANGUAGE IN MANITOBA.

Mr. LARIVIÈRE moved for:

Copies of all correspondence, petitions, memorials and any other documents submitted to the Privy Council, in connection with the abolition of the official use of the French language in the Province of Manitoba by the Legislature of that Province; also copies of reports to, or Orders in Council thereon; also copies of the Act or Acts relating thereto.

He said: The constitution of the Province of Manitoba is somewhat similar to that of the Province of Quebec in regard to the use of the two languages, English and French. When the Manitoba Act was passed it was provided by section 23, as follows:

"Either the English or the French language may be used by any person in the debates of the House of the Legislature, and both those languages shall be used in the respective Records and Journals of those Houses; and either of those languages may be used by any person, or in any pleading or process in or issuing from any Court of Canada established under the British North America Act, 1867, or in or from all or any of the courts of the provinces. The Acts of the Legislature shall be printed and published in both those languages."

This is the constitution of Manitoba. The Act passed by this Parliament in 1870 was subsequently confirmed by an Imperial Act; so that neither the Province of Manitoba, through its Legislature, nor this Parliament, has the power to amend the constitution, unless authorized so to do by the Imperial Parliament. In spite of this clause of the constitution an Act has been passed by the Manitoba Legislature doing away with the official use of the French language in that province, and ever since the passing of that Act, the statutes, the records of the House, the official *Gazette* and all other official notices which hitherto had been printed in both languages, are not now printed in the French

language. I am aware that petitions and memorials have been forwarded to His Excellency the Governor General in Council calling attention to these facts, and my intention in moving for the papers is to place the House in a position to know the true state of affairs with regard to this question. I do not propose at this stage to discuss the merits or non-merits of the action of the Local Legislature; but when the House is in possession of full knowledge of the question from the papers which will be brought down, hon. members will be better prepared to listen to any motion which may be made at a subsequent period.

Motion agreed to.

ABOLITION OF SEPARATE SCHOOLS IN MANITOBA.

Mr. LARIVIÈRE moved for:

Copies of all correspondence, petitions, memorials, briefs and factums, and of any other documents submitted to the Privy Council in connection with the abolition of Separate Schools in the Province of Manitoba by the Legislature of that Province; also copies of reports to, and Orders in Council thereon; also copies of any Act or Acts of said Legislature abolishing said Separate Schools or modifying in any way the system existing prior to 1890.

He said: The remarks I have made on the question of the dual language might apply as well to the question of the schools; but the House is more concerned, perhaps, in this than the other question, because, in reading the clauses of the Manitoba Act respecting education, I find the following as section 22:—

"In and for the Province the said Legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject and according to the said following provision:

"(1.) Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law or practice in the Province at the Union.

"(2.) An appeal shall lie to the Governor General in Council from any act or decision of the Legislature of the Province or of any provincial authority, affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education.

"(3.) In case any such provincial law as from time to time seems to the Governor General in Council requisite for the due execution of the provisions of this section is not made, or in case any decision of the Governor General in Council or any appeal under this section is not duly executed by the proper provincial authorities in that behalf, then, as in every such case, and as far only as the circumstances of each case require, the Parliament of Canada may make remedial laws for the due execution of the provisions of this section and of any decision of the Governor General in Council under this section."

When Manitoba existed as a colony, before it had a Legislature, a system of separate schools was in existence, and when the Manitoba Act was passed it was contemplated that this system of separate schools should be continued in the new Province of Manitoba as it existed already in the older provinces. This clause was, therefore, inserted into the Constitutional Act, but I regret to say that with regard to this question of education, and its kindred question of the dual language, the Manitoba Legislature has ignored both the letter and spirit of the constitution, and since the passing of a new Act by the Legislature repealing the separate school law, proceedings have been taken in the court to test the constitutionality of this new Act. I shall not detain the House even with a synopsis of what has since taken place, or of the judgments which have been rendered by the courts, but in this motion I am asking for a copy of all the documents, memorials and briefs and factums of the courts, so that this House, when sooner or later it may be called upon to pass a remedial law as provided by the constitution, shall be in full possession of the facts of the case and shall be in a position to give a just and proper verdict on the question. This is a delicate question I admit, but it is one of these questions this House will have to deal with liberally and so as to protect the minority in the Province of Manitoba, whose rights I claim have been attacked and ignored by the legislation I have referred to.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman, whether the judgment of the court is to be included in his motion?

Mr. LARIVIÈRE. I understand that the factum of the court will cover that.

Motion agreed to.

MANITOBA SCHOOL ACT.

Mr. DEVLIN moved for:

Copy of all petitions presented to His Excellency with reference to the School Acts of Manitoba; and all memorials, reports, Orders in Council and correspondence in connection with the same.

He said: The motion which I propose making is somewhat the same as that which has just been moved by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière); still, it is of such importance that it may be well to offer as briefly as possible the reasons which induce me to present this motion. Considering the variety of views and the disparity of opinions held upon the subject of the Manitoba School Act, the severe denunciation it has received in certain quarters and the strong favour obtained in others, a suspicion might be entertained by hon. gentlemen that in introducing a subject so delicate it is our desire to create fresh difficulties for the Government. That is not the case; we are actuated solely by a sense of duty arising from a conviction that by the allowance of this measure an unjust and indefensible Act has virtually received the sanction and concurrence of the Dominion Government. We are prepared to wait for the correspondence, documents, memorials, reports and orders relating to this subject before introducing a direct and well-merited motion of censure—a motion, Sir, that will enable us to protest with all our strength against a violation of what we consider a sacred right, against a statute embodying the very first principle of oppression, and fraught with danger to the best interests of our commonwealth; against a blow to the constitution of our country—a blow which should have been resisted by those whose first and sworn duty it is to shield from injury that written and thoroughly understood compact by which we are governed. While upon this subject it may not be unwise either, to draw attention in a few words to the agitation which is going on; an agitation which, in our opinion, is full of danger and full of gravity, and may be followed by very serious consequences. Assuredly, Sir, we have not only had in the Province of Manitoba legislation of the most astounding nature, but even in the great, prosperous and enlightened Province of Ontario, men of no mean eminence in the political world have attempted to climb into power and place over the ruins of a system of education which proved thoroughly acceptable to the people of that Province. Fortunately, Sir,

their design was frustrated: a great wrong was prevented; because the patriotic spirit of the people of Ontario refused to countenance the destruction of what it had taken years to build. However, Sir, the nature of recent events has excited a feeling of widespread alarm among a very great proportion of the population of the province from which I have the honour to come. I would be very proud indeed to-day, when I have the pleasure of addressing this House for the first time, were it possible for me to say to my co-religionists: "You are wrong when you suspect that there is ground for uneasiness; your rights and liberties shall be respected and maintained." But, Sir, in presence of the agitation now going on, in presence of the evident determination to wipe out the language of a large proportion of the population and to close up the separate schools, is it possible to give them this assurance? I am told that we have in the Cabinet gentlemen who will represent us and look after our schools and the interests of parents in the matter of education. Ah, Mr. Speaker, when I remember the manly stand taken a few years ago by the Cabinet representative of the nationality to which I belong, and compare that stand with the position he occupies in this matter, I am forced to exclaim, with the great Latin poet, *quantum mutatus ab illo*—how changed our champion! True, he was then a mere member of this House: to-day he is a member of the Government. Must the change in sentiment be accounted for by the change in position? Mr. Speaker, when we remember that upon more than one platform in the Province of Quebec, always, of course, in the exciting time of an election, the very eloquent Secretary of State and the very punctilious Minister of Public Works called Heaven to witness their devotion to the principles which had been attacked by this measure, and when we contrast their utterances and professions with their deeds, have we not reason to suspect that the mantle of office is capable of producing a very remarkable effect and tempting men, otherwise upright, from the usually beaten path? You are aware that during the last election not a little was said on the subject of annexation. Now, I believe the annexation was altogether on the opposite side of the House. For instance, take the hon. Minister of Customs whose views are pretty well known on the subject of which I am treating: have we not reason to believe that in a moment of fraternal effervescence he admitted to his embrace and succeeded in annexing the hon. Minister of Justice, the hon. Secretary of State and the hon. Minister of Public Works? The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Mc Carthy), encouraged by this success, went a step further and actually captured our Minister of War. I would be the last man to hurt the feelings or wound the susceptibilities of any hon. member, the last man to bring up a subject which might possibly engender strife between man and man, between race and race, or between creed and creed. As much as any member of this House am I anxious that peace should prevail in our country, because as strongly as any member am I attached to this country, proud of its extent, proud of its resources, proud of its institutions, and proud of its form of government. There is no land under the face of the sun so dear to me, for in our eyes it is a land of beauty, virtue and valour—a land whose lakes and streams and forests, whose mineral and agricultural capabilities compare with those of any other country—a land which has in it every element of national greatness and every element of national strength, provided the element of national unity can be preserved. It has a history peculiarly characteristic of the chivalry of its race—a history which reflects the greatest possible credit upon the schools which have been attacked in Manitoba, and upon the church which fosters and protects those schools. Ah, Sir, the more we study that history, the more reason have we to feel proud of the wonderful and heroic achievements of those who first came into this country and planted on the shores of the St. Lawrence the emblem of christianity, and introduced here the great language of France, rendered immortal by the oratory of Bossuet and the poetry of Racine. To do away with the French tongue, you must wipe from the pages of history the names of Champlain, Montcalm, and many others: you will have to go further, and demolish the monuments which commemorate the deeds of many brave Frenchmen: you will, if you wish to succeed, have to go still further, and destroy the entire French Canadian race. You must not leave a man, because so long as there is in this country a French Canadian possessed of some heart and attached to the land which was discovered, opened and settled by his fathers, so long will his beautiful language be spoken, cherished and defended against all attacks. Step by step has our country risen from the condition of a small colony to a position of importance which cannot be over-estimated. It has a system of railways which we must all admire: its vessels reach the most distant ports: on more than one occasion has Canada proved to the world that the national heart is sound to the core: and when Canada's flag required it, Canada's sword slept not in a sluggish scabbard, but promptly responded to the call of duty. Yet, it cannot be stated that the picture is all brightness: far from it. We may be told that there is no ground for uneasiness. Let me draw the attention of this House to the pastoral recently issued by the archbishops and bishops of the ecclesiastical provinces of Quebec, Montreal and Ottawa, and addressed to the clergy, secular and regular, and all the faithful of these provinces, in which we find the following passages:—

"Consequently, it is with great surprise and profound grief we learn that, even here in our own country where religious liberty is loudly proclaimed, legalized attempts have been made to introduce that censurable and censured system of unsectarian schools, in order to deprive the church of a right which is inseparable from the free exercise of Catholic worship, guaranteed by the faith of the treaties. In another province of this land, inhabited by Catholics, they are trying once more an underhand and satanic persecution against the sacred rights of the Church. It was with emotion of heart we heard the Venerable Archbishop of St. Boniface raise his voice once more against this iniquity. In a pastoral letter, dated the 15th of last August, the illustrious prelate makes known this perfidious stratagem for perverting youth, forewarns his flock against it, and lets them see how odious it is.

"A trial of a novel kind has come upon us. In a land where freedom of religion is so loudly proclaimed, fetters have been placed on that liberty. Our social and political institutions warranted protection to all our rights, and now, behold the same rights trampled upon by the very persons who should safeguard them. Here you are exposed to persecution—not a bloody persecution which attacks the body or external life, but a persecution most cunningly masked, which attacks the intellect, hinders

it from being enlightened by Christian light and guided by the reflections of its divine splendours."

Now, even since then we know that the attention of the Government has been drawn to this matter by the French press of the country, notably by the *Courrier du Canada*, the organ of the hon. Minister of Public Works, which in more than one brilliant article sounded the note of alarm. The attention of the Government has also been called by *La Minerve*, *La Presse*, and many other French Conservative organs of importance to this question, but all in vain: and ever since the expiration of the time when disallowance might have been applied for, a stronger feeling of indignation has prevailed. I could give you, in a few words, an expression of that opinion, which is certainly strong:

"It seems evident that the Manitoba Acts will not be disallowed.

"It is a misfortune, and a greater misfortune than it is perhaps believed.

"Not only does the sanction of the injustice perpetrated by the odious Martin deprive our compatriots and co-religionists of the use of their language, and of the right to have their children educated in Catholic schools, but it violently shakes Confederation.

"The compact of 1867 cannot for a long time stand such shocks.

"French Canadians and Catholics, who have always been the most faithful observers and the most constant supporters of the British North America Act, will know henceforth how little the constitution protects their most sacred rights, since a fanatical majority may trample upon them with impunity.

"The results may not immediately be felt. The people's feelings are somewhat blunted presently. People undergo the reaction of the violent crisis which they have had to go through of late. The weak and undignified stand of their natural leaders has disconcerted and discouraged them."

That is pretty strong language, but it is taken from a Conservative organ. Strong though it be, it is none the less, I believe, a faithful presentation of the sentiments entertained by the great majority of the population of the Province of Quebec. I can speak with certainty and positive assurance of the feeling in the County of Ottawa which I have the honour to represent—one of the largest, perhaps the most populous divisions, and certainly the wealthiest and finest electoral division in the Dominion. I know the feeling of my own constituents, both Catholic and Protestant. They keenly deplore this agitation. They feel that a great wrong has been inflicted; and I promised them, I candidly confess, during the campaign, that I certainly would bring up this subject at the very first opportunity, and it is my determination to keep it before the House as long as the injustice is allowed to continue. To-day it is the turn of our brethren in Manitoba to suffer; to-morrow it may be ours. The declaration of war is made all along the line. Do you doubt it, Sir? I refer, not to the senseless language, senseless literature and senseless pamphlets with which this country has been inundated, nor to the idle threats made by hundreds of speakers from many hundreds of platforms in Ontario; but when we hear a man stating in a prominent Legislature like that of Ontario that the agitation for the abolition of those schools is not a thing of the past: when we know that Mr. McCleary stated, about a month ago, in that Legislature:

"It is not dead or dying, but it is as alive and vigorous to-day as ever it was, and it will live and grow until every school that exists in the Province of Ontario is owned and governed and controlled by the State and by the State only."

When, Mr. Speaker, we see the London *Free Press*, and especially the Toronto *Empire*, with which the right hon. the First Minister must be acquainted—and whose articles he, probably, occasionally reads before they are printed—proclaiming these ideas as excellent, and going into a veritable ecstacy over the gentleman who made the speech to which I refer, can we be expected to remain perfectly patient and cool? I said a moment ago that I did not intend to refer to the persistent warfare urged against us by a certain ill-guided press, that press which has said Confederation would have to be smashed into its original fragments and the battle of the Plains of Abraham would have to be fought over again. For our part, when such threats are made, we are not seriously disturbed unless immediate consequences follow; and we firmly believe that if ever the battle of the Plains of Abraham must be fought over again—which God forbid—our Ministers, who represent us especially, will be down there and will fight more valiantly on the Plains of Abraham than they did on the Plains of Manitoba. The source of the attack is rendered more serious because of its importance. We know that this policy of aggression is not confined to one Province. Last year much of the time of the House was taken up with a discussion regarding the suppresion of the official use of the French language in the North-West Territories. I had not the honour then to have a seat on the floor of this House, but was the proud possessor of one in the gallery, and I cannot charge my memory with all the incidents of this debate; but I know that owing to the very weak policy pursued on that occassion, the friends of one language have become so emboldened that they have introduced, and introduced successfully, a similar measure in the Province of Manitoba. The nature of that measure is so destructive and oppressive, and its consequences may prove so far-reaching, that I fear we have not seen the end of it. We certainly have not, if we may judge from the resolutions introduced into the Ontario Legislature a few nights ago, and which are as follows:—

"1. That legislation respecting denominational schools in Upper Canada was adopted by the Parliament of the late Provinces of Canada at a time when Upper and Lower Canada were joined in a legislative union.

"2. That this legislation was adopted by the Parliament of Canada against the wishes and opinion of a large majority of the representatives of Upper Canada in the Legislative Assembly.

"3. That by the passage of the British North America Act, 1867, the Imperial Parliament imposed on certain Provincial Legislatures restrictions in dealing with education.

"4. That in consequence of these restrictions the people of Ontario are not free to make such laws respecting education as they may from time to time deem necessary and prudent.

"5. That these restrictions are contrary to the principles of proper responsible government as conferred on the Dominion of Canada and on the several provinces composing it, and to the autonomous powers which were in other respects granted to the Provincial Legislatures.

"6. That the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec are the only provinces of the Dominion of Canada which are so restricted.

"7. That, in the opinion of this House, the interests of the country require such changes in the British North America Act of 1867 as will place education under the jurisdiction of the Ontario Legislature completely, as the various subjects assigned to provincial jurisdiction under section 91 of that Act.

"8. That an humble Address be presented by this House to Her Most Gracious Majesty embodying the foregoing

resolutions and praying that she will be pleased to have them brought to the notice of the Houses of Parliament with a view of securing the changes desired."

I know perfectly well that I might be told that we enjoy in Quebec, where we are in the majority, the power of retaliation. As a Liberal, I protest against the idea of retaliating. As an Irish-Canadian, I cannot possibly sanction the idea that the rights of any people should be invaded. As a Catholic, I would condemn any proposals that might bear heavily and unjustly upon my Protestant fellow citizens, and, were those rights attacked, I would be the first to go into the fight to defend them. We do not anticipate retaliation in the Province of Quebec, and why? Because the people of the Province of Quebec are actuated by broad and generous sentiments. On more than one occasion they have given not only an idea of what justice they can deal out, but even what generosity can be offered by them. We remember that last Session an announcement was received in this House with sorrow, with anguish and with feelings of distress—the announcement of the conflagration which carried away Toronto's pride, that famous institution of learning where so many of Ontario's sons received the highest education in arts, in medicine and in law. The Legislature of the Province of Quebec, representing the people of that Province, then passed a most practical resolution of sympathy which took the form of a gift of $10,000. I know myself that, in the great Catholic University of Laval in Quebec, two Protestant gentlemen, Drs. Jackson and Sewell, occupied, I think up to the time of their death, the chairs of medicine, and that both gentlemen were members of the Council of this Catholic University. It is well to bring these facts to the notice of the country as well as to the notice of the House, because they constitute the best testimony to the generosity and liberality of an enlightened people. We can go further and show that, in the great city of Montreal, where the large majority is Catholic, and in the city of Quebec where the majority is also Catholic, the chief positions in the gift of the people—the mayoralty, for instance—have often been bestowed upon Protestant gentlemen. In the County of Ottawa, from which I come, the population being about 70,000, three-fourths of this large population being Catholic and principally French-Canadian, the same thing is evident. Take the city of Hull, whose population is 12,000—a city the most thoroughly Catholic and French in the Province of Quebec—and its mayor to-day is a Protestant gentleman, Mr. Mayor Eddy. The wardenship of the county has been also held by a Protestant gentleman for years. That Catholic and French county is represented in the Senate by a Protestant gentleman, it is represented in the Legislative Council of Quebec by a Protestant gentleman, and it was represented on the floor of this House for a great number of years by a Protestant gentleman. I am the first Catholic returned for that county to this Legislature, my justly popular predecessor, Mr. Alonzo Wright, having occupied the seat in Parliament for 29 years. What does this mean? We do not ask what are your religious views, but what is your political opinion, and the answer given to that question enables us to render our verdict. If the spirit of justice should be practiced in other portions of this Dominion in the same way, much of the agitation now existing would be dispelled, and we would have peace and prosperity in this country. It is time that the storm signal should be hoisted: it is time that the Canadian nation should be warned of the danger which threatens it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DEVLIN. It is very well for certain gentlemen to cry "hear, hear." Perhaps in a few moments they will not be in such a hurry to cry "hear, hear." It takes but a spark to start a flame which may easily be fanned into a huge conflagration, and it is only realized how great the danger is when it is too late. We may be warned of the approaching flood and heed it not, but, when the storm descends, when our property is destroyed and we have lost those who are dearest to us, then it is too late to stem the flood. But what are the calamities caused by the action of nature compared to those which are aroused by the letting loose of the passions of the people? We have only to go back about a century and we have before us the horrors of the French Revolution. We have only to cross to the south of our boundary to see the effect of the great civil war when brother's blood was shed by brother, when State fought against State, and when the existence of the great Republic was threatened. And there are those now sitting in this House who remember the days of 1837 and 1838—those sad days for Canada—when this country went through the agony of civil war. The heroes of those days sleep in their graves, but, though I may stand here on the floor of the House, I assert that they are not considered as the graves of traitors but as the graves of patriots. You cannot with impunity trample upon the proud spirit of a proud race. You cannot insult a people without receiving in return the insult you tender, and I am afraid that there are those who do not consider the effect of their speeches and of the appeals which they make to passion and prejudice. I believe that much of the agitation which has been aroused is due to the course of the hon. member for Simcoe. Had he the approval of his leader in the course he pursued? I know not. Did his chieftain encourage him? It is difficult to say. But what we do know is that, when he occupied a very prominent place in the Conservative party, when he was the leader of that party in Ontario, when he was the president of the Liberal-Conservative Association of Ontario in 1887, he spoke as follows in the town of Barrie:—

"And don't we find the French to-day in the Province of Quebec more French than they were when they were conquered by Wolfe on the Plains of Abraham? Do they mix with us, assimilate with us, intermarry with us; do they read our literature or learn our laws? No; everything with them is conducted on a French model, and, while we may admire members of that race as individuals, yet as members of the body politic, I say, they are the great danger to our confederacy."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is pretty strong language. Yet it was the campaign document of 1887. We are reaping to-day the fruits of such ideas. The first shot was fired at us in the Jesuit storm, the second was distinctly heard in the last local campaign in Ontario, and now the firing is going on all around. The separate school must go, the French language must go. I think the great danger to Confederation lies, not in the French race, or the French language, or the separate school, it lies in the policy pursued by the hon. mem-

ber for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and, perhaps, receiving the approbation of others who do not dare to declare openly their approbation of that policy. This crusade will have a most unfortunate effect, because it will lessen the confidence which we might have in the institutions which govern us, and also in the protection which is supposed to be extended to minorities. We know what sacrifices have been made for the development of the North-West. For it was built the Canadian Pacific Railway, for it was created the great national debt which rests so heavily upon this country. To the money which was expended there, the Catholic contributed as well as the Protestant; each to-day has to bear, in proportion to his means, in proportion to the population, some amount of the taxation. Sir, I ask in view of the legislation which has been passed: Is the door of the North-West not virtually closed, is the door of Manitoba not virtually closed, against Catholic emigrants who might intend going there? Can we encourage them to-day to go into that province? Not as long as the legislation exists which it was in the power of hon. gentlemen opposite, occupying the ministerial benches, to disallow, and which the people of the Province of Quebec thought they would disallow before the 5th March. We will be told, of course, in very fine technical language, we will even be told, perhaps, in subtle arguments, by the Minister of Justice, that the matter is before another tribunal and receiving the attention of that tribunal. Well, notwithstanding this assurance, we will still believe that the tribunal which should have pronounced upon it is before us: the constitution and laws of our country render that tribunal competent to pronounce, but policy, but expediency, but the desire of not displeasing the member for Simcoe and such other strong powers render this tribunal incompetent. That was the trouble. What should we think, if a fire was to start in this House, and if we were gravely informed that we must not take a pail of water to quench it, although we might have one at our hands, but that a page must be summoned, who, in his turn, will be sent to the caretaker, who, in his turn, will summon the city brigade, and, by the time this brigade would reach us, the whole building would be destroyed? That is about the amount and force of the argument of the Government with regard to this measure of the Manitoba schools. There is no wonder at all that the hon. member for Simcoe feels perfectly satisfied with the course pursued by the Government. In a speech delivered a short time ago at Collingwood he expressed his satisfaction, he expressed his entire pleasure, at the course pursued by the Government in this matter; and although we had been informed on more than one platform in the Province of Quebec that he had been expelled from his party, we did not believe it. We knew perfectly well that the people received one course of instruction in Ontario, while those specially deputed to fight us were informed by the chieftain of that party that he alone was the true defender of the faith. The Government sent its emissaries into the Province of Quebec to teach and preach that our policy meant annexation, that annexation meant the destruction of the Catholic religion, and would lead also to the ruin and destruction of the French language, and the laws, customs and institutions of the Province of Quebec. However, notwithstanding all these events, we have the consolation of knowing that it is not in the power of the Government of Manitoba to close the door of the separate schools—it is not in the power of any Government, of any agitator, to close the separate schools, because as long as a Catholic can earn a dollar in this country, he will gladly give that dollar to the end in view. We may be harassed, laws may be passed compelling us to support schools not our own, entirely out of sympathy with our religious view; we may even be forced to support them by taxation; and still, notwithstanding all the measures which may be passed against us in this respect, we will have our separate schools; so long as we enjoy the free exercise of our faith and religious opinions, so long will we have our separate schools. We all know, Mr. Speaker, the result of the policy pursued with respect to education in Ireland; we know that all the power of English statesmanship, all the glitter of English gold, that all human and inhuman devices were employed, in order to prevent the people of that country from receiving an education through Catholic channels. And still, what is the result? The result is stamped upon every page of history, showing that the Catholic Church has triumphed; and to-day the problem is how to destroy what was erected, and how to erect again what was destroyed. We know that to-day the heart of England has been touched, and an effort is being made, seriously and earnestly, to remedy the evil which existed, and to redress the wrong of centuries. We ask simply that we may be allowed to enjoy the privileges guaranteed to us by the constitution of our country; and one of the privileges before 1870, the year in which Manitoba entered Confederation, was that Catholics should have their separate schools, and from 1870 up to 1890 in Manitoba the Catholic school has existed, but last year it was closed. The right to have these schools is one which we are bound to keep, and it is a right which we will never cease to bring under the notice of this House.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I believe this information was furnished to the House last session; but if there is anything called for by this motion which has not already been brought down, I shall be very happy to bring down the additional information required.

Motion agreed to.

ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell), for Mr. LAURIER, moved for:

Copy of all correspondence between the Government or the Postmaster General's Department with Mr. Andrew Allan or any other parties, for the conveyance of the mails between Canada and the United Kingdom.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it is to be regretted that the Postmaster General or the Government have allowed us to come to this state of affairs when our mails have to pass from Canada to the United Kingdom through a foreign country. Two years ago the Government obtained permission from this House to offer a subsidy of $500,000 a year for a period of ten years as a subsidy for a line of steamships between Canada, the United Kingdom and France. For some reason that subsidy was not taken advantage of, and after the Government had for about a year dallied with it, we were told last year that the expected contractors, Anderson & Co., had withdrawn from the

negotiations. That left Canada with the old line of steamships as before, which had in fact been condemned by public opinion, and by the Government in this House so far as they represent the public opinion of the day. The Postmaster General last Session asked for a grant of $125,000 as a temporary subsidy to provide for the carrying of the mails by the Canadian route for one year. He knew that the arrangement would terminate in 1891, for he told us last year that the contract was for one year from April, 1890. It has, therefore, happened that, although the Government had a year's notice, we are now without a line of our own by which to send our mails to Great Britain. We have by the action of the Government in this respect condemned the Canadian lines, we have declared them unsuitable for the purpose of carrying the Canadian mails; perhaps they are, and I think this is generally conceded. But how does it arise that when the people of Canada are willing to give such vast sums of money towards the improvement of the service, two years have passed and we are now in a worse position than at the commencement? The Government have not only allowed the mail service to be diverted to a foreign country, but traffic, both passenger and freight, has also been diverted. In view of the great triumph just accomplished, whereby mails and passengers have been carried from Yokohama to the Atlantic shore in 14 days, I think every possible effort should be made by the Government to complete the triumph and bring us into direct communication through our own lines, if possible, with Great Britain and Europe. The country, I am sure, has not been penurious in the past in entrusting to the Government money for the purpose in question, nor is there any reason to suppose that the people will refuse to complete the system which has so far been carried to perfection. I, as a Canadian, rejoice at the triumph which has been recently accomplished in the direction I have mentioned, and I am sure the whole of Canada will endorse every movement that will improve and perfect our mail service. I should have regretted if this motion had passed in silence. I think there should be some information given by the Administration. How long are we to remain in the present condition? Are there any negotiations on foot? Has the Government anything in view? They have at present a pledge of half a million dollars for ten years from the people; has the Minister of Finance abandoned the scheme? I think it is due to the House that at this particular moment we should have information on the subject.

Mr. KENNY. I listened with pleasure to the remarks which fell from the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock). Hon. gentlemen who sat in the last Parliament will remember that on more than one occasion I drew the attention of the House and of the Government to the necessity which then existed for an improved trans-Atlantic mail service. I think, Sir, it is very much to be regretted that the efforts which the Government made to secure a better service have not been more successful, but at the same time I must say, my individual opinion is—and I think it is shared by the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House—that the subsidy which was paid to the steamers which performed the service during the past two years had better cease, than that we should continue a service which was so generally unsatisfactory to the country. I was glad to read recently in an English newspaper, an extract from a Canadian paper, which first met my eyes in the English journal, and which stated that a company had been formed recently in England, composed of the owners of the Allan Line steamers, of the Naval and Armament Construction Company of Barrow-in-Furness, of which the Marquis of Hartington is the president, the company which constructed the fine steamers which the hon. member for North York has so pleasantly referred to, and of other English capitalists, who have joined together for the purpose of acquiring all the present steamers of the Allan line to be used as freight ships, and also for the purpose of constructing four fast steamships to be engaged in the Canadian trans-Atlantic mail service. I share the hope expressed by the hon. member for North York that the Government will be able to give the House some assurance at an early date that there is a probability of Canada having a first-class trans-Atlantic mail service. I am glad to hear from hon. gentlemen opposite that they are of opinion we ought to endeavour to secure an efficient trans-Atlantic mail service, for the reason that the passenger and freight traffic will necessarily follow the mail service. That was my contention in reference to the West Indian steamship service, but I regret to say that during the two years I called the attention of the last House to that matter, I never received much support from the hon. gentlemen opposite. Thanks are due to the Government for having established the West Indian mail service for the very reason that the hon. gentleman for North York urges in favour of the trans-Atlantic mail service, namely, that the passenger and freight and general commercial traffic will necessarily go with the mails. I share the hope expressed by the hon. gentleman, that, before this session closes, the Government will be in a position to inform the House that the efforts which they have made and are making to secure an improved trans-Atlantic service have been successful.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think any fault can be found with my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) for pressing for some information with reference to this question; an important question, as he himself has very truly stated. The House will remember that the Act which authorized the Government to expend half a million dollars to obtain a fast mail service across the Atlantic between this country and France and Great Britain, also contained the authority for the expenditure of a certain amount of money for a fast and first-class line of vessels on the Pacific. It contemplated also, and made provision to a certain extent, to bring about the establishment of a line of mail steamers between Canada and Australia. The Act authorized a scheme which involved these three distinct proposals. The Government went to work with reference to these three schemes, and up to the present time one of them has been accomplished, and accomplished in a way which is very much to the credit of Canada, and of which we all feel justly proud. We now have on the Pacific Ocean, in the great route of travel from the extreme east across this continent to Europe, the finest inter-continental service that

can be found in the world, and with the exception of the trans-Atlantic service it may be said to be perfect. All companies are not like the one which undertook the building, and is now running the vessels on the Pacific, and running them under such successful auspices. Although the Government has spent as much, and I think I may say a great deal more time, and given more attention to the successful accomplishment, if possible, of the Atlantic service, it has not been so successful in bringing it to a termination on account of various causes. The reasons which have hitherto prevailed for this delay in bringing the Atlantic service to a success have been given last Parliament. Since the Messrs. Anderson gave up the project the Government has been in negotiation with other companies and other corporations, but several things have intervened to make it impossible for the Government to say that the scheme has been successfully realized. Negotiations have been going on, however, with certain English companies, and they had progressed to a very favourable extent when certain circumstances arose which caused delay. In the first place, Mr. Bryce-Douglas, who came here, and with whom the Government had personal, and I may say satisfactory communication, has suddenly passed away. As my hon. friend knows, Mr. Bryce-Douglas was a leading spirit in the company which built the Pacific line of steamers which are now running so successfully. In addition to this, certain financial difficulties arose in London which made it imprudent, for a certain time at least, to attempt to float so large a concern as was contemplated with reference to this service, because the scheme contemplated not only the establishment of a first-class line of steamers between Canada and the old country, but also the establishment of a first-class service between Canada and Australia, thus taking up and carrying to fulfilment the other two branches of the general proposal which was made two years ago. These circumstances militated against the bringing of this scheme to a successful completion. I may say that negotiations are still going on, and that the Government have not omitted any reasonable effort to bring them to a successful conclusion: and before the session terminates, I hope the Government will be in a position to give more definite information and a more favourable intimation than we are able to do at present. This much I say, and I think the House will take it in the spirit in which it is said, that we realize the great importance of having a first-class service from Canada to the old country as good as any that crosses the Atlantic, and the very generous grant given by Parliament to the Government has been used, so far as inducements went, with that end in view.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER. I wish to state that I propose to adopt the rule, and adhere rigidly to it, that, in case a member is not present at the proper time to move any motion which stands in his name, it must be dropped, unless it stands at the request of the Administration.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of the tenders asked for to construct a graving dock at Kingston; the tenders received; the reports and calculations made by the Engineers of the Department of Public Works made and based on these tenders; the contract which has been entered into; the reports of the Engineers which may have been made on the carrying out of the works; or the changes which may have been made in them: and also, a statement of the sums paid out to the contractors up to date.—(Mr. Guay, for Mr. Tarte.)

Return showing the quantities and kinds of timber and sawlogs cut annually in the lately Disputed Territory, in the Province of Ontario, under the authority of timber licenses issued by the Government of Canada; the names of such licensees; and showing also how the dues were imposed, and the amount per thousand feet, board measure, realized by the Government of Canada from each person or firm so licensed in each year from 1875 to 1887, inclusive; or what royalty or other revenue was received by the Government from licensees aforesaid on such quantities cut or sold.—(Mr. Barron.)

Copies of the Order in Council of date the 10th May, 1888, granting a subsidy of $12,500 per annum to Mr. Julien Chabot, for the use of the steamboat *Admiral*, between Dalhousie and Gaspé, in connection with the Intercolonial Railway;—and also of all other Orders in Council which may have been passed afterwards in respect to the same steamboat.—(Mr. Guay, for Mr. Tarte.)

Copies of the contract with the owners or owner, or the party in possession of the steamboat *Admiral*, made by the Government in consequence of an Order in Council bearing date the 10th of May, 1888; also of the contracts, deeds or transfers which may have been executed or notified to the Government, since the said date of the 10th May, 1888; also a statement of the sums paid out for the use of the said steamboat; the names of the persons to whom these sums have been paid; and the date of the payments and of the receipts which have been given therefor.—(Mr. Guay, for Mr. Tarte,)

Copy of the report of H. F. Perley, Esq., Chief Engineer of the Public Works Department, respecting the causes of the flooding by the waters of the Richelieu River, of the lands of the riparian owners, in the Counties of Iberville, St. John and Missisquoi.—(Mr. Béchard.)

Return showing the contingent expenses of the several salaried postmasters of this Dominion for the fiscal years 1888, 1889 and 1890.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Return showing the number of votes polled for the respective candidates in the several Electoral Districts and in the various sub-divisions thereof, together with the number of ballots rejected and spoiled in each and every sub-division at the last general election, specifying the cases in which a recount of votes was had and the changes made in respect thereof, giving the report of the returning officer in each case; also the number of electors on the revised electoral lists in each riding, the total in all, together with the population as shown by the census of 1881 and of 1891, of each and every such district and sub-division, giving the total population of Canada in both periods named.—(Mr. Landerkin.)

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 6 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 6th May, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PRIVATE BILLS—EXTENSION OF TIME.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved:

That as the time for receiving petitions for Private Bills will expire on Friday, the 8th instant, the same be extended until Friday, the 22nd instant.

He said: The custom is that a motion of this kind should be made in ordinary times on the report of the committee, and the rule of the House in reference to it reads as follows:—

"Except in cases of urgent and pressing necessity, no motion for the suspension or modification of any rule

applying to Private Bills or Petitions for Private Bills shall be entertained by the House until after references made to the several Standing Committees charged with the consideration of Private Bills and a report made thereon by one or more of such Committees."

No committee has yet been appointed, and, as the House ceases to sit this evening until Monday next, this motion becomes necessary.

Motion agreed to.

REPORTS.

Annual Report of the Minister of Justice on Penitentiaries.—(Sir John Thompson.)

Annual Report of the Department of Fisheries.—(Mr. Tupper.)

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 11) to enable an accused person to give evidence on his own behalf.—(Mr. Cameron, Huron.)

FISHERY BOUNTY CHEQUES.

Mr. FLINT asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government, in future, to have the fishery bounty cheques issued and in course of distribution previous to the 5th day of March, in each year?

Mr. TUPPER. It is the intention of the Government to have the bounty distributed before the 5th day of March in each year.

ANIMALS FROM THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to allow the entry into Canada free of duty of animals from the United States, for the purpose of their being slaughtered at Three Rivers or at any other place in the Dominion?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That subject is now engaging the attention of the Government.

KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER—DREDGING.

Mr. CAMPBELL asked, Whether any dredging has been done on the Bar or in the Kaministiquia River, Thunder Bay, since July, 1890; if so, were tenders invited for such work; how many tenders were received; what was the amount of the highest and lowest tender; was the lowest tender accepted; if not, why not? To whom was the contract awarded, and what was the amount of the successful tender? What progress has been made with the work, and what amount has been paid on account of said contract?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The answer to this question will require documents to be read, and I would ask the hon. gentleman to put it in the form of a notice of motion.

Mr. CAMPBELL. With the consent of the House, I would ask to let the question stand as a motion.

TWO CENT LETTER POSTAGE.

Mr. INNES (for Mr. SOMERVILLE) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to reduce letter postage to two cents?

Mr. HAGGART. That matter is at present under the consideration of the Government.

P. E. I. BREAKWATERS.

Mr. PERRY asked, What amount of wharfage dues has been collected at Tignish breakwater, Prince Edward Island, during the year 1890?

Mr. TUPPER. No return of the wharfage dues collected for the year 1890 has yet reached the Department.

Mr. PERRY asked, Whether tenders have been asked for, for new works at Miminigash breakwater, Prince Edward Island? If so, is the contract let? And to whom, and for what amount? When is the contract to be completed?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Tenders were asked for by public advertisement, dated the 10th of December, 1890, for extending and strengthening the south pier. The contract has been awarded to Alexander Macdonald for $2,000, and it is to be completed within seven months from the date of the contract.

Mr. PERRY asked, What amount of money has been expended repairing Miminigash breakwater, Prince Edward Island, during the year 1890? Who was the inspector? What amount was he paid for his services?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The amount expended during the year was $550.71. The foreman was Michael McElroy. The amount paid him was $65.

THE DOMINION CENSUS.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell) (for Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT) asked, How soon does the Government expect to receive returns of the number of the inhabitants of the Dominion?

Mr. HAGGART. The enumeration in connection with the census of 1881 commenced on the 4th of April of that year, and the result as to population was announced at the end of July of the same year. It is probable that the information asked for will be obtained this year at about the same time.

FISHERY INSPECTOR, DISTRICT No. 3, N.S.

Mr. FLINT asked, Whether the Inspector of Fisheries for District No. 3, in the Province of Nova Scotia, did, previously to the 5th day of March last, resign that office? If so, the date of such resignation; and whether the vacancy created by such resignation has yet been filled? If so, the name of the appointee and the date of his appointment?

Mr. TUPPER. The Inspector of Fisheries for that district did resign his office on the 25th of February, 1891. The vacancy created by that resignation has been filled. The name of the appointee is J. R. Pinhey. The date of his appointment was the 26th of March, 1891.

NEW SAFE IN FINANCE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, What is the entire cost of the new safe put in the Finance Department, including putting it in? Were tenders asked for? How many tenders were sent in? Whose tender was the lowest? How much did Messrs. Goldie & McCulloch, Galt, get for the safe?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The entire cost the new vault in the Finance Department, includin

the stone foundation, the cutting of the floors, etc., was $44,468. Tenders were asked on the 14th of November, 1889. Three tenders were received. The tender of Goldie & McCulloch, of Galt, Ontario, was the lowest, the amount being $29,750. The amounts paid to Goldie & McCulloch were: for erection and supply of vault, $29,750; and iron and steel boxes for each side of the vault, $3,627.40; making altogether $33,377.40. The other two tenders were those made by F. Toms, Ottawa, $36,850, and J. & J. Taylor, of Toronto, $37,942, both of which were higher than the accepted tender, with boxes included.

IMPERIAL POSTAL UNION.

Mr. DENISON asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to approach the Imperial authorities with a view to establish a uniform Imperial two cent postage rate between all parts of the Empire?

Mr. HAGGART. The Government are at present engaged in considering the subject to which the hon. gentleman's question refers.

ELECTION RETURNS.

Mr. LANDERKIN moved for:

Return giving the date of the declaration in every riding during the recent General Election. If adjournments or enlargements were made, in any case, from the time fixed at the nominations, stating where, when, how often and for what reason, and giving the name and address of the returning officer where such occurred: also, giving the name, occupation and post office address of every returning officer: showing the date of return by returning officer to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and the date of receipt of each by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery; together with the name of the electoral district and the member elected thereto, and the date of publication of his return in the *Canada Gazette*.

He said: Before the motion is put, I desire in a few words to state my reasons for making it. It has become notorious that irregularities have crept into the method of holding our elections, and that delays have occurred without good and sufficient reasons. In the election just passed the returning officer in the riding which I have the honour to represent announced that the declaration would be made a week after the election had taken place. I think, in the riding of East Bruce the declaration took place on the Monday following the election. In East Grey, I believe, it took place on the Monday following the election, and in North Grey on the Thursday following, a week after, as in my own case. In North Bruce it took place on the following Monday, and I notice also that in the gazetting, although the declaration in East Bruce took place at the same date as in North Bruce, the member for North Bruce was gazetted one week before the member for East Bruce; and in the case of North Grey, where the declaration took place at the same date as it did in South Grey, the member for North Grey was gazetted one week before the member for South Grey. And in the cases of North Bruce, North Grey and East Grey, the gazetting of three members took place on the 14th March, nine days after the election, and in one case two days after the declaration. I do not know whether this is according to law or not, but I want to enquire into the matter. If it is, the law should be remedied so that justice and fair-play may prevail. It is very desirable, if there is any advantage to be gained, that all should enjoy it in common; and if there are any disadvantages arising out of the system let them be removed. All parties should unite in obtaining fair-play in the conduct of elections and in the gazetting. I do not know why my election should be gazetted one week after the election in East Grey, when in reality my returning officer lives nearer Ottawa than the returning officer for East Grey. It does seem to me very peculiar that such a system should prevail, and that the Government should allow it to continue. We are here in a British colony where fair-play should be the rule. If the law allows the Government to take unfair advantage, the law should be altered. It does not make much difference to me whether I am gazetted earlier or later, but it is desirable that justice should be dealt out to all in the same measure. I want to find out how this is done, and for that reason I make this motion.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think this subject is entitled to some consideration. I notice that in a large number of instances considerable delay occurred between the day of election and the day of declaration. In some cases, no doubt, that is due to the fact that the returning officers undertook to make the most out of the elections, and instructed their deputies to retain the ballot boxes until they were called for instead of sending them in at once. In my own constituency the declaration was made a week after the day of the election, whereas in other constituencies, quite as large, it was made the third or fourth day after the election. The law requires that:

"The returning officer shall, immediately after the sixth day after the final addition by him, unless before that time he receives notice that he is required to attend before a judge for the purpose of a final addition or recount by such judge of the votes given at the election, transmit his return to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery."

Now, I know in the County of Bothwell that was not done. The election was held on the 5th of March, and the declaration was made on the 12th March, and the returning officer, instead of making his return immediately after the expiration of the sixth day, waited until the eleventh day, and made his return after the Saturday had gone by on which the Canada *Gazette* is published. He made his return upon the Monday following, knowing that another week would have to elapse before publication in the *Gazette* could take place. That is a gross abuse on the part of the returning officer of the duty imposed upon him by law. Under the 105th section of the Election Act it is provided:

"That every officer and clerk who is guilty of any wilful misfeasance or any wilful act or omission in violation of this Act shall forfeit to any person aggrieved by such misfeasance, act or omission, a sum not exceeding five hundred dollars, in addition to the amount of actual damages thereby occasioned to such persons."

I know that in the case I mentioned in my constituency the returning officer has made himself liable to that provision of the law, but what is the use of bringing an action against a man who has nothing? The House should see that it is not in the power of the Administration to appoint any man as returning officer who is not a responsible man and from whom the penalties imposed by law cannot be collected. Certainly this House owes it to every member to see that the law is honestly and fairly carried out. In many cases it has been violated in the way I have mentioned. After the elections of 1887 we had the Clerk of the Crown in

Chancery keeping back the returns, contrary to law. That has not been repeated on this occasion, but a different course has been pursued. It is the returning officer who has kept back the returns now, and so the same mischief which was inflicted in 1887 by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery has been inflicted in the present instance upon many members of this House by the returning officers. I think that this is a gross abuse, and one which ought not to be tolerated. If there is any law which ought to be fairly administered, it is the law relating to elections ; and I am satisfied that hon. members on this side of the House have great reason to complain of the course pursued by persons appointed as returning officers.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Every returning officer must be held responsible for any irregularity or impropriety in the performance of his duty.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But if he is worth nothing ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We can alter that. "If he has not goods to find, he may have a pledge to bind," as the saying is. It does not at all follow that because returns do not come in the same day or by the same mail that there has been any impropriety. Hon. gentlemen know there are very many cases of delay. I have no objection that the law should be altered, if necessary, to prevent any misuse or abuse of the powers conferred on the returning officers. There was no abuse in my case. The returning officer was a personal friend of mine, and a political friend of mine, but he was the sheriff of the county, and therefore would be acceptable to hon. gentlemen opposite. That he was a political friend of mine is not my fault, because he was elected at one time as a supporter of mine from the County of Frontenac. Still, there was a delay in my return, though I was elected, and possibly my return ought to have been announced in the first *Gazette*. I do not know why that was not done. I know that I have had the pleasure of having a protest served upon me, and, if I had appeared in the first *Gazette*, I might have been saved that pleasure. No doubt there was some reason for the delay, and no doubt other returning officers may have had equally good reasons. It may be that deputy returning officers have not made up their returns in proper time, or the delay may be caused by some other irregularities. I quite agree with the mover of this resolution and with my hon. friend who has just spoken, that all possible means should be taken to provide that there should be equal fair-play to both sides. When the return is made, we will be able to see better than we can now what the reasons are which are assigned for the delays and alleged irregularities in sending to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery the return of the returning officer. There is a plethora of motions connected not only with the franchise, but also with the whole electoral system, on the paper, and I have no doubt that, before the session is over, we will be able to consider this subject and arrive at means to cure it beyond the possibility of abuse.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is true, as the First Minister informs us, that returns cannot always come in at the same time and by the same mail. Circumstances will necessarily occur to delay the returns in many cases. He suggests that we may look to the returning officers for a redress of our grievances, but there is a suspicion in the minds of many members that some returning officers have been acting—not necessarily in collusion with the Government——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly not.

Mr. CHARLTON—but in collusion with the party to which they belong. The return from the north riding of Norfolk, which I represent, was made on the 9th March, and the return from the south riding of the same county on the 12th March. I received my certificate on the 16th March, and my return was gazetted on the 4th April, while the return of the supporter of the Government from South Norfolk was not gazetted until a week afterwards.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is a very suspicious circumstance, I admit.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is said that the returning officer was sick at the time, but he was able to make the return, at all events. Whether the delay was inadvertent or by purpose, I do not know, but it took place. I am happy to hear my hon. friend the First Minister state that he will take measures to rectify these abuses and to see that they do not occur again.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I know professionally that the returning officer for North Norfolk was very sick indeed. The papers were given to his clerk, and, through some inadvertence, I suppose, on the part of the clerk, they were not sent at once ; but I know that the returning officer was not only confined to his bed, but was very seriously ill at that time.

Mr. AMYOT. I think that, some few years ago, the Minister of Justice proposed to bring down a measure to fix the period of delay within which an election could be protested. That is the only cure for this evil. When there are 215 returning officers there will necessarily be some mistakes made and some faults. It would be better to cure the fault from which this arises. The Government has in its hands a very good means of curing this trouble, at least partially—that would be that they should decide not to contest the elections which have been protested within the last week.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman is mistaken in regard to my promise to bring down a measure.

Mr. AMYOT. We will consult the *Hansard* next time.

Mr. McMULLEN. The election took place on the 5th March. I was gazetted on the 4th or 5th April, a month after, but I have no fault to find with the returning officer in my riding, because there were six of the deputy returning officers who had neglected to sign the returns, and he had to adjourn for a week. Then there was a severe snow storm which shut up the roads. I mention this as I would not like any reflection to be cast upon the returning officer in my riding, because I think he did what he could to carry out the law.

Mr. MULOCK. I have no complaint to make against my returning officer. In fact, I have never had any ground to complain about the manner in which the officials in my riding have carried out their duties. The riding which I represent is inhabited by a very intelligent people, as you may

observe, and they are an incorruptible people. If that were not so I might not be here now. I believe there was no delay on the part of my returning officer, or, if there were any, it was not his fault. I desire to move in amendment, with the consent of my hon. friend, to add the following to the motion :—

Also copies of all letters written by or on behalf of any member of the Government, to any member-elect or to any other person or persons, suggesting that any returning officer be asked to delay making his return to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery."

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Return showing the cost of construction of the several elevators built on the Intercolonial Railway and branches; showing where erected and the capacity of each; the date of erection and the quantity of grain that passed through each of them, each year, since their completion.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Return of the Receipts and Expenditures in detail, chargeable to the Consolidated Fund, from the 1st day of May, 1890, to 1st day of May, 1891; and comparative statements from 1st July, 1889, to 1st May, 1890.—(Sir Richard Cartwright.)

Return in the form used in the statements usually published in the *Gazette* of the Exports and Imports from 1st day of May, 1890, to 1st day of May, 1891, distinguishing the products of Canada and those of other countries; and comparative statements from 1st July, 1889, to 1st May, 1890.—(Sir Richard Cartwright.)

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 4.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 11th May, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORT.

Report of the Department of Militia and Defence, for the year ending 31st December, 1890.—(Sir Adolphe Caron.)

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD presented the Report of the Special Committee appointed to report the lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees of this House, as follows :—

ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Messieurs

Adams,
Amyot,
Baker,
Barron,
Beausoleil,
Burdett,
Cameron (Huron),
Chapleau,
Coatsworth,
Costigan,
Curran,
Davies,
Desaulniers,
Dickey,
Edgar,
Flint,
Fraser,
German,
Girouard,
Ives,
Kirkpatrick,
Langelier,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
Laurier,
Lavergne,
Lister,
Macdonald (Sir John),
McCarthy,
McDonald (Victoria),
McLeod,
Mills (Bothwell),
Moncrieff,
Mulock,
Ouimet,
Pelletier,
Préfontaine,
Ross (Lisgar)
Tarte,
Thompson (Sir John),
Tupper,
Weldon, and
Wood (Brockville).—42.

Mr. MULOCK.

ON EXPIRING LAWS.

Messieurs

Cameron (Inverness),
Carroll,
Colter,
Corbould,
Daoust,
Dawson,
Delisle,
Dugas,
Dyer,
Ferguson (Renfrew),
Flint,
Gillies,
Grieve,
Hargraft,
Henderson,
Hutchins,
King,
LaRivière,
Legris,
McDonald (Victoria),
Reid,
Robillard,
Ryckman,
Savard,
Simard,
Somerville,
Temple, and
Tyrwhitt.—28.

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

ON RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES.

Messieurs

Adams,
Allan,
Allison,
Amyot,
Armstrong,
Bain,
Baker,
Barnard,
Barron,
Beausoleil,
Béchard,
Bergeron,
Bergin,
Bernier,
Borden,
Bourassa,
Bowman,
Brown (Chateauguay),
Brown (Monck),
Burdett,
Burnham,
Burns,
Cameron (Inverness),
Campbell,
Carignan,
Carpenter,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Cartwright (Sir Richard),
Casey,
Chapleau,
Charlton,
Choquette,
Christie,
Coatsworth,
Cochrane,
Cockburn,
Colter,
Corby,
Costigan,
Craig,
Curran,
Daly,
Daoust,
Landerkin,
Langelier,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
LaRivière,
Laurier,
Lavergne,
Leduc,
Léger,
Lépine,
Lippé,
Lister,
Livingston,
Macdonald (Sir John),
Macdonald (King's)
Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Mackenzie,
Mackintosh,
McAlister,
McCarthy,
McDougald (Pictou),
McDougall (Cape Breton),
McGreevy,
McGregor,
McKay,
McKeen,
McLean,
McLennan,
McLeod,
McMillan,
McMullen,
Madill,
Mara,
Masson,
Mignault,
Miller,
Mills (Annapolis),
Mills (Bothwell),
Montague,
Mousseau,
Mulock,
Murray,
Ouimet,
Patterson (Colchester),

Davidson,
Davies,
Davin,
Davis,
Delisle,
Desaulniers,
Desjardins (Hochelaga),
Desjardins (L'Islet),
Devlin,
Dewdney,
Dickey,
Dugas,
Dupont,
Edgar,
Fairbairn,
Fauvel,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),
Fraser,
Fréchette,
Geoffrion,
German,
Gibson,
Girouard,
Godbout,
Gordon,
Grandbois,
Guay,
Haggart,
Hargraft,
Harwood,
Hazen,
Henderson,
Hyman,
Ingram,
Innes,
Ives,
Jamieson,
Joncas,
Kaulbach,
Kenny,
King,
Kirkpatrick,
Perry,
Pope,
Préfontaine,
Prior,
Proulx,
Putnam,
Reid,
Rider,
Rinfret,
Robillard,
Roome,
Ross (Dundas),
Ross (Lisgar),
Ryckman,
Sanborn,
Savard,
Scriver,
Simard,
Smith (Sir Donald),
Spohn,
Sproule,
Stairs,
Stevenson,
Sutherland,
Tarte,
Taylor,
Temple,
Thompson (Sir John),
Tisdale,
Trow,
Truax,
Tyrwhitt,
Vaillancourt,
Wallace,
Watson,
Weldon,
White (Cardwell),
White (Shelburne),
Wilmot,
Wood (Brockville),
Wood (Westmoreland), and
Yeo.—170.

ON MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS.

Messieurs

Allan,
Allison,
Baker,
Barnard,
Beith,
Borden,
Bourassa,
Brodeur,
Burdett,
Cameron (Huron),
Campbell,
Carpenter,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Carroll,
Casey,
Choquette,
Cleveland,
Cochrane,
Corbould,
Corby,
Craig,
Daoust,
Davidson,
Davis,
Dawson,
Delisle,
Denison,
Dickey,
Dupont,
Edwards,
Fairbairn,
Featherston,
Jamieson,
Joncas,
Kenny,
King,
LaRivière,
Lavergne,
Leduc,
Léger,
Legris,
Lépine,
Macdonald (Huron),
McAlister,
McDougall (Cape Breton),
McGreevy,
McKay,
McKeen,
McMillan,
Madill,
Marshall,
Mignault,
Miller,
Monerieff,
Monet,
Ouimet,
Pelletier,
Prior,
Proulx,
Robillard,
Roome,
Ross (Dundas),
Skinner,
Spohn,
Stairs,
Vaillancourt,
Watson,
Weldon,
White (Shelburne), and
Yeo.—77.

Frémont,
Geoffrion,
Gillmor,
Girouard,
Hazen,
Hodgins,
Ives,

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

ON STANDING ORDERS.

Messieurs

Armstrong,
Bain,
Bergeron,
Bowers,
Brodeur,
Brown (Chateauguay),
Brown (Monck),
Burnham,
Denison,
Desaulniers,
Dyer,
Earle,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),
Ferguson (Renfrew),
Gillmor,
Grieve,
Harwood,
Hodgins,
Hutchins,
Ingram,
Landerkin,
Lavergne,
Léger,
Macdowall,
McKeen,
McNeill,
Marshall,
Masson,
Mills (Annapolis),
Monet,
Mousseau,
O'Brien,
Paterson (Brant),
Patterson (Colchester),
Perry,
Rinfret,
Rowand,
Semple,
Smith (Sir Donald),
Stevenson,
Wilmot, and
Wood (Brockville).—42.

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

ON PRINTING.

Messieurs

Amyot,
Bergin,
Bourassa,
Caron (Sir Adolphe)
Chapleau,
Charlton,
Davin,
Desjardins (L'Islet),
Grandbois,
Innes,
Kaulbach,
Landerkin,
Mackintosh,
McLean,
McMullen,
Putnam,
Rider,
Somerville,
Taylor,
Tisdale, and
Trow.—21.

ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Messieurs

Adams,
Baker,
Barron,
Béchard,
Bergeron,
Bergin,
Bowell,
Cameron (Huron),
Cameron (Inverness),
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Cartwright (Sir Richard),
Chapleau,
Charlton,
Coatsworth,
Cochrane,
Costigan,
Daly,
Davies,
Denison,
Desjardins (L'Islet),
Devlin,
Landerkin,
Langelier,
Lister,
Macdonald (Sir John),
Macdonald (Huron),
Mackenzie,
McDougald (Pictou),
McGregor,
McMullen,
Madill,
Mills (Annapolis),
Monerieff,
Montague,
Mulock,
Murray,
Rinfret,
Scriver,
Skinner,
Somerville,
Sproule,
Tarte,

Forbes,
Foster,
Fraser,
German,
Gordon,
Haggart,
Hyman,
Taylor,
Tisdale,
Tupper,
Wallace,
White (Cardwell),
Wood (Brockville), and
Wood (Westmoreland)-56.

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

ON BANKING AND COMMERCE.

Messieurs

Allan,
Allison,
Amyot,
Barnard,
Beausoleil,
Béchard,
Beith,
Bernier,
Borden,
Bowell,
Bowers,
Bowman,
Burnham,
Burns,
Cameron (Inverness),
Carignan,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),
Charlton,
Cleveland,
Coatsworth,
Cochrane,
Cockburn,
Corby,
Craig,
Curran,
Daly,
Davies,
Desjardins (Hochelaga),
Desjardins (L'Islet),
Devlin,
Dickey,
Dyer,
Earle,
Edgar,
Edwards,
Flint,
Forbes,
Foster,
Fraser,
Fréchette,
Gauthier,
Geoffrion,
Gibson,
Gillies,
Girouard,
Guay,
Haggart,
Hargraft,
Hazen,
Henderson,
Hyman,
Ives,
Jamieson,
Joncas,
Kaulbach,
Kenny,
Kirkpatrick,
Langelier,
Laurier,
Lister,
Livingston,
Macdonald (Huron),
Macdonald (King's),
Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Macdowall,
Mackenzie,
McAlister,
McCarthy,
McDonald (Victoria),
McDougald (Pictou),
McGreevy,
McKay,
McLennan,
McLeod,
McNeill,
Mara,
Masson,
Mills (Bothwell),
Moncrieff,
Mulock,
Murray,
O'Brien,
Ouimet,
Paterson (Brant),
Pelletier,
Pope,
Prefontaine,
Prior,
Proulx,
Putnam,
Rider,
Rowand,
Ryckman,
Sanborn,
Scriver,
Semple,
Skinner,
Smith (Sir Donald),
Spohn,
Stairs,
Sutherland,
Temple,
Thompson (Sir John),
Tisdale,
Truax,
Wallace,
Watson,
Welsh,
White (Cardwell),
White (Shelburne),
Wood (Westmoreland), and
Yeo.—112.

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

ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION.

Messisurs

Armstrong,
Bain,
Beith,
Hutchins,
Ingram,
Innes,
Bergeron,
Bernier,
Bowers,
Bowman,
Brodeur,
Burdett,
Burnham,
Burns,
Carignan,
Carpenter,
Casey,
Choquette,
Christie,
Cleveland,
Cochrane,
Corbould,
Daly,
Daoust,
Davin,
Davis,
Dawson,
Desaulniers,
Dewdney,
Dugas,
Dupont,
Earle,
Edwards,
Fairbairn,
Fauvel,
Featherston,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),
Ferguson (Renfrew),
Forbes,
Fréchette,
Frémont,
Gauthier,
Gibson,
Gillies,
Gillmor,
Godbout,
Gordon,
Grieve,
Guay,
Harwood,
Henderson,
Hodgins,
Joncas,
Léduc,
Legris,
Lépine,
Lippé,
Livingston,
Macdonald (King's),
Macdowall,
Mackintosh,
McDougall (Cape Breton)
McGregor,
McLean,
McLellan,
McMillan,
McNeill,
Mara,
Marshall,
Mignault,
Miller,
Montague,
Mousseau,
O'Brien,
Paterson (Brant)
Patterson (Colchester),
Perry,
Pope,
Putnam,
Reid,
Robillard,
Roome,
Ross (Dundas),
Ross (Lisgar),
Rowand,
Sanborn,
Semple,
Sproule,
Stevenson,
Sutherland,
Tarte,
Taylor,
Trow,
Tyrwhitt,
Watson,
Welsh,
Wilmot, and
Wood (Westmoreland)-98.

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

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

That the report of the Special Committee appointed to report on the list of members to compose the Select Standing Committees of this House be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

CERTIFICATES TO MASTERS AND MATES OF SHIPS.

Mr. TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 12) to further amend the Act respecting certificates to masters and mates of ships. He said: The Bill is rather a long one, but the amendment proposed can be explained very briefly and only affects the present Act to a small extent. Ever since the Act regulating the granting of certificates to masters and mates has been in force, the practice has been to distinguish in the certificates granted between the great lakes and the minor inland waters, and there has also been a distinction under the rules carried out by the Department in certificates granted for "fore-and-aft rigged" vessels and "square rigged" vessels. The practice in that connection has never been challenged, nor has it been found at all improper; but on a strict reading of the Act as it now stands it does not appear that these rules and regu-

lations are technically regular. The object of this Bill is to make legal and proper the rules and regulations under which the certificates have been granted in the past.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ADMIRALTY JURISDICTION WITHIN CANADA.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 13) to provide for the exercise of admiralty jurisdiction within Canada in accordance with "The Colonial Courts of Admiralty Act, 1890." He said: By an Act of the Imperial Parliament, passed during last year, the vice-admiralty courts in the various British possessions were abolished and power was given to the Parliament of each possession to establish vice-admiralty courts of its own. This Bill is intended to make provision for the circumstances which arise under that Imperial statute. The scheme of the Bill is to invest in the Exchequer Court of Canada the jurisdiction which has hitherto been exercised by the vice-admiralty courts of Canada, and by the maritime courts. It also contemplates the vesting in that court of additional jurisdiction of an admiralty character which was not previously vested in the vice-admiralty courts of this country, and which the Imperial statute allows us to confer upon any court in the country. In order to prevent the inconvenience from centralization through the jurisdiction being exercised exclusively by the Exchequer Court in Ottawa, it is provided in the Bill that the Governor in Council shall have power to declare from time to time, the existence of a territorial division, called the admiralty division. Until such regulations are made by the Governor in Council each province is to be the admiralty division, and is to have the local judge of the Exchequer Court for the administration of admiralty jurisdiction. There is to be an appeal from that judge to the Exchequer Court, and from the Exchequer Court to the Supreme Court of Canada.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 14) with respect to certain matters affecting the Administration of Justice. He said: The Bill which I propose to introduce, with leave of the House, is with reference to certain matters connected with the administration of justice in the different provinces. The principal clause relates to the administration of justice by the county court judges. The first section is to provide that the jurisdiction of a county court judge shall extend to a county or district, notwithstanding any territorial modifications which have been made in the original division for which he was appointed. Another section provides that the Governor General in Council, at the request of the Lieutenant Governor of a province, may direct any county court judge of the province to exercise his jurisdiction in any other county of the province. Another section is to enable the Governor General in Council to call upon any retired county judge of the province to perform any judicial duties in the county courts.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

COMBINATIONS IN TRADE.

Mr. WALLACE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 15) to amend the Act for the prevention and suppression of combinations in restraint of trade. He said: The object of this Bill is similar to the Bill I introduced last year. It is proposed to strike out the word "unduly" in paragraphs (*a*) (*c*) (*d*), and to strike out the word "unreasonably" in paragraph (*c*) of the Act. Another clause provides that this Act shall not in any way be applicable to the restriction of "Trades Unions."

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CHICOUTIMI ELECTION RETURN.

Mr. CHOQUETTE (for Mr. SAVARD) asked, Why the election return for Chicoutimi and Saguenay was not published in the *Canada Gazette* until the 2nd May instant? Is the said delay due to the fact that the returning officer did not sooner transmit his return? If so, what reasons does he allege therefor?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Because the letter with the return of the election was not received sooner by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. In fact, publication of the election of the member for Chicoutimi and Saguenay was made and a certificate given to him by the returning officer, and the regular return to the writ was only received on the 7th inst. In transmitting his report of the proceedings, the returning officer states that in view of the fact that he had given a certificate of the election to the member elected, he did not think there was any necessity of transmitting the election documents to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery until the opening of Parliament.

IMPORTS OF COTTON SAIL DUCK.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne) asked, How many yards of cotton sail duck have been imported at Halifax, N.S., from the 30th day of June, 1889, to 30th June, 1890, and from 30th June, 1890, to 30th December, 1890, and the value of such importation respectively?

Mr. BOWELL. I shall have to ask my hon. friend to allow that question to stand as a notice of motion for papers, as it is impossible to bring down the papers required by way of an answer to a question.

LATE GENERAL ELECTION—RECOUNTS.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Whether a recount took place in any constituency since the general election, after the member had been gazetted? If so, where, and was it regular; if not, is it necessary for the member to be re-gazetted?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The Government have nothing to do with that, and have no knowledge of it except what they get from the newspapers.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If a recount is made, the return is made to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and the Government have to do with him.

LICENSES FOR POUND NETS.

Mr. LISTER asked, How many pound nets were licensed in the year 1885, between Goderich

and Blue Point? And how many of these were double and treble headers? How many pound nets have been licensed between the same points for the year 1891? And how many are double and treble headers?

Mr. TUPPER. Nine pound nets were licensed in the year 1885 between Goderich and Blue Point. None of these were double or treble headers. No pound nets have yet been licensed between the same points for 1891.

Mr. LISTER asked, How many pound net licenses have been issued for Lake St. Clair for the year 1891?

Mr. TUPPER. Four.

CORN MEAL.

Mr. BOWERS asked, Whether corn meal is to be placed upon the free list this Session?

Mr. FOSTER. I shall have to ask my hon. friend to wait for that information until the Budget is brought down.

REGISTERED LETTER FEE.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Whether it is intended to reduce the fee now charged for registering letters? If not, is it intended to guarantee the safe delivery of all registered letters and their contents?

Mr. HAGGART. The subject is being considered by the Government.

LIVERPOOL AND ANNAPOLIS RAILWAY.

Mr. FORBES asked, Whether such sums will be placed in the Estimates to be submitted at the present session of Parliament, as will be sufficient to complete the subsidy to the whole line of railway from Liverpool to Annapolis?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That question cannot be answered until the measure respecting railways is brought down.

DOMINION ELECTORAL LISTS.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to order a revision of the Dominion electoral lists in 1891, at the period fixed by law? If so, have instructions to that effect been transmitted to the revising officers, and on what date?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. A revision of the electoral lists is ordered by law, and it is not the intention of the Government to propose a Bill this session to prevent that revision. No special instructions have to be sent to the revising officers unless there is need of such in the routine of the work.

FISHING LICENSES.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL asked, Is it the intention of the Government to continue the system of fishing licenses inaugurated in 1888, in the counties surrounding Lake St. Peter? Have they instructed the fishery overseers to require such licenses? If so, when were such instructions issued?

Mr. TUPPER. It is the intention to continue the system of issuing fishing licenses inaugurated in 1888, and instructions to that effect were sent in the month of March—I think about the 23rd; I can give the hon. gentleman the exact date later if he desires it.

PROHIBITION—LEGISLATION.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, In view of the very large number of petitions presented to this House in favour of prohibition, and in view of the fact that any legislation meeting, in whole or in part, the prayer therein contained should emanate from the Government, as the revenue of the country will be affected thereby, is it the intention of the Government to introduce any legislation this session to meet to any extent the prayer of those petitions?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That matter is under the consideration of the Government.

MERCANTILE AGENCIES.

Mr. TAYLOR asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce an Act during the present session to regulate mercantile agencies and to make them responsible for any losses sustained by persons giving credit on the reports of said agencies?

Mr. FOSTER. That matter has not yet been considered by the Government.

DIRECTORS OF TELEGRAPH COMPANIES.

Mr. TAYLOR asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce during this session an Act to amend the Act respecting Telegraph Companies so as to compel the directors of said companies to reside in Canada?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That matter has not yet been under the consideration of the Government.

H. E. HARTLEY—DISMISSAL.

Mr. CHRISTIE moved for:

Correspondence between any Department of the Government and H. E. Hartley, late Lockmaster on the Carillon and Grenville Canal, in reference to his retirement from the Civil Service, and any report to Council or Order in Council upon the same subject.

He said: I desire to read a letter which I received from Mr. Hartley in connection with this matter:

"CHUTE À BLONDEAU, 11th March, 1891.

"SIR,—I beg respectfully to submit the following: On the 4th July, 1890, I received word from Mr. Simpson, superintendent, by the order of Mr. Stark, that my services were no longer required as lockmaster at Chute à Blondeau as that lock was obliterated and that I had better get something else to do, no mention being made of superannuating me whatever. I claim that my discharge was not legal and that Mr. Stark had not the power to dismiss me in the manner he did. I have not received any pay since last 4th July, 1890, up to the present date, a period of eight months, and I think that I am entitled to my pay until I get my superannuation. I have a large family to support, and I cannot keep them on nothing. I have been twenty-three years in the service and have been paying into the superannuation fund ever since it began, a period of twenty years. I would beg to solicit your influence in procuring me that to which I am entitled to, that is superannuation allowance, or allow me to stay at Chute à Blondeau in the position I had before, that is lockmaster. Superintendent Simpson informed me that the Government did not want to discharge me, and that he (Simpson) would put me in my place immediately if he had a vacancy. There seems something very strange about it. I would like very much if you would take my case in hand, for I know that you

will see justice done to me. I offered to light the lamps if they would let me have a boy and I would pay him myself, as I could not go up that height on account of dizziness in the head. They would not accept my offer, but Mr. Stark sent me my discharge, a copy of which I enclose in this letter."

It would appear from this letter that Mr. Hartley has been rather hardly dealt with. He has been employed for twenty-three years on the canal, and, so far, as I know, discharged his duty faithfully and well. I have not heard of any complaints being lodged against him. He paid into the superannuation fund ever since it was organized, twenty years ago, and he supposed he had in that way made provision for his family should he become incapacitated for work. About ten months ago he was summarily dismissed, the alleged reason being that his services were no longer required, as the particular lock on which he was engaged had been obliterated—wiped out, I suppose, by the construction of the Carillon dam. It will be remembered, however, that that took place several years ago, and since then Mr. Hartley has been employed in different capacities. He took charge of the locks formerly operated by the late Mr. Cummings, and has discharged other duties besides. Since his dismissal he applied to be reinstated or to be placed on the superannuation list; but up to the present he has not received a cent from that fund. All this may be strictly according to law, but, if so, it appears to me that the law should be amended. It does appear a great hardship that an old employé, a man who has laboured faithfully twenty-three years in the service and paid into the fund for twenty years, should now be denied all participation in the fund and his family left in a state of embarrassment. I beg, therefore, to move for the papers in this matter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It will answer no good purpose to enter into a discussion of this matter until the papers are brought down. I would ask that there be added to the motion: "And all papers in connection with the dismissal of Mr. Hartley."

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Return showing a detailed account of all expenses incurred in connection with an investigation held into the conduct of the Indian agent at Sutton West.—(Mr. Mulock.)

Correspondence and papers relating to the resignations and re-appointments to office of the following parties:—Samuel Genest, John Cosgrove and Charles Leduc.—(Mr. Devlin.)

1. A statement of all fishing licenses granted in 1890, in the following counties:—Berthier, Maskinongé, St. Maurice, Champlain, Nicolet, Yamaska and Richelieu, showing the names of those who obtained such licenses, the amount paid by each of them, and the date of each payment; 2. A statement of the quantity and value of the several kinds of fish taken by the said license-holders, according to the reports of the fishery overseers for the said counties: 3. Copies of all instructions sent to the fishery overseers of the said several counties in 1890 and 1891, up to date; 4. Copy of all letters, petitions and complaints, received in relation to this subject during the years 1890 and 1891, up to this date, and of all replies made thereto; 5. For a statement of the salaries of the Fishery Overseers of the said counties, and of all other costs and expenditure incurred by the Government in connection with the fisheries of the counties aforesaid for the year 1890.—(Mr. Beausoleil.)

1st. Copies of all correspondence and telegrams between the Department of Militia and Defence, or any officer thereof, and the Commander of "C" Battery, having reference to sending a detachment of men under his command to Wellington on the 4th or 5th day of August last, to aid the civil authorities of that district. 2nd. Also copies of the requisition served on the said commanding officer, invoking military aid at Wellington, together with the names of the magistrates who signed the requisition, also the distance from Wellington at which said magistrates reside. 3rd. Also copies of the reports of the commanding officer, confidential or otherwise, as to the necessity there was for the military occupation of Wellington, and for their continuance there, until they were recalled. 4th. Also of all telegraphic or other correspondence between the Department of Militia and Defence, or any officer of the Government of Canada, and the Provincial Government of British Columbia, or with any officer thereof, if any, or with any other person, in reference to sending the said military force to Wellington. 5th. Also a detailed statement of all moneys disbursed by the Government of Canada, or by any Department thereof, either as regimental pay or for active service allowance, either to the officers and men of "C" Battery, or both officers and men of the British Columbia Garrison Artillery, while on service at Wellington, or for their maintenance while there, or for their transportation to and from Wellington. 6th. Also copies of all militia general and special orders issued by the Militia Department for the regulation and guidance of the officers of "C" Battery since its establishment in British Columbia.—(Mr. Gordon.)

Return of all papers, correspondence and other documents relating to the dredging on the Bar of the Kaministiquia River, Thunder Bay, since July, 1890, including the advertisement, tenders received and contract for such dredging; also engineer's report to the Department, showing what progress has been made in the work up to the 1st December last; also statement showing the amounts paid on account of such work, to whom paid, dates and amounts of such payments.—(Mr. Campbell.)

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT.—CONTRACTS.

On the Orders of the Day being called,

Mr. TARTE (Translation). Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to rise to a question of privilege. A few days ago, I gave notice to the Minister of Public Works and to the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. McGreevy) of my intention to move on this matter. I would much prefer to address the House in the language in which I am most familiar, but I believe the great majority of my colleagues are not familiar with the French language, and although it is with great difficulty that I speak their own language, I feel it my duty to use it in the present occasion. After the hon. members of both sides of the House have read the correspondence I happen to have in my hands, they will have to decide and the country will have to decide with them, whether, being in possession of such a voluminous correspondence, I would have been warranted to keep silent.

Mr. Speaker, before reading the motion I intend to put before you, I may be allowed to offer a few remarks, and to express, first, my deep sorrow at beginning my political career in this Parliament by accusations, by grave accusations, against old and important members of this House. Were it not that I am convinced I am performing a great public duty, I would not be in this seat to-day. I believe, Sir, I have every reason to believe, that I am in a position to prove, by documentary evidence and verbal evidence, every statement contained in the motion I am going to place in your hands; and those statements are to the effect that, since 1882 or 1883, the secrets of the Department of Public Works have been penetrated and divulged, for money considerations, to public contractors, by the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. McGreevy), who, according to the evidence I have in my hand, has been paid year by year, contract after contract, large sums of money; that, during that period of time, he has used his influence, as

a member of this Parliament and as a member of the Quebec Harbour Commission, against the public interest on numerous and important occasions. Perhaps you will remember that at the end of the last session of Parliament your attention was called to some statements published by me in the public press. That publication had been preceded by steps that it is no breach of discretion, I presume, to recall. Papers and documents had come into my hands, impeaching, in my opinion, the character of the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. McGreevy) and the integrity of the Department of Public Works. These documents were put into my hands without any endeavour on my part to obtain them. Under advice of very important members of the Conservative party, I thought it was my duty to show these papers to the right hon. the Prime Minister. At his request, I left some of those papers with him; a few days afterwards he gave them back to me stating, with his usual kindness, that he had seen the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. McGreevy) and had received from him positive assurances that there was no truth whatever in those documents; and that he had also received from the Minister of Public Works the same assurances. Then again, under the advice of the very same important members of the Conservative party, I published the statements of Messrs. O. E. Murphy and Robert H. McGreevy, the former a close friend for a number of years of the member for Quebec West, as the correspondence will show; and the latter named gentleman a brother of the member for Quebec West, and his confidential agent for twenty years past. In taking the risk and peril of that publication I had made up my mind that there was no other course left open to me, or left open to the friends who were in sympathy with me, if we would put a stop, as we desired to do, to the malversations and frauds that have been going on for a long number of years; we decided that no other way was left open to us but to appeal to public opinion through the powerful agency of the press. It was admitted on all hands in Quebec that something wrong and rotten was going on in the Public Works Department and in the harbour works of Quebec. For years and years this Parliament had voted large sums of money, millions of dollars, but very little useful progress had been made. However, nobody could get at safe evidence against the suspected parties. Look, Sir, at the well planned arrangements that surrounded and covered the doings of our Canadian Tammany Hall. The member for Quebec West was a very important member of this House, and he was at the same time a member of the Quebec Harbour Commission. Mr. Perley was the chief engineer of the Department of Public Works, and at the same time he was the chief engineer of the Quebec Harbour Works. The hon. member for Quebec West was known to every public man in Canada to be a very close friend of the hon. Minister of Public Works. The Quebec Harbour Commission contained an employé of the hon. member for Quebec West—I have no desire to accuse that man, but I wish to state that fact here. As an assistent engineer, we had then and we have still, a son of the hon. Minister of Public Works, although he has never been an engineer in his life. And, Sir, that strong combination of men was backed up by a strong company of contractors, belonging to both political parties. The head of the firm was Mr. Larkin—I think, a well-known Liberal. Mr. Robert H. McGreevy was known, and is still known, in Quebec, as a strong Conservative, and, as I said before, is a brother of the hon. member for Quebec West. The other three members of the firm were, and still are—I may be permitted to call your attention immediately to this fact—three American citizens, who have had, I think, a large experience in the United States. That organization had, and has still, subsidized organs, and those who dared resist them, or their political associates, were accused of treason to the old party, to the old leader and to the old flag. Ministers of the Crown whom I have the honour to see on the Treasury benches now, have been, to my knowledge, many times made the target and object of the mischievous intrigues of these men. As a matter of fact, this enquiry, which will be a complete one, I have no doubt, will bear out my statements; as a matter of fact, they have, for the last eight or ten years, controlled the direction and organization of the Conservative party in the Province of Quebec. Is it surprising, Mr. Speaker, that our old party has been for a long time losing ground in that old Conservative stronghold, the Province of Quebec? In vain did we complain, in vain did we come up here to Ottawa and set forth the evils which I have mentioned. With other influential friends of the party, I have been more than once delegated to make representations here. The power behind the throne was too strong for us, as we did not know the real nature of the influences against which we had to contend. Mr. Speaker, I need the assistance of both sides of the House. My appeal to you will be better understood after you have read the correspondence which I hold in my hand. It will show that we as a Parliament have to deal with men, some of whom are of a very desperate character, if we are to judge them by letters they have written and means they have employed. The hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. McGreevy) has stated elsewhere that he gave to the Conservative party the money he obtained from those men. As well for my friends of the Conservative party as for this Parliament, I must state a fact, which is a well-known one, especially in the Conservative party in Quebec. The hon. Minister of Public Works, who is the official leader of the Quebec Conservative party in this Parliament, appointed, or if I may be allowed to say so, imposed on the Conservative party the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. McGreevy) as the treasurer of the party; and in the name of the friends with whom I have worked for the last twenty years, I must repudiate in the strongest possible terms the idea that any one of us can be held responsible before this Parliament, because we may have been sent to a man appointed by the official leader of our party in the Province of Quebec. Among many others, I have been accused of betraying the old flag and the Conservative party, because I have thought proper to take the course I have adopted here. I may be allowed to state that I was elected as an independent Liberal-Conservative. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, whom we all regret not to see in his seat, has never asked me to repudiate my past. I would not have done so. He never asked me to give up any of my principles. Again I say I would not have done so. He never asked anything else than this. He said:

"I feel you are performing a great public duty; I extend to you my help." There never was any other agreement between him and me than the honourable agreement that I am now stating to the House. I believe there is no occasion to make a long speech, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will now proceed to read the motion, which is as follows:—

That J. Israël Tarte, Esq., the member representing the Electoral District of Montmorency in this House, having declared from his seat in the House that he is credibly informed and that he believes he is able to establish by satisfactory evidence that,

In 1882 the sum of $375,000 having been voted by the Parliament of Canada to carry out the works of the Harbour of Quebec, the Quebec Harbour Commissioners called for tenders for dredging in connection with the said works.

That Messrs. Larkin, Connolly & Co. tendered and were awarded the contract for the said dredging.

That in order to secure the influence of the Hon. Thomas McGreevy, then and now a member of the Parliament of Canada, and a member of the Quebec Harbour Commission by appointment of the Government of Canada, the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., with the knowledge of the said Thomas McGreevy, took as a partner Robert H. McGreevy, his brother, giving him an interest of 30 per cent. in the firm.

That the said Thomas McGreevy consented to his brother becoming a member of the firm, and stated that he had first consulted the hon. Minister of Public Works, Sir Hector L. Langevin, and secured his consent.

That the said contract, signed on the 25th of September, 1882, stipulated that the works thereunder were to be finished by the 1st of November, 1884, but that the said Larkin, Connolly & Co. continued to perform the work of dredging under the scale of prices therein mentioned up to the close of the season of 1886.

That in order to help Larkin, Connolly & Co. to secure the said dredging contract, the said Hon. Thomas McGreevy agreed to give and did give, in an undue manner, his help as Harbour Commissioner to Larkin, Connolly & Co.

That the said contract was approved and ratified by an Order in Council based on a report of the Hon. the Minister of Public Works.

That up to the year 1883 aforesaid, Messrs. Kinipple and Morris, of London, England, had acted as Engineers to the Quebec Harbour Commission, and that their resident Engineer for carrying out of the works was Mr. Woodford Pilkington.

That in concert with Larkin, Connolly & Co. the said Thomas McGreevy undertook to secure the removal of Messrs. Kinipple, Morris and Pilkington from their positions, and that they were in fact so removed in 1883, and replaced by Mr. Henry F. Perley and Mr. John Edward Boyd, with the consent of the hon. Minister of Public Works.

That in the same year, 1883, tenders were called for a cross-wall and lock in connection with the harbour works at Quebec in accordance with plans and specifications prepared in the Department of Public Works under the direction of Henry F. Perley, Esq.

That several tenders were made, and amongst others who tendered were Messrs. Larkin, Connolly & Co.

That before tendering, and in order to secure the influence of the Hon. Thomas McGreevy, then and now a member of the Parliament of Canada, and a member of the Quebec Harbour Board by appointment of the Government, Larkin, Connolly & Co. took into partnership with themselves Robert H. McGreevy, a brother of the said Hon. Thomas McGreevy, giving him a 30 per cent. interest in the firm, and this with the knowledge and consent of the said Hon. Thomas McGreevy.

That among the parties tendering were a contractor named George Beaucage and one John Gallagher.

That it was on the suggestion of the said Hon. Thomas McGreevy that Beaucage consented to make a tender.

That with the knowledge of the said Thomas McGreevy, the three tenders of Larkin, Connolly & Co., of Beaucage, and of Gallagher, were prepared by the members of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., Beaucage being throughout deceived by the said Hon. Thomas McGreevy as to his position in the matter, as he alleges in an action recently entered by him against the said Thomas McGreevy in relation to the said contract in the Superior Court of Montreal.

That the said tenders were transmitted to the Department of Public Works of Canada for examination and extension.

That while all the tenders were being examined and the quantities applied in the Department of Public Works of Canada, the said Hon. Thomas McGreevy, then and now a member of the Parliament of Canada, and a member of the Quebec Harbour Commission by appointment of the Government, promised to obtain and did obtain from the Department of Public Works of Canada, and from officials of that Department, in relation to the said tenders, to figures in connection therewith, and to the amounts thereof, information which he offered to communicate before the result was officially known, and which he did communicate to the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., and to certain members of the said firm individually.

That to the knowledge of the said Thomas McGreevy, the tenders of Messrs. Gallagher and Beaucage were lower than those of Larkin, Connolly & Co., but that in consideration of the promise of the sum of $25,000 to be to him paid, he, the said Thomas McGreevy, agreed to secure the acceptance of the tenders of Larkin, Connolly & Co., and that he suggested to that firm and to certain members thereof individually, to make arrangements in connection with the said Gallagher and Beaucage and to so manipulate matters as to render the tenders of those two parties higher than those of the said firm, or at all events to secure the contract for Larkin, Connolly & Co., and that said arrangements and manipulations were carried out as suggested by him.

That in consequence of the said arrangement and manipulations wherein the said Thomas McGreevy directly participated, the contract for the cross-wall and lock in connection with the Quebec Harbour works was awarded to Larkin, Connolly & Co., on a report to Council made by the hon. Minister of Public Works, under date 26th May, 1883.

That a few days thereafter the sum of $25,000 was, in fulfilment of the corrupt arrangement above stated, paid to the said Thomas McGreevy in promissory notes signed by the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., which said notes were duly paid.

That about the same date, namely, the 4th June, 1883, a sum of $1,000 was paid by the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. towards "the Langevin Testimonial Fund"—a fund destined to be given to Sir Hector Langevin.

That in the course of the carrying out of the works, the said Thomas McGreevy caused changes contrary to the public interest to be made in the conditions of the said contract.

That in 1884, Thomas McGreevy, then and now a member of the Parliament of Canada and a member of the Quebec Harbour Commission by appointment of the Government, agreed with the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., and certain members thereof individually, to secure for them a contract for the completion of the Graving Dock of Lévis, one of the conditions of the agreement being that he, Thomas McGreevy, should receive any excess over the sum of $50,000 in the contract price.

That to the detriment of public interest, a contract was signed in or about the month of June, 1884, for the performance of the said works, and that subsequently the said Thomas McGreevy received the price stipulated in the corrupt arrangement above mentioned, namely, $22,000.

That in 1883 and 1884, tenders were asked for by the Government of Canada for the completion of the Graving Dock at Esquimalt, B.C.

That the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. were among those who tendered, and that the contract was awarded to them in pursuance of a Report to Council, dated 24th October, 1884, and signed by the hon. Minister of Public Works.

That before tendering, the said Larkin, Connolly & Co. had with Thomas McGreevy, then and now a member of the Parliament of Canada, communications and interviews wherein they secured his services to assist them in dealing with the Department of Public Works, in order to secure the said contract.

That he agreed to help them, and that he did in fact help them in divers ways, and, amongst others, by obtaining from the Department of Public Works information, figures and calculations which he communicated to them.

That to the knowledge and with the consent of the said Thomas McGreevy, and for the purpose of securing for themselves his influence, Larkin, Connolly & Co. took into partnership with themselves his brother, Robert H. McGreevy, giving him a 20 per cent. interest in their firm.

That during the execution of the said contract, the said Thomas McGreevy was the agent, or one of the agents, in the pay of Larkin, Connolly & Co., in dealing with the Department of Public Works; that he endeavoured to obtain, and did obtain, for them, at their request,

important alterations in the works, and more favourable conditions.

That the said more favourable conditions and the said alterations enabled them to realize, to the detriment of the public interests, very large profits.

That during the execution of the works, large sums were paid by Larkin, Connolly & Co. to Thomas McGreevy for his services in dealing with the Minister of Public Works, with the officers of the Department, and, generally, for his influence as a member of the Parliament of Canada.

That in consideration of the sums of money so received by him and of the promises to him made, the said Thomas McGreevy furnished to Larkin, Connolly & Co. a great deal of information; strove to procure, and did procure, to be made by the Department and the hon. Minister of Public Works, in the plans of the Graving Dock and in the execution of the works, alterations which have cost large sums of money to the public treasury.

That he himself took steps to induce certain members of the Parliament of Canada to assist him, the said Thomas McGreevy, in his efforts, in concert with Larkin, Connolly & Co., to obtain alterations and additional works, for which large sums of money were offered to him by the members of the firm.

That on his suggestion members of the Parliament of Canada were approached by members of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co.

That certain members of the said firm have declared that the said members of the Canadian Parliament on being so approached, had asked for a certain sum of money for exerting their influence in favour of Larkin, Connolly & Co. with the Minister of Public Works, and that Larkin, Connolly & Co. had agreed to give them money for that purpose.

That Thomas McGreevy, acting in concert with Larkin, Connolly & Co., did at their request corruptly endeavour to procure the dismissal from office, of certain public officers employed in connection with the works of the Graving Dock at Esquimalt in order to have them replaced by others who would suit Larkin, Connolly & Co., the former having for a time incurred the ill-will of Larkin, Connolly & Co., because they then compelled them to carry out the works in conformity with the specifications and contract, and prepared their estimates according to the terms of the said contract.

That during the winter of 1886-87 the said Thomas McGreevy proposed to and made with the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., through certain members of the said firm, an arrangement whereby the said firm undertook to pay to him the sum of $25,000 on condition that he would obtain for the firm the sum of 35 cents per cubic yard for the dredging of 800,000 cubic yards in area of the Wet Basin in the harbour of Quebec.

That dredging of the same kind, and even more difficult, had previously and up to that time, and to the knowledge of the said Thomas McGreevy, been executed for the sum of 27 cents per cubic yard, and even less in the same works.

That the said Thomas McGreevy used his influence as a member of this House with the Department of Public Works, and in particular with Henry F. Perley, Esq., to induce him to report to the Quebec Harbour Commission in favour of the payment of the said sum of 35 cents per cubic yard.

That the correspondence on this subject between Henry F. Perley and Larkin, Connolly & Co., before the Quebec Harbour Commissioners were consulted, took place at the suggestion of the said Thomas McGreevy, and was conducted with his knowledge and participation in such a manner as to conceal from the eyes of Parliament and of the public, the corrupt character of the contract, in connection with which he had received $27,000

That Larkin, Connolly & Co. paid in money to the said Thomas McGreevy the sum of $20,000 in fulfilment of the arrangement above mentioned, and that at his own request a sum of $5,000 was left, to secure the election of the said Thomas McGreevy to the House of Commons at the general election of 1887, in the hands of one of the members of the firm, who, finding that sum insufficient, had to add thereto the sum of $2,000.

That on the 23rd May, 1887, in fulfilment of the arrangement above mentioned, and through the effort, the influence and the intervention of the said Thomas McGreevy, and without any public tender having been called for, a contract was made between the Quebec Harbour Commissioners and Larkin, Connolly & Co. for all the necessary dredging and removal of material in the Wet Basin of the Quebec Harbour Works.

That in the execution of the works of this contract extensive frauds were perpetrated to the detriment of the public treasury, and sums of money were paid corruptly to officials under the control and direction of Henry F. Perley and appointed by the Quebec Harbour Commission.

That by an Order in Council dated 10th May, 1888, the Government of Canada decided to pay a sum of $12,500 yearly during five years to Mr. Julien Chabot, on the condition of his causing the steamer *Admiral* to ply between Dalhousie and Gaspé, forming a connection with the Intercolonial Railway.

That the said sum of $12,500 has since been paid in the manner prescribed in the Order in Council and the contract made thereunder.

That the said Julien Chabot was merely a screen for the benefit of the said Thomas McGreevy, who then was and continued to be for a long time thereafter the proprietor of the *Admiral* in whole or at least in great part.

That previous to the 10th of May, 1888, to wit, since 1883 or 1884, the same subsidy of $12,500 was paid for the said steamer *Admiral* then also owned by men representing the said Thomas McGreevy.

That the said Thomas McGreevy received in that connection a sum of about $120,000, while being a member of the Parliament of Canada.

That in 1886, tenders were asked for by the Quebec Harbour Commissioners for the construction of a work called the "South Wall" or "Retaining Wall."

That Mr. Thomas McGreevy procured from public officials the tenders received, and showed them to Messrs. O. E. Murphy, Connolly, and R. H. McGreevy, for whom he was acting, in order to give them an undue advantage over their competitors.

That they had the said tenders in their possession during several hours, after which they were returned to Henry F. Perley, then in Quebec, by the said Thomas McGreevy.

That the contract was awarded to one John Gallagher, a mere figure head for the said Murphy, Connolly and R. H. McGreevy, who did the work for their own profit and advantage.

That changes detrimental to the public interest, but of a nature to secure great profits to the contractors, were made in the plans and the carrying out of the works, and in the conditions and securities set out in the contract, through the influence and intervention of the said Thomas McGreevy.

That from the year 1883 to 1890, both inclusive, the said Thomas McGreevy received from Larkin, Connolly & Co. and from his brother, R. H. McGreevy, for the considerations above indicated, a sum of about $200,000.

That during the period aforesaid he was the agent and paid representative of Larkin, Connolly & Co. on the Quebec Harbour Board of Commissioners, in Parliament, and in connection with the Department of Public Works.

That the said Thomas McGreevy exacted and received out of the subsidies voted by Parliament for the construction of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, a sum of over $40,000.

That the moneys expended in connection with the works mentioned in the present motion are moneys voted by the Parliament of Canada, and amount to about $5,000,000.

That the said Thomas McGreevy on several occasions demanded in the name of the hon. Minister of Public Works, and received from Larkin, Connolly & Co., sums of money.

That from 1882 to the present session, the said Thomas McGreevy has always lived in Ottawa in the same house as the hon. Minister of Public Works, and that he seems to have done so in order to put in the mind of Larkin, Connolly & Co. the impression that he had over said hon. Minister an absolute control and that he was acting as his representative in his corrupt transactions with them.

That in fact on many occasions he used the name of the hon. Minister of Public Works in his dealings with them, undertaking to obtain his co-operation or declaring that he had secured it.

That before the board of Quebec Harbour Commissioners he often also used the name of the said Minister.

That certain members of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. paid and caused to be paid large sums of money to the hon. Minister of Public Works out of the proceeds of the said contracts, and that entries of the said sums were made in the books of that firm.

A select committee be appointed to enquire fully into the said allegations, and specially, but without limiting the scope of such enquiry, to investigate all circumstances connected with the several tenders, contracts and changes therein, and the payments and other matters mentioned in the statements hereinbefore made, with power to send for persons, papers and records, and to examine witnesses upon oath or affirmation, and that the committee do report in full the evidence taken before them, and all other proceedings on the reference, and the result of their

enquiries, and that Rule 78 of this House as to the selection of committees be suspended, and that said committee be composed of Messrs. Davies, Edgar, Kirkpatrick, Mills (Bothwell), Ouimet, Prior, Tarte, Weldon and Wood (Brockville).

Although I have thought proper to suggest the names of certain members of this House, I am entirely in the hands of the House. I read with great pleasure, and the House will no doubt hear with the same pleasure, a very important statement made in February last in Halifax by the hon. Minister of Justice, in whom I have the fullest confidence, to this effect:

"Let me put in half a dozen sentences the facts of the case. Mr. McGreevy is member for the city of Quebec, but was never member of the Government of Canada. He had a quarrel with a brother about some money matters and his brother has been pursuing him since and has published some letters which might perhaps have the effect of driving his brother out of Parliament. I will not be Mr. McGreevy's defender until he has defended himself from the aspersions cast upon his character which those documents contain, nor will any member of the Liberal-Conservative Government of Canada. But let me tell you that while Mr. Robert McGreevy, the brother, has been dragging this correspondence out weeks after weeks and months after months, nothing has been disclosed to show that the slightest suspicion rests upon any member of the Government of the Dominion of Canada. But because charges have been insinuated that one member of the Government has been to some extent cognisant of what was going on, though that turns only upon some evidence that one or two clerks in his Department may have known something of it, that is enough, and when Parliament meets an investigation will take place and it will take place upon the motion of a member of the Government. [Applause.] What I have to say in conclusion is, that nothing with regard to the general policy of the Government, nor with regard to those scandals will the electorate of Canada be in any way deceived."

As I said a moment ago, if the hon. Minister of Justice or the Government think it is better in the public interest that my suggestion of a select committee be not adopted, I am in the hands of the House. I have been elected, Sir, to put this motion before you, and in doing so I believe I am performing a great public duty. I verily believe, unless I am face to face with a long succession of forgeries, which to my mind is not possible, that I shall have the painful duty to prove every statement I have just made.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This matter being a matter of privilege, we have a standing committee appointed by the House—the Committee on Privileges and Elections—which has to deal with matters of privilege, and this matter should be sent to that committee. My intention from the beginning had been to make the motion myself, but I understood that the hon. the mover of this motion had other matters to bring before the House than those which were published in the press, and I thought it therefore but fair to leave the hon. gentleman to take his own course and bring the subject as fully before the House as he might deem it his duty to do. As my name is connected with this question by the hon. gentleman, I think it my duty to make a statement to the House. That statement I now make as follows:—I never communicated, in any way, to any one tenders or prices of tenders, or relative positions of tenders, or names of tenderers at any time, before the contract was allotted and signed and the work in progress, the only persons having the same information being the members of the Privy Council and such of the officers of my department as were entrusted with the opening of tenders after the period fixed for their reception. I never found or knew any such or other officers of my department to be guilty of any indiscretion or breach of trust in connection with any tender or contract. Tenders accepted have been and are so accepted, according to law. If the parties named in the motion as having contributed to a testimonial presented to me some eight or ten years ago have so contributed to it I never asked them to do so, and up to this moment I never knew them to have done so. Directly or indirectly I never asked the contractors named in the motion for money, cheques or notes, nor did I receive any such money, cheques or notes from them for my use, profit or advantage. I have no reason to suspect specially Mr. Perley of having done wrong in this matter. If he has done so, it is without my knowledge; and having known him for so many years as a faithful officer of my department, I cannot make up my mind to believe that he has done wrong, that he has violated his trust and rendered himself liable to be punished by the Government. In so far as the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. McGreevy) is concerned, he is in his place, and, of course, it is for him to say what he has to say. For my part, when the Committee on Privileges and Elections meet, I will be there ready to give any information in my power and to answer any questions put to me.

Mr. McGREEVY. Last year when this matter was brought before the House I was absent, but I left a statement with my hon. friend the member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) to be read by him to the House. That statement was read by him in my absence. I adhere to that statement, and I state to the House to-day that the whole charge is false and untrue from beginning to end. It is a foul conspiracy concocted by a clique to damage me for their own benefit, because I would not be their tool and instrument to obtain for them what they wanted. They used my name on more than one occasion, not only by writing letters in my name, but even by forging my name. I am prepared to prove that there are letters written in the department in my name which I never signed. They made these statements because I would not do the work they wanted me to do. I am very glad this charge has been made, and I hope a speedy investigation will take place. I am prepared to defend myself, and the result will be that the whole thing will be proved a conspiracy and false from beginning to end. The hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Tarte), who takes up the case for those two parties whom I might call his associates, because the hon. gentleman has associated himself with them, has made statements and taken a position out of which I think he will have some difficulty in getting. I am prepared for a speedy and thorough investigation.

Mr. TARTE. I have only one word to add. I never associated myself——

Mr. McGREEVY. You have been always their associate.

Mr. TARTE. I never associated myself, never have been associated with the men who are named in the motion I have placed, Mr. Speaker, in your hands. My wish, my sincere wish, is that the words used by the hon. gentleman a moment ago may be found to be quite true, as I suppose he believes them to be. He speaks of forgery. Mr.

Speaker, if the letters signed in the hon. gentleman's name are proved to be forgeries, I will not only apologize to the House but I will have no other treatment to expect from this Parliament than to go out of it, and that very quickly.

Mr. EDGAR. As the hon. gentleman who introduced the resolution has intimated that he would be quite satisfied if it went before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and as the hon. Minister of Public Works has suggested that it should go there, I beg to move an amendment to that effect. I move that the last paragraph of the said motion be expunged and the following substituted :—

That it be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, to enquire fully into the said allegations, and especially, but without limiting the scope of such enquiry, to investigate all circumstances connected with the several tenders, contracts and changes therein, and the payments and other matters mentioned in the statements hereinbefore made, with power to send for persons, papers and records, and to examine witnesses upon oath or affirmation; and that the committee do report in full the evidence taken before them, and all their proceedings on the reference, and the result of their enquiries.

Amendment agreed to, and motion as amended agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 5.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 12th May, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 16) to amend the Acts relating to the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Curran.)

Bill (No. 17) respecting the River St. Clair Railway Bridge and Tunnel Company.—(Mr. Montague.)

Bill (No. 18) respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.—(Mr. Montague.)

Bill (No. 19) respecting the Canada and Michigan Tunnel Company.—(Mr. Montague.)

Bill (No. 20) respecting the St. Lawrence and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 21) to confer certain powers on the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in connection with its telegraph business, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 22) respecting the Lake Temiscamingue Colonization Railway Company.—(Mr. Trow.)

Bill (No. 23) respecting the E. B. Eddy Manufacturing Company, and to change its name to the E. B. Eddy Company.—(Mr. Mackintosh.)

Bill (No. 24) to incorporate the McKay Milling Company.—(Mr. Mackintosh.)

Bill (No. 25) to amend the Act to incorporate the Medicine Hat Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Daly.)

Bill (No. 26) to incorporate the Pembroke Lumber Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Leeds.)

Bill (No. 27) to authorize the London and Canadian Loan and Agency Company (Limited) to issue debenture stock.—(Mr. Denison.)

Bill (No. 28) to amend the Act to incorporate the *Empire* Printing and Publishing Company.—(Mr. Denison.)

Bill (No. 29) to incorporate the Montreal and Atlantic Railway Company, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Ives.)

Bill (No. 30) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of Jay Spencer Corbin.—(Mr. Reid.)

Bill (No. 31) to amend the Electoral Franchise Act.—(Mr. Charlton.)

PRIVATE BILLS—EXTENSION OF TIME.

Mr. BERGERON moved :

That the time for the presentation of Private Bills be extended to Friday, 29th inst., in accordance with the recommendation of the Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

Motion agreed to.

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved :

That a Select Committee, composed of Sir Adolphe Caron and Messieurs Amyot, Cockburn, Davies, Davin, Desjardins (Hochelaga), Desjardins (L'Islet), Edgar, Fraser, Kirkpatrick, Laurier, McNeill, Mills (Bothwell), O'Brien, Rinfret, Scriver, Weldon and White (Shelburne), be appointed to assist Mr. Speaker in the direction of the Library of Parliament so far as the interests of this House are concerned, and to act as members of a Joint Committee of both Houses on the Library.

Motion agreed to.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved :

That a Message be sent to the Senate informing their Honours that this House will unite with them in the formation of a Joint Committee of both Houses on the subject of the Printing of Parliament, and that the members of the Select Standing Committee on Printing, viz.: Messieurs Amyot, Bergin, Bourassa, Caron (Sir Adolphe), Chapleau, Charlton, Davin, Desjardins (L'Islet), Grandbois, Innes, Kaulbach, Landerkin, Mackintosh, McLean, McMullen, Putnam, Rider, Somerville, Taylor, Tisdale and Trow, will act as members on the part of the House on said Joint Committee on the Printing of Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

CODIFICATION OF THE CRIMINAL LAW.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 32) to codify the Criminal Law of Canada. He said : The object of this Bill is fully expressed by its title. It is intended to be a codification of the Criminal Law as well as of the Statutes relating to the Criminal Law of Canada, and it has been prepared principally on the model of the Imperial codification.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would enquire from the hon. Minister of Justice, whether he proposes to introduce any alterations, more or less, of the existing Criminal Law in this Bill, or whether it is to be confined wholly and entirely to the codification of the law as it now stands ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Bill includes a number of changes in the law.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are they changes of any considerable importance, because this is a matter of general interest?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They are only of the nature of such amendments as will be made in the shape of a Bill to amend the Criminal Law generally. Fundamental changes such as have been discussed in the press during the last few months are not touched on by this Bill, because it is deemed better that they should form the subject of discussion during the progress of the Bill, or of other Bills which may be introduced. The scope of this Bill is confined to the codification of the laws, with ordinary and subordinate amendments.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would ask the Minister of Justice whether the distinction between "misdemeanours" and "felonies" are preserved in the Bill, and if so, is there any change in that particular?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is proposed to abolish that distinction.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If in this Bill the hon. gentleman has introduced a large number of necessary amendments to the existing law, it will be hardly possible, in view of the voluminous character of the Bill, to give it full consideration this session. I suppose the intention of the hon. gentleman is to print the Bill and to submit it for consideration, but that it will hardly go further than its second reading during the present session.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Such is my intention. I propose the Bill should be read a second time, and I may then take the opportunity of stating briefly what the amendments are. It is desirable that a Bill of this extensive character should be circulated through the country and be very generally discussed. On the second reading of the Bill I will state briefly what were the changes, and ask the direction of the House whether it will be proceeded with further or deferred until next session.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DOCUMENTS PROMISED IN SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the Orders of the Day are called I ask the Minister of Public Works, in the absence of the First Minister, where are the documents promised us in the Speech from the Throne, and which I understood the First Minister to say a week since, would be forthcoming on the earliest possible day?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If the First Minister were here he could answer the hon. gentleman. I will take a note of the question and submit it to him.

THE QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY.

Mr. FLINT asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government (Her Majesty's birthday this year falling upon Sunday) to fix by proclamation, the 25th day of May inst., or any other day for the celebration of the birthday of Her Majesty?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The day following the 24th May, is expected to be proclaimed as the day on which the Queen's birthday will be celebrated.

REVENUE FROM REGISTRATION.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, What revenue has been derived from the sale of registration stamps by the Post Office Department during each year since 1882?

Mr. HAGGART. The revenue derived from the sale of registration stamps by the Post Office Department during each year since 1882 was as follows: In 1883, $61,769.50; 1884, $66,311.00; 1885, $66,444.50; 1886, $72,123.50; 1887, $74,032.50; 1888, $68,573.00; 1889, $73,310.00; 1890, $104,526.00.

WHARF AT CACOUNA, &c.

Mr. DELISLE (for Mr. CARROLL) asked, 1st. Whether the Government sent, during the course of last winter, instructions to George Lebel, farmer, of Cacouna, authorizing him to purchase timber to continue the work on the wharf at Cacouna, during the coming summer? 2nd. What is the date of these instructions? 3rd. What quantity of timber was he authorized to buy, and what was the price that he should have paid for it? 4th. What is the amount of expenditure up to date, on the dredging of the Du Loup River, in the County of Témiscouata? 5th. The names of the person or persons to whom this sum was paid?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. 1st. No instructions were sent to George Lebel, of Cacouna, authorizing him to purchase timber. 2nd. Instructions were sent to Mr. Assistant Engineer Michaud on the 12th February. The amount was limited to $600. 3rd. Expended on dredging the River du Loup, $4,486.75 up to date. 4th. The dredging was done by day labour, and consisted of the removal of sand bars and obstructions, men being engaged by the day for the work as required, and their names and time returned on regular pay-lists.

WINTER COMMUNICATION WITH P.E.I.

Mr. PERRY moved for:

Return giving the date at which the steamer *Stanley* commenced running between Prince Edward Island and the mainland in the fall of 1890, how many trips made, date of each trip, the number of passengers and the amount of freight taken to and from Prince Edward Island; the amount of money collected on account of passengers and the amount of freight; also the expenses of working said steamer during the winter of 1891, and the date at which said steamer stopped running from Prince Edward Island to the mainland.

He said: In connection with this motion I desire to say a few words, and they will be very few, because I am almost tired of bringing year after year before the notice of the Government and the House generally, the shameful way in which the passenger and mail service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland is being performed. We might reasonably expect that the service would be improved, but it has gone back fifty years. Last winter it was shamefully neglected; it was no better than the service of forty or fifty years ago, when we used the old-fashioned ice boats. This is not a mere Grit complaint, but it is one made by the friends of the Government. One of their own organs, a paper which is patronized by the Government to the amount of over $2,000 a year, complains bitterly of the neglect of the Government of Canada towards the people of Prince Edward

Island; and when that is the case, you must come to the conclusion that the neglect was very serious. Last fall navigation closed a little earlier than usual, and when we might have expected that the boat would be waiting for the weather, and not the weather for the boat, at the time the steam navigation company's boats stopped, the *Stanley* was at Pictou. She was then ordered to Charlottetown, and by the time she made her first trip ten days had elapsed from the time the steamers stopped crossing, and all that time the people of the Island were without communication with the mainland. Does that look like Prince Edward Island being part of the Confederation? No; it looks more like exclusion. But I suppose the Government at that time did not anticipate an election; and as there were six representatives from the Island on the Opposition side, I suppose they came to the conclusion that it was not even a political sin to punish the people in that way. Now I am going to read an extract, not from a Grit paper, but from a Conservative paper published in Summerside, and well known to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Minister of Public Works, the right hon. leader of the Government, and in fact to every member of the Cabinet, because I see they are all getting that paper in the Departments, and are paying its publisher over $2,000 a year. Here is what the Summerside *Journal* said on the 11th of December, 1890:

"The steamer *Stanley* arrived at Charlottetown, from Pictou, about noon on Sunday last, but did not begin work for the season until yesterday, when she left Charlottetown for Pictou. The Island boats being laid up, we have had no mail here since Monday morning, when we received St. John papers of Friday and Halifax papers of Saturday. This is not a remarkably rapid mail service for this season of the year."

This is the first complaint that any paper supporting the Government in Prince Edward Island has made, and it is not half as strong as it should be. Unfortunately, I have no scraps cut from any Grit papers, and if I had I would be afraid that hon. gentlemen opposite would doubt the veracity of any statements I might read from a Grit paper complaining of the gross neglect of the Government of Canada towards Prince Edward Island. I find that the same paper, a short time afterwards, made the following statement:—

"Once upon a time the people of this province had mail communication with the outside world, and received their mail matter with tolerable regularity, even in winter. This custom, however, seems to have gone the way of many other old customs, and is rapidly becoming obsolete."

That puts me in mind of the policy of "Old Tomorrow" very much—

"We have, in a great measure, grown used to doing without foreign mails, and have learned to make the best of our environments. The days of Rip Van Winkle have apparently returned to us, and we are philosophically setting ourselves to forget all about the outside world, though we fear that there is still here and there some heretically inclined malcontent who sighs for the good old days when there was regular mail communication with our sister provinces."

Now, that is a sad complaint, and I am sure no one on the opposite side of the House will question the veracity of this statement, published as it is by a good Tory paper which has received over $2,000 from the Government the last year, for doing what I do not know. But in the Auditor General's Report it will be found that that paper was paid over $2,000, and it is not said what for—

"Never, in the history of Prince Edward Island, have our mail arrangements been so badly managed as they were during the month of December, which has just closed. Between the Island boats, the *Stanley*, and the ice-boats, each of which three lines was called into requisition during the month, we had little better than a weekly mail. But the very worst mismanagement, bungling, or whatever word best describes the condition of affairs, occurred at the latter end of last week. On Friday evening 150 bags of mail were at Cape Tormentine. These, instead of being brought over on Saturday by the ice-boats, which could easily have been done, were ordered back to Pictou, the *Stanley* having resumed work on Friday. The steamer left Georgetown for Pictou on Saturday afternoon, and returned on Sunday. By the time she left Pictou on that day, however, the mails that had been ordered around from Cape Tormentine had not reached Pictou, and the *Stanley*, instead of bringing over about 220 bags of mail, brought only about forty, or a single day's mail, and the delayed bags did not reach the Island until her next trip, on Wednesday. Is it any wonder that the people are indignant? The mail arrangement with this province seems to be growing worse year by year, and we believe that such an instance as that above alluded to has no parallel in our history. The only satisfactory winter route for the mails is that between the Capes, and for Heaven's sake let them be left on that route."

That goes to show there must be some great neglect somewhere. In my opinion there is too much red tape used. There are two departments connected with the carrying of the mails to Prince Edward Island; and it appears to me that nothing can be done either by the Inspector of Post Offices in Charlottetown or the Marine Agent there—not even the smallest action—without a direct order from the departments at Ottawa. If anything is required by either, he has to send his red tape to Ottawa to the Minister of Marine, and the Minister of Marine has to get more red tape, and I have no doubt the charges for red tape to and from Prince Edward Island will be enormous. The red tape has to come back, and when it comes back it has to go to Cape Tormentine and two or three other places. The one officer does not understand the other, the one contradicts the other, and through the mismanagement and neglect of the department at Ottawa—for I charge the whole business to the Minister of Marine himself—the people of the Island are ill-used and suffer. The hon. the Minister of Marine knows that, last fall, application was made by the merchants at Summerside to have the *Stanley* come up there and open the harbour, as there was just enough keen ice to keep back a dozen of sailing vessels. The merchants of Summerside put their heads together, and asked the Minister of Marine to allow the *Stanley* to go up the river. The Minister, after consideration, telegraphed that he would, provided the merchants would pay five hundred dollars for the use of the steamer. I am not going to argue the point whether it was right to charge that five hundred dollars, but I believe it was not. I believe, in lieu of being charged five hundred dollars, the merchants should have received encouragement, because we know this amount does not come directly out of the pockets of the merchants of Summerside, but out of the pockets of the farmers who grow the potatoes and other articles of export. The merchants of Summerside, however, were willing to pay the five hundred dollars, and notified the Agent of Marine and Fisheries at Charlottetown to that effect; but when they looked for the steamer, where was she? In lieu of being in Charlottetown ready to commence operations, she was in Pictou, and the merchants were told that there was not water enough in Shediac

harbour to allow the steamer to go there. The Minister of Marine knows better than that. He knows very well that the *Lansdowne*, which draws more water than the *Stanley*, has been several times in Shediac and met with no impediment, but made her trips regularly and safely. Why not, therefore, have allowed the steamer *Stanley* to open up the harbour of Summerside, in order to set free those twelve vessels and their cargoes? What was the result of not sending the *Stanley* there? There was one thousand dollars expenses inflicted on the people of Summerside. They had hauled their produce to the wharf and loaded up the vessels, and were then obliged to unload their potatoes and barley and other products from the vessels and replace them in their granaries and cellars; and all this because they were misled by the telegram from the Minister that the steamer would be sent up. Thus, instead of helping these people to sell their products and enabling them to meet their bills at the banks, the people were obliged, at heavy expense, to unload their products and replace them in their granaries and cellars, and then meet their bills, I suppose, by borrowing at 7½ per cent. That is the way the people of my county are used. Is it any wonder then that the people of Prince County will not send a member here to support the Government? It is not necessary for a Grit candidate to canvass in Prince County. It is in every one's mouth, even the mouths of those too young to be entitled to vote, that the people of Prince County are wronged, that their interests are overlooked by the Government of Canada, as is shown by the articles I have read. We find further that the High Commissioner at London had a great notion of coming across to the Island, just about the time of the elections. He went all the way to Pictou, where I dare say his presence was required, but when he got there he found the steamer was not crossing, and he telegraphed to Mr. Ferguson of Charlottetown, the Government candidate and a very busy candidate, a strong canvasser and an able man, who, I should not wonder, will be rewarded in a day or two, as there is now a vacancy in the Chamber reserved for starving politicians. He sent Mr. Ferguson the following telegram:—

"I regret deeply it is impossible for me to go to the Island, as the *Stanley* cannot cross and I dare not attempt the Capes."

The High Commissioner says he dares not attempt the Capes. Well, I have to attempt them, and even the Minister of Marine, if he came there, would have to attempt them. These gentlemen do not know what troubles we have to contend against. They are here quite satisfied, drawing their $8,000 a year, without having to cross the Straits, and without having to work very hard. Their travelling expenses are paid, even their cab-hire is paid; and they have no sympathy with the poor people of the Island whose money is extracted from them to enable the Government to pay these nonsensical expenses. The High Commissioner says: "I have satisfied myself that the tunnel can be made for $6,000,000 and you may rely upon all the aid I can give to the completion of that important work." We have the assurance of the High Commissioner in all his dignity, in all his importance, in all his grandeur, that he will induce the Government to expend $6,000,000 to build that tunnel. We had a telegram the other day from—I do not know whether to call him Senator—I suppose he is the ex-Senator—he resigned his Senatorship to run during the last elections and he was not elected—I do not know that he has been re-appointed—I do not think he has—if I am mistaken, he may be a Senator still, but I will not believe it, unless a Minister of the Crown gets up and says so—so I will speak of him as ex-Senator Howlan—and he said that $5,000,000 was the estimate made for the building of that tunnel by Mr. Fox. Mr. Fox says that a tunnel of sixteen-feet diameter will cost $10,000,000, and one of eighteen feet $11,000,000. I can hardly reconcile these different statements, but I am not an engineer, and I do not know whether a twelve-foot tunnel is sufficient to keep up communication between the Island and the mainland. I leave that to the Government and to Mr. Fox. If Mr. Fox says it is sufficient, I am satisfied, and if the Government is told by Mr. Fox that a sufficient tunnel can be be built for $5,000,000, I say they cannot back down from their pledge. The right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government has repeatedly stated that he would at once commence operations on that tunnel, if the cost were within reason. In February last, the High Commissioner stated what I have read, and we have the promise of the leader of the Opposition that he will back him up, and I am sure that every member here will back up the present Government, if they have the manliness and courage to proceed with this work; but, in the name of common sense, do not go on humbugging about it and keeping it off till the next election. I am satisfied that, without that tunnel, or some other means of communication, the Dominion Government will not have redeemed their solemn pledge, their solemn promise, their solemn compact, entered into with the people of Prince Edward Island at the time of the Union. The terms were, that they would maintain continuous and efficient means of communication between the Island and the mainland both in winter and in summer. First of all, they put on the *Northern Light*. That was run down by the Conservative Dominion Government, but that vessel never did worse during the winters she ran than the *Stanley* did last winter. We have here statements from newspapers showing that, if the *Stanley* could do no better than she did last winter, it would be throwing away $150,000 of the people's money. When the Government saw that the *Stanley* could not carry on that communication, they should have had their mails carried by the Capes, but they did not, and for a month or six weeks we had a mail only once in about ten days, instead of a mail every day. I do not wonder so much at the Government using the people of Prince Edward Island in that way, when we remember the manner in which they dealt with the vessel that was stranded near Cape Tormentine last fall. That vessel was stranded about a mile from the shore, and if one of the Government ice-boats had been got at the time, the lives of the people could have been saved. I am not going to make a direct charge against the Minister of Marine for the loss of the lives of these people, but I say that, if they had proper officers, the three or four lives might have been saved. The assertion made at that time has never been contradicted—that, when that vessel struck, a hardy son of Neptune started from the shore with a small dory and managed to get near

the vessel, but had to return. The Government officials had to telegraph to Charlottetown to Mr. Lord for the use of a Government boat, and by that time the storm had increased and night had set in, and they could not get out to the stranded vessel. The result was that three or four lives were lost. It is no wonder, then, that the same or worse takes place in regard to the people of Prince Edward Island. If the Government are honest—and I have grave doubts as to whether they are—they will at once go to work and cause these estimates to be brought to Ottawa and submitted to Parliament, and then Parliament can allow the Government to build the tunnel, that being, as I am convinced, the only means by which it is possible to redeem the agreement made with Prince Edward Island at the time of the Union. Some years ago the Government were told by the Colonial Minister at home that it was their duty to carry out that agreement, that there only remained that link between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, with the exception of Newfoundland, to complete the Confederation; and, until they do that, they will not have completed the promises and pledges they have made. I think the House will readily understand that the people of Prince Edward Island have been badly used, and we know that on the eve of the election they were in a fuss about that. We know that Mr. Howlan resigned his seat, and came down to Prince County to run the election, but the people did not elect him. I do not know whether they elected as good men, but the people have every right to elect whom they please. There is no doubt that a great deal of influence was brought to bear on the electors, but the electors of Prince County are an exception to the general rule as far as honesty and sincerity are concerned. I can say that there is no use in sending the money bags or in making misrepresentations, or in holding out the bait as to what is going to be done, to seduce the people of that county. The fact is, that the people have got sick of false promises, and any bird who will go flying among those people with these promises will find himself deceived. I would give a piece of advice to the Minister of Marine, and that is, that next winter he should let the steamer *Stanley* not remain on exhibition at Pictou, that he should allow the steamer to wait for the weather and not expect the weather to be waiting for the steamer. Although these gentlemen told us a few years ago that they had power over the elements, I do not believe they have. The winter will come whether they like it or no, and they have no right to leave that boat at Pictou on exhibition when she ought to be crossing the Straits. Our merchants and farmers hold back their produce as late as possible, to take advantage of the prices. They hold their produce back until the price rises, and then when they want to carry it across they are denied that privilege by the Minister of Marine. He says he gave orders to others, but I hold that he is himself to blame and nobody else; and I tell him now that I hope the time has come when he will repair the harm he has committed against the people of Prince Edward Island. I intend to press this question before the Government. I intend to know what they intend to do about it; I intend to know officially if they have received the estimates made by their engineer, and I intend to know officially from them if they intend to carry out the work according to his estimate. I intend to know from them what they intend to do. It is time that we should have an answer, yes or no; it is time to do away with this humbugging business; it is time the people should know where they are; it is time the people should know whether we have a Government in Ottawa or not. Sir, it is time that they should pronounce themselves in this matter, it is full time that we should know who the Government are. The Government will be asked what they are going to do, and they will have to answer it. If the Government are not prepared to build a tunnel, if the estimated cost is too large to warrant them in undertaking the work, then I shall ask the Government to give a yearly amount of compensation to the Island to meet the claim they had since 1873. And how has their claim been met? We sent delegates from the Island in 1885; the Conservative Government sent delegates, who laid at the foot of the Throne their claim for $5,000,000. Do the Government mean to say that they can make the people of Prince Edward Island accountable for the $7,000,000 or $8,000,000 spent in building the Canadian Pacific Railway, in building these branches in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick? The Government will know best for what purpose they were built. I do not see why we should have three lines of railway there to compete with one another. And the Ship Railway—is there any article of Confederation, or any agreement, that would bind the Government to build that Chignecto Ship Railway? I want to ask the members of the Government if they are prepared to come forward and redeem the pledge which some of them signed with their own hands? I believe the Minister of Public Works is one of the men who took his pen and signed these terms; I think the right hon. gentleman who leads this Government is another who signed that paper. I do not see how these men can stand up before the members of Prince Edward Island without blushing when we make our just complaints. I think they were born without the ability to blush. I will now drop this subject till another time, and when the House goes into Supply by-and-bye, I will have another whack at the Government.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not intend to make a speech on this matter, but I want to say a word or two before the Minister of Marine replies. I endorse a great deal of what my hon. friend (Mr. Perry) has said with reference to the treatment the Island has received. I wish to confine my complaint chiefly to the action of the Marine Department and the Post Office Department in the carriage of the mails, and in conducting that service at the critical period of the year when the summer ends and the winter begins. I have taken occasion more than once to offer my congratulations to the Government on having provided such an excellent boat as we have now, to perform the service there. I have no complaint whatever to make about the boat. In such ice as she has encountered during the last two years, she has done most remarkably well, and I indulge the hope, although it is only a hope, that even when she meets with larger ice, she may prove a successful venture. I have talked with a good many of those who are good judges, and I think the universal opinion is that she is an excellent

boat. Now, what complaint have we got to make with reference to the management of the boat? In the first place, the boat having been built for the service of Prince Edward Island, I think the Minister would have been well advised had he left that boat ready prepared to begin the service in the harbour of Georgetown, or Charlottetown, instead of on the mainland in the town of Pictou. I think that has been the incipient mistake the hon. gentleman has made. Secondly, he made a graver mistake in not having her ready for sea when the time came that she should put out to sea, and the consequence was that both the mercantile public of the Island and the agricultural people of the Island sustained very grave and serious loss at this particular period of the year when it is absolutely essential to them that there should be steady communication. Hon. gentlemen know that we are situated in that peculiar way that we have to do all our shipping in three or four weeks in the fall of the year, and it is absolutely essential for the proper carrying out of the commerce of the country that during that period, and especially at that period, if at all practicable and possible, daily communication should be preserved. Just at that period when it was required, the hon. gentleman had his boat laid up in the town of Pictou, unprepared to go to sea, and there she remained nine or ten days during which time we had no service at all. Now, I cannot attempt to go into the figures of the loss which the Island sustained by reason of this interruption of communication. I know the Board of Trade complained most bitterly about it. I know I attended a meeting of that Board of Trade and I pointed out the steps that I had taken from year to year in this matter, and I ventured to point out where I thought the error lay. From year to year I have pointed out one remedy. What is that remedy? It is the appointment of some agent on the Island, or in the vesting in one of the agents now appointed there, of sufficient authority to control the running of that boat. The agent of the Minister of Marine and the Postmaster of the Island have no authority to act except under orders from Ottawa. Every order, whether it is to lay the boat up, or whether it is to hire men to start the boat, or for incurring a dollar's expense, must be communicated first by the agent to Ottawa, and afterwards orders must be sent down. Therefore, there passes a lot of red tape telegrams between the agents and deputies of the Post Office and Marine Departments, and after the Board of Trade have intervened, and after an immense deal of friction and great deal of trouble and irritation, the machinery is got to work. That should not be so. The Minister of Marine has a gentleman there as his agent in whom he has, or ought to have, great confidence. I want to ask him why authority is not given to that agent to control, in conjunction with the captain of the boat—who is a remarkably able and experienced seaman, one in whom, I think, the whole public have great confidence—why, in conjunction with the captain, the Minister of Marine has not given the necessary authority to this agent? I have proposed that every year. It is the one weakness from which emanates all the trouble, or nearly all, and I do not know how it is that the mails cannot be sent by the *Stanley*. The postmaster in the Island has not the authority to send them by way of the Capes or the *Stanley* as the circumstances may require.

Mr. HAGGART. He has.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I waited on him, in company with other gentlemen, last autumn, and he said he could not send them by the Capes unless he obtained authority from Ottawa. The Deputy of the Minister of Marine also said he had no authority to do so unless he received instructions from Ottawa. I understand the Deputy of the Minister of Marine went down there subsequently—I was sick at the time—and had an interview with the Board of Trade, and a circular was issued by him promising better things in the future. I wish to point out that I am not complaining of the boat, for she is a good boat, and I believe we have a fairly good service at the Capes—I have no complaint to make in that regard at all; but I do complain of the departmental management, which results in the Island being deprived, during ten of the most critical days, of the daily mail service which the people had a right to possess. I think the Minister is very much to blame in not putting the *Stanley* into commission in Charlottetown or Georgetown instead of at Pictou. No doubt the hon. gentleman could give some little patronage to his supporters at Pictou, but he could only do so at the expense of the service, and I maintain he did so when he tied up the boat and left it, as was done. It is not possible to blame the officers of the boat; I never heard any complaints against them yet, for they are good men. Mr. Finlayson has had ten years' experience—twelve years, my hon. friend tells me—and he is an excellent officer. The boat is a good boat, and if she were placed in the best possible condition no loss of time would be necessary. I will not enter for even one moment upon the very large and important question of the construction of the tunnel, which my hon. friend has raised. I will not enter into it for one or two reasons. First, we have the solemn pledge in writing given by the leader of the Government, that if it can be shown by scientific men that a tunnel is capable of being built for a reasonable sum, the Government will bring down the estimate, and that the right hon. gentleman will use his influence to induce the House to pass it. We have the further pledge of the High Commissioner, who was the responsible Government authority in the Maritime Provinces at the last election, over his own signature, that he had examined into the matter thoroughly and satisfied himself that a tunnel could be built for six or seven millions, and the construction of it would have his earnest, energetic and constant support. I cannot doubt, at all events at this stage of the session I will not doubt, that with the pledge given by the leader of the Government and the other pledge given by the High Commissioner, the project will be carried out, and so I will refrain at present from discussing it. Perhaps the hon. Minister will state to the House whether Mr. Douglas Fox has sent any figures or estimates as to the cost of the tunnel. If the hon. gentleman can answer this enquiry, it may avoid the necessity of placing a question on the Notice paper.

Mr. TUPPER. I desire, before the motion is carried, to add, with the consent of the mover, the words, "together with the report of the Deputy Minister of Marine, dated 5th March, 1891, touch-

ing the steamer." It would have been well, I think, if the hon. gentleman who moved the motion had waited until the House was placed in possession of the facts connected with the stoppage of the running on several occasions of the *Stanley* during the past extraordinarily severe winter. No one regretted more than I did that communication between the Island and the mainland was stopped on several occasions during that season, sometimes for quite a long period. Owing to that stoppage great inconvenience was suffered by the people as regards both trade and correspondence; but notwithstanding the speeches delivered to-day in connection with the supposed maladministration of my office, the report of the Deputy and the facts of the case will show that my Department and I, if the hon. gentleman prefers it, can only be held responsible for a delay of three days during the whole season. It is for that reason I regret that the hon. gentleman, previous to the official statements being brought before the House, should have occupied so much time of this body by alluding to what I fear he hoped the facts would show, that I had been guilty of great negligence in the management of this great and important service. The hon. gentleman entirely neglected to allude to the satisfactory service performed during the previous winter, when the *Stanley* was tried for the first time. In fact, the hon. gentleman had very little to do in the last House after the service had been made so satisfactory. I am not aware that he tendered his compliments to myself or the Government during last session for having brought about such a state of things that almost uninterrupted communication was had between the mainland and the Island; he has forgotten entirely to give credit where credit is due, but he has sought, as I think, to fasten on my Department a charge, which it is impossible, when the facts of the case are known, to lay at the door of that Department. I may say briefly, in anticipation of that report, that the whole trouble occurred through the ship's captain and officers having filled the boilers with salt water instead of having taken in fresh water at the beginning of the season, and that necessitated the ship lying up at Charlottetown for three days after the Island boats had ceased running, instead of the boat beginning, as the Department had hoped, at the very instant those boats had stopped running. Hon. members from the Island will recollect that the custom had been, and the custom had not been complained of during the last season, for the Government steamer not to go on the route until the regular boats had stopped running, and the Department was to watch for the occasion, and be ready promptly to place their steamer on the route. There was no fixed date for the Government steamer to go on the route, the idea being, I suppose, not to compete with the owners of the private vessels which do the service during the season, unfairly or unduly by a Government boat; and no request, so far as I am aware, has ever been made to the Department or to the Government that the Government boat should go and compete with the private vessels for the business that comes over that route. The people of the Island had not asked the country in general to support two services at the same time, they had not desired that we shoul l keep the Cape service in operation and also the *Stanley* at work. The system was that the Capes boat service should not go into operation until the *Stanley* was unable to make a passage. At the beginning of the season we commenced with the practice that had worked so well during the previous season, and the great difficulties met with were not anticipated in the slightest degree. But so anxious was I that no inconvenience should be suffered by the people of the Island, that the moment the *Stanley* came off the Fisheries Protection service, I gave orders that no steps should be left untaken to fit out the vessel so that the moment the Island vessels stopped running, she should proceed and do the work as well as it was possible to be done. These instructions were clear and distinct, they were sent to the ship, which was ordered not to be laid up at Pictou, but which came off duty at Pictou. It was considered, and I still consider it the most convenient thing as far as the public is concerned, to have the vessel ready on the mainland to carry the orders and instructions from the mainland and to begin the service from the mainland to Prince Edward Island. I take it that, even in the opinion of the people of Prince Edward Island, that is the smallest question connected with this matter. These instructions were given to the officers of the ship, and no one in the House will imagine that it should have been considered necessary for me to state distinctly and clearly that fresh water instead of salt water, was to be used for the boilers of that steamer. No specific directions on that head were given. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) testified to the ability and to the good service of the captain of that ship—and I am not condemning the captain now. I had every reason, therefore, to suppose that these instructions to a captain who had managed that service for so long a time, in poor boats as well as in this good steamer, would cause him to take all the measures necessary to properly carry out the service. He was trammelled in no respect by instructions to do anything which would involve delay, but the facts are, that having taken the salt water, and it not being safe for the ship or good for the boilers, he found himself in Charlottetown during a sudden spell of cold weather, the regular boat was stopped, and consequently it took him three days to get ready for the regular service. I have to apologise to the hon. gentlemen, under these circumstances, for the delay caused, and for the inconvenience which I know they suffered, but I am glad to say that when this report is brought down it will show that the other delay occurred through a leak in the steam pipe. The official report of Mr. Stevens, Inspector of Boilers and Steamboats, which is now in the Department, states that this was an accident which could not have been foreseen, and that it was an extraordinary thing that the leak was discovered in such seasonable time. For this there can be no responsibility attaching to the Department. For the exceptionally severe weather, even the most violent politician—not excepting my hon. friend the mover of this motion—will not attempt to hold me responsible. So far as that unfortunate occurrence at Cape Tormentine is concerned, I am glad to know from the officers who have reported on the matter, that had the keeper of that boat exercised ordinary intelligence and used the boat instantly he thought it was needed, the boat could have rendered no service whatever. I trust that this report is correct, for I would be sorry to think that the hesitation of an

officer under such circumstances, should contribute to the loss of life. If the hon. gentleman is anxious to see these papers and moves for them, he will find that no one connected with the Department of Marine can be held responsible for the sad event that occurred. Now, in reference to the tunnel. I do not think that the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) considers that this matter is under my particular charge. The name of the High Commissioner was mentioned as having given a strong assurance upon that subject, but the hon. gentleman knows very well that the hon. the leader of the Opposition, who sits very close to him, and who, I regret to say, is absent to-day on account of ill-health, sent him a message which gave him some pleasing assurances during that same election. I have no doubt that the hon. member for Queen's having the assurance of the High Commissioner, and the assurance of the leader of the Opposition, that the tunnel shall be built at the earliest possible moment, will, after consideration, admit that it would be superfluous for me to add my assurance to such weighty assurances as these.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I hope, nevertheless, that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries will give us his assistance in this matter.

Mr. TUPPER. I have no doubt that if I could get rid of the annual motions connected with the *Stanley* and the communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, and that if all my hon. friends, both members of the Opposition and those supporting the Government, would be happy and silent upon these questions, it would be well worth my while to support it. I cannot, of course, anticipate what the information on this subject will be, but when the Government is in a position to have the information, I hope it will be such as to enable the Government to deal with the question in the direction which the hon. members representing Prince Edward Island so much desire. I suppose the hon. gentleman will consent to the addition of the words "including the report of the Deputy Minister of Marine, dated the 5th day of March, 1890, touching on this subject."

Mr. PERRY. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would ask the hon. Minister to include in this amendment, "the correspondence, telegrams and representations made to the Post Office and Marine Departments, touching the mail and steamboat service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland," which preceded the visit of the Deputy Minister and which went to make up that report.

Mr. TUPPER. I have no objection to that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In justification of the amendment which I have suggested, I may say that representations were made to the Post Office and Marine Departments by the Board of Trade on this subject, and it was owing to these representations that the Deputy Minister of Marine paid his official visit to the Island and conducted the investigation which resulted in the report which the Minister now wishes to bring down. I desire to recall the attention of the House to the fact, that while the Minister of Marine has made a lengthy defence of himself and his Department on this occasion, he has not thought fit to answer the only complaint I made, and the only question I asked him. I ask again, is he prepared to recommend or appoint an officer in the Island who will have authority to deal in some measure with this much vexed question? The House complains, though not very bitterly, that this is an annual complaint, that it is perennial, and that we are never done talking about it; but we must complain about it until the evil is remedied. If the Minister will appoint an officer, having his confidence, who will have authority to deal with the question as to whether the boat shall leave or shall not leave, and as by what means the mail shall be forwarded, he will, I think, find that these difficulties will cease. I believe I have a right to ask an assurance from the hon. gentleman that he will do that.

Mr. TUPPER. Certainly. I have no intention to pass by any point which the hon. gentleman wishes to press. I have no reason, and the papers will show no reason, for any arrangement in connection with the management of the *Stanley* or of the Marine service of Prince Edward Island, other than obtains all over Canada. The hon. gentleman must know that my predecessors, both in the Liberal Administration and the present Administration, from Confederation down, have found it impossible to conduct the business of the Department, concerned as it is with interests in every Province and every part of every Province, without an agent or representative in these different districts. The papers will show, as I believe I have already pointed out, that no matter what arrangement had been in force, whether we had given greater responsibility to the representative of the Department in Prince Edward Island than we would think of giving to a representative of the Department in any other place, all that did happen would have happened. The delay that gave rise to the cause of complaint was not due to any trouble connected with the agent, nor to any want of authority on the part of the agent at Charlottetown, but to the fact that the mistake was made of putting salt water into the ship when they should have taken fresh water, and because the instructions, which were so distinct, and which ordered the doing of everything necessary to have that ship ready for sea and ready for the service the moment the other ships went off the route, were not properly interpreted. Under any arrangement, or under any division of control which the hon. gentleman can conceive, how is it possible that this would have been avoided when, as I say, the instructions from the head office were of that character, giving the responsible men, the men immediately concerned in the ship, not only the discretion, but commanding and directing them to do everything necessary to fit the ship for sea and to make her ready for service. I think that is a sufficient answer to the hon. gentleman's suggestion. The time has not yet come when any different arrangement can be made.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understand from the hon. gentleman that he does not see fit to change the existing arrangements. Of course I shall have to be satisfied with that explanation, and he will have to be satisfied with the responsibility of having made it.

Mr. TUPPER. Until we get the tunnel.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Well, we will see. I wish I could get the assurance of the hon. gentle-

man that in Council he would back up the High Commissioner and the First Minister and do what he could to forward it. He has not yet said that he will. If he has any sympathy with the project, I would be glad to hear him say so now; it is a very good opportunity. But, Sir, in relation to the *Stanley* the hon. gentleman, in throwing upon the officers instead of upon the Department the responsibility for the delay—he says three days, but I say nine days—is hardly dealing fairly with his officer, for he knows that fresh water could not be obtained at Pictou.

Mr. TUPPER. I know nothing of the kind.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) As a matter of fact, it was not obtained.

Mr. TUPPER. It was not, but could have been.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am instructed that it could not be. As a matter of fact, the boat had to go to Charlottetown to get fresh water, and that is where she should have been at first; and if the Minister had given the proper order, the service would have been carried on, everyone would have been satisfied, and we would not be wearying this House with this complaint. But he chooses to say that he will not change the present system, which causes so much annoyance, inconvenience and loss to the people of the Island, and imposes on their representatives the necessity of bringing the matter up constantly in this House until we get it remedied.

Mr. HAGGART. The debate has taken a wider range than seemed to be necessary from the motion before the House. There was nothing in the motion to lead anyone to expect that there would be any reference to the Post Office authorities, or I would have had the papers here for the purpose of answering the hon. gentleman. He states that certain complaints made by the Board of Trade to the Post Office Department have not been attended to, and that if they had been attended to, and the officers in Prince Edward Island had had the powers they ought to have had, there would have been none of the delays and annoyance resulting from the non-delivery of the mails. I may state that on receiving representations, I do not remember whether from the hon. gentleman or from the Board of Trade, that powers should be given to an officer of the Department for the purpose of getting the mails across the Strait, my memory is that I gave instructions that the officer on the Island should have full power to have the mails sent across in the most convenient and expeditious manner. With regard to postal matters on the Island, let me draw your attention to one or two facts. The total amount of the postal receipts from the Island are in the neighbourhood of $22,000, which, when the amount paid for commissions, &c., is deducted, is reduced to a little less than $19,000. On the other hand, we pay for the transport of the mails on the Island $13,000, and for carrying the mails on the railroad $17,577, independent of supplies which are sent to every post office throughout the Dominion. That is the cost to the Dominion, independent of the amount charged to the postal authorities for the transport of the mails across the strait by the *Stanley*. Whether the service is efficiently performed or not, the postal receipts from Prince Edward Island are the smallest in proportion to population of any part of the Dominion. We are expending a good deal more than double what we receive in the shape of postal revenue, for the purpose of accommodating the people of the Island with post offices and providing for the proper delivery of their postal matter.

Mr. PERRY. The hon. the Postmaster General has made a very feeble attempt to defend the Government. In fact, if that is the line of policy the Government wish to pursue, why not shut up the Intercolonial and the Prince Edward Island railways altogether?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Why not shut up every canal in the Dominion, on which is lost $200,000 a year?

Mr. PERRY. Why not cut off British Columbia for the same reason? The hon. Minister says that the receipts from Prince Edward Island do not meet the expenditure. Show me one place in the Dominion where the receipts meet the expenditure. It is a preposterous argument; he must think we are fools to be influenced by such a statement as that—because the revenue does not meet the expenditure, we will close the mails, we will shut up the railway, we will give them no steam communication! Sir, I hope the hon. gentleman will never look for a constituency in Prince Edward Island; I hope he will go somewhere else; he will get none there; he would be laughed at by the boys of Prince Edward Island. It is shameful. No wonder the hon. gentleman puts his hands before his face. Is that the policy the Government are going to carry out—that because the postal revenue of Prince Edward Island does not meet the expenditure, because the revenue from the piers and breakwaters and wharves does not meet the expenditure, we are to have no grants of money for these objects; because the Intercolonial Railway sinks $500,000 or $600,000 a year for political accommodation, to take voters from Dalhousie to Moncton and from Moncton to somewhere else to cast their votes for the Government, they are going to give it up! That railway is a political engine for the Government, and so is the Prince Edward Island Railway. Hundreds of dollars were spent to carry people on that railway during the last election to vote for the Government, and I believe that money has been recouped by the Government; I will find that out one of these days if I can get to the bottom of the bag. It is time that members from Prince Edward Island should begin to look for their rights. The hon. Postmaster General ought to know that the people of Prince Edward Island are paying interest on $7,000,000 for building the Canadian Pacific Railway through the Province of Ontario, and for branch railways and other public works which we have not got on the Island. We are paying interest on one-fortieth of the debt of Canada, and what share of justice have we got? And here is a man, a Minister of the Crown who dares stand up and say: We will starve you! Prince Edward Island. Thank Heaven, he cannot do that. We have plenty of potatoes, pork and beef; and he may thank his penurious policy for the high tariff Bill which it incited McKinley to introduce; but, thank Heaven, we have plenty of eggs yet.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER AT STE. CROIX.

Mr. RINFRET (Translation) moved for :

Copies of all Orders in Council, letters, correspondence, and documents of every nature respecting the resignation of James Thurber, Esq., Lieut-Colonel of the Sedentary Militia, in the County of Lotbinière ; the appointment of his son, Mr. William Thurber, as lighthouse keeper in the Parish of Ste. Croix ; and the refusal of the Government to grant to the said James Thurber, Esq., the amount claimed by him as his superannuation allowance.

He said : In introducing this motion, I wish, Mr. Speaker, to make a few remarks and give some explanations which might be of use to the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in the preparation of the Estimates. Lt.-Col. Thurber resigned his position of keeper of a lighthouse in the Parish of Ste. Croix, in the month of September, 1878, through the agency of Hon. Mr. Joly, then Premier of the Province of Quebec, who was in Ottawa at the time. In offering this resignation, Hon. Mr. Joly asked for the appointment of Lt.-Col. Thurber's son in his father's stead. On Mr. Joly's request the appointment was made by the Department. It was natural that in resigning, Mr. Thurber, who had been thirty-one years in the service of the Government, should expect to receive the pension to which he was entitled. However, during the twelve years which followed no pension was paid him. In March, 1881, Lt.-Col. Thurber applied to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to obtain redress, and the hon. Minister answered him that he had referred the question to the Council, and that he was almost sure to get his pension allowed. However, Mr. Speaker, two or three months later, instead of the money which he expected as his pension, he received a letter from the Department, in which he was informed that the Government could not grant him this pension because the Hon. Mr. Joly had waived it for him in asking for his son's appointment, and that as he was no more a member of the Civil Service it was too late for him to ask for such a pension. There was evidently a misunderstanding in connection with this question, for Lt.-Col. Thurber, before resigning his office, had addressed to the Department of Marine and Fisheries a letter in which he formally stated that he did not want to forego his pension. In fact here is a copy of that letter :

"I have the honour to inform you that I am forced to resign my position as lighthouse keeper in the Parish of Ste. Croix, in the County of Lotbinière, which I have held ever since 1842. You would do me a great favour, and, I believe, would do me justice, by appointing in my stead my son, John Thurber, who has all the necessary qualifications for the position. I have always paid the percentage required by your Department to entitle me to superannuation, and I feel sure that my two requests, viz., my son's appointment and the granting of my pension will meet with no obstacle."

In the face of this letter, which bears the date of 14th September, 1878, and which was received in the Department before the acceptation of Lt.-Col. Thurber's resignation and the appointment of his son, William Thurber, the Department holds that Lt.-Col. Thurber has no right to a pension because Mr. Joly is said to have agreed to his waiving it, although Mr. Joly does not remember any such transaction. Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the least that can be said, is, that there has been a misunderstanding somewhere. It will be possible to find the error when the documents shall have been put before us, and it is my intention to bring up the question when the House is better informed about the facts. But one thing is perfectly certain, that is, that if some error has been made, Lt.-Col. Thurber should in all justice receive his pension, after having been thirty-two years in the Government's service, and resigned at the age of seventy-one on account of ill-health. In any event, if there were any irregularities in connection with his resignation, I hope that the Government will overlook them, and that it will grant him this pension to which he is certainly entitled. Mr. Speaker, I leave this motion in your hands, and I hope the Government will take it into serious consideration.

Mr. TUPPER. There is no objection, so far as I am aware, to the motion. The subject to which the hon. gentleman alludes is rather ancient, and I do not think it has ever come before me, but when the papers are brought down the hon. gentleman will see how the matter stands.

Motion agreed to.

RETURN ORDERED.

Return showing how many yards of cotton sail duck have been imported at Halifax, Nova Scotia, from the 30th June, 1889, to 30th June, 1890, and from 30th June, 1890, to 30th December, 1890, and the value of such importation respectively.—(Mr. White, Shelburne.)

ADJOURNMENT—STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. EDGAR. I would ask the leader of the Government, when the Standing Committees will be called together for organization. While there is not any work for some, there is for others—the Standing Orders Committee and the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Standing Orders Committee has been called, and the others we will arrange in the morning.

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 5.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 13th May, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. McCARTHY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 33) to amend the North-West Territories Act. He said : The Bill needs but little explanation, at least one portion of it, when one remembers the long discussion which took place with reference to this subject at the last session of the last Parliament. I would only say now, that the object I have in view is to repeal the clause with reference to the dual language in the North-West Territories, and I do so because I am convinced that the direction in the North-West Territories Act that there shall be two official languages in the country is calculated to perpetuate race distinctions which it ought to be, and which I hope it is, the object of this House to do away with. I believe I was able to show that, however

some hon. gentlemen thought the measure was a harsh one, it was at all events in the right direction so far as these North-West Territories are concerned. It is, of course, well to remember that this Bill merely deals with the North-West Territories and that the right to the dual language is one based upon the British North America Act, and is to be found in that enactment alone. It is not a right conferred upon our French Canadian subjects at the time of the cession of the old Province of Quebec to the British Crown, and is not to be found earlier than the date of the British North America Act, and in that it is limited to the proceedings of this House, the proceedings of the Senate, and the proceedings of the Assembly of the Province of Quebec. No one who has given any attention to this subject can be otherwise than convinced that the perpetuation of these race distinctions is not in the public interest, and that nothing is more calculated to prevent the growth of the common nationality of the people of the Dominion than the encouragement of the additional language in the French tongue. I do not desire to interfere with the right which everyone has to speak in any language which seems right to him, but I desire to prevent anything which will foster race distinctions in our North-West without warrant, and, as I believe, without public object or public benefit. This Bill, however, goes further than that of last Session, in that it purports to deal with the school question. According to the genius of our constitution, as defined in the British North America Act, the subject of education is one belonging exclusively to the Provinces, is one of local concern to be dealt with by the Provinces. It is true that, owing to difficulties which existed in the old Province of Canada, there are certain limitations and restrictions in regard to school matters imposed upon the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, but these restrictions end there, and I know no good reason why the people in the North-West Territories should be limited or restricted in the matter of education. As the law now stands, separate schools are made imperative. Wherever there are two religious communities, there is the right to have separate schools. I propose not to interfere with that, but simply to give to the people of the North-West the right to deal with the question of education as to them seems fit. My Bill is, perhaps, not so objectionable in another respect as the one of last year, because I omit the preamble, which to some of my friends, was a stumbling block. I have found that hon. gentlemen who were quite willing to adopt the enacting part of the Bill, hesitated somewhat at the wide terms of the preamble. That preamble, of course, was unnecessary for the purposes of the enacting clause, and as I have no desire to increase the difficulties, already sufficiently great, that I have before me in order to repeal this particular clause, I have left out the preamble in this short Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

NEW CANAL—NORTH SIDE ST. LAWRENCE RIVER.

Mr. McLENNAN asked, Whether an Order in Council has been made authorizing the construction of a canal on the north side of the River St. Lawrence, in the County of Soulanges, Province of Quebec; and if so, at what date has said Order been passed? Has a survey been made? How much has been already paid for survey and other expenses connected therewith; the probable estimated cost of said canal; and whether it is the intention of the Government to proceed at an early date with its construction?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. An Order in Council was passed on the 7th February, 1891. A survey has been made, and there has been paid for the survey and other expenses connected with it, $28,151. The probable cost of the canal is $4,800,000. It is the intention of the Government to proceed at an early date with its construction.

SUMS PAID HIGH COMMISSIONER.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Did Sir Charles Tupper, the High Commissioner, receive from the people of Canada, in the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1890, the following sums:—

High Commissioner's salary	$10,000 00
Allowance to Sir Charles Tupper	2,000 00
Salaries of Clerks, etc., in office	7,477 63
Aid to distressed Canadians	25 33
Burdett's Official Intelligence	6 80
Cables and telegrams	195 55
Cabs and travel	86 83
Carpentering	66 20
Commission on postal orders	17 60
Directory of Directories, 2 copies	4 86
Fire insurance premiums	48 65
Freight and warehousing	73 87
Gas to March, 1890	14 94
Gratuity to Mrs. Wilkinson	68 13
Gratuities to postmen and others	29 57
Ground rent of official residence	332 15
House duty and tax	97 33
Housekeeping, D. Whitney	67 86
Income tax, High Commissioner	250 00
Lettering boxes	4 86
London Post Office Directory	7 90
Messenger's season railway ticket	38 49
Newspapers	196 04
Newspaper cuttings and mounting	24 33
Parliamentary papers	18 29
Parochial rates on official residence	349 47
Postage, London Post Office	483 02
Postage stamps and unpaid postage	342 63
Porterage	5 47
Repairs to house	62 79
Repairing furniture and tinting walls	97 33
Stationery	559 60
Stock Exchange Year Book, 2 copies	7 30
Subscription to Ashburn Gardens	10 95
Subscription to Colonial Institute	9 73
Sundry supplies for office	91 00
Typewriter repairs	5 29
Victoria Chambers, rent and heating 1 year	2,780 52
Winding and regulating clock	10 34
Total	$25,970 04

Did he hold the office of High Commissioner during the time he acted as electioneering agent for the Government at the recent elections? If not, who held the office? Was any salary or travelling allowance granted him during the time he was engaged in the elections, either as High Commissioner or as election agent? If so, how much? Was it by the direction of the Government that he canvassed the County of Essex in conjunction with Mr. Solomon White, an avowed annexationist?

Mr. FOSTER. I beg to say that Sir Charles Tupper, the High Commissioner, did not receive from the people of Canada in the fiscal year ending the 30th June, 1890, the sums mentioned, amounting in all to $25,970.04. Sir Charles

Tupper has held the office of High Commissioner continuously from the time of his last appointment, shortly after his resignation of the Finance Ministership of this Government. There are two other questions which, while asking partly for information, contain allegations of facts, so I shall not answer them.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The Minister indicates that I have stated facts in the question?

Mr. FOSTER. I did not state that they were facts, but that they were allegations of facts—quite different.

LATE GENERAL ELECTION—RECOUNTS.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Whether a recount took place in any constituency since the general election, after the member had been gazetted? If so, where, and was it regular; if not, is it necessary for the member to be re-gazetted?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes, in the constituencies of North Bruce and East Grey. Both members were gazetted on the 14th March, although a recount of votes took place on the 17th in the former, and on the 19th in the latter constituency. The return to the writ of the election of North Bruce was received by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery on the 11th March, and that of East Grey on the 13th, and as the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery must, upon the receipt of the return of the member elected, give notice at the next issue of the *Canada Gazette*, he accordingly gave the necessary notice. The balance of the question is a matter which has to be decided by another tribunal, that is to say, it is a matter of law, as to whether it is legal or not. I may, perhaps, tell the hon. gentleman that as the recount has not changed the return, and as the return in the *Gazette* is only the announcement of the return of the member, and not the number of votes, it may not be necessary to be re-gazetted.

ACCIDENT AT ST. JOSEPH DE LÉVIS.

Mr. CARROLL moved for:

Copies of all letters, documents, &c., between the officials of the Intercolonial Railway at Moncton and the Department of Railways in relation to the accident at St. Joseph de Lévis, on the 18th December, 1890.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is no objection to this motion, but the hon. gentleman cannot expect a confidential report.

Motion agreed to.

CAPE BRETON AND N. S. RY. ACCOMMODATION.

Mr. FRASER moved for:

Copies of all correspondence since 1st July, A.D. 1890, from the New Glasgow Board of Trade and other boards or persons, respecting the through train from Sydney, C.B., to Oxford, Cumberland County, *via* the Short Line Railway. Also, copies of all correspondence during said time from any person or persons, asking for better railway accommodation between Pictou and New Glasgow, to and from Halifax.

He said: I may state briefly that my object in making this motion is to obtain better railway facilities between New Glasgow, Pictou and Halifax. Now that the Short Line has been completed and a railway has been constructed in Cape Breton, it is of the greatest importance that the train for Sydney should take the Short Line at Oxford, and thus give an independent train from New Glasgow to Halifax. Hitherto our accommodation has been very bad. For example, on going one hundred miles, from New Glasgow to Halifax, we have to remain nearly four hours at Truro, a sufficient time to take us to Halifax. This interferes very materially with business men, and as the condition of railway travel in Nova Scotia has always been such as to pay the Government to run the railway, differing in this respect from the matter to which the hon. Postmaster General referred yesterday, we can ask for this change to be made and hope to obtain it. The Eastern Extension has always paid, and if the road were operated so that the through trains took the Short Line, we could have an independent route for the great County of Pictou and the eastern counties. This question affects one-third of the population of Nova Scotia, and I will, no doubt, have the support of the representatives from the Province, and particularly from the eastern part of Nova Scotia, for my motion. I am not taking this action to embarrass the Government, but to call their attention to the present state of affairs, and I trust the Railway Department will deal effectively with this matter outside of influences which at present seem to control the railway traffic.

Mr. STAIRS. Before the motion is put to the House, I would like to say that I fully indorse the remarks made by the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Fraser). Halifax is as much interested in the question he referred to as the eastern counties of the Province, and I trust the result of this motion will be that the attention of the Government and the Minister of Railways will be called to it, and that the time table of the railway will be so arranged, at all events for the summer, that the present inconvenience will not be continued. As the hon. member for Guysboro' has stated, a delay of four hours is now suffered by every passenger, from all points, on the Pictou line going east to Truro, on the journey going and coming from Halifax. This has a very serious effect on the interests of the railway, and it is on that account, as well as in the interests of the people, that I call the attention of the Government to the situation. The statement of my hon. friend from Guysboro', that one-third of the people of the Province are interested in this subject, is also correct. It is in the interest of the railway itself that travel between the centres of population and the provincial capital should be stimulated to the utmost extent, and I therefore trust this inconvenience will be remedied by the Government, and the time table so arranged that it will be possible for passengers to go from Pictou to Halifax and from Halifax to Pictou and return on the same day. I trust this will be arranged, not only for the summer, but for both the winter and summer.

Motion agreed to.

OWNERSHIP OF THE FORESHORES.

Mr. FLINT moved for:

Copies of all correspondence between the Governments of the various Provinces and the Dominion, with reference to the title and ownership of the Foreshores of the Dominion and of the beds of Harbours and Rivers: together with all Reports of the Department of Justice and Orders in Council on the above subject.

He said: Probably no subject referred to by His Excellency the Governor General in the Speech

from the Throne at the opening of Parliament was received with more general satisfaction by members from the Maritime Provinces than the announcement that measures relating to the foreshores of the Dominion would be submitted for consideration. If the proposal be similar to that of the last session upon the same subject, which for some reason was not proceeded with, I feel safe in assuming that correspondence of a valuable and learned character between the Governments has taken place in the interim. A study of that correspondence will be of great importance to the members of this House, in anticipation of the introduction of the Bill by the hon. Minister of Justice, notice of which has been already given. In 1888 correspondence of a very interesting nature, an exhaustive and learned review of some phases of this question, took place between the Attorneys-General of Ontario and Quebec and the Minister of Justice. The comments of the hon. Minister I have not seen, and for an intelligent understanding of the scope and relation of the proposed legislation it is almost absolutely essential that the publication of his doubtless very full and complete review of the matter should be had. It may not be advisable to republish the returns which were brought down at the last session of this House, but still even a repetition of that at this juncture, together with more recent correspondence, would permit of a more complete history of the negotiations and opinions of the Provincial and Dominion Governments in convenient form. The subject is a large one, very interesting to a numerous body of persons in several of the provinces who may be affected by any legislation on the subject. I therefore trust that before the Government Bill comes up for debate, this correspondence and the discussions referred to may be in the possession of the Houses.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I must ask the hon. gentleman to be good enough to amend his motion by adding after the word "correspondence" the words "not already brought down," because a large part of the correspondence has been already brought down.

Mr. FLINT. Very well.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I understand the hon. gentleman assents to that. As the hon. gentleman has referred to the Bill of last session, I may explain that that Bill contained the conditions which this Government thought should be embodied in any transfer of these properties to the Provincial Government. It was ascertained before the Bill reached its second reading that the conditions were not acceptable to the Provincial Government which had raised the controversy and was principally interested in it. It was, therefore, deemed futile to proceed with the Bill, as that Government was unprepared to accept its conditions, and, consequently, the transfer could not be made. It was considered advisable to reconsider the conditions, and consultation with the Provincial Government to which I refer has taken place upon that subject, which I hope will lead to an early understanding being arrived at which will enable the Bill to be proceeded with.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

FISHERY BOUNTY CHEQUES.

Mr. FLINT moved for:

Return of the costs and expenses of adjusting the amounts claimed for fishery bounties and of preparing and distributing the fishery bounty cheques in each year since 1883, and also the names of the persons authorized to distribute the bounty cheques in the Province of Nova Scotia during the years 1889, 1890 and 1891.

He said: In referring to this subject I desire to congratulate the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and the Department over which he presides, for the extraordinary energy and diligence with which the fishery bounty cheques were distributed early in this present year of grace 1891. It is possible that the pending election had as much to do with stimulating the activity of the Minister of Marine and his subordinates as the profound sympathy they have always professed for the hardy fishermen. We have a phrase in Nova Scotia which signifies the difficulty of getting along in the early spring months. It is called "Getting up March Hill." The Government may have felt that they had a "March hill" to climb, and consequently called to their assistance the breezy and assiduous labours of the local fishery officers, backed by the powerful aid of the bounty cheques. Hitherto, if I am not very much mistaken, fishery bounty cheques have been distributed much later in the year, and I was pleased to learn recently from the Government that it was their intention in the future that these cheques would be distributed about the 1st March in each year henceforward. With this scheme I am in entire sympathy. I think that about the month of March is the most appropriate portion of the year in which to confer on the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces this boon which has been so much spoken of by members on the Conservative benches. At the same time, and in connection with this matter, there are suspicious circumstances connected with the change of face on the part of the Administration, which probably may be explained as having resulted from correspondence with their deputies and officials in various portions of the country, as well as from political stress of weather. It is indeed strange that until the year 1891 it had never occurred to the Administration to distribute the bounty cheques among the hard-working and laborious fishermen of the Maritime Provinces during the winter season, when these men needed that help most and the bulk of them were at their homes. This idea of distribution of the bounty cheques early in the year occurred to the Administration in the spring of 1891, and the activity—almost feverish activity—of the Fisheries Department to provide for the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces must have been very gratifying to them, as well as to the friends of good government and the admirers of an energetic administration of affairs. There are, however, questions in connection with this subject of the distribution of the fisheries bounties which, I think, ought to be settled upon some other principle than that of the exigencies of the Administration on the eve of an election, or, for that matter, at any future time. In my opinion this matter should in some way be arranged by statute or otherwise fixed by law, and the distribution of the bounty funds should be so controlled that the Government or its subordinates could not make a political machine of it. Of course I will not accuse the hon. Minister of

Fisheries of harbouring any such design, but I must state in truth that the bounty cheques were this year made a part of the political machinery of the country, by his agents and supporters, at any rate in Nova Scotia. We distribute from $150,000 to $170,000 among thirty or forty thousand men in the various portions of the Maritime Provinces each year, and it is certainly very advisable that this distribution should be made entirely without possibility of partizan effect. It should be remembered that this money belongs to the people of the whole country and not to any political party. It is admitted by gentlemen on both sides of the House that this distribution of fisheries bounties is right in principle; there has never been any opposition to the grant from this side of the House, except the general complaint that the whole fund at the disposal of the Government has not been distributed in its entirety as it should have been, to the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces. We look upon this fund as a sacred trust, and why the whole amount available, by the calculation of the interest that must have accrued upon the sum placed at the disposal of the Administration in 1879, has not been distributed, has never yet been satisfactorily explained. I wish to call the attention of the House to another circumstance which took place in the constituency I have the honour to represent. To what extent the Government itself was cognizant of this matter I am not aware, but in the minds of independent and thoughtful people it reached to the dimensions of almost a public scandal. At the time Parliament was dissolved there was not a whisper from any corner that the fishery bounty cheques were about to be issued; but as the time for the election approached we found that the fishery bounty cheques had arrived from Ottawa and were being industriously distributed throughout the constituency by the active friends of the Government candidate. I presume the same was done in every other constituency in the Maritime Provinces by the officers of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. These gentlemen may have distributed the money in a manner above suspicion, they may not have made any observations or remarks to the recipients of the bounty, but at the same time we know that it is almost too much to expect from human nature, that the friends and agents of the Administration with the $150,000 in their hands would not make as much use of such a position and influence as is customary in cases where funds of this kind are placed in the hands of that class of men. Another peculiar circumstance presented itself in the constituency which I represent, and to this matter I also desire to call the attention of the House. Upon the face of it there may not be anything improper, but the circumstances themselves go to show that there was not that care and prudence exercised which is necessary for sustaining the high moral and independent position which the civil servants should occupy before the electors of this country at the time of an election. We found a leading supporter of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, after a conference with his superior officer, resigning his position a few days previous to the election; we found that he was nominated as a candidate by a convention of his own party, and that his office remained unfilled until several weeks after the election. But his subordinates were busy enough. We found that from $9,000 to $10,000 of fishery bounty cheques arrived in that constituency to be distributed—principally by the fishery inspector, who was then a candidate running for a seat in the House of Commons—in the interest of the Conservative party, and in his own interest throughout the constituency. I presume that the same thing must have taken place under somewhat similar circumstances throughout the Province of Nova Scotia and in the Maritime Provinces generally. I believe that the Conservatives of the rest of the Maritime Provinces are devoted to their party, and as much disposed to make use of this patronage to further political ends, as they are in the County of Yarmouth; but, at the same time, I express my conviction that it is not consistent with the position the Civil Service should occupy toward the people, that the money of the Dominion should be disposed of by political agents at election times for political purposes. I have also seen in the public press (although I am not prepared now to quote my authority), that so anxious was the Department of Marine and Fisheries that the interest of this trust fund should be distributed with great activity, and as promptly as possible previous to the election, that an extra sum of public money was appropriated for the purpose of employing extra clerks and extra labour in the Department, in order that these cheques should reach the people at that very particular season of the year. If this is the case, I trust that this course will be continued in off years when there is no election, and that we shall find these bounty cheques in the hands of the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces each year before the middle of March.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I was a little afraid, during the first part of the hon. gentleman's speech, that he was attacking the early distribution of the bounty, and I am glad that towards the end of his remarks, after having denounced the course I adopted this year, he expressed the hope that I would repeat that course during the years to come. That disposes, I think, of a considerable part of the charge that has been preferred against me. However, I will very frankly tell the House the circumstances under which I was enabled to do what the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) must be glad I have succeeded in doing, namely, distribute the bounty due to the fishermen who had earned it at the earliest possible period of the year since 1883, when the distribution was first undertaken. I may say that instead of its being a new departure, it happens to be a coincidence that in the year 1891 the distribution of the bounty was at a time very close to the day fixed for a general election.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TUPPER. But those hon. gentlemen who say "hear, hear," are evidently not familiar with the fact, better known to the hon. mover of the resolution, that that season is about the time the fishermen are fitting out for sea and preparing for their annual fishing venture, and that is the time when they most require, and in fact have demanded that this bounty shall be paid. Before I assumed the responsibility of the position I now hold, I was asked, I was even besought, by fishermen and representatives of fishing districts, to see whether this bounty could not be made more beneficial to

those for whom it was intended than it could possibly be when paid to them at a season of the year when it came to them as a mere addition to their earnings from their fishing ventures; and long before any general election was anticipated, immediately on my accession to office, I undertook the work I was asked to do, and the first distribution following was, up to that date, the earliest that had up to that time been reached. For that I received the thanks of the fishermen; I received them through the press supporting hon. gentlemen opposite, which, about two years ago—at any rate, over a year ago—asked me to make an effort to distribute the bounty still earlier in the season: and if my memory serves me aright, the distribution previous to the year to which I refer was made in the month of May and almost completed before June. But the great point pressed upon me constantly and unremittingly was that the distribution should take place before the fishermen went to their season's work. Now, I may tell the House and all interested in this subject that there were great difficulties in the way. By the regulations contained in the Order in Council, the fishermen are allowed till the 31st of December, after their season's work is ended, to prepare in due form their applications and their vouchers in support of those applications. The work of distribution is enormous, there being from 30,000 to 40,000 applicants, and the claims being small, the average payment being only $4 out of an aggregate amount of from $150,000 to $160,000 a year; so that the House will perceive the clerical work is very great indeed. Separate cheques are made out for all these amounts, and lists and vouchers prepared for the banks through which the money is paid and for the Auditor General's office; in addition, every claim has to be minutely examined, and every solemn declaration supporting it critically perused; and it seemed almost impossible that arrangements could be made for distributing the bounty before March, which was the month in which I was endeavouring to arrange to have the distribution made. I have already stated across the floor of the House, in answer to the hon. gentleman who has made this motion, that it was not an arrangement for the year 1889 to which reference had been made, but that my efforts and the efforts of my officers have been rewarded, and we are able now to say that it is the intention of the Government to distribute this bounty annually at the time when the fishermen need it so very much, that is, before the month of March. I may explain to the hon. gentleman how we are able to do that. He knows that we began the distribution in 1883—I forget, at the moment, the exact date; and the experience we have obtained since then has enabled us to arrange the distribution at this early period. Heretofore the accounts were examined and the claims investigated by clerks employed specially for that purpose and only so long as the examination lasted, and in addition the regular clerks of the Department were employed and paid extra for their extra time by the direct sanction of this House every year, a vote having been taken not only to cover the payments to the extra clerks, but to authorize, contrary to the provisions of the Civil Service Act, the payment of the regular employés of the Department extra amounts for their extra services. I was not satisfied with the working of this system under which we were employing for the bounty work officers whose work during office hours was sufficiently onerous, especially during the session. I, therefore, increased the number of the temporary clerks for this work and stopped the regular officers of the Department doing it, because I found that, being employed after their office hours, some of them did not work as hard or as enthusiastically as they might have done, and it was impossible to so check the work and to drive it on as to accomplish our object. However, I found, after the experience I had gained and after the experience of officers of the Department, that it was possible—and I ask the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution to mark this—without exceeding the appropriation authorized by Parliament, even to the extent of one dollar, to accomplish this year the annual distribution of the bounty by using a limited number of temporary clerks and by arranging to give the regular clerks, not so much per hour, but a payment, as it were, based on a reward; that is, if they could accomplish within a certain time the work given them, they should be paid a certain figure, not exceeding what they would have earned at the rate previously fixed, of 30 cents per hour. With that incentive they accomplished what we much desired, and that is to be the principle which I intend to carry out in the work of distributing the bounty. I am not going to deceive the House by expressing any sorrow or disappointment that during this year there happened to be a general election, and that a large part of the bounty happened to be distributed before election day. I have reason to feel gratified, just as any hon. member may feel gratified when his efforts on behalf of his constituents or the people generally have been such as to merit their approval. Undoubtedly the hon. gentleman knows that this was a popular measure among the fishermen. It was an act which could not be denounced: it was an action taken at their express desire: and I may say that the same gentleman who thanked me through the Reform press of Nova Scotia for the work with which the hon. gentleman seems to reproach me, has again this year expressed his gratification at the result of my efforts, and that gentleman belongs to the same political party as the hon. member for Yarmouth. There remains for me but one other point to notice, and that is the resignation of the fishery inspector. It is perfectly true that the inspector, after I had left the capital to visit my constituents and render them an account of my conduct in Parliament and in office, did resign. I was not spoken to upon the subject; I was not asked by him for permission to do so; and I would ask the hon. gentleman what he would have done under the circumstances? I did not even receive the resignation; it was sent to the Department at Ottawa; he had the right to resign, and he did so and ran his election: and I could not by any interference have prevented that event. No harm has resulted. The hon. gentleman is not able to cite a single instance of any matter requiring attention at the hands of the Department in his county having been overlooked or neglected during that short interregnum. But after that gentleman had run his election, I do not know that, no harm having been done in the meanwhile, it was a very flagrant act to re-appoint him when he solicited office. Those are the facts. Very little can be made

out of them, and in the community from which the hon. gentleman comes, I take it there was no great excitement over the matter. At any rate it was not the first case in which such a course of conduct has been pursued, and instances, I have no doubt, may be given to the hon. gentleman which will constitute very good precedents for that action. Now the hon. gentleman attacked in a very general way, without giving any special illustrations of the grounds for that attack, the system by which it is necessary for the Government to distribute this bounty; and I take it, the ground for that attack lies in the fact that when the work is well done credit is given. Well, this Government and every other Government, whether Liberal or Conservative, stand in that position in reference to the administration of the affairs of the country, that the manner of their administration makes them either popular or unpopular; and it would have been a great deal more to the point if my hon. friend had taken the House into his confidence, and shown that since 1883 we had distributed $150,000 to $160,000 every year, under the direction of the Marine and Fisheries Department, and no instances could be given of abuses having occurred.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Instances have been given every year.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island comes to the rescue, but is not more specific, and can only make a general charge. He says that every year instances have been given. I can tell the hon. gentleman that an hon. gentleman more careful than he in making charges of that kind, and who is not now in the House, did bring up cases, and having got my explanation and ascertained the facts, was so well satisfied that during the two sessions following he never opened his mouth upon the subject either in this House or elsewhere, as far as I am aware. I say again, it would be well if the hon. gentleman would bring forward charges showing that during that considerable period since 1883, abuses had occurred in the administration of the fund, that it had been diverted from its proper purposes and paid regardless of the rules and regulations prescribed under Order in Council. If he can find an instance where an officer of the Department has disobeyed the instructions given and based upon Order in Council, it will not be well for that officer. I take the responsibility of challenging the hon. gentleman to show wherein I have departed from the regulations of the Order in Council in the administration of the fund. I shall be happy to bring down the information connected with the subject, and I hope I will not be deemed insincere in saying that the fullest explanation will be a source of gratification to myself and those interested in the distribution of this fund since 1883.

Mr. PERRY. I am glad the hon. member behind me has brought up this matter. There are complaints not only from Nova Scotia but also from Prince Edward Island, and especially from Prince County, more particularly from Tignish, where I live. I am well aware that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is a very active man. I will give him credit for that; and whether he anticipated what was going to take place or not, he made preparations, he says, to have the fishery bounty paid in March. I can tell the hon. gentleman that nearly every Conservative fisherman in Tignish had his fishery bounty paid him in February. But there happen to be two regulations in the hon. gentleman's Department. There happen to be one regulation for Conservatives and another regulation for Grits. I can tell that hon. gentleman that to this day there are several Grit fishermen in my neighbourhood who are well entitled to their fishery bounty for 1890, but who have not yet got it. I am not the hon. member to whom my hon. friend says he gave some explanations a few years ago, and I am quite satisfied if that hon. gentleman were here he would have a different statement to make. The hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows that in 1887, 1889 and 1890, I had occasion to urge the Department several times to remedy certain grievances which his subordinates were inflicting on the fishermen around Tignish. Some of them got their money and many of them did not, and I would like to know if these unfortunate Grits around Tignish are going to get the money this year or not. I must see the list of names. There is no fisherman there I do not know. I know everyone within twenty-five or thirty miles of my residence who is entitled to a bounty, and I know those who are not entitled to it, and I know some to whom my friend the Minister of Marine has ordered the fishery bounty to be paid, who are not entitled to it.

Mr. TUPPER. Name them.

Mr. PERRY. They know nothing about fishing. They could no more catch a mackerel than my hon. friend the Minister. What do the hon. Minister's subordinates care about it? They are paid so much a year, and that is all they care. He tells us he has so many men on the staff. I tell my hon. friend that his mismanagement of this affair has cost nearly as much money as the whole of the fishery bounty. In the first place, his subordinates below charge so much for signing a certificate. In the next place, he has so many officials here who have to be paid and a number down below, and, when you pay the expenses, you will find they will very near come up to the amount of the fishing bounty, and I am afraid, if my hon. friend follows the principle laid down by the Postmaster General, we are going to have a nice time, and the poor fishermen are going to get very little. If they are going to get $3 a year and their expenses come to $3.15, they will have to pay 15 cents, and that will not be much benefit to them. However, I think my hon. friend the Minister of Marine is different from the Postmaster General, and I want to speak to him in earnest. I say that he ought to consult the members who represent those localities. It is no reason because they happen to be Liberals, that their information should be disrespected. If there is a case of dispute, who knows better, who feels more interested than the representative of the people? I say I have a right to be consulted, and I know as much about the fisheries as the Minister of Marine and his deputy. But I am not consulted. I have endeavoured to show plainly, honestly and fairly, that certain parties were entitled to certain bounties, and I was refused. The inspector or commissioner of fisheries down there says this person is not entitled to the bounty, and his word

is taken in preference to mine. I tell the hon. gentleman that many of the fishery wardens never go to the shore during the whole summer unless they want to get a lobster or a fresh mackerel. They get their pay and that is all they care about it. He says that if any officer broke the rules, he would know what would happen. We often find the rules broken by these men, but the Department has not enough backbone to dismiss them. They are allowed to do as they like, and the word of the man who is sent here by the people is not looked upon as equal to that of an official of the Department. In fact, it is almost a farce to send members here from certain counties who do not happen to think politically with the Government. Their word is not believed. They can get nothing. They cannot get a post office. They cannot get redress for a poor fisherman who has been robbed —I do not say by the Minister of Marine, but by subordinates in consequence of some hard feelings between man and man. The member is not able to get redress for these people or to get a post office. He is able to get nothing. I think that is a poor thing to do, especially to members from Prince Edward Island.

Motion agreed to.

ELECTORAL RETURN FOR BELLECHASSE.

Mr. AMYOT moved for:

Copies of all letters and correspondence between the Government or any member thereof, or any Public Department, and Mr. Solyme Forgues, of St. Michel de Bellechasse, Returning Officer, in relation to the last Dominion election in the electoral district of Bellechasse.

He said: On the 5th May I enquired:

"Why the receipt of the return for the writ of election for the County of Bellechasse was not gazetted until the 11th April?"

I was answered by the Secretary of State as follows:—

"The reason why the return of the writ of election for the County of Bellechasse was not gazetted until the 11th April was because the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery did not receive it until the 6th of that month."

This first statement of course I took as being perfectly true. The second part of my question was this:

"If the delay be due to the fact that the Returning Officer, Solyme Forgues, Esq., did not sooner transmit his return to the writ of election to him addressed, what reason does he give?"

The answer is this:

"The reason offered by the Returning Officer for not declaring sooner than he did who was the elected member for the county was the absence of the required statement on the part of the Deputy Returning Officer for polling division No. 10, giving the number of votes cast for each candidate, the production of which caused some delay."

I would have let that incident pass without noticing it, but as it attacks another officer than the returning officer himself, and as it is entirely false and an insult to this Parliament, I have to notice it. I received about the 10th March last a notice from Mr. Forgues, telling me that on the 12th March he would add up the number of votes given for each candidate at St. Michel at 1 o'clock in the afternoon. It appears that then one of the certificates of a deputy returning officer was not signed. This was the returning officer for poll No. 10, who lives three or four acres from the residence of the returning officer. He was informed on the next day, or the 14th, and he went immediately to the returning officer and signed the certificate, his signature being the only thing missing in the document. On the 16th March I received the following letter from the returning officer, which I will translate:—

"St. Michel, 16th March, 1891.

"G. Amyot, Esq., M.P.,
"Quebec.

"Dear Sir,—Enclosed please find statement of the votation of Bellechasse, and the certificate establishing your election for your division." * * *

And then he asked me to publish the statement which was enclosed, and I hold here a duplicate of the certificate annexed to the writ of election. This was on the 16th March. Everything was then complete, and, when the returning officer comes here and says the reason for the delay of three weeks was the neglect of a deputy returning officer, he deliberately says what is false and commits a gross contempt of this Parliament. I never knew of an officer of this Parliament insulting Parliament in this way. I am not the custodian of the honour of this House, but I inform the House of the facts. I say, that the report put into the mouth of the Secretary of State concerning the deputy returning officer of poll No. 10, contains statements contrary to the facts, and I wish to protest against it. It shows how much respect some of the returning officers have for this Parliament and for their duty, that which they have sworn to perform faithfully. This is another instance which illustrates the urgent necessity there is that this House should change the law and not to leave the conduct of the elections in the hands of such unscrupulous fellows.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not know whether there is any correspondence with regard to the returns of the election for Bellechasse, other than what I quoted the other day, which was in the letter forwarded by the returning officer of Bellechasse to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. I am not going to reply to the observations and accusations made by the hon. member for Bellechasse against the returning officer other than to say that I think they are somewhat too violent at this stage of the proceedings, because the papers, if there are any, are not yet before the House. He makes grave accusations against a man who had been a long time his friend and whom he knows to be an honest man. I have not seen this correspondence, and it may contain some things which I do not know. Perhaps the hon. gentleman had no occasion to know that after the election was over difficulties occurred which may have prevented the return of the election by the returning officer. I cannot speak without having before me the papers which may be in the Department, but I hope these papers will show, I hope the enquiry will show, that my hon. friend was not justified in using the language he did against that public officer.

Mr. AMYOT. I cannot be mistaken when I hold the duplicate of the certificate annexed to the writ of the election, which has not been changed since; I cannot be mistaken when I hold the detailed statement of the votes cast at each poll; I cannot be mistaken when I hold the letter of the returning officer. I am not going to quote private letters which would confirm the position I take. I do not throw any blame upon the members of the Government. I know it is not their fault, although it is very extraordinary that a returning officer

who has served in the local as well as the federal elections, since 1878, should commit such gross breach of duty. I have spoken in order to protect the reputation of the deputy returning officer who is attacked, and in order to show this House that one of its officers is guilty of contempt towards this House, and to show the necessity of changing the law so as to take away from the returning officers the tremendous power they have now.

Motion agreed to.

RETURN ORDERED.

Return giving the names of all persons in the County of Guysboro' fined for violation of the fishery laws, since the 1st day of January, A.D. 1890: the amount of each fine and costs; the sum collected of each; the names of the parties whose fines have been remitted, with the reason for such remission; the names of parties in said county against whom fines are still outstanding, with the amount of each and costs.—(Mr. Fraser.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 17) respecting the River St. Clair Railway Bridge and Tunnel Company.—(Mr. Montague.)

Bill (No. 18) respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.—(Mr. Montague.)

Bill (No. 25) to amend the Act to incorporate the Medicine Hat Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Daly.)

Bill (No. 26) to incorporate the Pembroke Lumber Company.—Mr. Ferguson (Renfrew).

Bill (No. 29) to incorporate the Montreal and Atlantic Railway Company, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Ives.)

CANADA AND MICHIGAN TUNNEL CO.

Mr. MONTAGUE moved that Bill (No. 19) respecting the Canada and Michigan Tunnel Company, be read the second time. He said: This Bill which has been placed in my hands, is simply to extend the time for the construction of this work.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

ST. LAWRENCE AND OTTAWA RY. CO.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK moved that Bill (No. 20) respecting the St. Lawrence and Ottawa Railway Company, be read the second time. He said: This Bill relates to some land in the city of Ottawa which the company wish to sell in order to relieve it from the mortgages upon it.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

C. P. R. CO.'S TELEGRAPH LINES.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK moved second reading of Bill (No. 21) to confer certain powers on the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in connection with its telegraph business, and for other purposes. He said: This Bill is for the purpose of conferring on the Canadian Pacific Railway Company certain powers with respect to its telegraph lines which are possessed by other telegraph companies, but which are not included in the Act of incorporation of the railway company. The object is to make the service more effective, and the clauses are adapted from those contained in the charters of other telegraph companies.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

LONDON AND CANADIAN LOAN AND AGENCY COMPANY.

Mr. COCKBURN moved second reading of Bill (No. 27) to authorize the London and Canadian Loan and Agency Company (Limited) to issue debenture stock. He said: The object of the Bill is simply to give to this company powers similar to those already possessed by the Canada Permanent Loan Company, the privilege of issuing permanent debenture stock instead of mere debentures. This power has been granted to other companies already.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think Parliament has granted those powers to other companies generally.

Mr. COCKBURN. I did not say generally—I mentioned the Canada Permanent Company.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it is a very dangerous and objectionable power to give, the power to create a permanent mortgage on its assets.

Mr. COCKBURN. I suppose the House considered the question when it was brought up in connection with the Canada Permanent and other companies, and I suppose the same principles that guided the House then will guide it now, unless some extraordinary light has been vouchsafed to hon. members since that time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That may be: but it is exceedingly desirable that one line of action should be followed in regard to all these companies. We framed a good many years ago, with some pains and care, a general Act under which all these companies were to be administered. I am quite prepared to consider any suggestion the hon. gentleman has to make as to enlarge powers which should be conferred on this company, and if he makes out a good case, I will consider it. But I submit to the Government that this is a matter which in the public interest they ought to take up. I think it should be done by an amendment to the general Act rather than by special legislation proposed from time to time, and which results in this: that so soon as a precedent is established in favour of one company, under very special circumstances, all the other companies sooner or later come to Parliament, or a great many of them come to Parliament, to obtain like privileges, and the whole object which the general Act is intended to serve is *pro tanto* destroyed.

Mr. MULOCK. I think there is great force in the argument of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). The loan companies have been invested with very large powers by the Local Legislature. In the Province of Ontario, for example, they are authorized to invest trust funds, and trustees, unless forbidden by the instrument creating the trust, are entitled to invest those funds in the purchase of the debentures of those companies. If I understand rightly the scheme of the Bill now under consideration it is this: that the company in question may issue permanent debenture stock, which will become, to the extent of the interest, a charge on the earnings of the company, and to that extent a mortgage on the earnings and assets of the company, and to that extent will rank with other liabilities, and therefore with the moneys

owing to trustees and creditors generally. It seems to me risky financeering for any company as well as for any individual, to be bound for all time to come, to pay a certain sum of money annually on what it may borrow. Interest may fall, interest may rise: and I think no prudent individual would bind himself or his estate for an indefinite period, to pay a certain rate of interest, and, therefore, if the present Bill is of the character which I should judge it is by the remarks of the mover, I think it would be wiser for the Government to deal with the whole question. If a mistake has been made, let us not repeat it. The loan companies to-day represent an enormous amount of capital, of borrowed capital especially, which it is specially the duty of Parliament to guard. Those who choose to invest their money as shareholders take their chance in one way, but the public who invest their money in debentures, who invest trust funds in debentures, are entitled to special consideration at the hands of Parliament. The amount of capital of that character invested in these companies, borrowed capital of one kind and another, is sufficient to warrant the interference of the Government, and the adoption by the Government of a policy before any further powers are granted to such companies.

Mr. COCKBURN. The Bill, no doubt, will be referred to the Banking and Commerce Committee, which will deal with it. I am sure that the hon. gentleman who has just sat down will, with his large experience in financial matters, when he comes to investigate the matter more fully, decide that the same powers that have been granted to the Canada Permanent Loan Company may safely be intrusted to the London and Canadian Loan and Agency Company, and that he will give the same vote.

Mr. MULOCK. I never voted to give that power to the Canada Permanent Company.

Mr. COCKBURN. I was not aware that any opposition was raised to the proposal by any hon. gentleman. With respect to his fear that the granting of this power might affect the position of other debenture holders, I have no doubt his fears will be relieved on that score when the Bill is fully debated before the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the second time.

EMPIRE PRINTING AND PUBLISHING CO.

Mr. COCKBURN moved second reading of Bill (No. 28) to amend the Act to incorporate the *Empire* Printing and Publishing Company (Limited).

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Explain.

Mr. COCKBURN. The explanation is very simple; it is merely to increase the number of directors. The business of the *Empire* newspaper has been enlarged so greatly that it has been found necessary to have a larger board of directors to manage the affairs of so growing an institution.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

ADJOURNMENT—ENQUIRY FOR PAPERS, &c.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to know when will the hon. gentleman be able to cause the various Standing Committees to be called together?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The intention is to have the Clerk call the committees together to-morrow, for Friday.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where are those papers which we are promised—I mean, more particularly, the papers relating to the negotiations at Washington?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The papers connected with that subject include a number of documents the production of which requires the assent of Her Majesty's Government and of the authorities at Washington. Until that assent is obtained we must necessarily look upon them as confidential. If there is any considerable delay in obtaining that consent, the papers which are available will be brought down.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As these documents are referred to in the Speech from the Throne, it strikes me that this consent should have been applied for a little earlier.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It was applied for as early as possible, but the correspondence continued up to a very short time ago.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the Minister of Finance tell us when he will be likely to introduce his Estimates?

Mr. FOSTER. I hope to introduce the Estimates on Friday of this week, or it may be on Monday of next week.

Mr. MULOCK. Before the Minister of Finance introduces his Estimates, I would like to bring a matter to his notice, in the hope that he will be able to make an appropriation for it in the Estimates. The House will remember that some time ago a serious conflagration took place in the city of St. John, and Parliament deemed it its duty to contribute public money to the relief of the sufferers. A similar worthy motive actuated the House when on the occasion of the two conflagrations in the city of Hull, Parliament voted $10,000. Recently the Province of Ontario has been visited by a similar disaster, which caused great loss to the people of Alliston. I understand that on the 8th day of this month a serious fire took place in that town, destroying all the buildings in five or six blocks, including the Government buildings, and causing widespread suffering and loss to hundreds of people who are homeless and houseless to-day. The *Empire* in describing the fire spoke of the town as almost entirely wiped out—the whole of the business portion destroyed, as well as the market hall, the town hall, the stores and other places of business. Appeals have been made throughout the Dominion for assistance, and I think it a fitting occasion for the people of the whole Dominion to contribute towards the relief of the sufferers. I trust that the Minister of Finance will make provision for this worthy object in the Estimates.

Mr. TYRWHITT. I am pleased that the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) has seen fit to call the attention of the House to this disastrous fire which has taken place in the county which I have the honour to represent. During the past few days I have drawn the attention of the Government to the matter, and as early as Monday last I appealed directly to the hon. Minister of

Public Works for assistance. I have in my desk at the present time a memorial to the House asking for aid, which I intend to present to-morrow. I am pleased to find that my hon. friend takes such an interest in the county I represent, and I am pleased that he and his friends on the opposite side of the House will approve of any grant that may be made by the Government to assist the people of Alliston. I am also pleased to find that I have such a strong ally in the cause which I have so much at heart, and which I took the earliest opportunity of drawing the attention of the Government to.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 5.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 14th May, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

RAYERS.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT.

Mr. FLINT moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 34) to amend the Canada Temperance Amendment Act, 1888. He said: In response to the request for an explanation of this Bill, I may say that it is proposed for the purpose of amending, in the direction of greater restriction, clause 11 of the Act referred to. In all particulars except as to spirituous liquors and alcohol, specified in that section, that measure is unaffected. It will be remembered that at the time of the introduction of this clause in 1888, the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Jamieson), and the then hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) objected quite strongly to some of the features of this clause number 11. The amendment which I propose does not substantially alter the clause except in the above particulars. It removes from the schedule of general exemptions, permitted to physicians and druggists by that clause, spirituous liquors and alcohol, and places them in a schedule by themselves, permitting their sale under certain clear and well defined restrictions. The terms of the restrictions I have introduced are conformed, as far as they can be, to the terms of the restriction imposed under the Canada Temperance Act against the sale of those articles, and which are now the law of the land where the Scott Act is in operation. It will be recollected that the objections then taken were, that by exempting druggists and chemists in the matter of the sale of alcoholic liquors, the Act was virtually emasculated and became ineffective for all practical purposes, and the primary object of the law destroyed. By placing chemists and druggists under the clause which I propose to add, I believe the amendment of 1888 will be brought into harmony with the Canada Temperance Act; and that Act, instead of being practically a nullity in those counties where it is in operation, as regards the sale of alcoholic liquors, will become as effective as in the nature of things this restrictive legislation can make it.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. LAVERGNE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 35) in further amendment of the Canada Temperance Act. He said: This Bill was introduced last year, but too late during the session to become law. Its only object is to amend the section in the Act concerning procedure in prosecutions. I desire to give the power to two justices of the peace, when the magistrate before whom the prosecution is brought is absent, to adjourn the case. We have suffered many inconveniences in certain districts owing to the rigidity of the law in this respect. In many instances, when magistrates have failed to be present, cases entered for trial have had to be dropped. I desire also to amend section 107, which provides that every offence against the second part of the Act may be prosecuted in the manner directed by the "Act respecting Summary Proceedings before Justices of the Peace." The 48th section of the Summary Convictions Act provides that no adjournment by a justice of the peace, before or during the hearing of any information or complaint, shall be for more than one week. The object of my amendment is to give power to the sitting magistrate to adjourn for at least one month, and not more than six weeks. In certain districts these cases are always brought before the district magistrate, who sits monthly, and if a case happens to be not ready to be proceeded with, it has to be dropped unless the magistrate can sit again within a week to try it. To make these two amendments is the object of the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INLAND REVENUE REGULATIONS.

Mr. GAUTHIER asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to continue the operation of the law preventing cultivators from manufacturing into cut tobacco or cigars, tobacco required for their personal use?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is the intention of the Government to continue the operation of the law in this respect.

Mr. GAUTHIER asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce this session a measure for the purpose of relieving merchants and others using weights and measures, from the payment of fees for the inspection thereof?

Mr. COSTIGAN. As the merchants bear only a portion of the cost of the inspection, it is not the intention of the Government to amend the law so as to throw the whole burden on the public.

TRENT VALLEY CANAL.

Mr. BURDETT (for Mr. BARRON) asked, Whether the Trent Valley Canal Commission have reported in favour of the completion of the scheme? If so, does the Government intend to ask Parliament this session for a grant for that purpose?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The commissioners appointed by the Government have reported. I am not in a position to state the contents of the report, which, of course, will speak for itself. The Government have as yet given no decision on this subject.

Mr. BURDETT. I submit that I have received no answer to the question. The Government either do or do not know whether the report is favourable to the scheme.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I gave the answer of the Government.

WEST INDIA STEAMSHIP SERVICE.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) asked, How many trips were made by the steamers subsidized to carry on the steam service between the Maritime Provinces and the West India ports, during the year 1890? What were the dates of such trips? What amounts were paid for each trip? What person or company is carrying out that service for the present year? Has any contract been entered into for such service this year, and what rates are being paid therefor and to whom?

Mr. FOSTER. This question involves rather a lengthy answer, and as I notice that my hon. friend has a motion on the Order paper in reference to the West India service, if, when the time comes for him to move that, which will probably be very soon, he will add this as an amendment, the whole of the papers will be brought down together. I am preparing them now.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I submit that the hon. gentleman should give me an answer to the question. I gave the notice of motion because I thought he could not give me the information it refers to if I put it in the form of a question; but this question does not require more than a categorical answer or figures.

Mr. FOSTER. It requires a good deal of compilation.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I submit that I am entitled to an answer. The Government cannot refuse to answer a plain, simple question as to what has been paid for a simple service, to whom payment has been made, and what is paid now.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. There cannot be any discussion on this question.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I shall be obliged to move the adjournment of the House in order to discuss my right to obtain the information. I submit that the hon. gentleman is treating me most unfairly.

Mr. FOSTER. No, I am not.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I intend to conclude with a motion: that is the customary practice.

Mr. SPEAKER. No, I think not. When the hon. gentleman proposes to move the adjournment of the House, the motion should be made before he discusses the question.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Very well, then; I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not desire to detain the House, and I resort to this method of putting my complaint before the House very reluctantly, because it is calculated to delay proceedings. The hon. gentleman remembers that he and I had some discussion last year on the subject of this steam communication between the Maritime Provinces and the West India ports. In complying with a motion made by the then member for St. John, he brought down towards the close of the session papers which gave us some information as to the amount of subsidy paid to those steamers. I understood from those papers that the contract expired at the end of the year, and I learn from information that is common to everybody that another line of steamers is plying on that same route this year. I want to know whether this service is being carried on at the same rate per trip and under the same conditions as appears by the return brought down last year in answer to Mr. Ellis' motion with regard to the lines subsidized? The hon. gentleman can have no difficulty whatever in telling me how many trips were made by the steamer subsidized during the year 1890 to carry on the same service. He can tell me in five minutes, or the information can be obtained in his Department. Why does he not answer how many trips there are, and the dates. He must know, since he told us last year that these steamers, under the terms of the contract, had to return their manifests to his Department. I have no means of knowing except by putting this question. I do not want to be delayed five or six weeks as I might be, if I made a notice of motion, while the hon. gentleman would be getting ready a voluminous mass of papers which I do not require. I only want to know what is paid for each trip and what persons are carrying on the service. The hon. gentleman must know with what company or persons he has entered into a contract. I venture to say the hon. gentleman could obtain all the information I ask for in an hour's time, from one of the officials of his Department. I submit this House is not being treated, nor am I being treated, with the ordinary courtesy we have a right to expect from a Minister when we ask for official information. I am not seeking a favour, but am asking for public information which I have the right to obtain; and the hon. gentleman has not the right to obstruct me by stating he will not answer, but that, if I move for papers, he will bring them down. Why not answer at once? There can be nothing detrimental to the public service in giving the information at once. He has entered into a contract with some persons for the subsidizing of a line of steamers to the West Indies. This House does not know how much he is paying them. We have a right to know with whom he entered into the contract and what amount he is paying. I want to know further, what the result of the new contract is, but as it will take some time to furnish that information, I have asked for it in the form of a motion for papers. The hon. gentleman is not treating me with ordinary courtesy, but is seeking to evade a part of the duty he is paid to discharge, which is the imparting to this House legitimate information with respect to public contracts and the expenditure of public money in his Department. The hon. gentleman may refuse to answer, but I do not think he is going to facilitate the progress of business very much at this early stage by adopting that course.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has tried hard to work up a grievance against myself and the Government in this matter. I do not think there was any cause for that. I certainly intended no disrespect to my hon. friend, nor had I the least intention of keeping from him or this House any information which it is his right or the right of the House to have. If the hon. gentleman will reflect for a moment, he will remember that I said he would have the information in a couple of days. The information is not so short as he fancies. In

the first place, we have three services from the Maritime Provinces to the West Indies. These three services have all their different dates of sailing, and the hon. gentleman is asking me to answer categorically a question which calls for the date of sailing and return of every one of the vessels on these three routes. I submit that, generally, it has not been the practice to ask for detailed information by question, and to give it in answer to a question. I told the hon. gentleman that I would accept this as an amendment to the motion he has on the Table, and that the information will be brought down in a very short notice. I have no intention of keeping him waiting for a week, but will engage to have all this information on the Table within twenty-four hours of the passing of the motion.

Mr. BURDETT. I think I have been treated with scant courtesy by the Minister of Public Works in refusing to answer my question. It is well known that the Trent Valley matter has been dangling before the public for nearly half a century, being resurrected periodically before each general election and then quietly assigned again to the tomb after the elections are over. A commission was appointed and made a report, and the simple question asked by me in the absence of the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron) is whether that report is favourable or not to the work. I can easily understand why the hon. gentleman does not give a plain yes or no. No doubt it is because a certain telegram passed from the Premier just prior to the elections, relating to the construction of this work. If the hon. Minister does not know whether the report is favourable or unfavourable, he ought to say so. If there is anything to conceal, and he refuses to answer, let him state that he refuses. I am entitled to a plain answer to a plain question. Is the report favourable or unfavourable? If unfavourable, the Government must abandon this work; if favourable, they ought in all fairness to complete it. I submit there is no excuse for refusing to answer this question. I may be told to read the report, but I may put one interpretation on it and the Government another. It is their interpretation which will prevail, and it is it that I am entitled to have.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I wish to remove the impression the hon. gentleman is under as regards my answer. The hon. gentleman must know that the answer I have given was that which should have come from the Minister of Railways and Canals. It was the one given to me to convey to the House. I have not seen the report, and therefore am not in a position to give the hon. gentleman the information he asks. But the report will speak for itself; and I thought the hon. gentleman would have asked for the report.

Mr. BURDETT. Then let the question stand until the Minister of Railways is present.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have given the hon. gentleman his answer, and if the hon. gentleman thinks well, he may ask for the report.

Motion to adjourn, withdrawn.

SOUTH-EASTERN RAILWAY.

Mr. LAVERGNE asked, Whether the Government is aware of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company refusing to operate the L'Avenir branch of their line, formerly known as the "South-Eastern Railway," and removing the rails from that portion of the said road, which railway has been subsidized by the County of Drummond and the Legislature of Quebec, and has been declared by this Parliament to be a work for the general advantage of Canada? Whether it is the intention of the Government to take any action in the matter?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I must ask the hon. gentleman to let this question stand on the Order paper until the First Minister is in his seat.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEYS IN THE EASTERN TOWNSHIPS.

Mr. FRÉCHETTE asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to order geological exploratory surveys to be made with respect to asbestos and other minerals, in the Eastern Townships, especially in the Counties of Beauce, Megantic, Richmond and Wolfe; and of these surveys to make a report, in order that foreign capitalists may gain sufficient confidence to place their capital within the Province of Quebec?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The whole district has been thoroughly explored, mapped and reported on, and the reports are to be found in volumes 2, 3 and 4 of the Geological Survey Report.

1st REGIMENT OF CAVALRY—SADDLERY.

Mr. HYMAN asked, When is it intended to make a new issue of saddlery to the 1st Regiment of Cavalry, in lieu of that condemned by the board of officers appointed for the purpose of examining the same?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The contract has been given out for the manufacture of saddles, some of which are expected to be furnished in a few days. As soon as the saddles will have been received in the Military Stores, the question of supplying them to the 1st Regiment of Cavalry will be taken up.

POUND-NET LICENSES—LAKE ST. CLAIR.

Mr. LISTER asked, When were pound-net licenses first issued for Lake St. Clair; what number were issued for the year 1890; what are the names and residences of the persons to whom pound-net licenses were issued for the year 1891?

Mr. TUPPER. Pound-net licenses were first issued for Lake St. Clair in 1884. Four licenses were issued for the year 1890. The following are the names and residences of the persons to whom pound-net licenses were issued for the year 1891:—Isa Drouillard, of Tecumseh; C. W. Gauthier, of Windsor; Gilbert Labutte, of Tecumseh, and Eli Labutte, of Tecumseh.

MENNONITE RESERVE IN MANITOBA.

Mr. LARIVIÈRE asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to further extend the time fixed for the reserve of land made for the Mennonites, in the Province of Manitoba, when the time expires in June next?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Nearly all the lands in the Mennonite reserves have either been pur-

chased or entered for by Mennonites; and, in regard to the remainder, the Minister of Agriculture is, and always has been, of the opinion that good faith with the Mennonites requires that the reservation should be continued until such time as the lands still available can be acquired by the younger portion of the Mennonite population. It is, therefore, proposed to continue the reservation for some little time longer.

ORGANIZATION OF STANDING COMMITTEES.

On the Orders of the Day being called,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to enquire whether any notices of the calling together of the several Standing Committees have yet been issued? I have received none, and none of my friends around me have received any. I understood, from the conversation which took place yesterday, that these notices were to be issued to-day.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. They are being issued to-day.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Including the Committee on Privileges and Elections?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Including all.

TRANSLATION OF THE VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation). Mr. Speaker, before the House passes to the Orders of the Day, I wish to draw your attention and the attention of the House to the manner in which the Votes and Proceedings and the reports of the proceedings in the House generally are translated. I do not frequently have occasion to take the floor in this House, but in looking over the translations of the propositions I may have offered or of the speeches I may have delivered here, I always found that they did not render the idea I intended to convey in the original. I always endeavoured to use the language of the majority in order to be better understood, but the translations of my words had no sense, and if those translations were to be sent to anyone knowing a little French, I would be made ridiculous by being supposed to have uttered such things in my own language. Now, to give an example of such translation, I will take the question I was putting to-day. I was asking "Whether the Government is aware of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company refusing to operate the L'Avenir Branch of their line, formerly known as the South-Eastern Railway." The words "L'Avenir Branch of their line," were translated by "l'embranchement sur l'Avenir de sa ligne." Well, Mr. Speaker, this is simply ridiculous. And it is not the first time I notice such blunders. I might say that at no time during the last Parliament, when I had occasion to put a simple question to the Government, was a proper translation made of it. Let us now glance at the Speech from the Throne. The first paragraph said: "The Honourable Sir William Johnstone Ritchie, Deputy Governor, does not see fit to declare the causes of summoning the present Parliament until a Speaker of the House of Commons shall have been chosen according to law." This is translated as follows: "L'honorable Sir William Johnstone Ritchie, député gouverneur, ne juge pas à propos de déclarer les raisons pour les quelles il a convoqué" (the reasons for which he has summoned) "le présent parlement de la Puissance du Canada." So that the Deputy Governor is made to say that it is he who summoned the present Parliament. This is a gross misrepresentation. As I said before, were these accidental occurrences they could be overlooked; but such things happen at almost every sitting of the House, and are to be found in almost every report of our proceedings. Mr. Speaker, my remarks are directed against no person in particular. I must say that I do not know who has the supervision of these translations, nor who writes them. But I think it is proper for me to draw the attention of the House to the matter, in order to secure a better translation in future, and avoid ridicule.

ALIEN LABOUR.

The Order being read for the second reading of Bill (No. 6) to prohibit the importation and migration of foreigners and aliens under contract or agreement to perform labour in Canada,

Mr. TAYLOR. Before proceeding with that Bill, I would like to enquire what correspondence has taken place between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States in reference to this subject? We had a special committee who reported, after taking evidence, last year, that a Bill should be introduced at the next session dealing with this question, if some amicable arrangement had not previously been arrived at between the two Governments. I have not learned, nor did I make enquiry, as to what, if any, correspondence had taken place, although I have seen in the press lately that the United States Government are relaxing to a very large extent the enforcement of the Alien Labour Act. I would also like to know if it is the intention of the Government to make this one of the questions to be discussed at the conference to be held this fall between the Canadian Government and the American Government? If it is one of the questions then to be discussed, perhaps it would be as well to allow this Bill to stand over till next session. However, I have introduced it, and it is on the Order paper, but before proceeding with it, I would like to know the views of the Government on the question.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In deference to the report of the committee adopted last session, some representations have been made upon the subject to the authorities at Washington—I think through the Department of Agriculture. I am not prepared to say, of course, that the amelioration which has taken place, and to which the hon. gentleman has referred, has been the result of that correspondence; it may have been rather with a view to the better administration of the Act itself relating to the importation of alien labour into the United States. I think, under all the circumstances, it would be unwise to proceed with the Bill, at any rate at present, especially in view of the circumstance which the hon. gentleman himself has mentioned, that negotiations covering practically all the questions between this country and the neighbouring country are fairly on the way to discussion next autumn. For that reason I think it would be very desirable that the hon. gentleman should not press the passage of this Bill, at any rate at the present time. I am hardly in a position

to assure the hon. gentleman that it will be one of the subjects of discussion at Washington; because that could only be done with the concurrence of the Washington authorities. Of course it is in their power to say that any particular subject shall not be one of the subjects of discussion at the conference which is expected to take place. But I can say, and I feel bound to say, out of deference to the report which was adopted last session, that the subject it dealt with will be certainly presented for the consideration of the authorities at Washington, with a view either to the amendment of the Act itself, or, at any rate, a more reasonable execution of the Act, than that which was brought to the notice of the committee last year.

Mr. TAYLOR. After the remarks of the Minister of Justice, I beg to move that the Order for the second reading of Bill (No. 6) to prohibit the importation and migration of foreigners and aliens under contract or agreement to perform labour in Canada, be discharged.

Motion agreed to, and Bill withdrawn.

BALLOT BOXES.

Mr. LANDERKIN moved for:

Report of Mr. J. R. Arnoldi, Engineer of the Mechanical Department of Public Works, to the Special Committee on Ballot Boxes last session.

He said: I understand the engineer made a report last session, which was not brought down to the House. I am not personally aware that such is the case, but I am so informed, and I move this motion for the purpose of having this report brought down.

Motion agreed to.

BUREAU OF LABOUR STATISTICS.

Mr. LEPINE (Translation) moved for:

Copies of all correspondence between the Workingmen's Associations of Canada and the Minister of Agriculture, with reference to the establishment of the Bureau of Labour Statistics for the Dominion.

He said: In offering this motion, Mr. Speaker, I beg to be allowed to give a few words of explanation. I take a great interest in the establishment of a bureau of labour statistics, not only because I consider such an institution as of high importance and great advantage for the labouring classes of the Dominion, but also because I know that it will be a benefit to industry and commerce. I take an interest in it because it will be useful to the whole of the population. However, as the establishment of this bureau is to be more especially useful to the working classes, and as the constituency which I represent is largely composed of working people, it behooves me to be watchful of this measure. After many entreaties, Parliament passed last year a Bill for the creation of a bureau of labour statistics, and voted a sum of $10,000 for the organization of such a bureau, following in this the example of several other countries where similar bureaus are in existence and rendering signal services. Vainly did some hon. members of this House ask to postpone until another session the consideration of this Bill; the question was thought to be pressing and upon no pretext was it allowed to stand. The establishment of such a bureau was held to be absolutely necessary, in order to obtain reliable data on the material and moral condition of the working classes, and with the help of such information to secure more thorough labour legislation. I was one of those, Mr. Speaker, who strongly urged the passing of that Bill which was known to everybody, and which the workingmen were anxiously expecting. Long enough had the consideration of that Bill been deferred. Well, the Bill passed, and the money necessary for the organization of this bureau was voted. Since then nothing has been heard of it. The bureau of labour statistics seems only to exist on the Statute-book. Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I think I am justified in asking the Government for what reason they have delayed establishing the institution, which was acknowledged to be so necessary and so indispensable to the working classes? The Department of Agriculture must have had grave reasons for postponing the endowing of the working people of this country with an institution the creation of which had been voted by Parliament. The House has a right to information in regard to this. The people also have a right to know why this bureau of labour statistics has not yet been put in operation. Such are the reasons, Mr. Speaker, which have induced me to ask for the correspondence between the workingmen's associations and the Department of Agriculture in this connection. If this delay in the carrying out of the law is due to a lack of sufficient power or money, I hope the House will, during the present session, provide the necessary means of immediately organizing this institution.

Mr. HAGGART. Some time will be required to prepare the papers, which are very lengthy documents, and as soon as prepared they will be brought down. When brought down, I will discuss the suggestion made by the hon. gentleman, which I am not fully prepared to do at present.

Motion agreed to.

POST OFFICE AND DOMINION SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS.

Mr. McMULLEN moved for:

Return showing the amount deposited in each of the Post Office and Dominion Savings Banks in the Dominion on the 1st of May last.

Mr. HAGGART. I desire to ask whether the hon. gentleman desires to obtain the amount deposited in each of the Post Office savings banks, or the total amount in the Post Office savings banks in the Dominion.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want the amount deposited in the several Dominion savings banks and the Post Office savings banks in the Dominion.

Mr. HAGGART. My officers inform me that it would be impossible to obtain this information, with the whole staff in the office, within from six to nine months, and at a cost of from five to six thousand dollars.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is there not an annual return of the amounts deposited in the several Post Office savings banks?

Mr. HAGGART. No. There are over four hundred thousand depositors in these banks throughout the country. All these accounts would have to be examined in order to prepare such a report as is desired. I can give the hon. gentleman the total amount on deposit—of course, he can find it in the Canada *Gazette*—but I can tell him at

once the amount on deposit in the Post Office savings banks on 1st May last.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think the hon. gentleman misunderstands my motion. I do not ask for a return of the entire amount deposited by the depositors in the several savings banks, but I only want the gross sum deposited at each point.

Mr. HAGGART. I understand perfectly well the motion. The hon. gentleman wants the amount deposited, for example, in Ottawa, Perth, London or Kingston. The accounts are not kept so as to show the amount in the different towns or cities, but they are kept in the shape of deposit accounts, and the whole of these accounts would have to be gone into, the amounts in the different places added together, and a return prepared for each place.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it not the case that each particular town is credited with a certain amount, and that this appears in the Public Accounts?

Mr. HAGGART. I do not think so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am merely speaking from recollection, and I cannot contradict the hon. gentleman. I would be very glad if my hon. friend would see his way to amend his motion so as to obtain from the Department a statement of the total of the sums below $400 in the hands of the Government in the Post Office Department. If, however, this were likely to delay the return asked for by my hon. friend, I would not wish to press such an amendment.

Mr. HAGGART. There might be new instructions given to the Department to make up these returns as they go on during the year. The hon. gentleman can see at once the impossibility of going through all these accounts and the expense involved in getting such a return now. If the hon. gentleman will let the matter wait until to-morrow, I will bring him a full explanation from the head of the Money Order Department, and the reasons given why it would be impossible to give this return now.

Mr. McMULLEN. Let it stand.

Motion postponed.

ANALYSIS OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS.

Mr. CURRAN moved for:

Return of all petitions addressed to the Government, praying for the analysis of intoxicating liquors manufactured or offered for sale, by wholesale or retail, in the Dominion of Canada.

He said: I make this motion, in the first place, for the purpose of discharging a public duty, and secondly, to fulfil a promise I made on the 1st October last when, as the House is aware, in every English-speaking community all over the world there was a series of celebrations commemorating the centenary of the birth of the Rev. Theobald Mathew, the great Apostle of Temperance. In the city of Montreal this celebration was conducted under the auspices of the Convention of Catholic Temperance Societies composed of the various total abstinence organizations, which associations have adopted a platform I have had the honor of reading before this House on more than one occasion. Amongst other reforms proposed by these temperance societies, they ask that a law be enacted for the analysis of intoxicating liquors manufactured or sold in the Dominion, either by wholesale or retail. On the occasion of the celebration to which I have referred many eloquent addresses and practical speeches were made, perhaps none more so than that delivered by the Rev. Father McCallen, of St. Patrick's Church, Montreal, who is the Apostle of Temperance in my own city. In the course of an able and eloquent address the reverend gentleman said:

"If a butcher sold tainted meat, a druggist compounded an injurious prescription, a baker adulterated his food product, they were pounced upon by the law; but those who send men to their homes, intellectual, physical and moral wrecks through the sale of adulterated beverages, which so quickly affect the brain, shatter the health, bring disease to the body and create an irresistible craving in the drunkard for still greater potations, did so with an impunity which is simply appalling to contemplate. We should, therefore, demand a law for the analysis of all alcoholic drinks, and see that it be rigidly enforced, not only by heavy fines but by imprisonment."

I took occasion, at the lay celebration of Father Mathew's centenary, to point out to those who are agitating for this reform, that, under the Revised Statutes of the Dominion of Canada, the Adulteration Act, 49 Victoria, chapter 107, section 17, the law did actually provide for such analysis of liquids; and it provided further as to what should constitute adulteration, by referring in the schedule of the Act to ingredients which are held to be drugs and injurious to health when used in conjunction with these beverages. It was shown further, that, whilst under the operation of that Act our blue-books contained the results of the investigation of the officers of the Government with regard to articles of food, even down to pepper and other commodities which are offered for sale by grocers and others, there was no such return with regard to any analysis having been made of intoxicating liquors. The physicians who delivered addresses on the occasion to which I refer pointed out, that, years ago, when pure intoxicating liquors were sold, there was comparatively little *delirium tremens* in the country, whereas, under the present state of things, that disease is very prevalent: and that it took but a very few years to reduce a man to the sad condition so eloquently described by Father McCallen in the extract from his speech which I have just read. I believe that the officers of the Government are being instructed to analyze liquors issued from compounderies and distilleries, but I am not aware that any such steps are to be taken with regard to places where liquors are sold by retail. In these places the great injury is really done, and I believe that every one will feel that it would be a very great improvement if the officers were instructed to make analysis of liquor sold by retail. Even if heavy fines and penalties and imprisonment were not imposed, as asked to be, upon those who sold adulterated beverages, as provided for in the law, the very fact that the name of a person so disposing of adulterated liquors would appear in the blue-books would be a great protection to the public, would have a very deterrent effect, and act as a warning to those who are in the habit of indulging in intoxicating liquors. I do not wish to detain the House longer, for I think it is only necessary to point out to the Government, and to the hon. Minister who is in

charge of the Department which controls this matter, the wish of these temperance organizations which have done so much good as the offshoots of the work of Father Mathew. I, therefore, leave the matter in the hands of the Government, satisfied that steps will be promptly taken to carry into effect the desire of these worthy organizations.

Mr. COSTIGAN. There can be no objection to bringing down the papers at my disposal. I may state, with regard to the Excise law, that its operation gives thorough security to the public so far as the outcome from the distilleries is concerned. The requirements of the law and the regulations of the Department make it impossible for any spirits to emanate from the distilleries except in a pure condition. With regard to liquors sold by retailers, I agree with the mover of the address that there is the greatest necessity for inspection, but it involves great difficulty. When my hon. friend says that while analyses have been made of different items of food and drugs, none have been made of liquors, he is not, perhaps, aware that officers in the chief analyses branch of the Department have collected very large numbers of samples in different cities throughout the Dominion with the view of ascertaining the condition of the liquors sold by retailers. In many cases they have been proved to be not up to the standard; but it is very difficult to get at the real quantity of liquors sold in this way, because persons can easily furnish a sample of passable liquor when they know the purpose of the officer sent to collect samples, and in that way avoid having the real character of the liquor which they sell tested. Of course it is of great interest that every effort should be made to have some check imposed upon the retail trade, not only in cities, but in country places; and, so far as the Department is concerned, I am quite sure that everything possible within the means at its disposal will be done in the direction of meeting the views of my hon. friend.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of correspondence, papers, and all documents respecting steps taken by the Government during last session, or since that time, to prevent American cheese being shipped through or from Canadian ports, and branded as Canadian: also copies of the instructions now given to the proper authorities or preventive officers on the subject.—(Mr. Marshall.)

An abstract copy or copies of the manifest of the cargoes carried by the steamships subsidized to run between the Maritime Provinces and the West Indies, on each voyage during the present year 1891; showing the character and value of the cargoes carried and the port or ports of landing and discharge of such cargoes, with an abstract of any other information given in such manifest; also how many trips were made by the steamer subsidized to carry on the steam service between the Maritime Provinces and the West India ports during the year 1890; what were the dates of such trips, what amounts were paid for each trip, what person or company is carrying out that service for the present year: also, what contracts have been entered into for such service this year, and what sums have been paid therefor.—(Mr. Davies, P.E.I.)

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 5 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 15th May, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 36) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 37) to amend the Act respecting the New Brunswick Railway Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 38) respecting the Central Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. McLennan.)

Bill (No 39) respecting the Maritime Chemical Pulp Company (Limited), and to change the name thereof to "The Maritime Sulphite Fibre Company (Limited)."—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 40) respecting the Farmers' Bank of Rustico.—(Mr. Macdonald.)

Bill (No. 41) respecting the Canadian Power Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 42) to prevent frauds on farmers in the sale of seed grain and other articles.—(Mr. Burdett.)

UNITED STATES FISHING VESSELS.

Mr. TUPPER moved second reading of Bill (No. 10) respecting fishing vessels of the United States.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this simply an extension of the *modus vivendi* for the current year?

Mr. TUPPER. Yes, in the same terms precisely as the Act of last year.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, and reported.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

On the Order being called for second reading of Bill (No. 8) to repeal the Act respecting the Electoral Franchise.—(Mr. Cameron, Huron.)

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Will the hon. gentleman let this Bill stand for to-day?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I am quite willing to let it stand for to-day. The hon. gentleman is to understand, however, that we will not stand on the Order paper all session. I hope to move the second reading on Monday or Tuesday next.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman might say Wednesday next, as Tuesday is Government day.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The Government does not appear to have any business ready, and I might be allowed to take the matter upon Tuesday. It is just as important as a Government measure.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman can take Tuesday, provided it comes up after Government measures.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Will the hon. gentleman allow me to move the second reading on Monday?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There are a number of members away on Monday.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I am as anxious to have a full House as the hon. gentleman. If the House is full I shall move it on Monday, if I can; but, in any event, I will move it on Wednesday. Will the hon. gentleman make it the first Order for Monday?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That would not be fair to the other members having notices on the paper for Monday, but I have no doubt that it will be reached in its order.

LAKEPORT (ONT.) HARBOUR.

Mr. HARGRAFT asked, Whether the Government or House of Commons ever received a petition asking that a harbour of refuge be constructed at the village of Lakeport, in the County of Northumberland, on Lake Ontario? Did the Government ever despatch officers or engineers to investigate the work referred to in such petition? If so, on what date were they sent, and at whose request; and if taken from the work, when were they so taken? For what reasons? And is it the intention of the Government to go on with the work?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It appears that a petition was presented in March, 1889, but I cannot lay my hands on it now. A survey was undertaken in 1891, on a promise that had been made by me to the predecessor of the hon. gentleman, that a survey would take place before the session. The order was given, and an engineer was sent on 17th February to examine and report. He worked about two weeks, but the report has not yet been laid before the Government.

DEEPENING OF THE RIVER ST. LAWRENCE.

Mr. DELISLE (Translation) asked, What sums of money have been paid out since 1887, for the deepening of the River St. Lawrence between Quebec and Montreal? To whom were the said sums paid?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to answer the hon. member that from the 1st of February, 1887, to the 30th of June, 1889, the Montreal Harbour Commission have been paid $438,334.28. Different persons were paid from the 1st of July, 1889, to the 15th of May, 1891, $226,554.87; a total of $664,889.15. The works of the channel between the Quebec harbour and Montreal were resumed by the Department of Public Works in January, 1889, in conformity with the law. I cannot give the names of the persons to whom the different sums were paid; those names appear on the pay lists and on the vouchers, and it would probably require three weeks for their copying.

REVISING OFFICERS.

Mr. DELISLE (Translation) asked, Whether the Government is aware that several revising officers, charged with the duty of preparing the electoral lists, in the Province of Quebec, have during the late general elections taken a part in the contest, at the hustings? Is it aware, more especially, that Mr. Lacoursière, revising officer for the County of Portneuf, did in the manner aforesaid engage in the contest on the Government side? Has the Government any intention of putting an end to such abuses?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Secretary of State, I beg to state that the information asked for has not been transmitted to the Government.

PUBLIC WORKS IN HASTINGS COUNTY.

Mr. BURDETT asked, Whether the Government intend to make any improvements in the navigation of the Bay of Quinté, between Belleville and Deseronto, during this season?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Governement has not yet come to any decision on this subject.

Mr. BURDETT asked, Whether the Government intend to erect public buildings in the town of Deseronto or village of Tweed and Madoc during the next fiscal year?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government has not yet considered these matters.

BRAE HARBOUR, P.E.I.

Mr. PERRY asked, Have tenders been asked for, for works on wharf or breakwater at the Brae Harbour, Prince County, Prince Edward Island? If so, is the contract let; to whom, and for what amount?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Tenders have been asked for works at the Brae Harbour. The contract has been awarded to Hugh McFee for $850.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND TUNNEL.

Mr. PERRY asked, Whether the Government have received from Sir Douglas Fox, either by telegraph or mail, estimates of the cost of building a tunnel across the Straits of Northumberland, from Prince Edward Island to the mainland? If so, at what amount does he estimate the cost?

Mr. FOSTER. The Government has received from Sir Douglas Fox by mail, estimates of the cost of building a tunnel across the Straits of Northumberland from Prince Edward Island to the mainland. The estimated cost from shaft to shaft, with land tunnel and contingencies, is as follows: For a tunnel 11 feet in diameter, £1,075,200; 16 feet diameter, £1,971,800; 18 feet diameter, £2,252,500.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to ask without notice, whether it is the intention of the Government to construct that work?

Mr. FOSTER. Put that on the Notice paper.

ILLEGAL SEIZURE OF LIQUOR.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, Has the Government been informed that Eugène Hammond, an alleged officer of Customs, at Montmagny, has illegally seized and confiscated a certain quantity of liquor belonging to F. X. Lamonde, tavern keeper at Montmagny; and that after having sent it up to Quebec, he was afterwards obliged to give it back to the said Lamonde, inasmuch as the duty upon it had been paid in due form? If the Government is aware of the facts of the above case, does it propose to reimburse the said Lamonde for the expenses

which this illegal act has put him to, and for the damage which he has suffered? Does the Government propose to remove this officer?

Mr. BOWELL. The Government has no knowledge or report of any seizure of the kind referred to having been made.

CLAIM FOR INDEMNITY.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to pay to Miss Lea Caron, of St. Roch de Québec, a sufferer by the accident which happened on the Intercolonial Railway, in December last, at St. Joseph de Lévis, an indemnity, and the amount of doctor's fee of some $40?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am sorry to say that we cannot answer that question definitely at the present time. The matter is, I understand, in litigation, and until that is concluded it is impossible to say what can be done.

STANDARD TIME.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK moved for:

Copies of all letters, communications and reports in the possession of the Government, relating to the fixing of a standard of time and the legalization thereof.

He said: Owing to the great extent of the Dominion there is great diversity throughout the country in the reckoning of time, and it is desirable, I think, that some steps should be taken to fix a standard of time for different parts of the country. At present our time is reckoned by railway time, but there is no authority for that. The consequence is that many duties are performed illegally or incorrectly; for instance, the opening and closing of the polls for the election of members of Parliament, the closing of banks, the protesting of notes, etc., are all done according to railway time, which is not the solar or local time. This may give rise to some difficulty. Of late a great deal of attention has been given to the subject of the proper method of reckoning time, and I have lately read a very interesting article in the *Engineering Magazine*, which states that some very valuable communications on this subject have been sent to the various colonial Governments, asking their opinions on the subject. I think it is desirable that we should know whether any of these communications have been received by the Government, and if so, that they should be brought down, and that at the same time the Government should have an opportunity of saying whether they intend to legalize the standard of time which has been adoptod, but for which, as I have said, no legal authority at present exists.

Mr. TUPPER. I may say that there are in my Department some very interesting papers touching this subject, including an interesting report from the director of the Meteorological Service, occasioned by the communication referred to by the hon. gentleman, which was sent by the Imperial Government as a circular letter to the colonial Governments on the subject of fixing a standard of time. All these papers I shall have prepared and brought down. I may say that the question of introducing legislation in conformity with that report and those representations, is now under consideration.

Motion agreed to.

SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS.

Mr. McMULLEN moved for:

Return showing the amount deposited in each of the Post Office and Dominion Savings Banks in the Dominion on the 1st of May last.

Mr. HAGGART. There is no objection to bringing down the return now asked for and having it ready for the 30th June, 1891, as the extra expense will be very slight. But to prepare the information asked for in the first instance would be almost impossible, as it would entail an examination of 450,000 accounts and the copying and verifying of 110,000 balances—a labour which, under the statute, is only done once a year.

DISMISSAL—J. R. GRAHAM.

Mr. BARRON moved for:

Return of all papers, letters and documents in any way whatever relating to the dispensing with the services of J. R. Graham, of Fenelon Falls, as Fishery Inspector or Overseer within the County of Victoria, and of all communications with or representations to the Government, or any member thereof, or any officer or clerk in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, relating to the said J. R. Graham and the performance of his duties prior to dispensing with his services: and of all new rules and regulations (if any) for the appointment of Fishery Inspectors in said county and the performance of their duties.

He said: While it is my desire to have these papers brought down, my chief desire, I confess, is to draw attention to what I conceive to be improper conduct on the part of the Department of Marine and Fisheries in regard to the dismissal of J. R. Graham. It appears to have been the practice, prior to the recent elections, to threaten all officers of Departments with dismissal unless they chose to support candidates running in the Government interest. Now, the gentleman whose name is mentioned in this motion had been for many years a Conservative and a supporter of the Government of hon. gentlemen opposite; but recently, believing in his wisdom that the policy of the Liberal party was in the general interests of the country, he decided to support the gentleman who now has the honour to address the House, in preference to his opponent. The consequence was his actions were watched, and communications were written to him with the view of drawing him into some correspondence with the Department and finding some fault with him in the discharge of his duties. And with what result? Quite lately, for no reason whatever except that he chose to support me, that gentleman was dismissed and cast upon the world utterly destitute, without means to support himself and family. It appears strange that the Government should feel themselves so hard pressed at election times that they should resort to such unfair means and endeavour to coerce, by threats of dismissal, officials into supporting them. Mr. Graham was aware of the whip being held over his shoulders, but nevertheless thought it was his duty to support the Liberal party and did so, with the result that he has recently been discharged on that ground alone. No word has ever been heard against the manner in which he performed his duty. So far as I have learned, and I have made enquiries, he has always been considered a good officer who did his work faithfully and well. I have no doubt whatever that if all the papers are brought down, we will find some peculiar underhand work has been going on, at the

instance, no doubt, of my opponent, with the view of getting this gentleman discharged from the office which he filled until recently with satisfaction to the public and some emolument to himself. I place this motion in your hands, Sir, and hope all the papers will be brought down, not only the communications had with the Department by my late opponent, but which passed between him and Mr. Gordon of the Department, because I believe—in fact my opponent has made a boast of it—that he is the gentleman who got Mr. Graham discharged.

Mr. TUPPER. There is no objection to this motion, but I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that it would have been better and would have saved a good deal of the time of the House had he refrained from making the serious statement he has just made until he could see by the papers whether there are any grounds for it. The hon. gentleman says that Mr. Graham was threatened, before the elections, with dismissal, if he should support the hon. gentleman. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman meant to convey to the House that such a threat was communicated, directly or indirectly, from the Department of Marine and Fisheries, but I desire to say that no such threats were ever heard of by myself, nor am I aware that any were made. The hon. gentleman says this poor man has been thrown on the world destitute. I suppose he was in receipt of the not very handsome salary which the fishery officers generally obtain, about $150 per year; but it may give the hon. gentleman some pleasure to know that Mr. Graham is not dismissed. I am not aware that he has been thrown upon the world starving, or that his pay has been stopped: but I am aware that very serious charges have been preferred against this man, and I have gone into a most thorough investigation, the end of which has not been reached; but when the papers are brought down I am sure the hon. gentleman will be induced to take back the insinuations he has cast across the House in advance of the information asked for. This information, I submit, should be before us before any such criticism as that which the hon. gentleman has made, should be addressed to the House.

Motion agreed to.

FISHING BOUNTY PAYMENTS.

Mr. FLINT moved for:

A comparative statement for the years 1882 to 1891, inclusive, (by Provinces) of: (*a.*) Total number of bounty claims received by Department: (*b.*) Total number paid; (*c.*) Number of vessels, tonnage, and number of men entitled to bounty in each year; (*d.*) Number of boats among which bounty was distributed, and number of men engaged in boat-fishing receiving bounty: (*e.*) Total number of men receiving bounty; (*f.*) Total annual payments of fishing bounty.

Mr. FORBES. I would like to ask the House, with the consent of the mover, to allow me to propose that the words "and by counties" be added to the motion.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. member and the hon. mover of the motion will find that all the information in detail which the mover has asked for, and also the information as to the returns by counties which the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Forbes) desires, are to be found in the report now in their hands on page 18 in Appendix No. 2. I had the statement carefully prepared.

Mr. BARRON.

Mr. FLINT. Are the returns there for 1891?

Mr. TUPPER. I forgot to add, that it is impossible to give the returns for the year 1891 until the end of the year.

Mr. FLINT. Does the statement in the report include all the items I have asked for here?

Mr. TUPPER. Yes; if there is any one item in the motion which is omitted, another motion will at once bring the information.

Motion withdrawn.

COUNTY OF HASTINGS MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. BURDETT moved for:

Return of all petitions, reports and papers in reference to the carrying of the mail between Reed Post Office and Shannonville, in the County of Hastings.

He said: This is somewhat similar to a motion made last year in respect to the same matter. I am not aware, although that motion passed, that any return has been made, but, if a return has been made, I only ask now for papers which have been received by the Department since that return. After my stating the causes of complaint last year, the Postmaster General was good enough to say that he would see, by making enquiry, if the present system was satisfactory, and if it was not he would make the necessary change. I trust he has been able to inform himself on the subject in the meantime, and I am certain that, if he has received honest information, he will come to the conclusion that a change should be made. The post office at Melrose lies between Shannonville on the south and Reed on the north, and in justice to the people, and in view of the efficiency of the mail service, the mail should start from Reed each morning, going to Melrose by way of Blessington, and then to Shannonville, to meet the noon train, returning that evening. By that means the people of Melrose, Blessington and Reed would be placed in communication both with the east and the west. As it is at present, the mail starts from Melrose in the morning, goes to Shannonville, receives the mail, goes back to Melrose, and then, by way of Blessington to Reed, and goes back to Melrose in the evening. Thus the people of Blessington and Reed have no opportunity to read and answer their correspondence upon the same day. If the mails were delivered in the evening and taken away in the morning, those people would have all the evening and part of the next morning to open, peruse and answer their mail matter. It is a matter of great importance to these people, who live in an old-settled and populous part of the country, where a considerable amount of business is done. There is another reason for the change which I consider important. Considerable sums of money are almost daily sent from these places to Belleville and Napanee to meet bills incurred in that vicinity. Under the present system the money has to remain over at Melrose. The Post Office Department has not provided proper accommodation there, and at any time the mail may be destroyed by fire or taken by other means. I am not for a moment attacking the integrity or efficiency of the postmasters or mail carriers. On the contrary, I believe they perform their duties efficiently, according to their contract with the Government. I am simply asking for expedition, safety and efficiency in the service, and nothing

more. Contrary to the opinion expressed by the Postmaster General the other day, I conceive that it is of the greatest importance to carry the mails efficiently, even if the cost of carrying them should be greater than the income. I understand that a great number of the hon. gentleman's friends, and supporters as well as opponents of the Government, are interested in this matter and are desirous to have the change made; and I think the Postmaster General should make the change even if it should be necessary to pay the mail carrier a little more for this service. All I ask is efficiency, expedition and safety in the conduct of this mail, and that the service should be performed in the interest of the people. I think if the Postmaster General takes the proper steps to inform himself on this subject, he will cause the change I have indicated to be made.

Mr. HAGGART. In reply to the hon. gentleman I may state, as I stated last session, that when I let the contract I acted upon the best advice I was in possession of; and, as I then told the hon. gentleman, the contract was let on trial for a year to see how it would work. I have had no communication that I am aware of from any one in that section of the country, since last session, in reference to it. As the hon. gentleman states, I made enquiries myself to find out whether there could be an improvement, with very little expense, on the present manner of carrying the mails. I find out by the report of my inspector that the route could be improved, perhaps, in the direction indicated by the hon. gentleman, and it is my intention, at some time soon, to give notice to the contractor that I intend to terminate the contract and make such arrangements as I think will be acceptable to the people of that neighbourhood.

Mr. BURDETT. I am well satisfied with the statements of the Postmaster General. I understood from a resident there that a petition had been sent down to the Post Office Department, and that is the reason I made the motion; but on the assurance of the Postmaster General—I know he will keep his word— I beg leave to withdraw the motion.

Mr. HAGGART. I am not certain that there was no petition, but in all the papers I have in my possession at present, there is no petition—but there may be one.

Mr. BURDETT. I do not desire to give the hon. Minister any unnecessary trouble; his word that he will look into the matter is quite sufficient.

Motion withdrawn.

STATEMENTS OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT moved for:

Return giving comparative statement of Receipts and Expenditures from 1st July, 1890, to 10th May, 1891, and from 1st July, 1889, to 10th May, 1890.

He said: I would just say to the Minister of Finance that it would save him and myself some little trouble if he would kindly give us these ten days' statements during the ensuing month, to be laid on the Table as a matter of course, without further notice, as he knows that, preparatory to a Budget discourse, it is well that we should be advised up to the latest moment how the expenditures stand. In the meantime I will move this motion, and would be glad if he would undertake to let us have, on the last of the month, these statements as soon as convenient after the dates arrive.

Mr. FOSTER. I will have that done.

Motion agreed to.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 16) to amend the Acts relating to the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Curran.)

Bill (No. 22) respecting the Lake Temiscamingue Colonization Railway Company.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

Bill (No. 23) respecting the E. B. Eddy Manufacturing Company, and to change its name to The E. B. Eddy Company.—(Mr. Mackintosh.)

Bill (No. 24) to incorporate the McKay Milling Company.—(Mr. Mackintosh.)

ADJOURNMENT—THE ESTIMATES—TRENT VALLEY CANAL.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe that the Minister of Finance has not brought down the Estimates. I would be glad if he would tell us when he expects to present them, and give us some idea when he is likely to make his Budget statement.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid my hon. friend has not exercised his memory well. I think I said the other day that I would bring down the Estimates on Friday or Monday. As they have not been brought down on Friday, I shall have to ask for the extension of time that I gave myself, until Monday, when I hope to have them down. In reference to the Budget speech, I hope to deliver it in about a week after the production of the Estimates, and I will give further notice.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman knows that it is a matter of convenience to all of us to know when that will be done. The hon. gentleman will not be in a position to deliver it next week?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. BARRON. Before the House adjourns I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact that last session the First Minister promised that the report of the Trent Valley Canal Commission should be, during the recess between the two sessions, placed in the hands of hon. members. He also promised, though, perhaps, it was a conditional promise, that the evidence upon which the commissioners arrived at their conclusion, should also be printed and distributed, in order that the members might have an intelligent understanding of the subject before the House met again. Now, yesterday, the hon. member for one of the ridings of Hasting, in my absence, asked a question of the hon. Minister of Public Works, and to that question he could get no satisfaction whatsoever. I have simply asked the question, if the Trent Valley Canal Commissioners had reported in favour of the completion of the scheme—a perfectly proper question, requiring an affirmative or a negative answer, either one thing or the

other. It was not a question which suggested that an opinion was to be expressed by the Minister, and, therefore, the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Burdett) was entitled to an answer, which he could not get, from the Minister of Public Works. Although my hon. friend, as a representative of the people, could not obtain an answer to his question, I find that the First Minister, on March 3rd, just prior to the general election, sent the following telegram :—

"From Kingston, Time, 1:25, March 3rd, 1891.

"*To D. R. Murphy, Trenton:*

"The Trent Valley Canal Commission having reported favourably on the completion of the scheme, Parliament will be asked in the Estimates next session for a grant for the purpose.

(Signed) "JOHN A. MACDONALD."

I should like to ask if it is proper for a member of the Executive to refuse to give to a member of Parliament that information which a Minister will give to one of his supporters just prior to an election? I find that when my hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Burdett) complained that he had received scant courtesy at the hands of the Minister of Public Works—and I say he did receive scant courtesy, because the question was a fair, proper and legitimate one, requiring either an affirmative or a negative answer, and such an answer he did not get—the Minister said that his answer was the one given to him to convey to the House. Who gave the hon. Minister that answer?

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman cannot refer to a former debate.

Mr. BARRON. I submit, with all deference, that it was not exactly a debate to which I was referring.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. The statement of the hon. Minister of Public Works was made on a motion for the adjournment of the House, yesterday.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think the answer was in reply to a statement.

Mr. SPEAKER. The statement to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barron) has just referred, was a statement made by Sir Hector Langevin on the motion for the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BURDETT. I think Mr. Speaker is correct. The statement was made on the motion for adjournment.

Mr. BARRON. My chief object is to call the attention of the House to the fact, that the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Burdett) has not been able to get an answer to a proper question, information as to which the First Minister thought fit to communicate to one of his supporters just prior to the last general election. And yesterday, when one of the representatives of the people asked that question he was politely, though I say with scant courtesy, refused it. I would ask the Minister of Public Works, if, in pursuance of the promise made last session by the First Minister, the report will be placed in the hands of members immediately, because the report is printed, and also, if possible, the evidence on which the commissioners arrived at the conclusion, for the promise was made last session that the evidence would be printed as speedily as possible, and would be placed in the hands of members before the then next session. Surely these documents are ready now and can be placed in the hands of members without the necessity of a motion being passed, as, if a motion were placed on the Notice paper, it might not be reached for some time, and it is absolutely necessary, in view of the promise of the First Minister, that the matter should be discussed as soon as possible, and it cannot be discussed intelligibly unless the report and evidence are placed in the hands of members without delay.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As the hon. member has alluded to the debate of yesterday, I may be permitted to offer a few remarks in answer to the observations he has just made. When the question came up yesterday, I gave the answer that had been placed in my hands. No doubt the hon. gentleman was perfectly well aware that it was not a matter coming within my Department, and I gave the hon. gentleman the best answer I could under the circumstances, in the absence of the First Minister. The hon. member called my attention to the fact that I had not answered the second portion of the first question. I answered in this way: that I had not seen the report, and was not in a position to give an answer to that part of the question. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Barron) stated that the First Minister sent a telegram on 3rd March last, stating that the report of the Commission had been received, and so on. That may have been done; I did not know it. That telegram was one from the First Minister to an outside party. It was sent during the election, and, of course, I did not know it. If the First Minister has made a promise, he will do, as he has always done—he will keep his word; if he promised to bring the matter before the House, he will bring it up. If the First Minister promised that copies of the reports should be placed in the hands of members during the recess, the hon. gentleman will see that the reason why it was not done was that Parliament was dissolved, and, therefore, there were no members to whom to send copies of the report. The election has taken place, Parliament has been called, and no time has been lost, if the report is in the hands of the Railways and Canals Department, as no doubt it is. So far as the information is concerned, although I could not give it to the hon. gentleman, he cannot be in such great haste, because he evidently knows that the report was favourable, for he has quoted a telegram from the First Minister.

Mr. BURDETT. The whole difficulty has arisen from the Minister of Public Works not permitting my question to stand until the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals was present to give an answer to my question. When I learned that the Minister of Public Works was only giving the answer placed in his hands, and had no personal knowledge of the matter himself, I felt I could not expect him to give an answer very different from the one he did give: but that was a perfectly good reason for permitting the question to stand until the Minister of Railways was in his place, when he could give the information desired. Had I got an answer either in the negative or affirmative, I would have followed it up with a question as to whether the telegram which my hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Barron) has read, was sent by the First Minister to Mr. Murphy, and then we would have had some basis on which to found a

motion. Outside of the technical nature of the question and answer, there is the broad subject as to the completion of this canal or the abandonment of the work. It is improper that the time of the House, session after session, should be occupied in discussing matters of this character, as to whether public works are simply kept before the public and spasmodic efforts made towards their completion just prior to or during an election, or whether these public works are undertaken and carried on in the public interest, no matter at what time they are undertaken, either before, during or after an election. This is an old and important undertaking, and I respectfully submit to the Minister of Public Works and to the Government, that the time has now arrived, in the history of this undertaking, when the representatives of the people ought to know whether the Government intend with due expedition to go forward and complete the work. If they arrive at the conclusion that this work is not of sufficient national importance to warrant the expenditure of the large sum of money that will be necessarily required to complete it, and if they say to the House that they feel that in the interests of the public they are unable to go on with it because it is not in the interests of the whole Dominion, then I will be prepared to carefully consider the question. There are many people who think that the public works of the Dominion are abreast, or somewhat in advance of the public requirements, and are certainly abreast, if not in advance of the resources of the Dominion, and that it probably would be more prudent, in the interest of the development of this country, that we should go somewhat slower in spending the public money in building public works, until they are absolutely necessary in the public interest. I am not speaking to make political capital or political interest, because the work does not go through my riding, neither does it affect me individually, if I put it upon the low ground of personal political gain; I am only speaking in the general interest and to save the time of the House, because our lives are short in any case, and they will be very much shorter if we have to remain here through the dog-days, debating questions of procedure as to whether we ought to get answers to questions and as to whether public works in course of construction for thirty or forty years shall be completed or not.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 4.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 18th May, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS—MILEAGE.

Mr. McMULLEN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 43) to further amend chapter 11 of the Revised Statutes, entitled An Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons. He said: Those members of the present House who were members of the last Parliament will remember that an hon. gentleman who then sat for Shelburne, N.S., was awarded by the pay clerk mileage for the whole distance from the city of London, England, to Ottawa, to attend Parliament. I brought the matter before the House at that time, and I think it right that we should provide against any incident of that kind taking place again. The Bill proposes to amend the statute so as to make it clear that a member of the Senate or the House of Commons shall only be entitled to mileage from his residence, which must be in Canada, to the seat of Government.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE SAFETY OF SHIPS.

Mr. TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 44) to amend chapter 77 of the Revised Statutes, respecting the safety of ships. He said: This Bill is for the purpose of preventing passenger ships from carrying dangerous explosives. In Canada to-day we have no such legislation, while in the United States and in England there is legislation of this very necessary character. The Bill is based largely on the English Act.

Mr. LISTER. Does it include refined petroleum?

Mr. TUPPER. It includes a good many dangerous things.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS.

Mr. AMYOT moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 45) to amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act. He said: The object of the Bill is to fix thirty days after the polling day for the contestation of elections, instead of leaving it entirely to the discretion of the returning officer. The Bill is very short, in fact containing only one clause. I presented the same Bill two years ago and three years ago. Two years ago it took one month to print it, though I had given it to the proper officers in both French and English. I expect that this year the printers will be less busy, and will print the Bill sooner.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE SAFETY OF SHIPS.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Before the House goes into the Orders of the Day, I desire to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the great importance in the public interest of his pressing forward the Bill which he had given notice of his intention to introduce to-day, but which he did not introduce—to amend the law respecting the safety of ships. It was my intention to make a few remarks on that subject. The hon. gentleman knows that on the 19th of June next, I think it is, the English law regulating the load-line will come into force, so far as it concerns Canadian ships sailing from British ports, and he knows that a great deal of anxiety is felt in the various ports of the Dominion on the subject. He has seen a large number of petitions from important shipping centres tabled here to-day, and I have no doubt he has also received private letters from leading shipping men of the Dominion, pressing this Bill on his attention. The Bill is of such great importance, that I fancy it will have to be

printed and sent out, so that those specially interested may have an opportunity of examining its provisions. I, therefore, desire to call the attention of the hon. gentleman, in view of the very short time which remains before the English Bill comes into operation, to the great importance of his introducing the Bill and having it printed and circulated, in order that, if possible, it may be passed and come into operation before the 19th of June.

Mr. TUPPER. I am very glad to find that the hon. gentleman appreciates the great importance of the Bill to which he makes reference. I am also very glad to be able to say to the House, that I have already taken occasion to send the information to the ports of the Dominion most interested; and in order to enable us to deal successfully with this important measure, the authorities of the Imperial Board of Trade have intimated to the Government here that the period at which legislation was expected from this Parliament under the Imperial Act, the 9th of June next, will be extended by the non-enforcement of the Act until October next, so that none of our ships will be embarrassed by the application of the rules under the Imperial Load Line Act until that date. In the meanwhile it is most desirable, in fact it is necessary, that the measure we introduce shall be on principles acceptable to the Imperial authorities, and I am engaged now, with the assistance of those officers whose help I can command, in preparing a draft; and as soon as that work is completed, I shall lose no time in laying it before the House, so that it will have, as I have no doubt it will have, the careful attention of all those interested in securing for the wooden ships of this country the opportunity of successfully carrying on their business.

ENQUIRY FOR PAPERS.

Mr. EDGAR. I would like to remind the hon. Minister of Public Works that on Friday last, at the meeting of the Privileges and Elections Committee, an order was made for the production before that committee of a number of documents from his Department relating to certain specified contracts. These were ordered to be brought to the committee room in charge of some officer of the Department, so that members of the committee might have an opportunity of inspecting them. I have twice been to the committee room to-day, and I have ascertained that they have not been brought yet. An enquiry has been made at the Department, and they are not ready to be brought, and the departmental officers cannot say when they will be ready. From the well-known business habits of the hon. Minister of Public Works, I am sure that he must have all the papers in his Department so arranged that they can be readily obtained, and I hope he will give his personal attention to the matter and see that the committee is not any longer delayed for that reason.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The committee met on Friday and gave that order, which reached the Department the next day, Saturday, and my officers went to work at once. I enquired on Saturday morning before the Council met. To-day I enquired again, and was told by my officers that they are looking for the papers. The hon. gentleman will remember that the motion was not a divided motion, but that certain papers are asked for together, and they must be classified on the different subjects of the enquiry, which must take more time than if all the papers were to be thrown together. Then, as the originals are to be delivered to the committee, by order of the committee, I of course gave orders that a tabulated statement be made, showing what papers are delivered and to what subject they relate, in order that there may be no mistake, and to prevent loss. The clerk of the committee will be answerable for their safety, and be bound to give them up when required. I can assure the hon. gentleman that the papers will be brought down as fast as possible.

Mr. EDGAR. Can the hon. gentleman give some idea of when we may have these papers? He says they are being classified under five or six different heads. If we cannot have them all, why not have some of the heads?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman must know that the papers belong to different years, and each year is fyled away separately, which occasions more delay in collecting them. They will, however, be all produced at the earliest possible opportunity.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 37) to amend the Act respecting the New Brunswick Railway Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 38) respecting the Central Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. McLennan.)

Bill (No. 39) respecting the Maritime Chemical Pulp Company, Limited, and to change the name thereof to the Maritime Sulphite Fibre Company, Limited.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 40) respecting the Farmers' Bank of Rustico.—(Mr. Macdonald, P.E.I.)

Bill (No. 41) respecting the Canadian Power Company.—(Mr. Montague.)

THE SOUTH-EASTERN RAILWAY.

Mr. LAVERGNE asked, 1st. Whether the Government is aware of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company refusing to operate the L'Avenir Branch of their line, formerly known as the "South-Eastern Railway," and removing the rails from that portion of the said road, which railway has been subsidized by the County of Drummond and the Legislature of Quebec, and has been declared by this Parliament to be a work for the general advantage of Canada? 2nd. Whether it is the intention of the Government to take any action in the matter?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government is not aware of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company refusing to operate the L'Avenir branch of their line, formerly known as the South-Eastern Railway. The Government has no power to force the railway company to operate that branch.

STEAM VESSEL ON GEORGIAN BAY.

Mr. SOMERVILLE asked, Whether the Government have recently contracted for the construction of a steel steam vessel for fishery protection on Georgian Bay? Was the contract let by tender, and if not, why not? To whom was the contract given, and the price to be paid?

Mr. TUPPER. The Government have made a contract, and the contract was not let by tender for the following special reasons :—There is but one firm, the Polson Iron Works Company, on the great lakes, who could build the screw steamer required, and this steamer is built according to special specifications and terms submitted by Lieut. Gordon, commander of the Fishery Protection Fleet, and Capt. Harbottle, Inspector of Hulls, Toronto. The contract price was $40,000 ; $30,000 in cash, and the Polson Company agreed to take a cruiser, now owned by the Government, in part payment, at a valuation of $9,000, being about the sum that vessel, with repairs, cost the Government. The date of the contract is 14th March, 1891.

POSTMASTER AT KENTVILLE, N.S.

Mr. BORDEN asked, Whether the postmaster at Kentville, N.S., has been suspended? If so, when and why? Who is the acting postmaster? What is the salary of the office, and who is now receiving it?

Mr. HAGGART. The postmaster was suspended 14th January, 1891, on account of deficiency in his accounts. Mr. J. M. Ward, clerk from the post office at Halifax, is in charge of the office. The salary of the postmaster at Kentville is $840. This is at present retained by the Department towards meeting the cost of keeping a clerk in charge and paying an assistant, Miss Eaton, who receives $5 per week.

ELECTORAL DIVISIONS, N.W.T.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL asked, Whether the Government proposes to make a re-arrangement of the electoral divisions of the North-West Territories, before the general elections are held there? If such is its intention, will the re-arrangement be made in an equitable and fitting manner, so as to permit of the French settlements being represented in a manner suitable to their population and their importance?

Mr. DEWDNEY. That question is now receiving the consideration of the Government.

FISHERY PROTECTION—SUPPLIES.

Mr. SOMERVILLE asked, Whether the supplies required by the crews of Government vessels engaged in the Fishery Protection Service are purchased by tender or by private contract?

Mr. TUPPER. These supplies are purchased by private contract, with instructions to the officers to obtain them at the lowest market rates in each case.

PUBLIC EMPLOYÉS IN ELECTIONS.

Mr. BRODEUR asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to dismiss those public employés who took an active part in politics during the last Dominion elections, and who were guilty of insulting their political opponents in an offensive manner?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Whenever a complaint is made of improper conduct on the part of any public employés, an investigation will be held in regard to it.

NORTH NATION RIVER WHARF.

Mr. DEVLIN asked, What steps have been taken by the Government toward the construction of a wharf on North Nation River, in the parish of Angélique, County of Ottawa ; when were such steps taken, and how much money has been expended in connection therewith ; has the wharf been completed, and if not, when is it proposed to complete it?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am informed by my Department that this work, the hon. gentleman speaks of, has not been undertaken by the Department, and no expenditure has been made for the construction of that wharf.

HULL POST OFFICE CLOCK.

Mr. DEVLIN asked, When does the Government intend completing the tower of the post office of Hull city, and is it the intention to place a clock therein? Was the contractor obliged to add the clock, and if so, why was this part of the contract not carried out?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The tower as it stands now is completed as far as intended. It is not at present the intention to place a clock therein. The contractor was not obliged to add the clock, as it was not part of his contract.

COTEAU LANDING WHARF.

Mr. MOUSSEAU (translation) asked, Whether it is within the knowledge of the Government, and in particular within that of the hon. Minister of Public Works, that the wharf at Côteau Landing, the property of the Government, on which is erected a shed built for the purpose of housing freight and sheltering passengers, is now under the exclusive control of two agents of the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company ; that they retain possession of the keys of the shed on this wharf, and that they refuse entry and access to this shed to the freight carried by other steamboats, such as the *Garnet* and the *Chaffey*? If the Government is acquainted with these facts will it divulge the reasons for this conduct ; and has the Government any intention of permitting this state of affairs to continue?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN (Translation). A lease was granted to the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company on 20th August, 1875, and this lease is still in existence. It gives the company the right of building a road 800 feet long to reach the Government pier ; of constructing and using a shed on this wharf ; and of levying and collecting tolls established by Order in Council for the use of the road. Such privileges are granted the lessees during Her Majesty's good pleasure, on the payment of a sum of $25 a year. The question goes further, and contains a complaint that the company does not allow two steamboats, the *Garnet* and the *Chaffey*, to use the shed. I purpose to inquire in the matter, in order to see whether any remedy can be secured.

CAVALRY SCHOOL IN TORONTO.

Mr. DENISON asked, When is it the intention of the Government to organize the Cavalry School in Toronto?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The subject-matter of this question is now under the consideration of the Government.

POUND-NET LICENSES—LAKE ST. CLAIR.

Mr. LISTER asked, Whether pound-net licenses have been issued for Lake St. Clair in each year from 1884 to 1891 inclusive? If not, in what years during that period were no such licenses granted?

Mr. TUPPER. Pound-net licenses were issued for Lake St. Clair in each year from 1884 to 1891 inclusive.

DUNDAS AND WATERLOO MACADAMIZED ROAD.

Mr. BAIN asked, At what date was the Order in Council passed respecting the ownership of the Dundas and Waterloo macadamized road? At what date was the Order in Council officially communicated to the Ontario Government? Has Dr. Walker presented any claim for damages in any way respecting the road, or has any allowance been made to him in settlement; if so, how much? Has Dr. Walker presented to the Government any statement of his receipts from and expenditure on the road from the month of April, 1885, when he entered into possession of the road, till he ceased to control it at a recent date? Has the Government any knowledge that Dr. Walker has sold and conveyed a brick house and site formerly used as a toll-gate on said road; and if so, has the sale been cancelled?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Order in Council respecting the ownership of the Dundas and Waterloo macadamized road is dated 11th December, 1890. The Order in Council was communicated to the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario by the Department of the Secretary of State on the 20th December of the same year. Dr. Walker has not presented a claim for damages, and no settlement has been arrived at with him. A statement of receipts and expenditure has been sent to this Department by the Department of Justice, through Messrs. McCarthy, Hoskins & Creelman, dated the 3rd April last, on behalf of Dr. Walker, showing the receipts and expenditure from 1884 to 1890 inclusive. To the above are added further payments made in the purchase of the road by Dr. Walker, and interest, and so on. The Department has no knowledge of the sale of the brick house referred to in the question.

SUMS PAID HIGH COMMISSIONER.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, If Sir Charles Tupper, the High Commissioner, did not receive from the people of Canada, through the Government, the under-mentioned sums for himself or his office, who did receive them:

High Commissioner's salary	$10,000 00
Allowance to Sir Charles Tupper	2,000 00
Salaries of clerks, etc., in office	7,477 03
Aid to distressed Canadians	25 33
Burdett's Official Intelligence	6 80
Cables and telegrams	195 55
Cabs and travel	86 83
Carpentering	67 20
Commission on postal orders	17 60
Directory of Directories, 2 copies	4 86
Fire insurance premiums	48 05
Freight and warehousing	73 87
Gas to March, 1890	14 94
Gratuity to Mrs. Wilkinson	68 13
Gratuities to postmen and others	29 57
Ground rent of official residence	332 15
House duty and tax	97 33
Housekeeping, D. Whitney	69 85
Income tax, High Commissioner	250 00
Lettering boxes	4 86
London Post Office Directory	7 90
Messenger's season railway ticket	38 49
Newspapers	196 04
Newspaper cuttings and mounting	24 33
Parliamentary papers	18 20
Parochial rates on official residence	349 47
Postage, London Post Office	483 02
Postage stamps and unpaid postage	342 03
Porterage	5 47
Repairs to house	62 79
Repairing furniture & tinting walls	97 33
Stationery	559 60
Stock Exchange Year Book, 2 copies	7 30
Subscription to Ashburn Gardens	10 95
Subscription to Colonial Institute	9 72
Sundry supplies for office	91 00
Typewriter repairs	5 29
Victoria Chambers, rent and heating, 1 year	2,780 52
Winding and regulating clock	10 34
Total	$25,976 04

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid I shall have to ask my hon. friend to be satisfied with a somewhat general answer to-day, and, if more minute information is asked, it would be well to put it in the form of a motion and have the return called for. The High Commissioner, Sir Charles Tupper, received the $10,000, the amount of his salary. He also received the allowance of $2,000 as given here. The clerks in the offices received the amount of $7,477. Distressed Canadians received the amount of $25.33. With reference to all the other questions, the parties or companies that rendered the services received the pay, and the municipalities and governments that imposed the taxation received the tax.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Would it not have been as well for the Finance Minister to have made that manly answer the first day I put the question?

Mr. FOSTER. I answered your question.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You denied the question the first day.

REWARD TO CAPTAIN OF AMERICAN SCHOONER *SEIGFREID*.

Mr. FLINT asked, Upon whose recommendation was the reward of a watch granted to Captain Peterson, master of the American schooner *Seigfreid*, for rescuing the crew of the schooner *Blizzard* of Lunenburg, burnt at sea in October, 1890?

Mr. TUPPER. The reward was granted upon the recommendation of the following people:—The master of the *Blizzard*, the collectors of the ports of Lunenburg and Shelburne, and the United States consular agent at Shelburne, followed by the recommendation of the Deputy Minister of Marine.

INDIANS IN ANTIGONISH AND GUYSBORO'—MEDICAL SUPERINTENDENCE.

Mr. FRASER asked, What was the amount paid annually for medical superintendence of the Indians in Antigonish and Guysboro' for the three years preceding the month of May, A.D. 1889? Who has performed the duties in said counties

since that date? Why were the services of Doctors Cadigan and McKinnon dispensed with?

Mr. DEWDNEY. To the first portion of the hon. gentleman's question, I may state that in the year 1886-87, $55.30 were paid; in 1887-88, $155.02 were paid; in 1888-89, $112.70 were paid. Doctors Cadigan, McKinnon and Cameron performed the medical duties for the Indians since May, 1889. The doctors are not engaged for any particular time, the agents securing the services of medical men as they are required.

PETERBOROUGH POST OFFICE.

Mr. BARRON asked, Who was the contractor for the erection and construction of the Peterborough post office building? What was the contract price? What amount (if anything) was paid to him by the Government for extras over and above the first contract price? What further sum was paid to finally complete and equip the building, exclusive of furnishing, and to whom?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The contractor was John E. Askwith. The contract price was $16,500. For extras, there was paid to him the sum of $1,642.56 above the first contract price. There were also paid to J. E. Askwith the following sums: for clock tower, $2,300; for post office fittings, $2,500; for fence walls, etc., $1,162; for granolithic pavement, $1,272.21; for coal bins, $373. Paid Chanteloup for letter-box fronts, $1,863.82. Paid McAndrews & Noble for heating apparatus, $1,270.75. Paid J. McLelland for clock, $1,895. Paid Peterboro' Gas Company for fixtures, $198.56.

LINDSAY POST OFFICE.

Mr. BARRON asked, Who was the contractor for the erection and construction of the Lindsay post office building? What was the contract price? What amount (if anything) was paid to him by the Government for extras over and above the first contract price? What further sum was paid to finally complete and equip the building, exclusive of furnishing, and to whom?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The contractor was Patrick Navin. Contract price, $16,497. Paid to him for extras over and above contract price, $2,960.43. The following further sums were paid: P. Navin, post office fittings, $1,600; P. Navin, boundary walls and fences, $655; P. Navin, detached water closet, $198; P. Navin, granolithic sidewalk, $941; P. Navin, artesian well, pump and cistern, $488; P. Navin, lifting and relaying church drain, $398.40; P. Navin, connecting drain with street drain, $142.50; P. Navin, extension of building, east side, $544; Edward Woods, heating, $1,574.45; Chanteloup, letter-box fronts, $1,078.25; Edward Woods, gas fixtures, $138.

GALT POST OFFICE.

Mr. BARRON asked, Who was the contractor for the erection and construction of the Galt post office building? What was the contract price? What amount (if anything) was paid to him by Government for extras over and above the first contract price? What further sum was paid to finally complete and equip the building, exclusive of furnishing, and to whom?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The contractor was M. A. Piggott. Contract price, $2,100. Paid to him for extras, $761.45. The following further sums were paid to M. A. Piggott: for post office fittings, $2,295; for Customs and Inland Revenue, $857; for water closets, $130; for retaining wall, $1,138; for stamp vendor's office screen, postmaster's office, and mail porch, $567. Paid McGuire & Bond, heating apparatus, $1,323. Paid Chanteloup, letter lock boxes, $1,324. Paid Harrison Bag Rack Company, $55. Paid R. Forsyth, granolithic pavement, $645.82. Paid H. H. Dakin, gas fixtures, $235.

WIARTON HARBOUR WORKS.

Mr. BARRON asked, Who was the contractor for the harbour works at Wiarton? What was the contract price? Was additional work decided upon and asked for by Government? Did the same contractor get the additional work? What was the price thereof? Were tenders asked for each additional work?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Contractor, David Porter; contract price, $5,900. Additional work was decided upon, namely, the placing of fender piles and stone talus around the work. Mr. Porter executed this work for the sum of $1,175. Tenders were not asked for this additional work.

BEAVERTON HARBOUR WORKS.

Mr. BARRON asked, Who was the contractor for the Beaverton harbour works? What was the contract price? Was additional work decided upon and asked for by Government? Did the same contractor get the additional work? What was the price thereof? Were tenders asked for each additional work?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Contractor, David Porter; contract price, $7,500. Additional work was asked for by the Government, being the filling between the two outer blocks of the structure, for strengthening the same, and adding to the protection of vessels lying there. The same contractor got the additional work. In the case of additional works, arrangements are always made with the contractor for their execution.

HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS, P.E.I.

Mr. WELSH asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to carry out, this season of 1891, the harbour and breakwater improvements, recommended by the Government engineers, to the harbours of New London, Pinette and Wood Island, or any or which of them?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The surveys or examinations were made for these works at the mouth of the South-West River; estimated, the cost is $1,300. At the Pinette, there are two estimates. For a channel 200 feet wide by 15 feet deep, the cost will be $5,200; for a channel 200 feet wide by 16 feet deep, the cost would be $10,000. Report is dated 20th January, 1890. At Wood Island the following estimates were submitted on the 21st of January, 1890:—Raising northern breakwater, $2,600; extending southern breakwater, $6,500; contingencies, $900; total, $10,000. No estimate is furnished for dredging. I am not in a position just now to say whether these works

will be undertaken, the Supplementary Estimates for 1891-92 not being completed.

SUBMARIN TUNNEL—P.E.I.

Mr. FOSTER. In answering the question asked by the hon. member for Prince, P.E.I. (Mr. Perry) the other day with reference to the tunnel, I find, in looking over the memorandum, that I gave the information for a land tunnel, the tunnel from shaft to shaft, and the contingencies, but did not give the separate sum estimated for the cost of the tunnel from shaft to shaft. I think it best that the House should have full information, and my hon. friend shall have all the information that is in my hands. Estimate by Sir Douglas Fox, May, 1891, for a tunnel of 11 feet, internal diameter, from shaft to shaft, £897,500; ditto, including land tunnel and contingencies, £1,075,200. For a tunnel of 16 feet, internal diameter, from shaft to shaft, £1,652,500; ditto, including land tunnel and contingencies, £1,971,800. For a tunnel of 18 feet, internal diameter, from shaft to shaft, £1,890,000; ditto, including land tunnel and contingencies, £2,252,500.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It will be remembered that last session the House passed unanimously an Address to Her Majesty assuring her of our loyalty and affection to her person and Government. A despatch in reply was received and forwarded to the Speaker, but, as the House was not in session, it could not be laid before this body until the present time. I now present a Message from the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, a copy of a despatch, No. 126, of the 9th July last, which he has received from the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Colonies, conveying an expression of Her Majesty's pleasure at receiving their loyal Address.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 15th May, 1891.

Lord Knutsford to Lord Stanley of Preston.

DOWNING STREET, 9th July, 1890.

MY LORD,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of Your Excellency's despatch, No. 111, of the 9th ultimo, and to acquaint you that I have laid before The Queen the loyal Address unanimously voted in the House of Commons of the Dominion Parliament, which accompanied it.

Her Majesty was pleased to receive Address very graciously, and to command me to convey to the Speaker, through Your Excellency, an expression of Her pleasure at receiving this renewed proof of the loyalty and devotion of the Canadian House of Commons, and of Her subjects generally in the Dominion.

I have, etc.,
(Signed) KNUTSFORD.

The Governor General,
The Right Honourable,
The LORD STANLEY OF PRESTON, G.C.B.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—THE ESTIMATES.

Mr. FOSTER presented a Message from the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—
Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1892, and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," the Governor General recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 18th May, 1891.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) moved for:

Reports from or correspondence with the Superintendent of the Prince Edward Island Railway, with respect to the condition of the road-bed or the rails of such railway, together with any reports or representations made with respect to such road-bed or rails by any of the track-masters or other officers of said road: (2.) Showing what portion in mileage of such road-bed has been relaid with steel rails since the completion of such road.

He said: I was not aware whether the reports of the track-masters were transmitted to the chief engineer in Ottawa, but, on reading the report of the Minister of Railways on the Intercolonial Railway and Island Railway, I find that the superintendent of the Island Railway stated that the road-bed was in excellent condition, or words of equivalent meaning. As this statement differs from representations made to me just before I left the Island, I think it is my duty to call the attention of the First Minister to the matter. The condition of the road-bed generally may be all that is stated, but I speak more especially in regard to the rails on the road. There are over 200 miles of railway on the Island, and the rails were laid in 1873—nearly eighteen years ago. Of these 200 miles, 62 miles have been relaid with steel rails, the remaining portion having the rails which were laid in 1873. I am instructed that these rails are all worn out, and the track-masters fear that, unless they are supplied with new steel rails, serious damage will result to passenger and freight traffic. Some years ago the Island Railway was charged with new steel rails for the Cape Traverse branch, but the Intercolonial Railway very coolly appropriated them and sent us second-class rails. That is apart from the point now in question, but I want to call the attention of the First Minister to the fact that his officials have stated to different members of Parliament, that, in their opinion, the condition of the rails, apart from the 62 miles that were relaid with steel rails, is dangerously bad, and the track-masters, who have been desirous of economising to the utmost possible extent, and who have from time to time been trimming the broken edges and piecing the rails together to make them workable, have so represented, I am told—for I have no personal knowledge of it—to the superintendent. I was, therefore, very much struck with the difference between the reports that were made to me on the subject by the officials of the road, and the official report of the superintendent made to his chief at Ottawa. I would not make so serious statements, as I consider these to be, without having satisfied myself thoroughly that they were based upon facts; and having brought them to the notice of the First Minister, I have no doubt that if he finds my statements are approximately correct, proper action will be taken to supply the road-bed with new steel rails at the earliest possible moment. I have no doubt that such action will be taken by

him, in view of these statements which I take the responsibility of making, as will enable him to determine in his own mind whether they are accurate or not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There can be no objection to giving this information. I would ask my hon. friend to state to what period this will apply. I suppose he only wants the present condition of the road and the correspondence for last year?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not wish the correspondence to extend for more than last year.

Motion agreed to

EMPLOYÉS ON WELLAND CANAL.

Mr. GERMAN moved for:

Copies of all letters, correspondence, documents and papers showing the number of extra or additional men employed on the old and new Welland Canal, between the 10th day of February, 1891, and the 7th day of March, 1891; the names of such men, the work required to be done, and the amount of money paid to each man.

He said: I beg to make known to the House some matters which came under my observation and within my own knowledge during the recent election, and as to the truth of which this resolution is moved. It has been a notorious fact that for the last eight years just prior to a general election either for the Dominion Parliament or the Local Legislature, a large number of men have been placed on the Welland Canal, ostensibly to do work, but really to influence the vote for the Conservative candidate, there being at the time no work to be done. I am credibly informed and believe that about a week before the last general election there were a large number of men placed upon the Welland Canal, and there being no work for them to do they were kept on the pay-list doing nothing until the next day after the election when they were all discharged. That was done in the neighbourhood of the town of Thorold, in the County of Welland. In the town of Thorold my opponent increased the majority he had four years ago by something over forty votes, whereas in every other portion of the county his majority fell off in large numbers. I cannot help thinking that his increased majority in the town of Thorold was influenced by the action of the Government paying wages to these men at the expense of the country when they had no work to do. It is time that this House and the country should know whether or not a great public work, such as the Welland Canal, should be used as an electioneering agency as it has been used during a number of years past.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When the papers are brought down I am quite satisfied they will convince the hon. gentleman that he is quite misinformed as to the matters he mentions.

Motion agreed to.

OTTAWA COUNTY POSTAL SERVICE.

Mr. DEVLIN moved for:

Copies of all letters, petitions and memorials relating to and praying for the construction of a suitable post office in the town of Buckingham, County of Ottawa.

He said: I may say that already a promise has frequently been made that a suitable post office would be built in the town of Buckingham. I know, as a matter of fact, that, on the eve of the provincial election, this promise was made by many prominent speakers belonging to the Conservative party, but, when the election was over, we heard nothing more about the post office. During the recent election we were also assured that a sum would be placed in the Estimates for the post office in Buckingham. It is also known that, on several occasions, deputations have come to the Government asking for this very necessary building. Buckingham is a large and prosperous town, and the mail matter which passes through its post office is very considerable, even more so than that which passes through the post office of the village of Aylmer, which is endowed with a post office building that cost the Government something in the vicinity of $15,000. I make my motion simply to obtain the papers and documents in relation to this question.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The petition was received on the 5th of February, 1890, for the construction of a public building at Buckingham; it was referred to the Post Office Department on the 13th; on the 15th, the answer was that the matter would receive the attention of the Minister. That is all we have.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. DEVLIN moved for:

Copies of all letters, correspondence and petitions relating to the establishing of a post office in the township of Lowe, County of Ottawa; also petitions, memorials and documents complaining of the mail service between Ste. Emile de Suffolk and St. André Avelin, in the County of Ottawa.

He said: I understand that a post office did exist in that part of the Township of Lowe, where recently a demand was made for the establishment of one, and I believe the postmaster received an annual salary of $10, which he possibly thought was hardly sufficient to remunerate him for the trouble of keeping the post office. However, it is not in existence now; and I know as a fact, that a petition has been sent to the Government praying for the reopening of a post office, and that the people of that district require one. With regard to the second portion of my motion, I may say, that during the last year demands have been frequently made that the mail service between St. Emile de Suffolk and St. André Avelin should be somewhat more regular than is the case now. At present the mail service is carried on once a week, and the people ask that it may be increased to three times a week.

Mr. HAGGART. In answer to the hon. gentleman I may state that it is only within a few days that any petitions have come in with reference to the subject of which he speaks; that they have been referred to the Post Office Inspector for his report as to the allegations in the petitions, and that the Post Office Inspector has not yet had time to report.

Mr. DEVLIN. The petition for a better mail service between St. Emile de Suffolk and St. André Avelin was made nearly a year ago.

Mr. HAGGART. The information I received from my Department was that the two petitions were in one.

Mr. DEVLIN. I would like to ask if the petitions came to the Department at the same time, or if the petition from the Township of Lowe came a few

days ago, and that with regard to the mail service at St. Emile de Suffolk about a year ago?

Mr. HAGGART. I was instructed that they were both received within a few days ago.

Motion agreed to.

MILITIA CAMP IN DISTRICT No. 1.

Mr. HYMAN moved for:

Copy of all correspondence, papers and reports, in the possession of the Government, relating to the locality for holding the camp of Militia District No. 1, for the years 1890 and 1891.

He said: In making this motion I desire to call the attention of the House and the Government to the fact that when this camp is held at any other place than the city of London an injustice is done to that city, which I have the honour to represent. In 1884, or 1885, I happened to be a member of a deputation who waited upon the Government in the endeavour to obtain the establishment of a military school at London. As a result of the negotiations which then took place, it was understood that the city should purchase the property known as the Carling farm and should deed it to the Government, and in exchange for that property the Government agreed to give to the city certain Ordnance lands, presumably of equal value, for military purposes. The question came up as to the number of acres necessary for the purposes of a military school, and it was then stated to the deputation that property would be required, not only for military school purposes, but also for camp purposes; so that when the arrangement was made, it was agreed by implication that the property should be used for camp purposes for District No. 1. I have had conversations with several officers in the district, and they have all stated to me that they feel that London is the proper place for the camp. The Militia stores are there; and to hold the camp at any other place is to deplete the public chest of such an amount as is necessary to transfer those stores to the place where the camp may be held. In 1890 the camp was taken to the city of Stratford, and it was stated that that was done as a political bribe; but, unfortunately for the Government, it was not successful, for we have in the House at present representing that city a gentleman who, I believe, is not entirely in accord with the Government. Public rumour states that the Government have somewhat changed their intention this year, and that the camp is to be taken away from London, not for the purpose of a political bribe, but that it is to be sent to the city of St. Thomas, as a sort of reward to East Elgin, in which that city is situated, for returning a supporter of the Government, and as a sort of a punishment to London for returning a representative who is not in accord with the Government. My whole object in bringing this matter before the House is simply that the Government may find, when the papers are brought down, that the representations made by officers in the district are so strong that they will hesitate in doing an act which, while bringing them a small amount of political influence, will be against the public interest and against the interest of Military District No. 1.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I fear very much that the hon. gentleman misapprehends the question completely. There is no doubt that when the exchange was made the Department of Militia asked for a certain quantity of land which would be required for drilling purposes. I think that the history of the past sufficiently indicates that London is considered to be an important place where camps should be held. Since I have been at the head of the Department of Militia, London has had the camp oftener than almost any other locality in Ontario. There is no objection that I know of to bringing down the papers, but I think the hon. gentleman will find on looking over them, that he is completely mistaken as to the conditions upon which the exchange of property took place in the city of London.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Return showing details of the following items of expenditure which appear in the statement of Governor General's warrants issued since the closing of the last Parliament: July 10th, 1890, Franchise Act, $4,000; March 26th, 1891, Kingston graving dock, $6,006.14; August 30th, 1890, new dredging plant, $5,000.91; March 26th, 1891, breakwater at Southampton, $38,022.30; April 28th, 1891, cost of litigated matters, $10,468.75; January 31st, 1891, seed grain to settlers in N.W.T., $2,288.18.—(Mr. Mulock.)

Return showing what amount of money was expended in repairing wharf at Big Bay, in the Township of Keppel, North Grey, during the summer of 1890; whether the work was let by tender or private contract; who performed the work; who acted as inspector, and what compensation did inspector receive.—(Mr. Somerville.)

Return showing the amount expended on each Experimental Farm up to 31st December, 1890.—(Mr. Mara.)

Return of the names of all persons in the County of Guysboro' to whom fishing bounties have been paid during the last three years, with the amount paid each; the amount still unpaid, with the names of the persons to whom such bounties are still due.—(Mr. Fraser.)

List and prices paid for all articles purchased for the Indians of the Counties of Guysboro' and Antigonish, including in said list any cattle purchased as well as farming implements, during the last three years. Also, statement of prices realized from sale of cattle or other articles purchased for the use of the Indians in said counties. Also, statement in full of articles belonging to the Department of the Interior in said counties for the use of said Indians.—(Mr. Fraser.)

Copies of all petitions received by the Department of Public Works since 1st of January, 1887, praying for the construction of a harbour of refuge at the village of Lakeport, in the County of Northumberland, and of all letters and telegrams since said date come to said Department in regard to such work; and a statement showing the date when such petitions, letters and telegrams reached said Department; with the names and addresses of all persons performing any services in connection with the proposed work, and the amount paid them respectively, and the nature of the services so rendered.—(Mr. Hargraft.)

UNITED STATES FISHING VESSELS.

Mr. TUPPER moved third reading of Bill (No. 10) respecting Fishing Vessels of the United States.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). I thought the Minister of Marine would have taken the opportunity of the third reading of this Bill, to make a statement to the House as to the position in which matters stand between Newfoundland and Canada under this Bill. The Bill extends the operation of licenses granted by Canada to Newfoundland, provided there is a mutuality on the part of Newfoundland; but there have been some other dealings in regard to Newfoundland, such as those in reference to the sale of bait, with reference to which I know negotiations have been pending, and I expected that the hon. gentleman would have taken the opportunity of stating whether negotiations had been

successfully concluded between Canada and Newfoundland by which our fishermen could obtain their bait in the ports of Newfoundland. We know that complaints have been made, that a written undertaking of the Attorney-General of Newfoundland, and further representations made by the Minister of Justice when in England, have not been carried out. I would like to know what the representations were, and if our fishermen are justified in assuming that, during this season which is fast passing away, they have the right to obtain bait in Newfoundland harbours or are excluded from obtaining their bait there? This is a very serious matter, and I thought the Minister of Marine would have taken this opportunity to inform the House on this subject. The report of his Department only deals with the matter up to a date some time ago, and gives very few details. I would like to know now in what state the negotiations are.

Mr. TUPPER. I did not think it necessary to the consideration of this Bill to state any of the matters at issue between Canada and Newfoundland, because this Bill simply affects the vessels of the United States, and does not in any way affect the vessels of Newfoundland or Canadian vessels. I think it well that the Bill should proceed on the old lines, and as already stated, this Bill is a reproduction of the old Act. In this way and proceeding on these lines, it will be less likely to lead to any misunderstanding as to the position of the Canadian Government as to privileges which have been conceded for a time to American fishing vessels. As to the remarks of the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), in regard to the stage of the negotiations with the Government of Newfoundland or the position of our vessels in the waters of that colony, I regret that at present I am not in a position to tell the House the exact position that question is now in, except to say that the negotiations have not ended which are under way through the Imperial Government. I trust before long the Government will be able to give the more pleasing intelligence that the negotiations have ended satisfactorily. At present the position is simply this: that the Government of Newfoundland has, under the provisions of the Bait Act, prohibited, and now prohibits, Canadian fishing vessels from obtaining bait in the ports or waters of that colony under any terms. Last year our vessels were permitted to go into the ports of Newfoundland and obtain a limited supply of bait, on payment of a license fee. This year, however, even that so-called privilege has been withdrawn. The Government is pressing with every effort possible the solution of this question so that the rights of the fishing vessels of Canada may be respected. I need hardly dwell upon the allusion the hon. gentleman made to past assurances, as the hon. gentleman admits that the information has been brought down both in the Imperial blue-book, and explained to some extent in the Fisheries blue-book this year. But the hon. gentleman stated quite accurately that there were pledges given by the Government of Newfoundland previous to the passage of the Bait Act that the Act would not be enforced in its express terms against Canadian fishing vessels. The negotiations have been going on since that time, and I am not yet in a position to give the full explanation as to them or to lay the papers before the House, as they are at present considered confidential.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think, before the hon. gentleman presses this Bill to a third reading, the House is entitled to information which up to this time it does not possess. I suppose that the Government are proceeding with this Bill on the assumption that negotiations are to be renewed with the United States Government for the settlement of the question with which this Bill deals. We have no information as to the action of the Government on that subject before us. We do not know what the action of the Government on that subject is. We know that a few years ago the Government appointed a Commissioner who, along with the British Ambassador at Washington, negotiated a treaty which was rejected by the Congress of the United States. We do not know that any further action has been taken. The Government have not told us they intend to take further action, or to take the initiative in opening negotiations upon this subject. It seems to me that we are entitled to all the information it is in the power of the Government to give the House upon this question before we are asked to pass this Bill. What is the object of such a measure—unless the Government propose to abandon the exclusive control of the fisheries altogether—unless it is passed with a view to negotiation; and why should this House be called upon to pass a measure with a view to negotiation when it is not informed that there are any negotiations pending or even contemplated? Before the hon. gentleman presses this measure to a third reading, the Government ought to place before the House their intentions upon this question, and, if any negotiations have taken place, they ought to inform the House as to the character of those negotiations. We were informed a few days ago, with regard to another branch of this subject, that certain papers would be brought down. I think we are entitled to the possession of that correspondence, that we should have the opportunity of perusing that correspondence before we are asked to read this Bill a third time. I noticed, among the English papers that came into my possession a short time ago, a very extraordinary Minute of Council prepared by the Minister of Justice, which seems to have been communicated to the Colonial Secretary of the Imperial Government, interfering with the negotiations which Newfoundland was carrying on, on her own behalf and in favour of her own people, with the people of the United States. It seems to me an extraordinary proceeding on the part of the Canadian Government, that it should have intervened between the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of the United States with reference to the negotiations which were being carried on in the interests of the people of Newfoundland exclusively. I do not say that negotiations might not take place of such a character, affecting so vitally the interests of this country, that, as a measure of self-defence, they might take so extreme a position as the Minister of Justice did take in that Minute of Council. Now, I say that this House is entitled to that paper, and to all other papers that may have passed between the Government of Canada and the Colonial Office, and the Government of Newfoundland, upon this particular question. Let us not be called upon to legislate in the dark. Why, if it is

the intention to hand over to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the discretionary power to do precisely as he pleases in this matter, let us abdicate our function, let us carry through this House a measure declaring that all necessary legislation shall be enacted by hon. gentlemen upon the Treasury benches. But if we are going to discharge our duty, if we are going to exercise an independent judgment upon an important question of this sort, then it does seem to me that we are entitled, merely for the protection of our own self-respect, if for no other reason, to ask that these papers should be laid upon the Table of the House, and placed under the control of the House, for its information, before we undertake to carry a measure of this sort. I think it is due to the House that the hon. gentleman should not press the third reading of this Bill, but that the information that the House is entitled to upon this subject, should be placed before us before any further proceeding is had.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman objects to the third reading of the Bill relating to the *modus vivendi*, on the ground that the papers are not on the Table of the House to give him information which would enable him to discuss a subject entirely foreign to the Bill. If the correspondence which the hon. gentleman refers to were upon the Table of the House, there is no member of the House so fully aware as himself that he could not, without being called to order, rise to make a discussion such as he has just indicated that he would like to make upon the third reading of this Bill. The hon. gentleman, however, commenced to give, as a reason to the House why this Bill should not be read the third time now, that he was not in possession of the information, of which he showed himself five minutes afterwards to be fully cognizant of. The hon. gentleman complained that he had not a certain document. If he has it not, it is his own fault, because he undertook to quote from it and to characterize it as very extraordinary. As the hon. gentleman has gone so far into that subject, I may be permitted to say to him, although it is not within the range of the discussion which ought to come up on this Bill, that that Minute of Council, in the opinion of those who are best qualified to judge, namely, that portion of the population of this country whose interests it most affects, is not an extraordinary one, but one which the Privy Council would have been criminal if they had not adopted it in its entirety. Let me remind the hon. gentleman—for I will not undertake to give him information upon such a point—that the policy with which every colony in the Empire has been well conversant ever since responsible institutions were given to the colonies of the Empire, and which has been fully recognized by the Imperial Government, is that the interests of every colony shall be considered in relation to negotiations which take place with regard to any one of them; and while the administration of affairs is in the hands in which it is now vested, the Government of this country will not consider it extraordinary, will not consider it outside the line of its duty, to interfere in any negotiations which may take place with regard to any colony of the Empire, which touch important interests of the people of Canada. I must remind this House—the hon. gentleman is already well aware of it, because he has read the Minute to which it refers—that the interests of the fishing portions of our population especially, would have been deeply affected by the negotiations which were going forward and to which he refers, on behalf of the Island of Newfoundland; and I know to his credit that there would have been a no more eloquent and forcible remonstrance addressed to this House on that subject, if we had failed to pass such a Minute of Council, than that which would have come from the hon. gentleman for Bothwell this afternoon. So far from being extraordinary, as he intimates, on the ground that it was uncalled for, even that Minute of Council, dealing with the interests of the people of Canada, and protesting in the interests of Canada against certain negotiations being consummated without our right to be heard—even that Minute was not adopted until Her Majesty's Minister at Washington and the Secretary of State for the Colonies had invited an expression of opinion on the negotiations which were going forward, and, therefore, in no sense was the remonstrance uncalled for. Now, I think the hon. gentleman has not taken the point well—that the House is not informed that any negotiations are likely to take place, or that any negotiations have gone forward in the past. The House has been informed, in the first place, that negotiations have been entered upon, and that intimation has been received by the Government going to show that, at an early day, negotiations will again be entered into with regard to these very questions. The hon. gentleman says he has not all the correspondence which he would desire to have, but the reason for that delay has been made known to him, and I think his judgment will be satisfied as to its soundness and its fairness, namely, that the correspondence in its entirety could not be brought down because the assent of other Governments had to be had, and until that assent was had, portions of the correspondence would have to be considered as confidential. But I assured the House, in giving that reason the other day, that if any protracted delay should occur, owing to the non-assent of the other Governments concerned, in the correspondence as to confidential portions being produced, we would bring down, at any rate, those documents in relation to which that restriction does not apply, and, as I said before, I think the hon. gentleman can hardly fail to consider that a satisfactory answer. But it is remarkable that at this session, after that most solemn and official announcement that negotiations are to take place—and that consequently it would be well to consider the propriety of renewing the *modus vivendi* for another year—had been made, the objection to this Bill for the extension of the *modus vivendi* should come from hon. gentlemen opposite, when for the last two years, at least, we have passed Bills for the extension of the *modus vivendi* framed in the very terms of this Bill, without any remonstrance whatever, or any enquiry as to future negotiations, or any mistrust as to the supposed discretionary power which this Bill is said to confer. With regard to the objection of the hon. gentleman, that the Bill conferred discretionary power upon the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I think he has misapprehended its purpose. It simply permits the Minister to issue a license to enable foreign fishing vessels of the United States

to obtain supplies, to obtain bait and other port facilities, in the Dominion of Canada, precisely on the terms of the Act passed last year and the Act passed the year before. Every provision with regard to the way in which these licenses are to be carried out, and the privileges they are to give, are enumerated in the Bill, and contained in the license which is embodied in the schedule; so that there is no discretionary power vested in the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, but merely the power to do that which Parliament has instructed the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to do, namely, to extend the *modus vivendi* licenses another year, as has been done for the last four years.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

REPORT.

Annual Report of the North-West Mounted Police.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Mr. BOWELL. I desire to move that certain changes be made in the Standing Committees, and I may say they are made with the concurrence of hon. members who formed the Committee appointed to strike the Standing Committees. I move:

That the following changes be made in the Standing Committees:—That Mr. McDougall (Cape Breton) be substituted for Mr. Cameron (Inverness) on Banking and Commerce Committee; that Mr. Cameron (Inverness) be substituted for Mr. McDougall on the Committee on Agriculture; that Mr. Denison be substituted for Mr. Miller on the Committee on Railways and Canals; that Mr. Miller be substituted for Mr. Denison on the Committee on Standing Orders; that Mr. Daly be substituted for Mr. Ross (Lisgar) on the Committee on Privileges and Elections; that Mr. Choquette be substituted for Mr. Préfontaine on the Committee on Privileges and Elections; that Mr. Paterson (Brant) be substituted for Mr. Cameron (Huron) on the Committee on Public Accounts.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT—MINISTERIAL EXPLANATION.

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

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I desire to bring to the attention of the Government the fact, that they have not yet informed the House whether the President of the Council has tendered his resignation as a member of the Administration, and if so, whether any other person has been appointed a member of the Administration in his place.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The question had escaped me, and this seems a fitting opportunity to make a statement. Mr. Colby, much to the regret of his colleagues, tendered his resignation. His resignation was accepted by His Excellency the Governor General, and his office as President of the Council has not been filled.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 5.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 19th May, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 46) respecting the South-Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

Bill (No. 47) to amend the Act of incorporation of the Collingwood and Bay of Quinté Railway Company.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

Bill (No. 48) to incorporate the Western Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. Macdonald, Winnipeg.)

THE COMPANIES' CLAUSES ACT.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 49) to amend chapter 118 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, known as the Companies' Clauses Act.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the object of this Bill?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I would ask the House to allow any explanations of the Bill to go over until it is before the Committee. It was placed in my hands only yesterday, and I have not had time to look at it fully. It seems to confer on companies not organized under the general Act certain powers which are conferred by the general Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DELAY IN PRINTING BILLS.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to enquire of the Minister to whose Department the matter belongs, why the Bill to amend the Election law which I introduced on the 5th of May has not yet been printed in English, while Bills introduced after that day have been printed in both English and French? I introduced a similar Bill on three different occasions in a previous Parliament, and I never could get it printed in time to enable me to move the second reading. This Bill ought to have been printed before now, as there is very little printing to be done.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My attention having been drawn to the matter, I will send down to the Printing Department and ascertain the cause of the delay. Was the Bill introduced complete?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Complete.

SUPPLY—TREATY PAPERS.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the motion is put, I would like to enquire when there is any prospect of getting the papers I enquired for with respect to the negotiations with the Washington Government, and certain other papers which have been promised us with respect to the fishery negotiations, and certain papers moved for by my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I gave the answer the other day as to the Washington papers, and I

think in the course of a week we shall have the answer from England that we are waiting for. We are not in a position to bring them all down yet.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I must say that the statements of the Minister both yesterday and to-day are rather disappointing. I find in His Excellency's Speech this statement :

"The papers relating to this subject will be laid before you."

And now, after the House has been in session nearly a month, the hon. Minister of Justice tells us that leave has not yet been obtained to submit those papers to the House. I would like the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches to tell us how they came to instruct His Excellency to give this promise when the hon. Minister of Justice and the hon. Minister of Finance now tell us that they have not obtained permission to submit the papers at all ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is hardly the time to raise that question. I shall be ready to answer the hon. gentleman when the proper time comes to make a speech.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think this is a very proper time, when we are going into Committee of Supply, to discuss the grievances of the House and the country ; and it does seem to me a most extraordinary condition of things for the hon. gentleman to inform the House at this period of the session that the Government have not permission to submit those papers which they promised through His Excellency at the opening of Parliament would be laid before us. If the Government are not masters of those papers, how is it they made such a declaration ? Why, these hon. gentlemen are unable to keep their promises. My hon. friend from South Oxford criticized the course pursued by the Government before the correspondence was made public, and what answer did the hon. Minister of Finance make on that occasion ? He told the House that when the papers came to be submitted, the facts would be found to be different from what my hon. friend stated them to be, that he ought to wait patiently until those papers were brought down, that they would be almost immediately laid before us, and that we ought rather to have confidence in the statements of our own Government than in those made by the Secretary of State at Washington. At this moment the Government are not in a position to keep the promise which they caused His Excellency to make to Parliament, and I submit that the House is not being fairly dealt with by these hon. gentlemen, who are asking us to go into Committee and vote the necessary appropriations, while upon the question, in which above all others this country is interested, we are to be kept in the dark.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is no foundation whatever for the statement of the hon. gentleman, that we are in default in any way in regard to the statement made in His Excellency's Speech. The Speech promised that the papers would be laid before the House. So far from having repudiated or violated that promise, we have distinctly told the House that the papers will be brought down, and have given a definite idea of the time when they will be brought down. The hon. gentleman was equally unfortunate in his attempt to persuade the House that the statement in His Excellency's Speech was incorrect, because we were not in a position to promise the papers. I have already said that the great bulk of the papers are already under the control of the Government ; but every member will feel more satisfied, inasmuch as the papers, taken together, form a complete record of the transactions and negotiations, that they should be all brought down together rather than piecemeal. It is obviously for the convenience of the House that hon. members should not be asked to consider first those over which we have complete control now, and then those which may subsequently be brought down, but that the papers should be brought down in a complete, connected form ; and as the Government had complete control over a large portion of the papers, the promise made in the Speech from the Throne was perfectly capable of fulfilment. The Government are in no way in fault. It was necessary, as regards the latter documents, that permission should be obtained from the other Governments concerned before the papers could be laid upon the Table. That permission has been applied for, and it is in no sense the fault of the Government that it has not yet been given.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think the remarks of the hon. member for Bothwell are well founded. While the hon. the Minister of Justice may have pursued a course consistent with his utterances, we have the statement of the hon. the Minister of Finance, which certainly warranted the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) in making the remarks he did. The hon. the Minister of Finance took the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to task for having made some allusion to the negotiations that were in progress, saying that the hon. gentleman had dealt with matters with which he was not acquainted, and that if he had read the Speech from the Throne he would know that the House would be shortly in possession of the necessary information to make the matter plain. I will read to you what the hon. Minister said, and the Minister of Justice will admit that when a promise is made by the Minister of Finance the House expects it is to be carried out. The hon. Minister said on that occasion :

"But what is the information on which he speaks? Mere suppositions, a bundle of extracts from various newspapers. Hour after hour he consumed in concocting possibilities, in devising imaginings, in seizing what this one and that has said, when, in the Speech from the Throne, there is a promise that if he will wait a day or two, he will have the very papers and documents which will make all this matter plain. Is the hon. gentleman afraid of his case? Was he afraid that if he waited three or four days until these papers came down he would not be able to make the speech he has just made, and so decided to forestall the address and get his surmises spread throughout the country before they could have a chance of being confronted by documentary truth?"

My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was content to wait a day or two, or three or four days, but when three or four weeks have elapsed and he is told that the Minister does not know when the papers will be brought down before the House, he has a right to express dissatisfaction.

Motion agreed to ; and House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Governor General's Secretary's Office, $10,325

Mr. FOSTER. In this item there are two statutory increases of $50 each and an increase of $200,

caused by the promotion of a third class clerk to a second class clerkship. Then there is a saving of $125, being the difference between the salary which the third class clerk received and that of his predecessor.

Privy Council Office..... $27,630

Mr. FOSTER. In this there are eight statutory increases of $50 each. Then there is a saving, being the difference between the salary of one first class clerk transferred to the Marine Department and that of his successor, $200. The net increase is $200.

Department of Justice..... ..... $22,135

Mr. FOSTER. There are six statutory increases of $50 each, two at $30 each, and one, short estimated last year, $15. Then there is a saving of $125, between the salary of a clerk and his predecessor, and there is one new third class clerk at $400.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think there should be a change made in this system of statutory increases. In the first place a man who tries to perform his duty faithfully every year, while he is entitled to a statutory increase, has no incentive to zeal once he has reached his limit. There are in some of the Departments men who have reached the limit of their statutory increases and are now simply doing a kind of routine work, and in many cases not doing it. There should be a change made. Either those statutory increases should be reduced and extended over a longer period of years or they should be altered, so that when a man reaches the ultimate sum he can earn he will be subject to a reduction if he does not do his work with that efficiency and care with which he performed it when expecting the statutory increase. Before the limit of the statutory increase is reached a man is liable to have his increase cut off should he fail to perform his duties efficiently, but I have not found a single case in any of the Departments of the increase having been refused. There is no case in which they are deprived of it. Then, when they reach the ultimate sum they can earn under the operation of that statutory increase, there is no inducement for them to do their duty. They lag behind and do not perform their duty with the attention they should. I know there are cases in which certain men have been complained of who are droning along in the discharge of their duty without that zeal and attention they should display.

Mr. FOSTER. There may be something in what my hon. friend states, but this is the law at present, and some change in the law would be needed before it could be altered. He says that, when a third class clerk gets to the limit, there is no longer any inducement for him to do his work well. That is not quite true. There is always the inducement of promotion, and every ambitious and skilful and good clerk has before him the prospect of promotion from the lower to the higher classes, so that is an incentive for him to perform his duty well. What my hon. friend suggests really amounts to a system of fines. But at present, if a man is at the head of his class and does not perform his duty, there is a very heavy punishment which may be inflicted upon him. He may be suspended, or he may even be dismissed. As to the statutory increases, that is not so much a matter of form as my hon. friend seems to think. The deputy head has to report on each of his clerks, and, if the deputy head reports that a clerk has not done his work well and is not worthy of the statutory increase, he will not get it. I grant that probably minute care has not been taken in this matter, and that the rule has been that, generally speaking, the statutory increases came. I know, however, that stricter care has been taken of late, and that several clerks had been refused the statutory increase.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman know of any case in the last twelve months where it was refused?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; I know of two or three cases, but then, as a rule, we have very good clerks.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You have a regiment of clerks, amounting, I should think, now to nearly a thousand men. Are they all such good clerks as to deserve the statutory increase?

Mr. FOSTER. I will try to find two or three cases for the hon. gentleman.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understood the Finance Minister to say that these statutory increases were strictly a matter of right.

Mr. FOSTER. No; I did not say that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We ought not to accept that. It is a thing which should be entirely a matter of judgment when approved by the head of a Department on the recommendation of the proper officer, and an examination should be held in every case.

Department of Justice—Penitentiaries Branch $6,300

Mr. FOSTER. There is only one statutory increase of $50.

Department of Militia..... $44,000

Mr. FOSTER. There are simply the statutory increases.

Department of the Secretary of State. $38,240

Mr. FOSTER. In this there are 17 statutory increases at $50; 1 at $37.50, 3 at $12.50, 2 at $30, and 1 at $20; there is an increase by promotion of two second class clerks to the first class amounting to $125, the one being an increase of $50 and the other of $75. There is a promotion of three third class clerks amounting to $300, and there are two new third class clerks amounting to $800. This makes the total of $2,230.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Probably the Secretary of State would advise us why he requires two new officers in the Department.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. These are officers who have been employed as supernumerary clerks, one for ten years and the other, I think, for eight years. I do not see why we should charge to contingencies the salaries of officers who are practically permanently employed, and the amount paid last year on contingencies will be reduced by more than double this apparent increase.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then I understand that the policy of the Government is about being adopted that, if temporary clerks are required to be used continuously, they are to be transferred

from the temporary to the permanent list and the contingencies are to be reduced accordingly?

Mr. FOSTER. That is the case in regard to this item.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not see that the contingencies are decreased.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I spoke of the expenditure last year of contingencies, which was $14,000. That will be reduced this year to the normal sum.

Department of Printing and Stationery.....	$25,447 50

Mr. FOSTER. There are 15 statutory increases at $50, 1 at $37.50; there is one second class clerk transferred from the House of Commons, formerly paid from the vote for printing, printing paper and binding, $1,200, and a corresponding reduction will be made in that vote. Then there is one third class clerk, formerly paid out of contingencies, amounting to $950, and there is a saving of difference in proposed salary of one third class clerk at $200.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I should like to ask if the Secretary of State thinks he has now sufficient clerks in the Stationery Department to manage it, or will it be necessary to go on increasing the staff each year?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend has heard, I suppose, that half of the increase is composed of the salary of an officer who has been transferred from the House of Commons, at a salary of $1,400, to the Printing Department, for what we call outside distribution. Another officer, a messenger, has been required to assist the officer in that outside distribution. My hon. friend will have an opportunity to look into the detailed account of the Printing establishment, and I am sure he will be satisfied, as I am, that the strictest economy is practised there.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The Secretary of State has not answered the question. The question I asked was this: Has he a sufficient number of clerks there to attend to the business of the Department without going on and increasing the expense more next year?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not think anybody will want more than they are getting this year. As I always do with supernumerary officers, I have put this man on the regular list so as not to charge it to contingencies, because they are not regular contingencies.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I asked the question because a large amount of printing that ought to be done at the Bureau is not done by the Bureau at all, but by outside printers. When the Government introduced the Bill for the establishment of a Printing Bureau they promised to do all the printing in the Bureau; now, as I understand, a large proportion of the printing is done by outside printers, not by the Bureau at all. If this printing is hereafter to be taken into the Bureau and done there, I suppose the Secretary of State will require to appoint more officers to look after the work, and that is the reason I ask the question.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I would like very much to know what is the large amount of printing done outside of the printing office?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Certainly, the Secretary of State ought to know. The public know, the men who got the money know, because a very large amount of money was paid for the printing of the voters' lists that ought to have been printed in the Bureau; and I believe the Geological Survey reports are still printed in Montreal, whereas they ought to be printed in the Bureau. Besides this, other work is done outside. I think the Secretary of State ought to be well aware of these facts.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The remark of my hon. friend, if the expression is parliamentary, is rather antiquated. The voters' lists were printed outside, some of them, three years ago, and not a single line has been given outside since then. The Geological Survey Report, which was printed outside, is now done in the printing office since last year. My hon. friend should know that, because I have taken into the Department everything that could be done in it. The Geological Survey Report required a large number of cuts and some kinds of printing for which we were not just prepared in the Department. At present the Geological Survey Report is being printed, and will be printed in the Department.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The Secretary of State knows perfectly well that the plates that are printed in the Geological Reports are not printed from type at all, but are lithographed, and no printer in Montreal, I believe, has a lithographing establishment in connection with his printing office; so that the Government Bureau could get this lithographing done just as well as a private printer in Montreal could get it done at an outside establishment. I can see no reason why the Geological Reports should not be printed in the Bureau as well as in Montreal. The reason given by the Secretary of State is not at all sufficient. So far as the voters' lists are concerned, I am asking for information—what the intention of the Government is with reference to these lists in future? The hon. gentleman states that we have had no revision of the voters' lists, and there was, therefore, no occasion for this work to be done, either in the Bureau or outside; but I want to know if it is the intention to have the Bureau do all this work in the future, if it is the intention that this work shall not henceforth be given to outside parties?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I see my hon. friend is improving. I never said that lithographing and wood cuts were required for that Bureau. I said some work was done outside because it was peculiar, not ordinary printing. But when my hon. friend says that he was only asking for information, I am glad to hear it. He was not asking for information a moment ago; he was making charges, at first. If he had asked for information he would have got it, and it would have satisfied him. Besides, I will tell the hon. gentleman that the Geological Report is now printed at the Printing Bureau, and that the voters' lists have not been printed outside the Bureau since two years, at least. That is the information I can give, and it is true information.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. According to the Auditor General's Report, the Geological Report last year was printed not in the Bureau, but in Montreal.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The report ending the last fiscal year, not this year. They are printed here now.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I am glad to hear it, but the only information I had was obtained from the Auditor General's Report, and that report stated that the book was printed in Montreal. How was I to know, without asking, that the Government had turned over a new leaf? Because we have a statement, made by the Minister of the Interior in this House during last session, that the reason he had the Geological Report printed in Montreal was because the printers here could not do it as cheaply as he could get it done in Montreal. Now, I am glad to know that the Printing Bureau is prepared to do the Geological Report just as cheaply as it could be done in Montreal, although I must say that the price paid in Montreal was largely in excess of the price that the contractors offered to do the work for, and were prepared to do it for, when the Government let them the contract for doing that work and then refused to give it to them. At the present time, Mr. Chairman, there is an arbitration going on in a suit against the Government for damages, for having had this work done by other parties than the contractors, and I suppose that a heavy verdict will be obtained against the Government for having had this work done outside the contract—and not only the Geological Report, but other work which the contractors ought to have had.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend is just as mistaken on that point as he was about the voters' lists. I do not suppose the amount of the award will be heavy, I hope it will not be much. As a matter of fact that work was done outside, and I may say it was done with the assent of the contractors. No damages will be awarded, because no damages were asked for, in so far as that work is concerned.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The Secretary of State does not give the whole statement; for the simple reason that after the Government renewed the contract with the contractors, they put a saving clause into the contract to prevent them from obtaining damages for certain work; but in the original contract which was running for years, they have a right to obtain damages for this work that was given out.

Mr. IVES. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman, who does not seem to be at all satisfied after he has learned that the work is now being done in the Department, that he should ascertain from the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), who sits just in front of him, how the matter is managed in Quebec by the Provincial Government. It would be very interesting for us to know just how the public printing is done by the Mercier Government. If we knew all about that, and how economically and cheaply it is done, the Secretary of State might be able to adopt some improvements in the matter here at Ottawa. Speaking of the claims of the contractors which have been arbitrated, I believe that an arbitration was called for with reference to a claim of a similar character arising under the Mackenzie Administration.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives) seems to be considerably exercised about the printing done in the Province of Quebec. Now, I do not profess to know anything about that; it is not my business to enquire about that. I am sent here to enquire about the printing done by this Government for the Dominion of Canada, and I am not here to look after the printing of the Province of Quebec, or after legislation in the State of Texas. I think if the member for Sherbrooke knows anything of that, this House would be interested in learning about it; because if this House is interested in learning about the printing of the Province of Quebec, it would be equally interested in learning about legislation in the State of Texas, and the hon. gentleman ought to be able to give us that information.

Mr. IVES. With regard to legislation in the State of Texas, when people there get too impudent they are sometimes called to order in a very summary manner. I think my hon. friend is very unkind in trespassing upon the territory of the hon. member for East Grey. That is a favourite interruption of the hon. member for East Grey, and I do not think it is fair to the hon. gentleman, who is supposed to know all about printing and to represent the printing intelligence of the Opposition, to trespass upon his limits. Reference is frequently made that I come from Texas, and represent Texas. I suppose there is some point in this reference to Texas. I should like the hon. gentleman to tell what it is. If it is that I have invested money in Texas and have not invested in Canada, I will undertake to say that I have invested more money in Canada and am now employing more labour and paying for more labour to-day in Canada than any man who sits on the Opposition side of the House.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You should be taken into the Cabinet at once.

Mr. IVES. That might be a very good reason, because part of my business is manufacturing chairs, which would seem to fit the point. I do not know of anything to qualify the hon. member for a Cabinet position. The fact of the matter is, that if the reference to Texas, which is frequently made by my irrepressible friend from East Grey, means that, it is utterly unfounded and there is no ground for his charge. I have invested in Texas and in Canada and in other parts of the world, and I am only happy to say that my Texas investment, in regard to which I have been laughed at so much, is likely to prove very profitable. We have had some lean years, it is true; but things are looking up, and I am happy to inform the hon. member for East Grey of this fact, and I can afford to be laughed at in regard to it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I rise to a point of order. If the hon. gentleman desires to speak, I hope he will not point to me as the hon. member for East Grey. I draw the line at that.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I can readily understand why the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives) remains a resident of Canada. He has shown that in Texas, where he has investments, the people deal very summarily with those who indulge in a certain line of conduct which is not very reputable, and I suppose that fact accounts for the hon. gentleman living in Canada.

Mr. AMYOT. I understand I am called upon to state as to how the public printing is managed in the Province of Quebec, and I have no reason to refuse a reply. The Government of the Province of Quebec have not thought proper to take away from private enterprise the printing of public documents. It is a false principle that the State

should carry on that work. It is a means by which to help private individuals in their regular and honest line of business. If the result is the aiding of some newspaper, I see no harm to it. When a Government, be it Liberal or Conservative, or both, or be it Grit or Tory, deprives private firms of their share of public patronage, and place the work as a monopoly in the hands of the Government, a wrong principle is adopted, and such action is contrary to the principles adopted by those countries which look to the welfare of private enterprises as well as to the public at large. I never heard any complaint made as to the way the work was done in the Province of Quebec. I will go one step further, and say that if the hon. gentleman seeks to attack in this Parliament absentees, and to strike them in the back when they are not here to defend themselves, he is not doing a very brave deed. Let him go where his attacks may be answered. We have not here the papers, tenders and contracts, and the parties involved are not here to defend themselves. Such an attack is entirely uncalled for, and does not throw much credit upon the valour of the hon. member for Texas—I mean for Sherbrooke.

Mr. IVES. It is understood, I think, in regard to the printing of the Province of Quebec, that the proprietor of *La Justice* obtained a share. The hon. gentleman spoke about some members upon this side of the House being robbers. I think some of the late friends of the hon. gentleman characterized the manner in which he got possession of that paper as being somewhat of that character. It is well understood that *La Justice* has received justice in the matter of printing in the Province of Quebec.

Mr. AMYOT. That I am one of the proprietors of *La Justice* is true; but the proprietors of *La Justice* never received a cent either from one Government or the other. All such work falls to those who print that paper, and I do not belong to that part of the company. There is not a member of this House or the other Chamber who is a member of the company who prints *La Justice*. It was born in a moment of public excitement throughout the Province. It has an object to attain, and it will pursue its regular line of conduct until its object is attained. I defy the hon. gentleman to prove that a single cent was ever received by any one of the proprietors of *La Justice*, and I will wager my seat against his on that point.

Mr. McMULLEN. I was glad to hear the Minister state that the principal part of the printing was done at the Printing Bureau. What was the printing given out to an Ottawa newspaper for, when it drew over $10,000?

Department of Interior.....$91,817.50

Mr. FOSTER. There are 27 salaries increased by $50 each, one $62.50, two by $25 and one by $30. Five additional third class clerks are provided. The total increase is $2,730.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I must say that as regards the Department of the Interior it is very objectionable, looking at the receipts of that Department, that we should be called upon to provide five additional hands. We are now called upon to vote 87 employés for that Department instead of 82, at a cost of $91,000 and $18,000 for contingencies, exclusive of Minister's salary. These sums amount to almost as much as the total receipts from all the North-West lands, and the hon. gentleman's predecessor promised us to have $70,000,000 on hand on 1st January last. I look with extreme regret on the proposed increase in this Department, under the existing circumstances, and I hope the Minister of Interior will be able to explain satisfactorily to the Committee why he wants five new clerks.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Although this is apparently an increase, it is really a decrease. The hon. gentleman will remember that last year I made an explanation in regard to some change I proposed to make, and that was to do away with a number of temporary clerks and place some of them on the permanent list, and I accordingly asked for a comparatively large increase for third class clerks. Unfortunately, during recess, circumstances occurred which prevented my carrying out this arrangement. It occurred in this way: I proposed to place a number of temporary clerks on the permanent list—and this is the matter about which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has just referred to. A difference of opinion arose, however, between the Auditor General and the Department in regard to the standing of temporary clerks paid under the heading of Dominion Lands. The Minister of Justice, on the matter being referred to him, gave his opinion that all the clerks, whether paid out of the Civil Government money or the Dominion Lands money or out of contingencies, should come under the Civil Service Act. That prevented my carrying out the arrangement I had proposed, for the reason that I would have done a great injustice to several officers of very long service. If the hon. gentleman will look at the last page of the Estimates he will find that I am making a decrease of $22,440.75 in Dominion Lands, for the reason that I am taking a number of temporary clerks who were drawing large salaries and putting them on the permanent list, where they will receive the minimum salaries of their class. This is saving a large amount of money on salaries as well as conferring a boon on some of the clerks who otherwise would not be eligible to work for us on account of not coming under the Civil Service Act. I am sure the hon. gentleman's remarks with reference to an increase were made under a misapprehension, because there will be a large decrease in the cost of management of the Department of the Interior this year.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How many extra sessional clerks are there in the Interior Department? Are there more than five?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I cannot remember the number now, but there are more than five on the temporary list and paid out of Dominion Lands fund.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not object to the principle proposed by the Minister, but I doubt the application. My experience has been that when a number of men are put on the permanent list, although for a few months the number of extra clerks appears to diminish, we invariably find that the exigencies of the service—or political exigencies or some other exigencies—require that the vacancies should be filled up, so that we do not gain in the end by the substitution of permanent for extra clerks. I hope the hon. gentleman will be able to make a better showing in this respect than has happened in the past.

Mr. DEWDNEY. There will be a large decrease this year.

Mr. CHARLTON. I notice on page D—124 of the Auditor General's Report, expenditures for surveys, that the amounts seem to be given in round numbers. Are the payments to the several persons mentioned for salaries or for contracts let to these persons for work done?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The majority are for contracts, and there are, I think, a few permanent officers.

Mr. CHARLTON. Are these contracts let for surveying each township?

Mr. DEWDNEY. They are let at so much a mile, and the rate is fixed by Order in Council.

Mr. CHARLTON. I notice that the expenditure for surveys for 1890 is very much less than for the previous year; is that due to the fact that a smaller amount of Government land has been surveyed during the latter year?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The amount asked this year is practically the same as for the year before. We took $100,000 in the main Estimates last year and $25,000 in the Supplementary Estimates: the latter for the reason that we wished the parties to be able to go out to work earlier in the year.

Mr. CHARLTON. The object of my question was to learn what amount of surveying was done for the two years.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I presume there must have been less work done last year. There are several classes of surveys, and I presume the hon. gentleman's question refers only to the sub-division work in the North-West.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is the intention of the Minister of Interior the same as that announced by the Secretary of State, namely, to do away with the employment of these temporary clerks and to give employment to permanent clerks instead?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes, that is what we propose to do; that is the arrangement which I was endeavouring to explain to the hon. gentleman from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright.)

Department of Indian Affairs.....$49,087.50

Mr. FOSTER. There is a statutory increase in salaries amounting to $1,937, less extras for 1890 and 1891, which leaves the net increase $1,554.48.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice, from the Auditor General's Report, that Mr. Wm. McGirr, of Ottawa, is engaged in this Department at a salary of $1,600 a year. Under what circumstances was it necessary to engage him?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The gentleman referred to by the hon. member has been in the service of the Department since the winter of 1879. The salary, which is the same as he has been receiving for the last three years, and when he was working with me in the general office in the North-West, has been paid out of the Indian vote for general expenses in the North-West.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is it only last year that he has been engaged in the Department here?

Mr. DEWDNEY. When I came down I brought him here for the purpose of giving assistance in the office in North-West matters. He has been here now two years and a half.

Mr. WATSON. Is he employed continuously at Ottawa now, or are part of his duties in the West?

Mr. DEWDNEY. He is working continuously here now.

Mr. WATSON. I thought East Assiniboia engaged part of his time.

Department of Finance and Treasury Board.....$49,382.50

Mr. CHARLTON. How is it we have the unusual spectacle here of a decrease?

Mr. FOSTER. You will always find these instances of economy in my Department. The work will be done quite as well. In this Department there are twelve statutory increases, in addition to an increase in Mr. Toller's salary of $200. The decreases are in part due to the differences between the salaries of two officers, Mr. Jarvis and Mr. Baxter, who have been superannuated, and the salaries of their successors. No new appointments have been made in the place of those gentlemen, but there will be promotions from the class below. Then, one of our clerks died, and the difference between his salary and that of his successor is $300. The three places thus vacated have not been filled, and I find that under the re-distribution it will not be necessary to fill them.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has mentioned the name of one clerk who is to have an increase of $200; he did not state why.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Toller holds a very responsible office: he is comptroller, and has charge of all the securities which have mounted up to a very large sum, as well as supervision of the printing and custody of the Dominion notes. He has had no increase of salary for a number of years; and taking all these things into consideration, I thought it only right that he should have this increase, especially as in the general distribution of the work of the Department I was not asking the country to pay more largely for equally good service.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am aware that the Treasury Department is entitled to the unique distinction of being the only Department in the public service which for a number of years back has continuously decreased the cost of its civil appropriation, and I am glad to see that it is continuing the good work. But I wish to know what position this gentleman holds, what his salary is, and how long he has been in the public service? And with all due respect to my hon. friend, I have failed to find in his explanations any valid reason for the increase. The mere fact that Mr. Toller has charge of certain securities does not seem to me to entitle him to an increase of salary.

Mr. FOSTER. His salary is $2,400, and this increase makes it $2,600.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Did the hon. gentleman recommend an increase in the salary of any other clerk in his Department?

Mr. FOSTER. The arrangement I have made here and which I have explained, provides for the promotion of some of the other clerks. That has not taken place yet; of course we must have the authority of Parliament before it can take place.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The arrangement with Mr. Toller has not taken place yet, I understand; that is the proposition the hon. gentleman is now making to Parliament. He does not state that

there has been an increase without the authority of Parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. There has been no increase.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then does he propose to increase the salary of any other clerk in the Department?

Mr. FOSTER. If I carry out the arrangement, I do propose to promote three or four clerks, and that promotion will carry with it necessarily an increase of salary.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman kindly state who they are?

Mr. FOSTER. I am not altogether certain as to what arrangement I may make, and I do not think I ought to state the names of any clerks who might be promoted.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understood the hon. gentleman to say that he had made arrangements for the promotion of three or four clerks, and I assume that he would not make those arrangements without having decided who the clerks were. I certainly do not object to proper promotion: far from it. But if the hon. gentleman singles out Mr. Toller, this gentleman who has been so markedly favoured in times gone by for increases in his salary, which some people might hold his services did not justify, I think the hon. gentleman might give us the names of others who are entitled to the same promotion. This gentleman, I think, comes from the same locality as the hon. gentleman himself.

Mr. FOSTER. The date of Mr. Toller's appointment was 1871. With all due deference to my hon. friend, I do not think I stated that I had arranged for what promotions should take place. I said I had asked the authority of Parliament to vote sums which would be necessary to make the arrangement. The arrangement is not completed, and I do not think my hon. friend should press for the names of certain persons who might be promoted before I have determined what promotions should take place. That I think might very well be left to the head of the Department.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman says he is not in the position in which he wishes the House to assume he is. He has already determined what promotions shall take place.

Mr. FOSTER. I have not.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He has, I understand, determined what salaries shall be given to those who are to be promoted, and asks this House to vote the appropriation. Having determined the number to be promoted and the increases to be paid, the hon. gentleman should take the House a little further into his confidence and say whom he intends to promote. I would like, also, to understand the grounds upon which the hon. gentleman recommends the $200 increase in the case of the officer whose name he has given. If I understood the hon. gentleman correctly, he said there was a heavy responsibility attaching to this gentleman's office, owing to the fact that he has the charge of valuable documents. But he has had the charge of those documents for years, and I am not aware that his responsibility has been increased in that regard.

Mr. FOSTER. I think I have already stated the grounds for the increase, but will re-state them. I thought that Mr. Toller should have an increase of $200 for several reasons. He has had the responsibility of the care of very valuable documents, which have been, it is true, in his custody for a number of years, but my hon. friend must know that these documents are constantly increasing in number. The great advance which has taken place in the insurance business, and the consequent increase in the deposit of valuable securities, has led to a very large increase in a number of these securities, and Mr. Toller has, so far as I know, performed the duties of his office well, and I must be responsible for considering what is to be done with the officers of my Department, and, after thinking the whole matter over, I came to the conclusion it would be but fair to give him $200 increase.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman may have the best grounds for that, but he has not suggested them here. What I complain of is, not that the increase has been given, but that the grounds urged by the hon. gentleman for that increase are inadequate. I cannot see that the possession of valuable documents locked up in the safe over which Mr. Toller has control, is any reason for increasing his present salary of $2,400 by an extra $200. Everybody in the service who happens to be entrusted with the duty of keeping certain valuable papers in a safe will be entitled to demand an increase, if such a precedent be established. The hon. gentleman must have some other reasons.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps you would state them.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If I did, the hon. gentleman might repudiate them. But the hon. gentleman should take the House into his confidence and state the reasons himself. There may have been political services rendered which the hon. gentleman thought worthy of reward.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not aware that Mr. Toller ever was a politician.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman is not aware whether he was engaged directly or indirectly in the late elections? Of course, if the hon. gentleman has no other grounds for the increase, we must be content with those he stated, but they are certainly not sufficient.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would again ask the hon. gentleman, who has taken the place of Mr. Graham, who has been superannuated?

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend must refer to the Assistant Receiver-General in Victoria, B.C., who was superannuated, and one of the officers next to him given his place. I will give full particulars of that when we come to the item relating to the management of the Assistant Receiver-Generals' offices.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would ask the hon. gentleman who it is takes charge of these valuable securities during Mr. Toller's absence, and whether the party who takes such charge is entitled to any additional compensation?

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose when Mr. Toller is absent, some other official, under the direction of the Deputy, takes charge.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does he receive additional compensation?

Mr. FOSTER. I am not aware of any.

Department of Inland Revenue. . $38,750

Mr. FOSTER. There are nine statutory increases at $50 each; one at $25, and one at $30. Then there is a difference in salary of a third class clerk transferred from the Interior Dopartment of $112, and a difference in salary between that of a second and a third class clerk of $50, and a difference in Mr. Gerald's salary of $200. The House will find that in Mr. Gerald's case the $200 has been struck off later on under another heading.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understood the hon. Minister to say that the salary of the Deputy head of that Department had been materially decreased either last year or the year before. Is the present sum paid the decreased sum, or has the salary of the Deputy been put back at its old figure?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not think I said the salary had been decreased. When Mr. Brunel ceased to be Commissioner, Mr. Miall was appointed, and the position of Assistant Commissioner was not filled, making a saving to the country. Mr. Miall, therefore, claimed very strongly that he was entitled to the allowance of $800 per year which had been made to his predecessor, as Commissioner of Standards, but had been dropped after Mr. Brunel left the office; and under those circumstances he was granted that allowance. After that, the position of Assistant Commissioner was revived by the appointment of Mr. Gerald; and the vote of $800 was dropped out of the Estimates some two years ago.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) On the recommendation of the Minister?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman may say so if he chooses.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I only asked the question if it was on your recommendation.

Mr. COSTIGAN I do not know that I could give a satisfactory answer to that at present. The only other increase is the $200 increase proposed to the salary of Mr. Gerald. Mr. Gerald is not only Assistant Commissioner, but discharges the duty of Inspector of Tobacco Factories throughout the Dominion. He is entitled to this increase by his great ability and his attention to the duties of his office, and this includes the two offices.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I understand that the Minister proposes to pay Mr. Gerald $3,000; that is within $200 of the amount paid to the Commissioner, Mr. Miall?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I only wanted the hon. gentleman to state the fact. I understand that Mr. Miall was appointed at a salary of $3,200, and that after occupying that position one year, he was granted the $800 which was paid to his predecessor as Commissioner of Standards.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then in another year, on the Minister's recommendation, as I assume, or on the responsibility of the Government, at all events, that was withdrawn, and now the hon. gentleman proposes to give the Assistant Commissioner an increase of $200, which will bring him within $200 of the salary paid to Mr. Miall. Does the hon. gentleman propose to increase Mr. Miall's salary?

Mr. COSTIGAN. That is now under the consideration of the Government.

Department of Customs..... $33,110

Mr. FOSTER. There are seventeen statutory increases at $50. There is an increase caused by promotion from third to second class of $550. Then there is one packer at $430 and one new third class clerk at $450, making a total increase of $2,280. One first class clerk has died, and the saving has taken place by the third class clerk having been appointed. The net increase is $830, which is more than covered by the statutory increases.

Post Office Department..... $201,360

Mr. FOSTER. The statutory increases amount to $6,870. Then there is an increase to Mr. LeSueur of $200, and an increase caused by additions to the staff and promotions of $2,330, making the total increase of $9,400.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is the reason of that special increase to Mr. LeSueur?

Mr. HAGGART. He is a very efficient and able clerk, and the salary of chief clerks generally is more, I think, than $2,600. His predecessors in office received $2,800, and we thought that, on account of his ability and efficiency, he should receive this amount.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is this the Civil Service examiner?

Mr. HAGGART. No.

Department of Agriculture..... $54,130

Mr. FOSTER. There is a decrease of $1,830 there.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is quite as interesting to know why the decreases take place as to know the reason for the increases.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought it was all right when the amount was decreased.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) We like to know the reason why.

Mr. HAGGART. The increases are as follows:—Statutory increases, 24 at $50, $1,200; 1 at $37.50, 2 at $30, and 2 at $20, $137.50; Mr. St. Denis to be promoted to first class, $200; Mr. Lyster to be promoted to second class, $100; amount short voted Miss Steacy last year, $12.50; second class vacancy, $1,100; four third class clerkships (three vacant), $1,600; making a total of $4,350. The decreases are:—D. Brymner, $50; J. B. Jackson, $100; (these officers did not pass their examination in time to obtain the increase voted to them), $150; Mr. D'Auteuil (dead), $1,450; Mr. Lemieux (dead), $950; Mr. Skead (not appointed), $730; Mrs. Fraser (resigned), $650; difference between salary voted for Mr. Béland (deceased) and minimum salary of second class, $50; Mr. Lyster (provided for at minimum of second class), $1,000; Mr. St. Denis (provided for at minimum of first class), $1,200; making a total of $6,180, or a net decrease of $1,830.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Lyster has been in that Department for a good while. He was on the permanent staff before, and I should like to know what salary he formerly received. He is to get $1,000; I thought he was getting more than that before.

Mr. HAGGART. No, it does not appear so. He is to be promoted to second class, with an increase of $100. There was a provision made for him last year at the maximum of the third class, of $1,000.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then we are to understand from the explanation of the Minister, that these vacant places are not to be filled to which he has referred, and that the present staff is adequate for the work?

Mr. HAGGART. This is all the information I have on the subject.

Department of Marine..... .... $32,067.50

Mr. FOSTER. There are 13 statutory increases at $50, $650; a first class clerk transferred from the Privy Council, $1,650; addition to Mr. Anderson's salary, $400, making $2,700. There is a decrease in the salary of one first class clerk, $50; net increase, $2,650.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see that Mr. Chipman received $2,970 last year and that he has been appointed to another situation. I would like to know about his holding these two positions.

Mr. TUPPER. That gentleman is no longer in the service. He resigned about a couple of weeks ago.

Department of Fisheries..... $17,825

Mr. FOSTER. There are 8 statutory increases of $50, and one at $30. Difference caused by the promotion of two third class clerks, $200; addition to Mr. Winter's salary, $250, making in all $850.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Minister of Marine and Fisheries just made an observation that, perhaps, the Government would explain. The Minister stated that Mr. Chipman had resigned his office as a clerk in the Department. What does the Government do in cases of that sort with reference to the superannuation fund? Do they refund the payments to the party who retires?

Mr. TUPPER. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He has no claim upon the fund?

Mr. TUPPER. He resigned without any special allowance being made or claimed. He received other employment: he has been made a Commissioner of the Hudson Bay Company at a salary, I believe, of £1,000 sterling, with allowances, including a house, so that his present salary is about $6,000. With reference to the Fisheries Department, that, I may say, is a special case, and an increase, making the salary $850, is asked for on the grounds that Mr. Winter has been about eight years in the service of the Department, and he acts now as secretary to the Deputy Minister, and, consequently, his time is taken up much over the ordinary office hours. He is specially a typewriter and stenographer, and under all the circumstances we thought him worthy of a small increase.

Department of Public Works $47,60.750

Mr. EDGAR. Would the Minister tell us whether Mr. Henry F. Perley is still in the employ of this Department and comes under this item?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. EDGAR. In what capacity?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In the same capacity as last year—Chief Engineer.

Mr. EDGAR. He gave up the superintendence of the Quebec harbour works?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, last year.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Has the Minister all the help he requires in the Architect's department of Public Works? I understand that there were to have been some plans prepared for a drill shed, and that they have been in preparation for two or three years, and as the Minister told me that I might leave the matter to him, I had relied upon that. I thought probably the delay must be owing to a pressure of work in that Department. I think they have been working at it for about three years, and as I understand the plans are not yet ready, if there is a want of sufficient help in that Department, I think Parliament will sanction a little further advance in that direction.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is not the work that I require for the prosecution of this drill shed, but the money. I have not sufficient money to erect a building such as the hon. gentleman wishes to see erected. The matter is still under the consideration of the Department, and I hope that before long we will come to a decision, and have a smaller building erected with the money that will be at our disposal.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The difficulty could be overcome by asking for an additional grant. But it does seem to me that the Department—without wanting to reflect too severely upon it—has not done itself any credit in this matter. After having made this grant years ago the Government, it seems, have come to the conclusion not to go any further. I will speak on this matter further on, but it is a matter of great injustice, and if they felt it was their duty not to increase the grant, it does seem to me that instructions ought to have been given, and plans ought to have been prepared, coming within the amount of the vote. That is the reason I make this observation at the present time.

Mr. TARTE (Translation). Is the hon. Minister in a position to say whether Mr. Perley has resigned his position as Chief Engineer for the Quebec Harbour Commission, or whether he has been removed from that office without any notice?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN (Translation). I am not sure, Mr. Chairman, as to what took place; but I believe that the Chief Engineer gave in his resignation. It is my impression.

Mr. TARTE (Translation). The information I was able to secure, and which I hold from good source, tends to establish that a dismissal took place. I even read a letter from a person well acquainted with the facts, which states what I have just stated, that this officer, who held a very important position in Quebec, was not notified but dismissed without any warning. I will add, Mr. Chairman, that in view of the very grave charges that hang over this officer, I do not know whether the House would be justified in voting the item of his salary. I declare here that I have in my possession letters signed by Mr. Perley in which information of the most serious nature is given to public contractors, information which I might call most indiscreet on matters connected with the Public

Works Department. I call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to this fact. I am ready to accept his word before this House that when Mr. Perley was writing "I am directed, &c.," he was not authorized as he pretended to be. I am ready to accept the word of the Minister of Public Works should it be given before this House. But until we get a candid and clear explanation on this matter I think the hon. Minister himself should not insist upon having the House vote a salary for a man who is just now under the most serious charges.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN (Translation). In answer to the hon. member I may say that the amount put in the Estimates for specified officers, such as deputy heads, chief clerks, accountants, chief engineers, &c., are not amounts to be voted especially for the persons now occupying such positions, but rather for the offices themselves. Thus, if an officer should die before the 1st July the salary voted for him would be paid to his successor. Therefore, the vote is not especially for the officer but for the office he holds.

Mr. TARTE (Translation). I understand that, but on the other hand I call the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works to this fact: I declare, under my own responsibility, that I have in my possession letters from this engineer—for whom we are now called upon to vote a salary—giving information on what transpired in the Minister's office; and I say that as long as this man is maintained in the office which he holds the Minister himself cannot be justified in asking the House to vote that salary. So that I believe it would be as well perhaps—if the public service would not thereby suffer—nay, that it would be better, to say, stand.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN (Translation). No, it is out of the question to postpone this item; for if the amount put in the Estimates is not voted I shall not have the necessary money to pay this officer. Therefore, this item should be voted now.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) has made a complaint against the Government, that for about three years the people of his constituency have been waiting for the construction of a work which the Government have not been able to proceed with for lack of architects and draughtsmen. I do not think there is the slightest ground for complaint, for he has only waited three years. I remember the case of a small public work in my riding promised by the Minister over and over again, which was postponed over ten years, as I suppose, because the architects and draughtsmen were so busy they could not attend to it. The people chose, for reasons known perhaps to the Minister of Public Works, to change their representative, and the architect was there at once, and within six months the land was marked out, and within a year or a year and a half the building was commenced. Of what has my hon. friend to complain when he has only waited three years, and I waited ten years, and it was only when the people changed their representative that our little work was carried out. The people were then satisfied, and they again changed their representative. Let my hon. friend not complain now, but let him wait ten years, and then complain to the Minister, who no doubt does the best he can, but who apparently has not a sufficient number of draughtsmen and architects to attend to all these works.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is not to be wondered at that delays should occur in regard to such an important work as a drill shed in a large town such as the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) represents. But, in the little matter of a fence running around post office grounds in Prince Edward Island, the Department have been four years in preparing plans before undertaking the construction of that work.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman does not usually take the fence.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is quite evident I have not taken it. I have been using my powers of persuasion with the Minister of Public Works for a good many years in regard to that little two-penny-halfpenny matter, and I received the positive promise of the Minister last session, that he would personally see that the work was carried out, that his overworked men should attend to the matter at once, and that I need not trouble further about it. I knew the hon. Minister's character for veracity, and the care he has always shown in this House not to make any promises he could not fulfil to the letter, and, therefore, I at once wrote down to the people interested in this little work, told them it was going to be built at once, that few weeks would pass before a fence would be erected, and the boarding which had disfigured the grounds removed. I thought I could rely on the Minister; but the overworked officials could not overtake the work, and the whole summer went by and they were unable to determine the plans for the fence, and so the matter has remained. I hope, from indications I have seen lately, that we shall have this work of art erected and the promise of the Minister redeemed, and I have only to express the hope that the gentlemen charged with preparing the plans have not had their health seriously impaired.

Mr. LANGELIER. I desire to bring the attention of the Committee back to the question of Mr. Perley's salary. The hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Tarte) stated that very serious charges had been made in the public press against that officer, and that very damaging correspondence, which was supposed to emanate from him, had been published. Mention was made of the fact that in some of the correspondence, which was so damaging to the party who wrote it, Mr. Perley wrote as if he had been directed by the Minister of Public Works to write as he was supposed to have done. The hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Tarte) asked whether Mr. Perley was warranted in stating in those letters that he was instructed to write, as he had written, by the Minister of Public Works. I noticed that no reply was given by the Minister to that question, which was a very important one. I wish to call the attention of the Minister to another point, and it is as to the course which the Government intend to pursue against that officer. If the charges which have been made against him were proved, will the Government retain Mr. Perley in his office? It appears there is some difference of opinion between the Minister and the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Tarte), who seems to be very well posted, as far as Mr. Perley is concerned. The hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Tarte) stated as a fact

that Mr. Perley had not resigned his position as Chief Engineer of the Quebec Harbour Trust, but had been dismissed on account of the damaging correspondence which had been published. The Minister stated that Mr. Perley had not been dismissed, but had resigned. There may not be much difference between the hon. gentlemen, because everyone knows that certain resignations are tantamount to dismissals, for the individual resigns instead of being kicked out. Accordingly, the hon. gentlemen may agree that Mr. Perley was dismissed. But whether he was dismissed right off or was asked to hand in his resignation, we should ascertain whether, after the publication of the damaging correspondence to which the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Tarte) has alluded, Mr. Perley went out of the office of Chief Engineer of the Quebec Harbour Trust. It is most extraordinary that the Government have not informed the House as to what they propose to do in regard to one of their highest departmental officers who stands under a cloud, very grave charges having been made against him. The Committee should have some explanation, first, as to whether the statement made in those damaging letters, that Mr. Perley was directed so to write by the Minister of Public Works, is true; and second, what course the Government propose to adopt with respect to him?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. While replying to the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Tarte) on another subject, I forgot to answer this matter, but the hon. gentleman knew my answer from having heard it elsewhere. It is a formula in my Department, as well as in other Departments, that the chief officers of the Department when replying to certain matters merely say, "We beg to acknowledge your letter," or, "I am directed to," and so on. The Minister does not answer all these communications, for if he had to look over all these letters he would be obliged to go through 15,000 or 20,000 of them during the year. These are mere matters of form, but important letters have to be shown to me, so that I may answer them. Now, with reference to Mr. Perley, I am sure it is the opinion of this House, as it is the general practice in such cases, that Mr. Perley being accused before this House, and the accusation being referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, we are not to decapitate that gentleman before his trial. British fair play is to try a man before you hang him, and you do not punish him before you find that he is guilty. An accusation has been brought against Mr. Perley, and the House has decided that it should go before a committee. That committee will meet at the proper time and try that gentleman, and if he is found guilty we know what the Government have to do. Up to that time we must consider Mr. Perley innocent. In making this statement I feel sure that I am only speaking the sense, and opinion, and wish of the House.

Mr. TARTE. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to decapitate anyone before all the evidence which I possess is produced against him. It is not forged evidence, but the evidence of genuine letters which I now hold in my hands. But, Sir, holding in my hands at this present moment, not forged letters, but genuine letters from an hon. member of this Parliament, I think I am justified in saying that this House should not proceed too quickly in voting a salary for a man who is not accused by me, but by another hon. member. It is no use saying that those letters are forgeries; they are not forgeries. It is no use saying, as I know it has been said, that I was a party to a conspiracy. That statement is an unmitigated falsehood. The hon. Minister of Public Works stated a minute ago that Mr. Perley gave up his position as Chief Engineer of the Harbour Commission in Quebec, and, later on, he said that he was not quite sure of this fact. When such an important officer resigns such an important commission it seems to me that the hon. Minister himself should be the first to be informed about it. Then, Sir, I wish to know if the hon. Minister of Public Works is in a position to state before this Parliament that he has been informed that Mr. Perley has given up his position as Chief Engineer of the Harbour Commission at Quebec. If it be so, let the correspondence be brought down as soon as possible. Again, let it be understood that I quite agree with the hon. Minister when he says that we do not wish—not one of us wish it I am sure—to be unjust towards anyone. If Mr. Perley is not a guilty man—and I hope he is not guilty—I will be the first to state so before this Parliament, if he is pronounced innocent. But if he is a guilty man, if he has given information which the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. McGreevy) has stated he has given, if the letters which are now in my possession, and which I now hold in my hands, and which the hon. Minister may see whenever he likes, immediately if he wishes—if these letters are true, then this man is a guilty man indeed.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read the letters.

Mr. TARTE. No, Sir; if the Prime Minister tells me to read, I will read, but I believe we should wait for the action of the committee. Although I am quite prepared to read now, yet I remember that the matter has been sent for report to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I have not only one letter, be it remembered. I believe, Sir, that, if I am not mistaken, two and two make four, and that I have about forty or fifty letters from the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. McGreevy). If these letters are forgeries, then forgers have committed crime for a long time indeed. I say again, these are not forgeries: these are genuine letters, and these letters prove, if they are true, that from year to year, from week to week, and during the session of Parliament, almost from day to day, a member of this House has received the most private information from Mr. Perley. The hon. Minister of Public Works has himself a deep interest that this correspondence shall be brought down as soon as possible, and I may state for his information that his name has, over and over again, been dragged into contempt by the hon. member to whom I refer. More than this, if we are to believe that these letters are true, we are face to face with nothing short of high crimes. Then, Sir, I say that I was justified in asking, if it is not against the public interest, that this item should stand until we have evidence that Mr. Perley is either guilty or not guilty. If he is guilty we would not be justified in voting one cent for his salary. I do not ask that this item should stand, if it would be an injury to the public interest, but if it is not against the public interest it seems to me we can

allow it to stand in view of the fact that an enquiry is about to be made in a very short time.

Mr. EDGAR. The Minister of Public Works referred to English precedent, and he said that every accused person should be assumed to be innocent until he is proved guilty. That is all right; but you cannot ignore in this House, and the country will not ignore, a statement made on the floor of this House on the responsibility of an hon. member charging an officer of the Department of Public Works, whose salary we are now asked to vote, with highly improper conduct. I do not think it would have been an un-English precedent for the Minister of Public Works, in the face of these charges, to suspend this officer from his functions; not to dismiss the officer and say he is guilty, but to say: "In the face of this charge, which will be settled in one way or the other in a very short time, you will be suspended until this case is decided." If the Minister of Public Works had looked a little further into British precedents he would have found out that whenever a Minister of the Crown is charged, as he is charged to-day, with a gross offence, which if it is proved would have the most serious consequences to himself and his colleagues, I say that if he looks at British precedents he will find that in no case has a Minister who has charges like that hanging over his head continued in office until a decision on the accusations was arrived at. If the Minister of Public Works were to follow British precedents I am perfectly satisfied that his course would be to say to his colleagues: I am innocent, I will stand aside, I will vindicate my public character and I will not drag my colleagues down with me if I fail to do so; and if I am innocent, as I claim to be, I will come back to my place with increased honour and reputation. That is the position which I think the hon. Minister should take; and I am not surprised, when he remains where he is, that he does not think it proper to suspend Mr. Perley.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is greatly to be regretted that on this ordinary item, which appears in the Estimates every year, the House should be drawn into a discussion of a matter which is of very considerable importance, but which is altogether irrelevant to the vote now before the Committee. There is such an officer as the Chief Engineer of Public Works; we must always have such an officer; and this vote is for the salary of the person who will be Chief Engineer from and after the 1st July next until the 1st of July, 1892. The vote is not necessarily for Mr. Perley; it is for the person on whom the Crown may confer the office of Chief Engineer on the 1st of July next. So that all this discussion is irrelevant; and after these charges have been relegated to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, it is unfortunate that we should be induced by feeling or otherwise to extend the scope of this discussion; and I may say, Mr. Chairman, that it would be quite within your jurisdiction if you were to put an end to a discussion so irrelevant. One would suppose that some hon. members have a pleasure in attacking their fellow members. I regret that any cause for reference to the proceedings of a committee should have arisen. I speak thus because I think it is well that we should keep the two subjects altogether separate. Now that the matter has gone to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, I hope it will be pressed, as it ought to be pressed, to a thorough investigation, and that we may free our minds of the subject in this House until it is dealt with by the tribunal to which it has been relegated.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What the right hon. Prime Minister says is no doubt perfectly true, that the House is not called on to vote the salary to Mr. Perley, one of the incriminated parties in the charges brought by an hon. member; but at the same time we cannot ignore the fact that the gentleman so charged holds the position to which the salary we are now voting is attached. Therefore it seems eminently proper that we should ask whether it is right that the party or parties against whom these charges have been made on the responsibility of a member of Parliament should continue to hold the responsible positions they do while the charges are pending. There is no doubt of the truth of the remark that the right hon. First Minister has made, that these charges should be brought to a speedy trial. There is no doubt, on the other hand, that if the hon. Minister of Public Works had felt it right for the time being to resign the responsible position he holds, and to resign to another member of the Government the custody of the documents which the hon. gentleman making the charges has asked for, he would perhaps have been consulting his own self-respect and the wishes of the members of this House; but he has not seen fit to do so. On that point a great deal rests with himself; but on the point now before us, I think the House is entitled to receive more information from the hon. gentleman. Are we to have these matters burked or not? Is the investigation to be delayed from day to day, or not? The hon. gentleman who made the charges moved, on the first day the Committee met, for certain papers which he said he required in support of one or all of those charges; he stated that it would be impossible for him to proceed with the oral testimony until he had the official documents in the Department of Public Works. I should have supposed that all the other work of the Department, not absolutely necessary in the public interest, would have been delayed until all these documents had been collected and presented to the committee. I should have supposed that the urgency of the case would have presented itself to the mind of the hon. Minister himself, and that he would have given directions that other matters should be in the meantime laid aside, in order that these documents should be brought down to the committee at the earliest possible moment. If these gentlemen are innocent, in God's name let it be proved so, and let it be proved quickly; if they are guilty, it is necessary in the public interest that they should be removed from the responsible positions they hold. As the hon. First Minister says, this matter should be brought to a speedy issue, and before the proper tribunal; and it is to be regretted that the delays occasioned by the Public Works Department should necessitate the matter being brought up here. Holding as I do the position of a member of the committee, I shall try to keep my mind clear in the matter——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I hope so. Some hon. gentlemen cheer; I hope it is in support of the honourable position I take on this matter; but, in trying to hold my mind clear, I think I am safe in

saying that I voice the opinion of the majority of this House when I say that so far as the Public Works Department are concerned, every energy they possess should be devoted to bringing down these papers at the earliest possible moment, so that not a shadow of suspicion should rest on their good faith in the matter.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I agree with very much that the hon. First Minister has said, and with what my hon. friend beside me has said. The charges which have been made would be very much better discussed in the committee than on the floor of this House at the present moment; but I think the hon. member has taken a very reasonable position in asking that this vote should not be proceeded with at present. The hon. gentleman has made charges against a member of the Administration and against a member of the House who occupies no official position, also against the Chief Engineer of the Public Works Department. That being the case, it does seem to me that it was proper for the hon. gentleman at this time to discuss the actual position of affairs. Let us suppose for one moment that this engineer has from day to day, as is charged, been giving confidential information from the Department to outside parties. That would be a most improper proceeding. Now, the Department continues to discharge its public duties, and that gentleman, whether he be innocent or whether he be guilty, ought not to be permitted for one moment, until those charges have been investigated and disposed of, to continue to deal with those confidential matters with which he is necessarily brought into contact. I think every hon. member will understand the propriety of that position. Suppose a commander-in-chief of an army in the field were charged with entering into correspondence with a view of betraying the army to the enemy, would he be permitted to continue to hold his position—to jeopardize the interest of his country, until he was exculpated of the charge made against him? Hon. gentlemen will see that that is a perfectly reasonable request. Then, with regard to the hon. Minister himself, those charges being made against him, it was the duty of the First Minister to assume the control of that Department for the time being, and to see that those papers are furnished to the committee. Surely the business of furnishing the papers should not be done by the party inculpated; surely the hon. the Minister of Public Works, supposing for the moment that the charges are well founded, can have no interest in bringing down the papers by which those charges are to be established. If it were the case of a private party being charged with a private matter, he would not permit the accused to control the evidence by which the charges against him were to be established. I am discussing this matter altogether apart from the question whether the Minister of Public Works is guilty or innocent. With that, for the moment, we have nothing to do. Let us lay that question aside. Let us consider this fact: that an hon. gentleman on this side of the House has made from his place in the House certain charges, and has asked for a committee, and the House has considered his charges sufficiently important to refer them to a committee. The hon. the First Minister has stated that it is of the first consequence that those charges should be expeditiously investigated. I entirely concur in that opinion, but I hold that it is his duty, as the leader of this House, as the First Minister of the Crown, as the one specially interested in the maintenance of the honour and purity of Parliament, in the maintenance of purity in the administration of public affairs—as the one who is interested not merely in preventing wrong-doing, but in preventing the suspicion of wrong-doing going abroad, for the suspicion itself is mischievous and injurious to the country—it is his duty, I say, to the House and the country to see that everything relating to the Department in question is not, for the moment, under the control of the Minister against whom the charges are made, but under the control of the First Minister himself, or of some person whom he vests with the responsibility for the time being of the charge of the Department. It is his duty to see that the papers moved for be prepared free from the supervision of the Minister against whom the accusations are made. Otherwise what must be the opinion that will be entertained abroad among the people? It will be that some of the papers have been destroyed; that some improper action has been taken, if the party against whom these charges are made is to remain in charge of the papers and to prepare the case in part against himself. Surely the hon. Minister of Public Works is more interested than any of his colleagues in having nothing to do with the search for those papers or their arrangement or their custody. They ought to be in the custody of some other Minister, so that if the hon. gentleman who made these charges fails to substantiate them, his failure will be satisfactory to the public and not be viewed with any suspicion.

Mr. IVES. I do not think that the course proposed by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), or the hon. member who has just addressed the House, would be practicable. I do not think it would be practicable to carry on the business of Government, if, every time an accusation is brought against a Minister, he should take the course suggested. For example, it would be rather difficult for the right hon. the First Minister to maintain his Government at all, if that principle were adopted—if, because one of his colleagues were attacked, he should at once resign. On the other hand, to carry that principle out would work badly for our friends opposite, who are all laying under serious charges. The illustration used by the last speaker is very applicable to the case of hon. gentlemen opposite themselves. He said, if a commander-in-chief, in presence of the enemy, with his batteries unlimbered, ready for action, and the country depending on him to lead his army to victory—if that commander were charged with conspiring with the enemy, it would be his duty to resign at once, leave his army without a chief, and let the enemy take possession of the artillery and supplies. The illustration was unfortunate for the hon. gentleman. He is, I believe, one of the leaders of his party, one of the syndicate who lead the party, and that party has been accused in the public press and throughout the country generally of having conspired with the enemy, of having been engaged in raising funds in a foreign country——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Texas.

Mr. IVES. If it is right that a member of the Government, because he is accused by any hon.

gentleman on the other side of a high crime, should resign, I think that the hon. gentleman opposite, who stands accused of conspiracy against his native country—of conspiracy to bring about annexation to a foreign country—I do not say the charge is true, but that he is charged with that act——

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). Who charges him?

Mr. IVES. There are people who believe the charge to be true. I do not say that I do, but the hon. gentleman knows that the charge has been made.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). Why speak of a charge if you are not prepared to make one?

Mr. IVES. If the principle laid down by the hon. gentleman opposite be the correct one, the hon. gentleman against whom such charge has been made should take no part in the proceedings of the House until he has disproved it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Make a charge and ask for a committee. Be a man.

Mr. IVES. We left the matter to a committee composed of the people, and they acquitted us and convicted hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). You had to flee for your life.

Mr. IVES. Judging from the uneasiness and irritation of hon. gentlemen opposite, they are evidently in a hungry mood, and as it is now on the point of six o'clock, I will defer continuing my remarks until after recess.

Mr. FRASER. I wish just to say one word——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; six o'clock.

Mr. FRASER. If the Chairman says I am out of order I will sit down, but I will not yield to the cries of the unruly horde opposite.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. FRASER. What I wish to say is that I commend very much the bravery of the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives).

Mr. LISTER. Texas.

Mr. FRASER. After the admirable manner in which the hon. member for Sherbrooke was sat upon this afternoon, it does say a great deal for his reviving bravery that he should again enter the lists, but let me say the instance he has given is not a happy one. I grant it would be a very difficult matter indeed for the Government to continue administering public affairs if all the charges brought against members of the Cabinet compelled them to leave their seats, as most of them would be out of their places; but we cannot help that. It is their misfortune. But when the hon. gentleman advances, seriously, as an argument what is said in the country by the irregular camp followers—and he has not the courage to make in the House a single charge against the Opposition except in this irregular manner—I must say the Government would have been better served, and the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives) himself would have covered his retreat with more glory this afternoon if he had said nothing. It is about time that we understood that these irregular remarks are good enough for the hustings, but certainly they are unbecoming the dignity of Parliament. The hon. gentlemen ought to understand that the less said about it the better, not only in the interest of Parliament, but for their own reputation. This appears to be the difference—a member of Parliament makes a charge against a Minister of the Crown: outside parties make statements in order to serve party ends; and the hon. gentleman sees no difference between the statements of a gentleman who pledges his reputation as a public man for the accuracy of his charges and that of the camp followers outside. If that be the view taken by the hon. gentleman, I can readily understand how it was he had to leave one constituency and seek another.

Committee rose; and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the Committee rise and report the resolutions.

Committee rose and reported the resolutions.

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

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What business will the Government take up at the next sitting of the House?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. To-morrow is not a Government day. Whenever we have the opportunity, we will go on with the Estimates.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The understanding is that the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) shall go on with his Bill to-morrow?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; that is arranged.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 8.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 20th May, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 50) to incorporate the Steam Boiler and Plate Glass Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Hyman.)

Bill (No. 51) to incorporate the Vancouver Dock and Ship Building Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

Bill (No. 52) to incorporate the McLeod Irrigation Company.—(Mr. Davis, Alberta.)

Bill (No. 53) to make voting compulsory.—(Mr. Amyot.)

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

Mr. BARRON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 54) respecting elections of members of the House of Commons, being chapter 8 of the Revised

Statutes of Canada. He said: The object of the Bill is to set aside any disputes as to whether the deposit of $100 required, on asking for a recount, should be paid in legal tender or ordinary bills of any chartered bank. Recently, in the county from which I come, a large number of people thought great injustice was done by reason of a recount being refused because the deposit had not been paid according to the views of the County Court judge. The second section of the Bill is to enable any person, who is dissatisfied with the refusal of the County Court judge to grant a recount, to compel the judge by means of a mandamus to have the recount. As the law now stands, a judge may refuse the recount, and there is no means of compelling him to grant it.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

MOUNTED POLICE, N.W.T.

Mr. DAVIN asked, When the report of the departmental enquiry into the management of the Mounted Police of the North-West Territories, by Lawrence W. Herchmer, Commissioner of the North-West Mounted Police, will be laid before this House?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will be able to inform my hon. friend on the return of the Comptroller, who is just now out of town.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS, WALKERTON.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Who tendered for the contract of the Walkerton public buildings? What was the amount of each tender? Who received the contract? Where does the contractor reside? What was the total contract price to complete the works? How much has been paid up to date, and to whom paid, on all accounts in connection with the contract? Were the plans open to inspection in Walkerton; if so, how long before the last day advertized in which tenders would be received? Who was the inspector; when was he appointed; what is his salary; has he been continuously, and is he still employed; what was his former occupation? Was a clerk of works engaged; if so, what is his name, occupation, date of employment and salary; and has he been steadily in the employ of the Government since his appointment? Are the buildings completed?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The tenderers were: Tighe Bros., Toronto, $14,560; P. Navin, Lindsay, $14,897; Lewis & Cluff, Ottawa, $15,950; Tobin & O'Keefe, Ottawa, $17,000; M. A. Pigott, Hamilton, $17,500; J. Bower, Paisley, $18,500; H. Clerk, Walkerton, $18,517. The amount of the lowest tender was $14,560. Tighe Bros. received the contract. They reside in Toronto. Building not yet completed; no contract let for post office fittings or heating. Paid to Tighe Bros. up to date, $9,830. Plans were open to inspection at the office of Mr. C. W. Storel from the 7th July until the 22nd July, 1890, and at the Department of Public Works, Ottawa. No inspector employed, but the work was examined periodically by an officer of the Chief Architect's staff. A clerk of works was engaged. His name is J. J. Tolton. He is clerk of works, and was appointed 7th July, 1890, at $75 per month. He has been steadily in the employ of the Government since his appointment. The buildings are not completed.

69TH BATTALION, No. 5 COMPANY.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis) asked, At what date did Charles Whitman succeed Captain George Wells and become captain of No. 5 Company of the 69th Battalion, Annapolis County, N.S.? Who was the colonel of the 69th for four years subsequent to said Whitman becoming captain?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say: 1st. Charles W. E. Whitman succeeded Captain George Wells on the 18th February, 1873, and became captain of No. 5 Company in the 69th Regiment. 2nd. At that time Lt.-Col. Starratt commanded the 69th. 3rd. Lt.-Col. W. E. Starratt was in command for four years subsequent to said Whitman becoming captain.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). At what time or times did Edward or Edwin Inglis officiate as bandmaster of the 69th Battalion within the last eight years? Who was the colonel of said battalion at the time or times the said Inglis so officiated? What pay did Inglis and his band receive at such time or times?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am instructed that enquiry will have to be made in Nova Scotia before a reply can be given.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS, LINDSAY.

Mr. LISTER asked, Have the Lindsay public buildings been completed? Who were the contractors for the same? What is the contract price? What is the total amount paid on account of such buildings to this date? Is any further sum to be paid; if so, how much? Who tendered for the buildings? What was the amount of each tender, and was the lowest tender accepted?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The buildings have been completed. Lewis & Cluff were the contractors. The contract price was $14,475. Total amount paid up to date, $25,028.61. This amount includes cost of site, clerk of works, heating, post office fittings, furniture, &c. The contractors claim that $2,119.50 is due, and the chief architect reports the amount due $10.50. The tenderers were A. Johnston & Co., Strathroy; Patrick Navin, Lindsay; Lewis & Cluff, Ottawa; J. Strachan, Ottawa; William Stewart, Ottawa; F. Toms, Ottawa; Tumbling & Jones, London. The amounts of the tenders were as follows:—A. Johnston & Co., $19,646; P. Navin, $20,222; Lewis & Cluff, $14,475; J. Strachan, $18,992; Wm. Stewart, $17,711; Tumbling & Jones, $18,670. The lowest tender was accepted.

VOTERS' LISTS REVISION.

Mr. MULOCK asked, What is the total amount paid out to date in connection with the two revisions of the voters' lists had under the provisions of the Franchise Act? Does such amount include the cost of printing done in the Government Printing Bureau? If not, what is the amount of such cost?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The total gross expenditure to 1st May, 1891, was $682,078.83, less refunds,

proceeds of sale of lists, $5,513.42, leaving the net expenditure, $676,565.41 : charged in the following years:—1885-86, $159,882.85; 1886-87, $196,575.07 ; 1887-88, $65,970.35 ; 1888-89, $17,337.75 ; 1889-90, $233,078.35 ; 1890-91, to 1st May, 1891, $3,721.04 ; net expenditure as above, $676,565.41. The above amount includes cost of printing done in the Government Printing Bureau. There may have been a few trifling items since that date, but not such as to appreciably change the total. The old lists being in type will by so much reduce the cost of next revision.

WEST POINT WHARF, P.E.I.

Mr. PERRY asked, Have the Department of Public Works a report of the engineer on the state of the Government wharf at West Point, P.E.I. ? Is it the intention of the Department to repair said wharf during the present season ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The condition of this wharf was reported upon in February, 1885, at which date it had been damaged to such an extent that it was useless as a shelter or shipping place. It was advised that a new wharf should be built to the southward of the present one, the cost being then placed at $10,000.

SHAWANAKISKIC'S INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. BARRON asked, How many Indians are there on Shawanakiskic's Reserve, No. 6 of the Robinson Treaty, entitled to receive bounty from the Government of Canada ? How much money has been paid to them out of and from the sum realized from the sale of timber on said reserve ?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Seventy-seven persons of this band are entitled to share in the annuity provided under the treaty. The amount paid to these Indians, being the interest on the proceeds of the sale of timber on their reserve, is : 1873, $33.63 ; 1876, $101.42 ; 1879, $124.91 ; 1880, $41.50; 1881, $31.30 ; 1882, $49.02 ; 1883, $136.34 ; 1884, $256.95 ; 1885, $162.03 ; 1886, $147.19 ; 1887, $183.73 ; 1888, $193.45 ; 1889, $262.50 ; 1890, $222.96 ; total, $1,946.93.

MacLEAN, ROGER & CO.'S CLAIM.

Mr. INNES asked, Has an award been made by the arbitrators appointed to investigate the claim for damages made by MacLean, Roger & Co., late contractors for Government printing, for work given to other printers which was included in their contract ? It so, what is the amount of the award ?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The claim is not before arbitrators. It is before the Exchequer Court, and is still pending.

Mr. BARBER'S CLAIM.

Mr. SOMERVILLE asked, Has Mr. Barber, paper manufacturer, who had a contract with the Government to supply printing paper, entered a suit against the Government for damages for orders given to other dealers which he was entitled to receive under his contract ? If no suit has been entered, has the Government agreed to an arbitration to ascertain what, if any, damages Mr. Barber is entitled to receive ?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Mr. Barber and his administrators have sued some time ago in the Exchequer Court for damages. The question of the amount was referred to referees, whose award is now before the court for confirmation or revision.

WELLAND CANAL TURNING BASIN.

Mr. GIBSON asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to build a turning basin on the enlarged Welland Canal, at St. Catharines ? If so, at what date ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The attention of the Government has not yet been drawn to this subject.

ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK.

Mr. TARTE asked, What amount of money has been paid to Larkin, Connolly & Co. on account of the Graving Dock at Esquimalt, B.C., from 1884 up to 1890, inclusive ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In reply to the hon. member I beg to say that the amount is $580,841.43.

QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. TARTE asked, Whether the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec owe any sum of money to the Government on account of interest ? If they do owe anything, what is the amount of the debt ?

Mr. FOSTER. The interest is made up half yearly. The amount due on the 31st December, 1890, was $185,925.07. This amount is still unpaid.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS AT ANNAPOLIS ROYAL.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis) asked, Why has Augustus Fullerton ceased to be the collector of Customs for Annapolis Royal, N.S. ? 2nd, Is he superannuated ? 3rd, If so, what is his allowance ?

Mr. BOWELL. Mr. Augustus Fullerton was superannuated on the 1st September, 1890, at his own request on account of ill-health. His annual allowance under the Superannuation Act is $336.96.

POLSON MANUFACTURING CO.

Mr. SOMERVILLE asked, Were the Polson Manufacturing Company of Owen Sound permitted to import free of duty, the steel plates and other materials required for the construction of the new steel steam vessel they are building for the Fishery Protection Service ?

Mr. BOWELL. The Polson Manufacturing Company of Owen Sound has not been permitted to import free of duty steel plates or any other material required for the construction of the new steel steam vessel they are building, other than such articles as are provided for free entry under the tariff regulations, departmental numbers 863, 977, 978 and 979.

INTOXICATING LIQUOR—SALE TO INDIANS.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, What has been the total expenditure incurred by the Government for

the prosecution of persons selling liquor to Indians, in the County of Bruce, during the fiscal years 1887-88-89-90? How much was incurred for legal expenses? What was the name of each lawyer retained, and how much did each receive in the same period?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The total expenditure incurred by the Government amounted to $836.26. The amount incurred for legal expenses was $393.69. The amount paid to different legal firms was as follows:—Shaw & Shaw, $43.72; H. A. Ray, $15; Shaw & Bobier, $12; A. B. Klein, $283.84; A. Shaw, Q.C., $39.13.

TYPE-SETTING MACHINES—COST.

Mr. LÉPINE asked, What is the cost of the type-setting machines purchased by the Government, and what is the cost, per thousand ems, of the work done therewith?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The machines cost $3,500 each. They are now at $3,000. They are capable of composing 3,500 ems per hour, or 31,500 ems per day of nine hours, for which we pay $2. Therefore the cost per thousand ems would be 6⅜ cents.

PROHIBITION OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

Mr. JAMIESON moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the time has arrived when it is expedient to prohibit the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes.

He said: I hesitated a moment ago in presenting this resolution to the House, for I was informed there was an understanding that another matter would have precedence to-day. I am glad, however, that such has turned out not to be the case. I think we will have ample opportunity this afternoon for discussing this very important question, which has been so frequently before Parliament and this House in times past. I think I owe no apology to this House in again offering this resolution. Those who have followed this question and the action of this House upon it in the past, will agree that the present resolution is simply the logical outcome of the action which the House has taken upon the question of the prohibition of the liquor traffic in intoxicating liquors. In addition to that, we have had during the present session a very large number of petitions presented to this House in favour of the prohibition of this traffic, and if for no other reason than for the purpose of recognizing in some way the action of the people of this country in petitioning Parliament, I think it is due to the House to bring up this matter in order that we may have a full discussion upon it. It is quite evident that the people of the country, from one end of it to the other, are agitated in reference to this question. In addition to the petitions which have been presented to this House signed by private individuals, we have also had a large number signed by the ecclesiastical bodies of the country, and I think that the representations that have been made to this House in these petitions are entitled to a great deal of consideration and a good deal of weight. It is my desire, at the very outset, to express the hope that this question will be fairly discussed upon its merits in connection with the present resolution, and I do hope that no question will be raised in connection with this matter which will give a partizan complexion to it of any kind. It is not, and has not been, a party question in the country. Neither political party has thought proper to adopt the question and to make it a part of their policy, and, in my judgment, that is the better way to deal with it. Now, in approaching the consideration of the question, I may be permitted to look back upon the action of this Parliament in former years. I have with me here the Journals of the Senate for the year 1873, and I will refer to the action of the Upper House upon this question before referring to the action in this House. In 1873 a committee of the Senate was appointed for the purpose of considering this whole question. That committee presented a very full report, and I may be permitted to refer to some of the findings of that committee, one of which is in the following words:—

"Your committee are fully convinced that the traffic in intoxicating liquors, in addition to the evils already mentioned, is detrimental to all the true interest of the Dominion, mercilessly slaying every year hundreds of her most promising citizens, plunging thousands into misery and want, converting her intelligent and industrious sons, who should be her glory and strength, into feeble inebriates, her burden and her shame, wasting millions of her wealth in the consumption of an article whose use not only imparts no strength but induces and leads to insanity, suicide and murder, thus diverting into a hurtful channel the capital that should be employed in developing her resources, establishing her manufactures and expanding her commerce—in short it is a cancer in the body politic, which, if not speedily eradicated, will mar the bright prospects, and blight the patriotic hopes of this noble Dominion."

The committee added:

"And concurring in the opinion of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, as expressed in their petition, that a prohibitory liquor law such as prayed for by the petitioners would be most beneficial in its results to the Dominion, would respectfully recommend that the prayer of the petitioners be favourably entertained."

That was the action of the Senate upon this question in 1873. In or about the same year that body, by a very large majority, passed a resolution in favour of the prohibition of the traffic in intoxicating liquors. In the same year there was a committee appointed by this House, and they also placed a full report before this House, which report is a most significant document. After reviewing the whole question the committee finished by this recommendation:

"In view of these facts the committee would most respectfully submit to your Honourable House the importance of speedily removing the evils complained of by the enactment of a prohibitory liquor law; that is, a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of all intoxicating liquors except for medicinal, manufacturing and mechanical purposes, to be regulated by proper safeguards and checks."

That, Sir, was the recommendation of a Select Committee of the House of Commons in 1873 upon this question. Then, again, in 1875 Mr. Ross moved a resolution in favour of a prohibitory liquor law. The House went into committee on that resolution and recommended the following:—

"That, in view of these facts, it is in the opinion of this House that a prohibitory liquor law fully carried out is the only effectual remedy for the evils inflicted upon society by intemperance, and that Parliament is prepared, as soon as public opinion will sufficiently sustain stringent measures, to promote such legislation as will prohibit the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors so far as the same is within the competency of this House."

We come down to 1877 when a resolution was moved by Mr. Schultz, and an amendment was also moved setting forth that in view of the fact

that the power of the Dominion Parliament to pass prohibitory legislation was questioned, it was advisable to postpone action until this point was determined. In 1884 the present Minister of Finance submitted a resolution to this House, and the late Hon. Thomas White moved an amendment pledging the House to the enactment of a prohibitory liquor law when the sentiment of the country would warrant prohibitory legislation. That amendment was carried, and the resolution thus amended was passed. In 1887 I had the honour to submit a resolution to the House, and seventy members on that occasion sustained the proposition for a prohibitory liquor law. In 1889 I had the honour to again introduce a resolution embodying the principle of prohibition, and on that occasion an amendment was moved by the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) in almost the identical words of the amendment which was moved in 1884 by the late Hon. Mr. White. So that on several occasions this House has pledged itself to the enactment of a prohibitory liquor law when the public sentiment of the country would warrant prohibitory legislation. The resolution which I have now the honour to submit to this House I regard as the logical outcome of the action of the House in past times. We submit now the proposition that the time has arrived when it is expedient to prevent the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes. Should this House be of that opinion, then it is the duty of the House to pass the resolution which I have the honour to submit to it. It will possibly be argued that the people have not yet arrived at the point when the House is warranted in passing prohibitory legislation. But that question may be viewed from two different standpoints. In the first place, there are those who are honestly in favour of a prohibitory liquor law, but who hold the opinion that it would be unadvisable to pass a law of that character until a large proportion of the people have been educated up to the point of the enforcement of that law. On the other hand, there are a large number of people in this Dominion who believe in the principle that if a law is required, it should be enacted, and that the law would become an educator, and that the people should be educated up to the point not only of receiving but of enforcing the law. I believe that it is the duty of Parliament to enquire into a matter of this kind, and if Parliament comes to the conclusion that the law itself is right and proper, then, in my judgment, it is the duty of Parliament to enact the law and trust to the good sense of the people to enforce it. Let us for a moment consider what the action of the people has been upon this question. In 1864 a large number of petitions were submitted to this House, or rather to the Legislative Assembly of Old Canada, and the Temperance Act of 1864 was passed embodying the principle of local option. That Act was found to be somewhat defective in its provisions, and a demand was made in this House in 1875 for a general prohibitory law. The Government of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was then in power, and a committee from a very important and influential convention in Montreal carried to the leader of the Government a resolution passed by the convention in favour of a plebiscite on the question. The position taken by the hon. Premier for the time being was that a proposition of that kind was unknown under the British constitution, and, consequently, he refused to accede to the request of the temperance people of the Dominion. However, a compromise was entered into by which the Canada Temperance Act, popularly known as the Scott Act, was enacted, and that Act shortly afterwards was very largely seized upon by the people and passed into law. It is quite true that in a large portion of the Dominion the Canada Temperance Act has been repealed, and I have no doubt that during the discussion which will follow the introduction of this resolution we will be told that the repeal of that Act indicated in the strongest possible terms that the people of this country were not prepared for the enactment of a prohibitory law. In my judgment the repeal of the Canada Temperance Act does not mean anything of the kind. It is quite true that it indicates the fact very strongly that they were dissatisfied with local option, with that peculiar kind of prohibition which was embodied in the Canada Temperance Act; but it does not indicate on the part of the people any retrograde step on the question of the general prohibition of the traffic. For my part I never was very favourably impressed with the Canada Temperance Act. I supported it in my own constituency, and I endeavoured to have it properly amended in this House, simply because I believed it was the best legislation we had on the Statute-book, and that it was our duty as temperance people to test it, and if found ineffective, then it was the duty of Parliament to give us something better. But I apprehend that, notwithstanding the repeal of the Canada Temperance Act, the sense of the people of this country is still in favour of the general prohibition of the traffic in intoxicating liquors. We are told, too, that the Canada Temperance Act was not effective in prohibiting the traffic in intoxicating liquor to any appreciable extent. I have taken the trouble to ascertain what is shown in connection with this view of the matter by the returns which have been made in the Province of Ontario, as well as in the Dominion generally. I have in my hand the figures taken from the "Taverns and Shop License Act" for the different years to which I shall refer, and these figures show that in the counties which are not connected with cities, in 1884, eighteen counties in the Province of Ontario were under license, and during that year the convictions for drunkenness numbered 692. In 1887 these same counties were under the Canada Temperance Act and the convictions for drunkenness numbered 186, showing conclusively, to my mind at all events, that the Canada Temperance Act had a salutary effect so far as preventing drunkenness is concerned. These facts might not be so conclusive were it not that we have the report for 1890, when these eighteen counties returned again to the license system, and we find that instead of the 186 convictions for drunkenness which took place under the Canada Temperance Act, there were 506 convictions last year. I believe that these figures are convincing to any reasonable mind. Now, Sir, in order to show the baneful effect of the traffic which we are endeavouring to prohibit, let me call the attention of the House to the fact that the Criminal Statistics for 1889 show that there were 13,841 commitments for drunkenness in the Dominion. From the Ontario Prison Inspec-

tor's Report for 1890 we find that the commitments to gaol during that year numbered 11,810, and of these commitments there were registered as intemperate, 8,478, so that about 72 per cent. of these commitments were directly traceable to the use of intoxicating liquor. The record of the Central Prison in Toronto since it was established in 1874, shows that there were 18,133 persons committed to that institution, and about 80 per cent. of this number were registered as of intemperate habits. Permit me to go a little further into the discussion as to the advisability of a prohibitory liquor law, and as to the baneful effects of the present licensing system. In the year 1834 the Parliament of Great Britain in its report on drunkenness, founded on an elaborate examination of witnesses from the three kingdoms, made the following declaration :—

"The consequences of the vice of intoxication are so many and so fearful that it is difficult to enumerate even the outlines of them : and to pursue them in all their melancholy details would require a volume. The following are only a few of the evils directly springing from this baneful source :

"Consequences to National Welfare.—The destruction of grain given by a bountiful Providence for the food of man, which is now converted by distillation into a poison : the highest medical authorities examined before your committee being uniform in their testimony that ardent spirits are absolutely poisonous to the human constitution, so that not only is an immense amount of human food destroyed, whilst thousands are inadequately fed, but this food is destroyed in such a manner as to injure greatly the agricultural producers themselves for whose grain, but for this perverted use of it, there would be more than twice the present demand. The loss of productive labour in every department of occupation to the extent of at least one day in six throughout the kingdom as testified by witnesses engaged in various manufacturing occupations : by which the wealth of the country is retarded or suppressed to the extent of one million out of every six that is produced, to say nothing of the constant derangements, imperfection, and destruction in every industrial process, occasioned by the intemperance and consequent unskilfulness, inattention and neglect of those affected by intoxication, producing great injury to our domestic and foreign trade. The extensive loss of property by sea, from shipwrecks, founderings, fires, and innumerable other accidents which, according to evidence of most experienced shipowners and nautical men, are clearly traceable to drunkenness. The spread of crime in every shape and form, from theft, fraud and prostitution in the young, to burnings, robberies and more hardened offences in the old : by which the gaols and prisons, the hulks and transports are filled with inmates, and an enormous mass of human beings are transformed into excrescences of corruption and weakness, and constituting our troublesome and dangerous classes. The retardation of all improvement —inventive or industrial, civil or political, moral or religious. That the mere pecuniary loss to the nation from the several causes already mentioned may be fairly estimated at little less than fifty million pounds sterling per annum."

At this late date it is scarcely necessary to argue in favour of the prohibition of the liquor traffic, because it must be plain to everyone the beneficial effects which a prohibitory liquor law would have upon the morals and upon the trade of the country. This question has narrowed itself down to the issue, whether the people of this country are prepared or not for the reception and the enforcement of such a law ; and to properly argue the question now, we have got to argue it from this standpoint. A few minutes ago I pointed out the fact that the Canada Temperance Act had been adopted in a large portion of this Dominion ; and just allow me briefly to show the present condition of the different provinces so far as prohibition is concerned. We find that in Prince Edward Island the whole of that province, except the city of Charlottetown, is under the operation of the Canada Temperance Act, and so far as I know the working of the Act has been satisfactory there. It is quite true that there, as well as in other portions of the Dominion, there have been infractions of the law. That is inevitable, but all we can ask of any law is that it reasonably answers the object for which it is promoted and adopted. Perhaps I should leave the description of the working of the Act in the different provinces to hon. gentlemen coming from these provinces, but I may remark that the Province of Nova Scotia has more than one-half its territory under the operation of the Canada Temperance Act, and that prohibition largely prevails in other portions of the province, owing to the unwillingness of the people to sanction the issuing of licenses. In the Province of New Brunswick I am informed that nine counties out of fourteen are still under the operation of the Canada Temperance Act. In the Province of Quebec, in which the people did not so generally avail themselves of the provisions of the Canada Temperance Act as in some of the other provinces, I am told that the Act is still in force in three counties and that the Dunkin Act is still in force in one or two other counties. So far as Manitoba is concerned, I believe that four-fifths of that province is under the operation of prohibition through provincial legislation. In the Province of Ontario it is quite true that at the present time the Canada Temperance Act is not in force in any county ; but a year or so ago the Legislative Assembly of that province passed a local option law. It is quite true there is a question as to the constitutionality of that law, and that question is now before the courts ; but in many of the minor municipalities the law has been voted on and adopted by the people, indicating that they are not, at all events, tired of local option. But in my judgment, Sir, were no portion of this Dominion without local option, that would be no answer to the proposition we submit in this resolution, that it is expedient to prohibit the traffic in intoxicating liquors throughout the Dominion ; because I do not think any prohibitory liquor law will be acceptable to the people which does not include every portion of the Dominion : and if we had a Dominion law prohibiting the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors, there would be an enforcement of it sufficient to abate, at all events, this very great evil which is abroad in the land. Now, Sir, I believe it to be the duty of Parliament, when dealing with matters of national importance, to look after the morals of the people as well as after the trade and commerce of the country. I believe in the great wisdom of a remark made by an eminent English statesman, that Parliament should legislate so as to make it as easy as possible for men to do right, and a great legal authority has told us that the object of all law is the well-being of the governed. If these propositions are correct, it is the duty of this Parliament, as speedily as possible, to pass a law to prohibit the traffic in intoxicating liquors, which we all admit—which every reasonable person in this House or throughout this whole Dominion will admit —is hurtful to every good interest of the country. Now, Sir, I know that some men—who claim to be good temperance men, and I am not going to question their orthodoxy simply because they do not agree with me—contend that the proper way to deal with the traffic in intoxicating

liquors is to regulate it. Well, Sir, for centuries past the people of every civilized country in the world have been endeavouring to regulate that traffic; but it has refused to be regulated; and I believe that any traffic which refuses to be regulated should be prohibited, and should be prohibited as speedily as possible. Now, I do not intend to trespass at any greater length on the time and patience of this House. I have as briefly as possible supported by a few arguments the resolution which I have submitted, and I trust that this question will be treated on both sides of the House as it should be treated, on its merits. I trust that we shall have an honest and fair discussion of the question, and that this great inquest of the nation will in some way or other arrive at a conclusion which will satisfy the conscience of the country: because, Sir, I believe the public sentiment of this country to-day is in revolt against the traffic in intoxicating liquors. That being the case, it is the duty of the representatives of the people in Parliament in some reasonable manner to apply a remedy, and a remedy is needed in the very worst way. If we are honestly of opinion that a law prohibiting the traffic is a righteous law, it is our duty to pass such a law, and then to endeavour, as far as possible, to lift public opinion up to the reception and enforcement of the law.

Mr. FRASER. I desire, in seconding this resolution, to say that I believe I am not only performing a duty so far as my own individual interest is concerned, but a duty in the interest of good citizenship in this country. I need scarcely say that I do not look on the question as one which it is easy to discuss, or for which a solution can be arrived at by this House without a great deal of difficulty. On the threshold I can see the difficulties in the way of a prohibitory law in this Dominion, constituted as we are of men who honestly believe that it is not only their right but their privilege to use intoxicating liquors, as well as of those who are in favour of prohibition; we are confronted with the difficulty of dealing with men who consciously are as honest in the one belief as we are in the other. But in view of the ravages wrought in the past and in view of the present state of society, I am as satisfied as I am of my existence that the best interests of this country for the future are bound up in bringing to an end the traffic in intoxicating liquors in this Dominion. Holding that view I cannot but vote now as I have always voted on that question. It may be said that the time has not yet arrived when we should legislate on this subject; and I admit that this is a question on which there may be not only a difference of opinion, but such a difference of opinion as may be honestly held even by men who are in favour of prohibition. But I regard a vote in this House, as the hon. mover has suggested, as something of an education; and if the trend of public opinion in this country is, as I believe it to be, in favour of prohibition, I submit that the men who make the laws of the country should anticipate that condition of things and act accordingly. Back of the vote, and back of the whole question is individual abstinence; and while I am not addressing a temperance society, I am addressing temperance men when I say that the carrying out of this law and the beneficent results which we hope to flow from it, are bound up, not only in the individual abstinence of the members of this House, but in the general abstinence of the people of this country. I think that the people of this country understand that, both for themselves individually and for the country at large, total abstinence is the best, and I am glad that public opinion on the subject is so strong that men who will not go that far, will yet vote in favour of the principle in Parliament, and that is a great gain. I am not going to address the House at length. I could not hope to make converts, because I am addressing intelligent men who have thought over this question carefully, who have had it discussed in their presence and have discussed it themselves time and again. I therefore conceive that this is not the occasion for reviewing the facts or the arguments, for the purpose of inducing hon. members to vote for the resolution. But believing as I do that we must educate the country on the question, and that in my own and my fellow citizens' interests it would be best that we should have prohibition, and hoping that if not now, yet before very long, all our citizens will so see and understand the question, I have much pleasure in seconding the resolution.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I congratulate the House that for once the question under discussion has been introduced in a manner consistent with common sense, and with every appearance of sincerity. The hon. gentleman who moved the resolution laid a great deal of stress on the number of petitions in favour of the proposition before the House, and on the number of those who signed these petitions. But we all know that a very large discount must be made upon the value of petitions of that nature, as representing public opinion, more especially when we know that they are signed, not only by the heads of families, not only by voters, but by all the members of families from the youngest to the eldest. Still, although a large discount must be made, I freely admit that those petitions do present so important a body of public opinion in favour of prohibitory liquor legislation, that we are bound to treat their prayer not only with courtesy, but with the most careful consideration. We are bound to assume that these petitioners are, as I believe they are, perfectly honest and sincere in their views. I for one am entirely opposed to the principle of the proposition before the House; but I would no more dream of charging those who advocate prohibition with indifference or carelessness, as to the possible results of their action, than I would venture to charge, as I never have charged, a political party with harbouring treasonable designs, because, in my opinion, the policy they are pursuing might bring about treasonable results. I give the supporters of prohibition in the country and in this House credit for the utmost sincerity, and I believe this House is bound to give these petitioners that which they ask, namely, not only a fair and honest consideration of the question, but an expression of opinion upon it, which will satisfy them, at any rate, as to what the opinion of the House really is. I believe the time for fencing and avoiding, by all sorts of amendments and counter-resolutions, the plain issue has gone by, and I for one, though not in favour of the proposition, shall, by my vote, assist its advocates in bringing it fairly to the test. In dealing with this question we find it presented in a two-fold aspect—the religious or moral, and the economical. From the religious or moral point

of view, very great stress is laid by the advocates of prohibition, both in the House and out of it, on the assumption that it is a necessary consequence of our religious teachings. But those who take that position are either unscriptural or illogical. In order to justify the right of the majority to impose their will upon the minority in matters of this kind, the advocates of prohibition are compelled to put upon the Scriptures an interpretation which they have never borne, and never can be shown to bear, and that is, that the use of intoxicating liquors is in itself immoral. They are obliged to abandon what is the scriptural teaching that drunkenness is a deadly sin; otherwise they can find in Scripture no logical basis for their argument. Let us now proceed to deal with the question from the economical point of view. The advocates of the present proposition lay stress upon the statement frequently made by authorities whom we are all bound to regard with great respect—a statement which has become an accepted axiom, with, I think, very little foundation—namely, that to the use of intoxicating liquor is due nine-tenths or nineteen-twentieths or some other very large proportion of crime. That statement has been repeated by judges and other men of authority on various occasions, on the bench, in the press, and elsewhere, until it has become accepted as true. I am not prepared to accept it as true. If any one will consider what the nature of crime is, he will find there are very few classes of crime to which intoxication is an incitement, and that there are many classes in which intoxication would render the criminal incompetent and incapable of carrying out his criminal design. Let hon. gentlemen consult their own experience; let them look at those in their own rank of life or elsewhere, who have unfortunately given way to indulgence in intoxicating liquor, and then say whether the great majority of those men are criminals? Their own observation and experience will show such a statement to be utterly unfounded. If intoxication be the source of crime, how is it that those nations in which it unfortunately prevails the most are not the most criminal? This is a historical fact which the advocates of prohibition have not ventured to meet. Let them compare the northern countries of Europe, where intoxication most largely prevails, with the southern countries where intoxication is almost unknown. I venture to say the criminal annals are strongly in favour of the former. Let them meet that historical fact, if they can, before pressing their legislation on the ground that intoxication is the parent of crime. Again, their theory is altogether at variance with the teachings upon which they profess to base their case. I do not know that we are taught anywhere in those teachings that intoxication is the source of crime. We are told to look elsewhere and not to intoxicating liquor. If it were true that intoxicating liquors are the source of crime or of the greater portion of crime, we would find that doctrine laid down somewhere in the authority to which we all bow. But we find that opinion nowhere expressed, and that contention is, therefore, altogether unfounded. It is easy to rake up cases in support of a contention and apply them so as to fit the argument. I will give one which happened to my own knowledge. A respectable farmer, who had hitherto borne a fairly good character, was found guilty of killing his wife under most brutal circumstances. He was intoxicated, or partially intoxicated, but not so much as not to know perfectly what he was doing, when he committed the act. That was proved by the evidence, but it was also proved that he had planned the murder in his sober senses for weeks before, and had simply fortified himself with whiskey to bring himself up to the striking point. To say that murder was chargeable to intoxication is absurd. There was another case to which I might refer. A man committed a forgery. If there is a crime which requires a man to have all his wits about him, it is that of forgery. Well, what was the excuse of the criminal? It was that he was intoxicated. This plea has been so often abused that it has really come to pass that when a criminal comes to judgment he tries to escape moral responsibility by throwing the whole blame on intoxicating liquor. That doctrine, promulgated as it is by judge after judge, has been productive of very mischievous results. It is contrary to our own individual experience; it is contrary to history; and contrary also to the teachings of the Bible; and although it has become to be an accepted maxim, those who use it ought to carefully look into the evidence before they can regard it as applicable. But assuming, for the sake of argument, that all which is charged against intemperance can be fairly laid to its account, that all this crime, mischief and imbecility which is said to be the result of intoxicants can fairly be attributed to it, we are then to treat this question, not from the religious point of view, upon which, I say, the supporters of this resolution have no ground to stand, but simply as a question of economy, simply as to whether this remedy which is proposed is the one which will best meet the case. It is very hard to get evidence on this point. If we look at the experience of the States of the American Union which have adopted prohibitory legislation, we find the evidence so contradictory that I myself, after endeavouring honestly to discover what the result of that legislation has been, have to confess that I am unable to do so. I could quote page after page from various documents proving that the prohibitory liquor law in force in Maine and elsewhere has been productive of the most beneficial results, and I could quote page after page to prove that not only has it not been attended with beneficial results, but that it has been productive of a great amount of injury and misery. We cannot have a better example than the working of the Scott Act in this country. In the County of Simcoe, in which I live, the Scott Act was carried by an enormous majority, showing that the people there were in favour of that system. What was the result? For a few weeks—perhaps for a few months—the law was enforced, and the men who wanted liquor could not get it; but, after a very short time, places came to be known where liquor could be found. The Scott Act did not prevent the man who wanted to get drunk from getting drunk; it did not prevent the man who had a craving for liquor from getting liquor. The only result was that sober men who thought themselves respectable and did not like to be seen going into such places, did not get the liquor or got it at home, but the man who was desirous of getting intoxicated, the men of the very class whom the Act should have benefited, got the liquor just the same. Then there were prosecutions. Men were

brought before the magistrates and charged with infractions of the Scott Act. What was the result of that? It was absolute failure so far as the prevention of drinking was concerned, but the result was of a very serious character in bringing about an amount of perjury, false swearing and false evidence fearful to contemplate. Finally, when the three years had elapsed, the Scott Act was repealed in that county by almost as large a majority as that which originally passed it. But it is said that this Act was not enforced because the officials of the Ontario Government did not try to enforce it. Well, I have, perhaps, as poor an opinion of the officials of the Ontario Government as anyone in this House. I have had some experience of them, and I think they are as inefficient for any purpose except political campaigning as any body of people in the Dominion of Canada. But it was said that they did not enforce this Act because it was a Dominion law, and the Dominion Government ought to enforce it. I think all criminal Acts are Dominion Acts, but it is the duty of the province to enforce them. Why should they make an exception in this case when there are a hundred other Acts which they do enforce? The reason why they did not enforce it was this, which will always stand in the way of any legislation of this kind: that public opinion did not support them in doing so. We can enforce a law against stealing because we are all united in the belief that it is contrary to the well-being of the community that one man should be allowed to rob another. We can enforce a law against crimes of violence because we all have respect for our own skins, and do not want men to go at large who will commit such offences. Public opinion does support the enforcement of laws of this kind, but in regard to the Scott Act they were powerless because public opinion was not with them, and because people who were brought forward, from whom better things might have been expected, did not hesitate in many cases—of course it is hard to say that a man actually swore a false oath, but the inference is very strong that they did give false evidence: and the result was that liquor was sold as freely and openly during the latter part of the existence of the Scott Act as in any previous period of the history of the county. It is said that you could not enforce the Scott Act in a county because it is surrounded by other counties in which liquor is sold. If that applies to a county, it would apply to a province, and it would apply equally to the Dominion. Have we not a country with a frontier of 3,000 miles? What power can prevent the smuggling of liquor along that frontier? Are the Government now able to prevent smuggling in the North-West Territories? Is that army of the North-West Mounted Police able to enforce the law there? We know that it has been to a large extent a failure. If there were only two millions of people in this country who wanted liquor, how could the Government prevent its being smuggled when it might be brought in at any place on the frontier from Victoria to Halifax. Then, illicit distillation had become common under the Scott Act. In many parts of the backwoods, in swamps which were inaccessible, stills had been erected and illicit distillation had become very common. Illicit distillation is very common to-day. The price at which ordinary whiskey is sold to-day is sufficient to induce many persons to enter into illicit distillation. If that is practised under the present system, how much illicit distillation would there be, in the present state of public opinion, if the manufacture and sale of liquor was entirely prohibited throughout the Dominion? Then we come to another question, and a very practical question. I said that I did not question the sincerity of the promoters of this legislation or its advocates in this House, but I do not think they have given sufficient weight to the heavy responsibility which would rest upon them if this measure were carried. With regard to the question of revenue, I will freely admit that, if you can prove your case, if you can prove that the prevention of the sale of intoxicating liquor will bring about all the advantages you say would accrue from it, then the Government would be bound to lose the revenue they derive from it and find that revenue from some other source. All I say is that the advocates of this measure must face the responsibility of calling upon the Government of this country—whoever they may be—to impose the necessary taxation, and to justify the course they have taken in causing the additional taxation. I say I admit that, if you are right in your contention, there ought to be no difference whatever on the ground of a loss of revenue, but that those who advocate this measure must be prepared to face that responsibility, and to ask themselves this question: If this resolution were carried to-day, the Government must carry it out as a resolution of this House. They must do that, or, if they resigned, and other gentlemen took their places, they would be equally bound by the mandate of this House. Are those who advocate this proposal prepared to assume that responsibility? I do not mean to say that they ought not to assume it, but I ask them: Are they prepared to assume it? My hon. friend upon my left says, in a very vague and airy way: Oh, we have no doubt that the prosperity of the country will be so great under prohibition that enough revenue will flow in from some other source. Well, that is just about on a par with the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite when they are met with the prospect of a loss of a similar amount of revenue by unrestricted reciprocity, and they tell us: Oh, we would be so prosperous that our revenue would come from some other source. I should like to hear from those who advocate this motion, some definite idea of how we are going to meet that difficulty, which we should have to meet if we passed the resolution now in your hands. Now that is a very serious consideration, and it is one to which the members of this House are bound to pay respect. They are also bound to meet all the practical difficulties which would arise in the event of such legislation. It is said in this resolution that the Dominion is to enforce it. Well, how is the Dominion to enforce it? Is the Dominion to establish police all through the country in order to enforce it?

Mr. JAMIESON. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; that is not in the present resolution. It simply affirms the principle of immediate prohibition.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Well, if it is not in the present resolution, all I have got to say is that it ought to be in the present resolution, because it has been the contention with reference to the Scott Act, when the officials would not enforce it, that it was Dom-

inion legislation: so, if hon. gentlemen are sincere in wishing to carry out this resolution into practical effect, they ought to be prepared to tell us, and the mover of the resolution ought to be prepared to tell us, how it is going to be carried out.

Mr. JAMIESON. That is a question of detail.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Well, if ever was a question which, based upon a principle, is yet very largely dependent upon details, it is the question now before the House. It is all very well to bring down abstract resolutions, it is all very well to put before the House a resolution such as this, but if the advocates of this resolution in this House are really sincere, they ought to give us some idea how it is to be carried into effect; if they do not, I think the sincerity which we might otherwise be willing to accord to them, must be qualified considerably. Now, the hon. gentleman has not given us any idea as to how his proposal is to be carried out. I say it will be impossible to carry it out, according to the experience we have had, unless the Federal Government is prepared to do it. Therefore, the Dominion, in addition to the loss of six or seven million dollars revenue, would have to establish a corps of preventive police throughout the country, irrespective altogether of the Provincial authorities whose business it is now to carry out legislation of this kind. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have said nothing about what really underlies this whole question, and that is, whether a majority in this House, or a majority in the country, no matter how honest and sincere they may be, have a right to impose upon the minority legislation which is not based upon some better principle than that which is found in the resolution of my hon. friend. That is a view of the question which I do not urge very strongly, because, although it is vital to the question, yet I think many of us might be willing to say that if we believed that legislation such as is now proposed would really accomplish the very great ends in view we might be willing to sink our individual liberty, to make a sacrifice of our individual liberty and our individual inclinations, in order to bring about that result. But while we may be willing, personally, to make that sacrifice, a majority has no right to compel us to make it. There is a vast distinction. I may be willing to sacrifice my interest, to give up my liberty, in order to establish a great national end, but in a case like this, a majority has no right to say to me: Whether you like it or not, you shall give up your liberty, and you shall surrender the opinions which you have just as good a right to hold as those who entertain opposite views. Now, Sir, holding these opinions, I certainly cannot vote for that resolution, because the doctrine of total prohibition, as laid down in this resolution, and as laid down in the constitution of the Dominion Alliance, and which should, probably, carry more weight even than the remarks of the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution, is one which I can by no means support. This resolution has been drawn up by the body which the hon. gentleman and others represent in this House. In this resolution he is carrying out the wishes of the Dominion Alliance. Well, now, what does the Dominion Alliance say? It assumes, in the first place:

"That the history and results of past legislation in regard to the liquor traffic abundantly prove that it is impossible satisfactorily to limit or regulate a system so essentially mischievous in its tendencies."

That is to say, that you cannot have a license system which shall be effective in reducing the degree of intoxication. They go on to say:

"That the total prohibition of the liquor traffic is in perfect harmony with the principles of liberty and justice."

Now, Sir, I for one, by my vote in this House, can never give assent to a doctrine so monstrous as that. The Dominion Alliance must be singularly ignorant of the first principles of liberty and justice when they can lay down the proposition, in a solemn document like this, in their constitution, that:

"The total prohibition of the liquor traffic is in perfect harmony with the principles of liberty and justice, is not a restriction of legitimate commerce, and is essential to the integrity and stability of the Government, and the welfare of the community."

They may be justified in saying that the traffic in intoxicating liquors is a very great evil, and one that ought to be restricted and prohibited in every way possible, as being a matter of police regulation; but they have no right to say that total prohibition is in harmony with the principles of liberty and justice. Now, Sir, I think the advocates of this so-called temperance measure make another very great mistake; I think they make a mistake in representing, in the exaggerated terms they do, the existing evils of intoxication and the extent of them. I think they make a great mistake in not claiming for themselves, and for the kindred associations of those who take the same view that they do, some of the credit which they might take for the great good they have done in this respect in the past. I think they are not quite honest in their modesty. They wish to make the evils of intoxication appear so great as to justify them in asking the House to pass this resolution, and therefore they ignore even the results of their own action, they ignore even the results of their own societies. Why, Sir, when I was a boy I can remember very well in the township in which I lived, to give only one instance affecting one particular class of the community, that a majority of the farmers who went to town on various occasions, on public holidays, or to market, or for any other purpose, usually went home more or less intoxicated, and if any man went home habitually sober he was a marked man, he was looked upon as something far and away above his fellows. But to-day the very opposite is the case. There are thousands of men who go to market two or three times a week, but if one of them goes home intoxicated, or does it more than once, why, he is a marked man, he is looked upon as a person with whom one ought not to associate, he is looked upon as a dangerous and mischievous character, and he is shunned and treated accordingly. Now, I say there has been a very great reform in this respect, to whatever cause it is due, and I believe it is largely due to the operation of these various societies. So I say they make a mistake when, in order to give greater weight to their arguments in favour of prohibition, they entirely ignore the operations of their own societies. At the present day there are hundreds and thousands of young men and women growing up who, I believe, do not know the taste of intoxicating liquors, and this result is largely due to the operation of the Good Templars and similar

societies. While they preach total prohibition they practise something much more valuable—they practise personal prohibition. I hold that a person who believes it to be in his interest either in this world or the next, to practise personal prohibition is worthy of all praise, and he is still more worthy of all praise if he does so, not because he himself is in any danger, but as an example to others. That person is entitled to the very greatest respect, and his opinion is entitled to the very greatest consideration. But it is a totally different matter from action to force at the point of the law opinions which I say are not in harmony either with liberty or with justice. Holding these opinions, and looking at the vast responsibility we would have to undertake were we to enact the legislation proposed, feeling the due weight of the responsibility which every hon. member should feel, I have no hesitation in saying that I shall vote against the proposition, because I think it is one that in its results will cause, if anything, more injuries than the benefits that will accrue to the country. Temperance associations are not wise, even from their own point of view, in endeavouring to force this legislation on the country. They would be much wiser were they to pursue the course which, although perhaps they do not admit it, has been attended with vast success in every part of the Dominion, and the very fact that such large petitions in favour of prohibition can be sent to this House is, I admit, proof of the great success achieved. Let them be content with pursuing the path which has been successful, and not attempt to pursue a path which, in my opinion and, I think, in the opinion of the majority of the people, if that opinion were honestly expressed, would not bring about the results which are desired. But, as I said at the commencement, I admit that these petitions present such a body of opinion, honestly and sincerely entertained, that I feel all the more bound to meet them, as I have met them, with an honest expression of my dissent from what they hold. I have many electors in my own constituency who have petitioned for prohibition, and I feel I would be treating them unfairly if I did not on the floor of this House, having given no pledges whatever on the question, give the reasons why I shall vote against the resolution, which I know many of them desire to be carried. But having that respect for their convictions, I think it is due to them and to the country that this House should give a clear expression of opinion, and therefore, actuated by that regard, I shall vote against every proposition that may be made which may tend to prevent that distinct expression for which they ask: and I am satisfied, from what I have read in the various publications of the temperance people, that unless this House gives a distinct expression of opinion, they will feel they have been unfairly and discourteously treated. For these reasons I shall vote against the resolution, but at the same time I shall do all I can to have the question brought fairly and squarely before hon. members of this House.

Mr. AMYOT. I desire to ask the mover of the resolution whether sherry wine is included?

Mr. JAMIESON. Whatever is intoxicating in its character will be prohibited.

Mr. AMYOT. Then, if I understand properly from those who are in the habit of tasting wines, it is an intoxicating drink. I am rather surprised to hear that the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) finds a difficulty in regard to the revenue which would be lost if we had prohibition. Are we not in a state of great prosperity? We were told during the late election that the system of protection gives us ample means of providing for any particular want. The Government have been boasting of four millions of surplus, and I believe the Minister of Finance himself is one of the apostles of prohibition. So, under these circumstances, I do not see that the loss of revenue should be an objection. But I go a step further. I do not believe in clubbing principles into a man's conscience. I believe those who think it is wrong to have a glass of wine are incorrect. They remind me of a parish priest, who said to his flock that anyone who tasted a drop of wine was condemned to Hell forever. His bishop, who passed by one day, said that this was going too far, because our Lord himself took the trouble to turn water into wine. Thereupon the priest replied, yes, but it was not the best thing He did. I will now endeavour to present a more serious view of the question. The mover of the resolution must know that by the laws of this country, and more especially by chapter 74 of the Consolidated Statutes, which is still in force, it is declared that the free exercise and enjoyment of religious and public worship are guaranteed to all Her Majesty's subjects. The Catholic religion is one of these religions. The Catholic priest when he says mass and consecrates has to use wine, according to the rites of his church. If the principle laid down by the hon. mover of this resolution were applied, the priest could not procure here the necessary wine. The hon. gentleman is, therefore, seeking to prevent the free exercise of the Catholic religion. With his sincere zeal, he has seen only one side of the question, the great need of having laymen apply force to send the people of this country to Heaven.

Mr. COATSWORTH. I have some hesitation in addressing the House for the first time upon this very important question, because I see some difficulties ahead of us which have been temperately pointed out by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien). At the same time I have held for many years a strong conviction on this subject, that the evils of the traffic in strong drink are so great that it would be necessary, sooner or later, that something should be done to prohibit the traffic entirely; and, therefore, while I hesitate to speak upon this subject, yet my convictions are so strong that I feel it is my duty, not only to many of my constituents who supported me because they believed me to be a moderate temperance man, but also to the public generally, to whom we owe the duty to do what we think is best in the interests of the Dominion, not only on this question, but on all other questions brought before the House. I should like at the outset to refer to a few of the arguments brought forward by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) and also the question which was raised by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot). In regard to the latter I may say it has always been conceded by the most ardent prohibitionist that in any prohibitory law enacted we would have to exclude the wines and liquors used for sacramental purposes, and also those used

for mechanical purposes and for medicinal purposes. So that is a complete answer, I think, to what the hon. member said in regard to that point. Although I belong to a different church from that to which the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) belongs, yet in my own church wine is used for sacramental purposes, and, I suppose, will continue to be so used. So that is a point we are not discussing, and one we need not quarrel about in any way. It is conceded on all hands that the use of wine for sacramental service and the use of all alcoholic liquors for medicinal and mechanical purposes will be allowed to continue. Now, with regard to the arguments of my friend, the hon. member from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), I think the first strong attitude he took in reference to prohibition was, that the position of the prohibitionists is unscriptural, and that we are seeking for the prohibition of something that is recognized in Scripture, and not only recognized, but the use of it countenanced. I do not know whether or not I am taking unorthodox ground, from a Methodistical point of view, so to speak, but, if so, I hope the reporters will not take any note of it and will allow it to remain silent and keep it out of their papers. Now, while I am prepared to admit that the Scriptures do recognize, and to a certain extent countenance the use of wine, yet the use of strong drink, to the extent to which it prevails at the present time, is entirely contrary to the principles laid down in the Scriptures for our guidance. There were other things which were recognized by the Scripture as not being evil in early times, but which are evil now. For instance, what we now consider the crime of slavery is recognized in the Bible and the same argument might be applied to that, as to intoxicating liquor, but as soon as it was found out by the advancement and development of society, that slavery was not only a great evil but a great crime, it was considered that it was essentially necessary for the well-being of society, and in order that the principles of the Scripture might be followed out in daily life, that slavery should be abolished. Consequently, it was abolished. I believe we have now arrived at the same point in reference to the traffic in strong drink. It is many years ago since the use of intoxicating liquor was felt to be an evil; it is many years since we have been trying to restrict it in every way; it is many years since we began to curb it within proper limits, but notwithstanding every effort put forward by the people, notwithstanding the local option law, notwithstanding the work of temperance people for many years, the evil still goes on. Although this evil has been abated to a material extent, yet it still exists to such an extent that it is the duty of the people to curb it, it is the duty of Parliament to take hold of it, and if we can see our way clear to pass such a law as will either suppress or lessen this evil, we will be doing something that our country in future years will be glad to boast of. The hon. member from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), also questioned to a certain extent whether the amount of crime which is generally attributed to strong drink, is really traceable to that source, but the hon. gentleman did not produce any statistics in support of his argument or to refute the statistics presented to the House by the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson). These statistics presented by the mover of the resolution are fresh in the minds of the House, and the hon. member for Muskoka did not attempt to show that they were not correct. We have in the annals of our country the clearest evidence that a very large proportion of the crime and imprisonment in Canada is directly traceable to the use of strong drink. Indeed I think the hon. member for Muskoka was rather unhappy in the illustration he used to show that crime was not traceable to drink. His illustration, in my opinion, rather tended to show that if the man who murdered his wife had not got the strong drink, he would never have nerved himself to commit the murder, and, therefore, the illustration of the hon. gentleman reacts upon his own argument and tends to support the resolution which we are now discussing. I will not repeat the statistics which have been brought forward, for we all know very well that a large proportion of our crime is entirely produced by the liquor traffic and by the indulgence in strong drink. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) referred to the possibility, or impossibility, of restricting this traffic and enforcing total prohibition. He properly referred to the fact that we have a very long border line connecting us with the neighbouring nation, and that all along the border line there would be danger of smuggling, so that we would probably have a great deal to contend with in order to prevent liquor from being smuggled across the line. I do not pretend, Mr. Speaker, that we will not have very great difficulties, in the outset, at any rate, in enforcing a prohibitory law. I do not think that even the most ardent prohibitionist is prepared to say, that when we put that law in force it would run along so smoothly that we will have no trouble about it. Like all great measures which have been brought forward, we will have difficulties for some time in coping with the evil which the law is intended to suppress, but I feel sure that with the sense of the people in favour of the law, as I believe it is, and with a law passed by this Parliament backing up that public sentiment, I believe that such a law, if it goes into force, will be faithfully carried out, and that in a few years we will see prohibition from one end of the Dominion to the other. Nearly all great reforms have met with more serious opposition than this reform which we are now asking for. I do not know whether it is fair to compare this liquor traffic with the traffic in slaves, but if the hon. gentleman thinks so I hope he will pardon me if I compare it to that traffic for a moment. You will remember that the suppression of the slave traffic cost the nation to the south of us a long and bloody civil war, entailing an expense of millions of money and engendering a feeling of antagonism between North and South which has not yet abated. Therefore, in dealing with a question of this kind, by which it is proposed to suppress a great moral evil, we will always find great opposition, but we who favour prohibition are firmly convinced that if this law is passed, and if there is an honest endeavour to carry it out, that we will soon have prohibition throughout our country. Another difficulty which the hon. member for Muskoka referred to was the probability of extensive illicit distillation. That will not be a new evil, for notwithstanding the fact that we have at present a law against it, it is well known that there are illicit stills, although the

law is as faithfully carried out as we can hope it to be. I have no doubt that we will have to deal with that question when we pass a prohibitory law. I believe that the hon. member is correct when he says that under prohibition we will have a great deal of illicit distillation in the country, but that is one of the evils we have to meet and with a vigorous enforcement of the law we can meet it. If vigilant and responsible officers are appointed, illicit distillation will, I believe, disappear in a short time. I was really surprised that the hon. member for Muskoka questioned the fact as to whether the law could be carried out if it were passed by this House. I have heard that statement repeated often and often upon the public platform, when the supporters of the Scott Act and of other local temperance measures were endeavouring to have them passed, but I did not expect to hear upon the floor of Parliament that any laws which were passed by this House could not be enforced. I did not expect to hear upon the floor of this House that the people of this Dominion were not prepared to support Parliament in carrying out a prohibitory liquor law, or any other law, which the wisdom of this Parliament deems fit to pass. I believe the people of the country will support the officers in carrying out the law just as heartily as the members of this House, and will be prepared to stand by the Government in their endeavours to enforce it. Another argument offered by my hon. friend, which as an argument I thought was not quite as strong as some of the others he advanced, was that the majority would have no right to impose this law on the minority. Well, I do not know how far that principle ought to be carried into operation. I know that the majority of us have forced the minority to support the grand old leader and the grand old flag, and I suppose in this age when majorities rule that whatever the majority decide upon the minority will have to assent to. That I understand, from my studies of the matter, to be the underlying principle of our Government. If the argument of my hon. friend were carried to its legitimate conclusion, we should have no right to say to hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House: Because you are in the minority you must do as we say, you must submit to the laws which we pass. In reading the resolution which I thought at first the hon. gentleman was going to put before the House by way of amendment, though he afterwards disclaimed that intention, and in which reference was made to the liberty of the subject, I came to the conclusion that the hon. gentleman had not read that old and well-known volume called Blackstone; because if he had perused that valuable work, he would have found that his definition of liberty was not quite correct. If I remember Blackstone aright—it is some years since I read it—it states that liberty is not unlicensed freedom, not that every man may do exactly as he pleases, but that every man may have that measure of liberty which is consistent with the state of society in which we live. That, I contend, is the true definition of liberty. We cannot expect to be free from restraints, because we are surrounded by them on all sides; but we enjoy that measure of liberty which is consistent with our present state of society, and that is all that any man or woman wishes to have. Therefore, to say that a prohibitory law is wrong because it interferes with the liberty of the people is not a correct statement of the principle of liberty, because if the majority decide that we ought to have such a law, then it is quite right and proper that this House should pass it. I was very glad that the hon. member paid the tribute he did to the progress which has been made in the temperance movement in Canada. I am aware myself, although I have not been actively connected with the movement, that there are very many men and women in our country who have made great sacrifices in the cause of temperance. I have seen and I know men who have been maligned and traduced by those opposed to them, men who are sacrificing time and talents in the interest of this cause which might bring them greater personal advantages if applied in some other direction. Therefore, I am very glad to hear from an hon. member of this House who is opposed to this resolution the tribute he has paid to the workers in the temperance movement which has been going on so long in our country. Yet he says that the temperance people are not true to themselves. He expresses the opinion, that we ought to continue to pursue the same lines that we have been pursuing for so many years, and endeavour still further to educate the people until there shall not be one man or one woman in the length and breadth of this Dominion who will not be crying out for prohibition: then he thinks this House may pass it, and not before. Why, Mr. Speaker, the very progress that the temperance movement has made, and the very fact that the hon. gentleman refers to it in such laudable terms, is a clear indication that these people are not prepared to recede from the position they have gained, but are now endeavouring to press forward still further in order to secure a prohibitory measure from this House. They consider this question to be, as it is, a developing question, and they believe that the time must come when it will develop beyond mere moral suasion, and be taken up and dealt with by this House. So that it appears to me that the positions taken by the hon. gentleman, although they are about the strongest positions I have ever heard taken against the cause of prohibition, will not stand the test of argument when they are followed to their legitimate conclusions; and some of them really react upon the hon gentleman himself, and are arguments in favour of prohibition. We cannot overlook the fact of the extent and enormity of the evils which have been produced by strong drink. These have been eloquently and vividly depicted by the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), in referring to those evils, said they were now restricted. I am quite prepared to admit that such is the case; and yet we must all realize that in this traffic we are still face to face with a great evil. We must realize that, in spite of all that has been done to restrict it, that evil still stands before us as one of enormous magnitude, and one with which this country has yet to deal. If I were to address myself privately to the members of this House, I am sure, and I say it with sorrow and regret, that there is not one of us who could say in his heart that he had not felt in himself or his family the sting of this serpent, notwithstanding all the advances which have been made in temperance, because it is a well-known fact that the evil which we are contending against has come into our houses and has sometimes tried to nestle itself there in the bosoms of our families;

so that, with all our restrictions, we realize that we have not yet got it trampled under foot, but that we must place further restrictions upon it; and the very next restriction which we must place upon it is total prohibition. The history of this movement in the direction of prohibition is one that must be interesting to every person who favours temperance reform. I think we may say that the temperance movement dates from some fifty years ago, although we have evidence of its existence at a time very much anterior to that. But the history of the temperance movement proper can be comprised within the past fifty years. We find that period has been one of development. The evil was at first grappled with in a small way by means of the license system. Then followed a reduction in the number of licenses granted. Then we had temperance organizations. Then a high price was fixed for licenses: and then came the local option laws. What is the result of this progress? We are not as far from prohibition to-day as we were fifty years ago. Although I am a young man, I can remember the time when the drinking habit was much more frequently indulged in than now; and I am glad to be able to say that the temperance movement is largely to be credited with the decrease in this great evil of indulgence in strong drink. We have yet to deal with the financial problem, and that is where a great difficulty lies. It is all very well to talk of local option and high licenses and temperance organizations; but so long as we do not strike at the source of the evil we will fail to remove it. If we could by local option, by temperance education, by high license, stop the fountain of the evil from flowing, we would be able to deal with it in a more practical manner, but the great difficulty is that the manufacture of liquor has been continually going on, and the only thing that seems capable of being done at present is to strike at the foundation of the evil and pass a prohibitory law. I am well aware that in addressing ourselves to that part of the question we come face to face with one of the most serious difficulties, and that is that there are very many persons engaged in the manufacture and sale of intoxicating drinks, and we cannot deal with this question without considering how it affects their interests. We cannot sweep away at once a man's business without making up our minds beforehand as to whether or not he is entitled to some compensation. If I am trespassing a little outside of the resolution, it may be that my hon. friend the mover of the resolution will bring me to time, but I must confess I am not quite orthodox in the matter of prohibition, because I am personally in favour of compensation to the manufacturers. That is my private opinion, which I state to the House as I have stated it to my temperance friends whenever I have had occasion to address them on this subject. It does not appear to me fair, that these gentlemen, who have such an immense amount of capital invested in machinery, buildings and other property for the purpose of carrying on their business, should have their business swept away and no compensation given them. Therefore, at the risk of being called to task by my hon. friend, I feel it my duty to this House and to the country to state that I am in favour of compensation to the manufacturers. I do not think I would like to go further. I know there are hon. gentlemen in this House who say: Why not compensate also the other liquor sellers. I think the others stand in a very different position, but without taking up the time of the House in discussing a matter, which will probably be a question of detail should we decide on prohibitory legislation, I would simply repeat that while I am in favour of compensation to the manufacturers, I do not think compensation should extend to those who only sell liquor and are not manufacturers. Another question arises, and that is as to the right of this House to prevent a man from taking a drink of strong liquor if he chooses. Now I would not like to refuse that right to any man because I believe in the principles of freedom as they have been enunciated, to a certain extent, by the hon. member for Muskoka. I do not think we have a right to say to any man: While there is liquor in this land you have no right to take a glass of liquor; but I do say that if, in the opinion of this House, the time has come when we ought to prohibit its manufacture and sale for beverage purposes, there would not, I believe, be any improper interference with the liberty of the subject if when dealing with a great evil we should subject people to certain restraint. It does not occur to me that the freedom of our people would be restricted to any extent which would be hurtful to them. I would, on the contrary, be disposed to say that the restriction would be beneficial even to those who indulge moderately in strong liquors. We must recognize, in dealing with this traffic, that there are multitudes of our men and our women who are dragged down by means of it so that they no longer enjoy any freedom; and not only that, but the curse falls upon their children. How much of the crime, how much of the suffering, how much of the misery in our land can be traced directly and indirectly to the immoderate indulgence in strong drink. If all men and all women could restrain their appetites so that there would be no intoxication, and no social and moral misery produced by this evil, we would not be standing here to-day speaking in support of this resolution; but it is because men and women have been made slaves, it is because children have been made worse than slaves, that we are here to-day asking that those who feel that a certain amount of restriction is placed on their liberty by this proposed law should submit to the curtailment of that liberty for the benefit of the multitude who are so deeply affected by the traffic. Another difficulty we have to face, and one likely to cause a great deal of serious discussion before a prohibitory law can be passed, is the question of revenue; and yet I do not see, after all, if we are satisfied upon other points, if we are convinced that this law ought to pass, if we are convinced of the evil we are seeking to banish, if we are satisfied that it is in the interests of the people, a prohibitory law should be placed in our Statute-book that the question of revenue should be allowed to stand in our way. If we are making revenue out of an evil so great that it requires to be prohibited, then we should sacrifice that revenue. If we are making a revenue at the cost of the suffering, and misery, and loss, and ruin of many of our people, then we ought to be prepared as a Government to sacrifice that revenue, and to say to the people: We will give you a prohibitory law, whatever loss it may be to us by way of revenue. But it is contended, and it appears to me with some degree of force—I must confess,

with convincing force to my mind, although it does not seem to have struck all the hon. gentlemen in that way as yet—that, although the revenue would be at a loss immediately after passing the Bill, ultimately we would be no losers by the passage of a prohibitory law. I do not know whether I can work that out satisfactorily to the gentlemen who have taken the opposite view, but, as it presents itself to me, it is something in this way: Take the manufacturers who are engaged now in the manufacture of liquor and from whom the Government derives its revenue. Of course, all the revenue from the dealers is municipal. It is not to be supposed for a moment that these gentlemen would withdraw their capital and their machinery and everything they have invested their money in, and would go out of business entirely. We would find that these immense distilleries and breweries where liquor had been manufactured before would at once be turned into revenue-producing manufactories. We would, therefore, find that the capital now invested in the manufacture of strong drink would be directed into other channels.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You would have to protect them.

Mr. COATSWORTH. That would be a question for the other side to deal with, and, whether we protected them or not, we find in the actual working out of our manufacturing interests that one of the results of establishing manufactories in our country is the production of so much more revenue. There is another question which may affect it, perhaps, a little more indirectly. I am not personally familiar with the working of the traffic, but I am told on credible authority that there are fewer workmen by far employed in the manufacture of liquor than would be necessary in any other manufacture, so that one of the results of the passing of a prohibitory measure and the establishment of other manufactures in place of the manufacture of liquor would be that an immense number of workmen would be employed, more than are employed in the liquor manufacture at the present time. There is another aspect to that question, and it is that, if it be true, as the statistics of my hon. friend the mover of the resolution have shown, that a large proportion of the crime in this country is traceable to strong drink, then the natural conclusion is that, when strong drink is banished from our country, when we are able to put into force and operation a prohibitory measure, that crime, to a large extent at any rate, will be checked, will be stayed, and therefore the cost of the administration of justice, the cost of the maintenance of our prisons, and the cost of all those things which are produced by strong drink will be reduced in proportion, and there would be a great saving to the Government in that line of expenditure. In concluding my remarks, I would just like to say that we must not look entirely at what might be called the economical side of this question. Every gentleman in this House is to a certain extent responsible for the moral and social well-being of this country; and to the extent that we can by our laws, passed after due consideration, lift up the moral and social condition of our people, to that extent we are responsible for the passage of such laws as will do so, and I believe this prohibitory legislation will be in the direction of the uplifting of our people both morally and socially. We have all realized that the indulgence in strong drink, to the extent to which it is carried on, is an enormous moral evil. What mean those petitions which are coming to us? How is it that we are having petitions presented from almost every church in the Dominion, asking for the prohibition of the traffic? It means that the churches, who are to a certain extent, if not to a full extent, our moral guides, realize that the traffic in strong drink is so immoral in all its tendencies that it ought to be suppressed. If it were not a great evil from a moral point of view, if it were not felt by all the churches of our country that the time had come for the suppression of this traffic, would we have such petitions as have been presented here from the churches? I would call your attention to a petition I had the honour of presenting yesterday from the General Conference of the Methodist Church in Canada.

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

After Recess.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 36) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 46) respecting the South-Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Sproule, for Mr. Bergeron.)

Bill (No. 47) to amend an Act to incorporate the Collingwood and Bay of Quinté Railway Company.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

PATENT RELIEF BILL—J. S. CORBIN.

Mr. REID moved the second reading of Bill (No. 30) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of Jay Spencer Corbin.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the House ought to have some explanation concerning this Bill before consenting to its second reading.

Mr. REID. The circumstances under which relief is sought are set forth in the preamble of the Bill. It appears that Mr. Corbin had a patent on some harrow, that the patent expired, and as he wished to renew it he sent forward the application and fee, which failed to reach its destination in time. There was a similar Bill passed last year.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. As the hon. gentleman states, the Bill is somewhat in the line of a Bill which we passed last year in this House. The circumstances are not quite similar, but the parties claim that the case is an exceptional one. It is a case in which the patentee, by what is alleged to be an oversight, failed to secure a renewal of the patent for the reason that the fee required for renewal, together with the application, arrived six days after the proper date. I had a very strong impression that one of the Bills at last Session ought to pass because the case made out in evidence before the committee showed that the patentee was in no way at fault. He had made his application in due time, and it was due to the mistake of one of his clerks that it did not reach the Commissioner at the proper time. There are no such strong circumstances stated in this Bill; nevertheless, I think it will not be improper that it should have its

second reading, and should go to the Committee on Private Bills for investigation of the allegations set out in the petition. I would not advocate that course if the rule were not well understood, that in reading a private Bill the second time we are not committed to its principle. I am somewhat doubtful that the facts which are contained in the preamble of the Bill can be made out, but if the facts are made out we can deal with the principle of the Bill when it comes back from the committee. So far as I am concerned I would be disposed to support the second reading. As a general principle, I am opposed to persons obtaining exemption from the general rule by means of special legislation; nevertheless, under the circumstances, I would consent to the second reading.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

WESTERN LIFE ASSURANCE CO.

Mr. CURRAN (for Mr. MACDONALD, Winnipeg) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 48) to incorporate the Western Life Assurance Company.

Mr. COCKBURN. There is in Toronto an insurance company doing business under the same name, and when this Bill goes into Committee I shall move that some change be made in the title of the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

FRANCHISE ACT REPEAL BILL.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 8) to repeal An Act respecting the Electoral Franchise. He said: I desire to say but a very few words with reference to this Bill. The Bill which I propose by my Bill to repeal, passed the House of Commons some five years ago, and I can safely say that no Bill affecting the representation of the people in Parliament, that has received the Royal Assent, for the last quarter of a century has proved more entirely unsatisfactory than the Act called the Electoral Franchise Act. The law itself, in my judgment, at the time it was introduced in Parliament, was wholly uncalled for. There were no demands for it, no petitions presented in Parliament in favour of it, no public clamour for it. It was a Bill that was entirely uncalled for; and I think the experience of the last five or six years has shown it to be a harsh Bill, a vicious Bill in principle, and a Bill difficult to work out in detail. It was, I believe, introduced into Parliament by the First Minister solely for a political end. I believe it was forced through Parliament, against the strenuous efforts of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, solely for a political end. I believe it was introduced and forced through Parliament and received its final stage with a view to benefit one political party and damage, if not destroy, the other political party, and the effect of the Bill has proved eminently unsatisfactory to both the political parties. I believed then, and I believe now, and more especially now, that the honest sentiment of the great mass of the Dominion is adverse to this Bill. I believe the honest sentiment of the majority of the members of Parliament is not in harmony with this Bill; I believe it is a Bill that has proved as unsatisfactory to hon. gentlemen opposite as I know it has proved unsatisfactory to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. The honest sentiment of the country, as well as the experience of the last six years during which we have had this Electoral Franchise Bill in operation,—no, not in operation, sometimes in operation and sometimes its operation suspended—has pronounced decidedly and emphatically against the longer continuance on the Statute-book of this Bill. The experience of the last six years has shown beyond a reasonable peradventure that the Electoral Franchise Bill has opened wide and free all the doors for all kinds of electoral misconduct and electoral frauds. I believe the experience of the last six years has shown us, beyond all doubt, that it is a harsh Bill to both political parties, a harsh Bill to the candidates who are seeking the honour of representing the people in Parliament. The Bill when introduced by the First Minister, six years ago, was based, the hon. gentleman told us, on four grounds. He said, as will be found in *Hansard* of 1885, page 1134, that the Bill was necessary, that a system of representation applicable to all the provinces was an absolute necessity, that a representation of every class alike in all the provinces was a necessity, that the franchise in all the provinces should be exactly alike, and further, that every interest in every province alike should be represented in this Parliament. Before the Bill had received its second reading, before it had received the Royal Assent, every assurance the First Minister gave us as to the necessity of a Dominion Electoral Franchise ceased to exist, and was practically abandoned. We have not now, we never had, under this Electoral Franchise Bill, a system alike in all the provinces. We have not now, we never had since the Electoral Franchise Bill received the Royal assent, a system of elections that was exactly the same in all the provinces. We never had, and we have not now, the same classes in all the provinces represented alike in the House of Commons in Canada. We never had under this Bill, and we have not now, the same interests and the same classes represented alike in all the provinces in the Parliament of Canada. The Province of Ontario has not now the same system of representation the Province of Prince Edward Island possesses. The Province of Quebec has not now the same classes represented as the Province of British Columbia. The two older provinces have not now, and never had under this Bill, the same classes and interests represented in this Parliament as the North-West Territories, as the Province of British Columbia, the Province of Manitoba and the Province of Prince Edward Island. A different system and a different franchise prevails. In one province we have manhood suffrage, in another province we have universal suffrage practically, in another province we have a suffrage based on a real property qualification, and in another province the suffrage is based on a real and personal property qualification. So that the grounds on which the First Minister insisted that this Bill should be passed through Parliament, and was a necessity, ceased to exist before the Bill received the Royal Assent; and for this reason, if for no other, I submit it ought to be repealed by the Parliament of Canada. The Bill is open to grave objections apart from the point I have already been discussing. I have stated that it has been the experience of the last six years in carrying out this Bill that it opens the doors wide

and free for electoral frauds of all kinds in the preparation of the voters' lists. Let me give the House a sample or two which have come under my notice since this Bill became law. It was declared, when the First Minister was pressing the Bill through Parliament, that the mixed and complicated franchises he was proposing for some of the provinces would necessarily entail expense, labour, trouble and complications of all kinds; that the returning officers would not all decide alike on the same questions; that one revising officer would decide the point in one way and another returning officer in quite another way. I know of one electoral district in which an income franchise voter made a declaration in order to have his name inserted on the voters' list. He made the usual declaration. He swore to that declaration on oath, and made his application to the returning officer; and the oath—and it is that which substantially affects the merits of the case—was in the following words:—"I am in receipt of wages to the value of $300 a year or over; I have been so for one year prior to 1st January, 1886, and have been a resident of the city for that same period." One would naturally think, that the object of Parliament and of the returning officer would be, that any man making a *bonâ fide* application to be placed on the voters' list, asking to enjoy the right that every British subject ought to have the right to enjoy, should have his application dealt with, not in a technical spirit, but in a broad and liberal one. This worthy returning officer rejected the declaration and cut off the unfortunate man from his right to exercise the franchise, and the grounds on which he did it emphasizes the stand we took when we opposed the Bill in 1885. The returning officer said: I want information, and the information must be supplied in an intelligible form; the 1st of January must be supplied in so many words, and not by contractions, the words "$300 or over" convey no meaning, the law requires "not less than $300." "Prior to 1st January" is bad. On these four grounds that intelligent and unpartizan returning officer—I am bound to assume that he was such—rejected this man's application to be placed on the voters' list: because the figures "1st January" were inserted, because the words "three hundred dollars or over" were used instead of "not less than $300," and because the words "prior to 1st January, 1886," were used. I say the work of carrying out the Act is difficult besides being expensive. I say that it leaves the doors open to all kinds of electoral frauds. I will give you an illustration of this instead of an argument, because I believe that one illustration is better than an hour's argument. I have in my mind an electoral riding in the Province of Ontario where 125 names on the voter's list were put upon the voter's list twice; on the same voter's list, 15 names were inserted three times, and on the very same list 50 voters put on as income voters had not been living in the riding, nor in the electoral district, nor in the county, for a year or more before the application to put them on the list was made, and yet every one of these irregularities were on the face of the voters' list when the election was held. Is it possible that hon. gentlemen on either side of the House can be satisfied with this mode of preparing the voters' lists: 125 names inserted twice on the one list, 15 names three times, and 50 voters who were not living in the district at all, many of them living in the United States, more of them living in the North-West Territories, and yet every name was inserted on the voters' list when polling day arrived. In the same riding, but in another polling sub-division, 119 names were added to the voters' list by the court of revision as I understand it, and yet when the electors came to the poll their votes only 12 of these 119 names were found on the list. In addition to that, upon that same voters' list and in the same polling sub-division there were 12 names inserted every one of whom was a minor. I have the names here, and they are as follows:—

"Jas. E. Oldershaw, aged 17; Fred. Northwood, 18 years old; Ed. Delahanty, 20; Philip Coate, aged 20; Geo. Northwood, 17; Morton Rolls, 16; Adam Redner, 18 years; Walter George, 16; John Snape, 20; John Symington, aged 18."

This shows you that the electors, the great mass of the people of this country, have no protection whatever for their franchise. They may have their names inserted upon the voters' list at the preliminary or final revision, but they have no guarantee whatever that these names shall appear upon the voters' list when they come to record their votes for or against one candidate or the other. Let me give you another illustration. In another constituency 150 names were stricken off the voters' list altogether. You would think that would be the end of it, Mr. Speaker. I suppose, for I am bound to suppose, that the Government honestly intended to carry out the law. One would naturally suppose, giving everybody credit for fair dealing and honesty, that the revising officer would act the same, but of the 150 names I refer to which were erased from the voters' list, every one of them was upon the voters' list when we came to record our votes. I do not know where the fraud arose. I am hardly prepared to say that it was a fraud, but it was an extraordinary circumstance that 150 names were struck off the voters' list in one riding, and that the revising officer so decided, and yet everyone of these names were upon the voters' list when we came to vote on polling day. I can point to the facts in my own county with absolute certainty and without fear of successful contradiction, and I can state that scores of names which were added to the list, both by declaration and at the preliminary and final revision, were not found upon the voters' list that was sent to Goderich and upon which we recorded our votes on the 5th of March last. Scores of names which were erased from the voters' list by the revising officer remained on the voters' list. Men dead for five years, men who all these years had been sleeping their last sleep and whose names were stricken off, suddenly appeared upon the voters' list. I do not know that there was a resurrection and that these dead men voted, but I do know that they were personated in more than one instance. Dead men voted through their proxies; the grandfather and the father were dead for five or six years, the grandson and the son living on the old homestead for ten years had no vote at all under this beautiful Franchise Act which was to correct all the errors and cure all the mistakes, and be perfect in every respect, as we were told by the First Minister and his colleagues when we were fighting this Bill for months on the floor of Parliament. I will give you another instance which came under my personal observation. In the town of Clinton, with a population of

between 2,500 and 3,000, on the voters' list upon which the polling took place there were 119 names of persons who had been absent from the country—some of them absent for four or five years. Eighty of these men had sold their properties and severed their connection with the county altogether, forty-six of them had for years been living in the United States, seventeen of them were dead, and in addition to all this, over fifty good substantial voters were omitted from the list. In the town of Clinton, having a population of 2,500 or 3,000, with the dead men and the absentees on the list and with the good votes not on the list, the voters' list in that town alone was wrong by over 100 votes. The riding of West Huron contains seven municipalities, of which Clinton is the smallest, and assuming that the same mistakes arose in every other municipality, then the voters' list in the west riding of Huron was wrong by 700 votes. Had it not been for this I would have had a majority of 1,000 instead of 379 votes. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have about 210 constituencies in the Dominion of Canada, and if the voters' lists in the west riding of Huron were wrong by 700 votes, as I am satisfied they were wrong, then if you multiply 700 by 210 you will find that the voters' lists of the Dominion of Canada at the last general election were wrong by at least 150,000 votes; and this is the list that was to be perfect under the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite. I suppose I am bound to assume that these mistakes crept in there unintentionally, but it is a marvellous circumstance that they crept in just upon the occasion of a general election, and that the most of the mistakes were in favour of hon. gentlemen opposite. It is marvellous, I say, that the mistakes should have crept in just then, and under these peculiar circumstances. That could not have happened under a good law, it could not have happened under the old Franchise Law, but it did happen under this law, which I believe to be the very worst Franchise Law we ever had in the Dominion of Canada or in any of its Provinces. The principle of the Bill is bad, the details are vicious in the extreme, the working of the Act is complicated, difficult and expensive, and altogether I am sure that there is not a man upon the other side of the House who will venture to declare on the floor of Parliament that this Bill has proved in every respect thoroughly satisfactory. But that is not all, Sir. There are other and perhaps stronger and more powerful arguments in favour of the repeal of this Bill. I recollect well, others with myself pointing out to the First Minister and to the First Minister's colleagues: you force this Bill through Parliament, and what will be the result? The result will be difficulties in getting the names upon the voters' lists, difficulties in getting names that ought not to be on the voters' list taken off the voters' lists, and, above all, it will entail upon the tax-payers an enormous annual public burden. And that is not all: it will entail upon the candidates and on both political parties an additional enormous expense at every revision. We were told that it would not be so; we were told that it would be a cheap franchise and one easily operated; our fears were belittled, and hon. gentlemen would not take a word of advice or warning. Who proved to be right and who proved to be wrong? According to the Auditor General's Reports—I do not know whether they are correct or not, but they are issued under the authority of the Government—I find that during the year ending on the 31st of June, 1888, $409,317 was expended under this Dominion Franchise Act by the Government alone; in a subsequent year $69,970 was expended, in 1889 $17,237, and in the last year $233,078; making an aggregate of $729,700 of expenditure by the Government as the direct result of this Act, which has given satisfaction to nobody, and has worried and harassed everybody who has had anything to do with it. I notice that the hon. Secretary of State says that the expenditure does not amount to so much; he puts it at $676,000. Well, let us take the lower figure; is not that an enormous sum to pay in such a way? And recollect, we have had only two revisions in six years. The Act is so vicious in principle and so bad in detail that the supporters of the Government persisted in suspending its operation for every year of the six except two years. The result of the suspension was that in the last election the votes in all the constituencies were recorded on ancient voters' lists two years old, the effect of which was to disqualify men who ought to have been enfranchised, and to leave enfranchised men who were not entitled to vote. But you must recollect that the sum which the Government pays is not the whole of the burden imposed on the people of this country by the Franchise Act. As examples, take my own riding and some others in the same neighbourhood. I know as a matter of fact that there was spent in cash in revising the voters' lists in West Huron $750 by the Liberal party alone, and I know that that sum was inadequate for a thorough and effective revision. I know constituencies in which double that sum, and others in which three times that sum was expended. Our Conservative friends in my riding declared that they spent a sum equal to what we did. That makes $1,500 which was expended in that one riding, over and above the expenditure which the Government charged against the tax-payers for the revision of the lists. And that is not all. The total cost of this Act is not the bare expenditure by the Dominion Government out of the tax-payers' money, not the bare expenditure by the parties in the counties out of their own pockets. For a week or two scores of men in each riding have to devote their attention to gathering information as to who should and who should not be on the list, and they have to incur expenditure in attending court, looking after preliminary and final revisions, and so on, which must come to a very large sum. But I am content to put the expenditure at $750 on each side, making $1,500 for each constituency. There are about 210 constituencies in the Dominion; and if you multiply $1,500 by 210 you will have a very nice sum of money, very nearly equal to what the Government pay for revising officers, printing, &c., out of the taxes of the people. The two revisions which have taken place cannot have cost the people of this country less than a million and a quarter of dollars; and I venture to say that if anyone took the trouble to ascertain the real facts of the case he would find my estimate to be below rather than above the mark. That is not all. We ran the last election on obsolete voters' lists two years old. We were handicapped in the race; we have often been handicapped; it has often been "tails I win, heads you lose:" the contest has generally been with loaded dice, the

Government having everything in their hands. With an honest voters' list, fairly scrutinized and honestly printed, we should have nothing to say when we lose; but what we complain of is, that in the last two elections the voters' lists have been imperfect, especially in the last. But that is not all. Although this House is fresh from the people, elected upon a stale voters' list, the hon. Secretary of State tells us now that we must have another revision in 1891—for two years before the election no revision; two months after the election a revision, and $150,000 in the Estimates to cover part of the cost. Why, Sir, everybody will have to revise. We do not know, and the Government do not know how long they may live; they may be on the brink of a precipice now, I hope without any personal danger; there may be a new election after the census is taken and after a new distribution takes place, and we must all do as the hon. Secretary of State intimates we ought to do, revise the voters' lists. If we revise them this year the Government will have to pay, according to what the two last revisions cost, about $300,000, and the candidates in the various constituencies will have to pay at least an equal sum. Everybody may revise: I know that 70 at least will revise. I am quite sure the hon. First Minister, the hon. Minister of Justice, the hon. Minister of Public Works and the Minister of War will revise their voters' lists before the year expires. If only half the constituencies revise, the cost will be at least $300,000; if only 70 revise, the cost will be about $200,000. Without desiring to discuss this question at length, I ask hon. gentlemen honestly, is it not the fact that the Dominion Franchise Act has proved unsatisfactory to yourselves? Honestly, do you not find it difficult to work, complicated and expensive, and do you not find when polling day comes that, notwithstanding all you have done, there are an enormous number of mistakes in the voters' lists? The mistakes may be due to the mode of payment to the official in charge, of so much for so many hundred words, instead of in some way that would not offer any temptation to do wrong. Honestly, is it not time that this Franchise Act was repealed? I am not particular about, and I have paid very little attention to the details of this Bill. What I want is the announcement of a principle—the announcement that the Dominion Franchise Act is unsatisfactory and that we should replace it by another Act. If the Parliament declare that the Bill which was passed in 1885 is unsatisfactory, then it will be the duty of the Government to inaugurate or initiate a different and another Franchise Act. I suggest a different and another franchise. I say we ought to adopt the franchise which each Local Legislature has prescribed in each province. We could have had that, not at the cost to the people of this country of two revisions, or nearly $1,500,000, but free of cost. We can have a franchise, tried by the people among whom we live and who know more about it than we do, and we can have it without the expenditure of a farthing. There is not a member of this Parliament who has taken the trouble to revise the voters' lists on the two occasions when they were revised who will not agree with me that it would be far better to have a less complicated and expensive mode than we have now. I think we can, with all confidence, ask hon. gentlemen opposite to assist us in having this Act repealed. It is not a question of politics, although introduced by a Liberal. I have heard as pronounced Conservatives as I am a Liberal declare that of all the measures the Government had passed in the last twelve years, the Electoral Franchise Act was the most vicious in principle and the worst in detail, the most difficult to understand, and the most expensive to operate.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) has followed the course I anticipated he would follow, when proposing the repeal of the Franchise Act, by refraining from going at any great length into the arguments the House has heard many times before as to the merits of the Franchise Act. The discussions which have taken place with regard to that Act are, I fancy, familiar to almost every member of this House, notwithstanding so many new faces are present. In 1885 we had a most elaborate discussion on every principle involved in the measure; in 1886, when I had occasion to introduce some amendments, we had a very full discussion, not only of its principles but of the expediency of its repeal; in 1887, I think in 1888, and certainly last year, we had every argument exhausted and every argument renewed which this House had heard at such great length during the summer of 1885. The hon. gentleman, however, has called the attention of the House to some of the main objections which he and his political associates urged against the original passage of the Bill. I shall follow his example in touching upon some of those with great brevity, conscious of the force of the reasons which induced him to refrain from speaking at great length in renewing the objections he had to urge. The hon. gentleman has referred to the fact that notwithstanding the pains that were taken to secure a complete and effectual revision of the lists year by year, differences have occurred in different constituencies in the decisions of revising barristers; and the hon. gentleman has urged those differences as a ground for repealing an Act which accomplishes more in the direction of securing uniformity of decision—decisions according to law—than any Franchise Act in force to-day in any province. If the measure which is now sought to be repealed were cast aside, we should have to resort to a system which gives much less security for uniformity of decision, much less security for decisions according to law. If the hon. gentleman will cast his glance over the Franchise Acts of the other provinces he will find that in some of the provinces there are revisions by municipal authorities; in others there are revisions by municipal officers; in others the revisions are made by the sheriffs who are officers at pleasure of the Provincial Governments. There is no pretence of uniformity; there is no attempt to secure any kind of legal qualification in the officers who have to perform this duty of revision; whereas the Act now under consideration establishes a qualification for the office of revising barrister second to none required for any public office connected with the administration of any law, second only to that required for the filling of the highest judicial offices in the country. The hon. gentleman has referred to the fact that considerable expense has attended these revisions in the past. That is undoubted. Much as the expense has fallen below the predictions made in that regard on the other side, it is an undoubted fact that the two revisions which have taken place have been accompanied by considerable expense

The first revision involved really the construction of the election lists from the original elements, and was necessarily attended with expense which could not be expected to follow any subsequent revision; and in the second revision, as has been repeatedly explained to the House, the expense of printing was greatly increased in order to make provision for the permanent setting up of the lists as they were then prepared, so that any subsequent revision might take place, with far less cost, by using the standing forms. All this was charged against the second revision. We are making preparations for the third revision, with the full expectation that the expense will be largely decreased, that it will be reduced to the lowest cost at which any franchise lists can be prepared in this country. Let me call the attention of the House for a moment to the provisions of the Bill which the hon. gentleman asks us to read a second time. As explained to the House by the hon. member for West Huron, it is simply a Bill to repeal an Act which, he says, is inconvenient, cumbersome and inefficient; but the serious question that arises is, what is to take its place? The Bill would establish a set of franchises which, I undertake to say, no member of this House understands at the present moment. Even since the discussion which took place in 1885, the franchise of nearly every province of Canada has been changed, and the Bill now before us asks us to adopt the franchise of every one of these provinces as it exists, and makes, if the first section of the Bill is cast in the form in which it is to continue, that franchise, as it will exist at the passage of this measure, the franchise of the Dominion for all time to come. I presume that is hardly the hon. gentleman's intention. Indeed the language of section 4 would lead me to suppose that he would ask in Committee of the Whole to amend the first section so as to make the franchise in force in the different provinces from time to time the elective franchise for this House. But supposing that to be the case, the hon. gentleman seeks to establish a franchise with respect to this country which, as I understand, would require a most careful study of the Franchise Acts of all the provinces, and with regard to which the hon. gentleman has not offered to this House this evening one word of explanation. Let me call the attention of the House to the fact that, while the hon. gentleman sees such great disadvantage in a want of uniformity, sees such cause for alarm in the fact that mistakes are made and contradictory decisions are given with respect to the rights of voters to be placed upon the list, the hon. gentleman will, under this Bill, have no two provinces uniform, and have no two members of the House from different provinces sitting under the same franchise, and that while in some of the provinces the scope of the present Dominion Franchise Act would be greatly widened, in other provinces the franchise would be greatly restricted. Let me call his attention to a fact, which perhaps he has not duly considered, and which forms one of the strongest arguments in favour of having a franchise for ourselves, namely, that in at least two of the provinces, for some years past in one of them, to serve Her Majesty in any office under the Dominion Government, or at all events in most of the offices, is considered so great an offence as to deprive the person who holds it of the franchise. As a citizen coming from a distant province in which that disqualification exists, I protest against the disfranchisement of hundreds of my fellow citizens, who are just as competent to consider, discuss and vote on public affairs as I am, and have no other disqualification for exercising that franchise than that they serve the Dominion of Canada as public officers, and many of them serve in positions which have a reward so small that it is absurd to suppose the judgment which they exercise on public affairs would be controlled by the paltry emoluments they receive. Without following the hon. gentleman through all the arguments he has advanced, and which he has hinted at, and which, as I have said before, have been discussed at almost every session of Parliament since the Franchise Act was adopted, let me call attention to the insinuating method in which the hon. gentleman appeals to this side of the House to support his Bill. With a frankness, which would be charming if it were not altogether too specious, the hon. gentleman desired us to say whether we like the Act or not, whether it is entirely satisfactory and in harmony with our opinions or not, and above all with open arms the hon. gentleman appealed to us and asked us for our own sake, not for his sake, not for the interests of a down-trodden Opposition which he says this Act was intended to extinguish, but in our own interest, to come to his support and assist in repealing the Act. The hon. gentleman made a further appeal, which was equally bland and touching, to members of the Government, and he reminded us that to-night we may be standing on the brink of a precipice; that we know not how long we have to live, and we may have very soon to face the people again. As I said before, this would be a very charming appeal indeed, if we did not think that behind all this courtesy and blandishment there is a hidden purpose, which I really think I see in the Bill the hon. gentleman has presented for our consideration to-night. The hon. gentleman, I fancy, entertains, as most of his party do, advanced views as to the effect which should follow an extensive change in the franchise. The hon. gentleman, feeling with respect to the appeal which has lately taken place to the people as much dissatisfaction as he claims many members on this side of the House feel in regard to the Act which he wants repealed, considers it is a great opportunity to make a complete and fundamental change in the electoral franchise of the country. Then he and his friends, as great constitutional authorities, would say: "We have entirely changed the franchise of this country; although fresh from the people, within three months of the time we received our right to sit in this House, we have declared that the franchise under which we came here was a wrong franchise—too narrow in some provinces and too wide in others." Having entirely changed the electoral franchise, as the hon. gentleman by his Bill would do, and provided another, we should hear the cry raised, which hon. gentlemen opposite have raised on far less occasions than this, that we ought to go to the country at once, that our own action in repealing the franchise law had declared that the basis on which the representation of the country had been made ought to be changed as a wrong basis, that we had substituted another, and that we had asserted by law the right of hundreds of people in this country—the hon. gentleman would say this in respect to his own province where the provincial franchise has been

extended—to vote, and they should be at once admitted to the exercise of the privilege of assisting to return members of Parliament. I do not think that even if the hon. gentleman were right in his appeal to this side of the House, and that the Franchise Act is capable of improvement, we are willing to go to the length which the Bill proposes; that within, as I have said, three months of the time we acquired the right to sit here we should adopt as one of our first acts a measure to repudiate the right of the people who sent us here, and to afford the right to others who did not participate in that franchise and to deny that franchise to others who did participate in it. Holding these views, and without detaining the House by entering into arguments which the House has heard night after night, and divided on night after night, I move:

That this Bill be not now read the second time, but that it be read the second time this day six months.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If we were to judge of the hon. gentleman's position by the speech he has just delivered to the House we would conclude that he would rather see the Bill proposed by my hon. friend from West Huron (Mr. Cameron) become the law than see his own motion prevail. Certainly I never heard any speech in this House delivered by the hon. gentleman in which he manifested less energy and earnestness in the support of a proposition which he placed before the House than in the speech in which he supported his present proposition. This is a very important subject. The electoral franchise lies at the basis of representative government in this country, and the chief reason advanced by the First Minister in favour of the Bill which my hon. friend proposes to repeal was the desire to secure uniformity in the qualification of the voters in the various provinces of the Dominion. Whether the principle of uniformity, of which the First Minister was five or six years ago so zealous an advocate, is the proper principle to adopt or not, depends in part, but not wholly, upon whether there is uniformity in conditions, employment and circumstances of the population of the various provinces. Some of the provinces are old, some are very recently colonized. In some of these provinces society has become complex, as it is in old communities. In other provinces some of the people are devoted to agriculture, some are devoted largely to manufacturing industries, and some are devoted to maritime pursuits. Surely where there are such a variety of circumstances, those who are in the immediate vicinity of each class of the population are the best judges of the qualification of those who ought to be entrusted with the electoral franchise. The Minister of Justice has laid very great stress upon the fact that we are not at the present time acquainted with the qualification of voters under the Franchise Acts of the various provinces. Sir, I do not trouble my mind with that subject; I have confidence in the common sense, in the fitness, of the people of the country for self-government. All our institutions are based upon that assumption. We have, under our constitution, representative institutions in the provinces as well as here, and if we were to suppose, as the hon. gentleman assumes, that we can trust nobody in the provinces, that we must look in every instance ourselves into the matter before we can be sure that we will be standing upon safe ground, then the hon. gentleman should begin by undertaking to reform the constitution, he should not entrust with the franchise those that he is afraid to trust with the powers they possess under the provincial constitution in the different provinces. Let us look at what has been done by our neighbours. In the constitution of the United States it is expressly provided that the qualification of the electors for the election of members to the most popular branch of the State Legislature shall be the qualification for the election of members for the House of Representatives in Congress. Now, Sir, that provision of their constitution has been in operation for 104 years. None of the difficulties which the hon. gentleman apprehends from the passage of the Bill proposed by my hon. friend for second reading now, have arisen there. Are the people of this country, are the inhabitants of these provinces less qualified to be trusted, less qualified to exercise the rights of self-government, than the people are in the various States of the American Union? Sir, I need not go into an elaborate defence of the population of the provinces. Why, those who return us here are the same people who return members to the Local Legislatures. They are qualified to elect those members as they are qualified to elect us. They are as likely to exercise a sound judgment in one case as they are in the other. Our charge against the Bill is not solely, as the hon. gentleman assumes, that it gives us a different class of electors, that it produces entirely different results. Our charge is against the expensiveness of the system; our charge is against the inconvenience of the system, it is against the imperfection of the machinery employed to create the voters' lists. That machinery, in the necessity of things, exists under the local constitutions, and it does not exist under ours. The hon. gentleman overlooked that fact. He says that we want the change for party purposes, in order that we may have some advantage over the Administration, and over the hon. gentlemen who support the Administration. Why, Sir, have we asked by this measure that the preparation of the voters' lists shall be placed in our hands, that they shall be put under the control of our party? The First Minister bows assent to that proposition. Well, I dissent from it. I say the preparation of the local voters' lists is not in the hands of the Local Governments, the preparation of the local voters' lists is in the hands of the representatives, or the supporters of the Government in the Local Legislature. It is in the hands of the people themselves, it is in the hands of the community of each locality, of each local community in every municipality throughout the Province of Ontario, at least, and largely so, I believe, in some of the other provinces. Well, Sir, the preparation of that list is as much in the hands of the supporters of the hon. gentleman as it is in the hands of the supporters of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. We stand upon a footing of perfect equality in that matter. We have no advantage over him whatever. We are seeking no advantage. What we are asking for is simple justice; we are asking that the people may be trusted with the care and protection of their own interests. We say that our whole system of Government is based upon the assumption that our people are fit for self-government, that they are competent to govern themselves, and we want no manipulation of the constituencies, no

manipulation of the voters' lists, no manipulation of the officers by whom those lists are to be prepared. We ask simply that the preparation of those lists shall be left in the hands of the authorities in the various localities, who are most competent to deal with the subject, who know the people, who know those who ought to go upon the list. Both parties are there present, and they can see that every member of the party, without expense to any candidate, or any aspirant to become a candidate, shall be put upon the voters' lists as they have been. Why, the Minister of Justice speaks as if this were a new and untried experiment in this country, and that some terrible unforeseen evil might befall us if we were to repeal the measure put upon the Statute-book by supporting the Bill proposed by my hon. friend from Huron. What are the facts? We had this measure upon the Statute-book for seventeen years. Did any one complain? Did any hon. gentleman opposite say that a wrong had been done him by the character of the voters' lists? Were there any complaints that these voters' lists were interfered with, or that names were improperly put on, or names improperly left off? In this House we usually legislate for the purpose of promoting some practical improvement, or for the correction of some evil, or mischief, or abuse, that experience has shown to exist. Was this measure which my hon. friend proposes to repeal, put upon the Statute-book in consequence of any practical mischief that had flown from the trial of that experiment which has lasted over a hundred years on the other side of our boundary, and which was tried for upwards of seventeen years on this side? Not at all. Everyone who has sat in this Parliament, everyone who has had any experience in the conduct of elections when obtaining a seat in this House, knows that the lists were prepared with perfect fairness, because they were in the hands of the electors themselves. They were not dominated by one party or another, and the result was that the House, apart from any manipulation of the boundaries of the constituencies, was likely to be a fair expression of public opinion. Sir, I think that the preparation of the voters' lists by the people themselves, is the proper thing. What is the practice in England? The lists are prepared there by the parish officers. The revising officer is not the party who prepares the list, as he is with us. The party called the revising officer here is a misnamed party. He is not simply the revising officer, but he prepares the lists as well as revises them. And who revises the lists in the United Kingdom? A revising barrister, appointed by the judge upon the circuit. The Government do not interfere, the Government do not undertake to assume control of the preparation of the voters' lists, and take them out of the hands of the electors. The Government do not appoint an officer to see to the printing of those lists: the Government do not put the printing of the lists in the hands of the same department, where the lists are, from carelessness or from some other cause, manipulated, and a large number of the voters left off. I say there is nothing of that sort in England, but there is that sort of thing here. Why, I could refer to a constituency represented by my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Campbell) where hundreds of names that were put on the list when it was revised were left off when it was printed in the office here, and where hundreds of names that were struck off the lists—and the judge himself affirms that he struck them off the list—were found upon the list when the elections came to be held. Now, I say that shows the impropriety of undertaking to centralize the preparation of printing the voters' lists here. It is perfectly consistent with the Act: it is perfectly consistent with the plan of the Act, but it is wholly inconsistent with the rights of the electors, and with a fair and honest election. The hon. Minister has told us that if we were to carry this Bill we must necessarily go the country again. Well, why go to the country? Will he go to the country after revision? The last election was upon lists which will differ as widely from a new list as from the local lists. Our statement is not that there should be a large number on the list in the one case or off them in the other. That is not the statement upon which we are asking for the change; that is simply one phase of it. What we are saying is this: that there are a large number of people with whom the returning officer must be unacquainted, and who could not be put on the list, that there would be no special supervision, that there must be unnecessary expense, as is the case at the present time, in order to perfect the lists. The reeve, councillors and assessors, who go to every house for the purpose of making assessments, become acquainted with those who are entitled to go on the list and with those who are not so entitled, and he must be a party personally acquainted with those who are entitled to become voters, to be qualified to prepare the voters' list in the first instance. What have we now? We have a returning officer who is placed in charge of a population of 30,000 people, not 500 of whom he knows, and so unless some person assists him, and practically does the work, the work is not likely to be done. Indeed, unless we are on the eve of an election, the work in nine cases out of ten is not likely to be done on account of the expense. It is of the first consequence that this change should be made, that a perfectly fair and just measure should be adopted, that a list upon which members may be elected to the Local Legislature should be adopted as the list upon which members should be returned to this House. The hon. Minister will not pretend to say that the Legislative Assembly of Ontario is a very incompetent body, or that it is elected by men who are not entitled to the electoral franchise. The franchise in Ontario has been extended; but by whose support and at whose instance? Was it by the Government alone? and was it opposed by those who opposed the Government? Not at all. The measure was as warmly supported by political friends of the First Minister as it was supported by friends of the Prime Minister of Ontario. What, then, has the First Minister to fear? Nothing except this, that the undue advantage which the appointment of the returning officer and the control of the lists give him under the law would be lost; but I think that the friends who sit around him would be well pleased to share that loss and to take the chance of equality in order to get rid of the expense which is a necessary incident to the supervision of the voters' lists. I need not say anything further with respect to this question. The Minister of Justice says it is well understood in this country. Yes, thanks to the Opposition of 1885 this measure is well understood in this country. On that occasion, at least, Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition in this House did their

duty. They made the public thoroughly conversant with the features of this measure and with the principles upon which it was based, and it speaks well for the general intelligence of the people that they read with attention and care and thoroughly appreciated and understood the character of the measure which my hon. friend proposes to repeal. I have no doubt of this, that the First Minister does not like to place a measure on the Statute-book and afterwards admit he made a mistake. He is advancing in years, and it would be a handsome act on his part on this occasion, and it would not in any way be derogatory to his dignity or his influence in this House, if he were to admit that he made a mistake, and now assist us in repealing the measure and in righting the wrong that he committed in 1885. I am perfectly sure that the friends of the hon. gentleman who sit behind him if he made that announcement would cheer him much more heartily than they cheered the speech of his colleague the Minister of Justice.

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). In addressing the House for the first time I must beg the indulgence of my colleagues while I offer a few remarks. Although a new member of the House, the question under debate is not new to me. When it was first brought under discussion in Parliament I had the honour of occupying a seat in the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Quebec, and from that distant point I followed with interest the very important proceedings of this House. I read from day to day the reports of the speeches *pro* and *con* on the measure submitted for the consideration of hon. members. I thus ascertained the objections of the Opposition to the Bill and the reasons advanced in support of the measure. I remember very well that the first outcry raised in the House was that the Government in proposing such a measure were striking at the provincial autonomy of the provinces. I remember also that it was prophesied at the time that the working of the measure would involve a very large expenditure, and hon. gentlemen sitting on the left of Mr. Speaker, who are always so cautious on the question of public expenditure, were rather afraid of the consequences. In the Legislature of Quebec the Federal Government was attacked for seeking to establish a federal franchise at great expense, and I very well remember that there I heard the strongest denunciations of the Federal Government for trampling under foot the provincial rights. I am free to declare here to-night that at the time I was not carried away nor frightened by this discussion, and that I mustered sufficient courage to take my stand in the Local Legislature of Quebec in favour of the Dominion Franchise Act. Since that time, on several occasions, before many public meetings in the Province of Quebec, I have been called upon to express my opinion on this part of the policy of the Dominion Government, and the stand I adopted in the Local Legislature I took, as it was my duty to do, before those public meetings. To-night we have to decide whether the law is to be repealed or maintained. We have heard two of the hon. gentlemen opposite, leaders of the Opposition, again repeating, although in somewhat briefer form, their objections to the measure. We have heard no new arguments from them whatever; it is a revised edition of what has been said in the House for several years past, not augmented but much decreased. There were two points raised by hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the other side. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) employed all his effort to prove that the Bill is an outrageous one, because of the errors committed in the preparation of the lists, and the other hon. gentleman pointed to the question of expenditure. In the few remarks which I intend to make, with all due respect to the two hon. gentlemen opposite, I will try to look at the question from a little higher standpoint. So far in the debate I have not heard a repetition of the argument which was formerly used that the Bill was a violation of the federal principle of the constitution. I have not heard it repeated to-night that it was a violation of provincial rights. On this subject I will repeat in a few words what I said in the Legislature of Quebec. When the sovereign authority of the Crown, with the sanction of the Imperial Parliament, gave us this constitution which has been now working so well for the last 25 years, it was based on the federal principle it is true, but if we want this constitution to work well, and to produce all the good results we have reason to expect from it, we must never forget that if there is such a thing as provincial autonomy there is also such a thing as federal autonomy. I said in the Local Legislature that it was most absurd to pretend that when the Federal Parliament in the due exercise of its constitutional rights decides upon the question that hereafter there should be a Franchise Bill for the Dominion of Canada, and I repeat now,—it is most absurd to pretend that there is in this a violation of provincial rights. If a measure had been brought forward in this House to declare what would be the provincial franchise for the provincial elections, well and good, then there would have been a violation of provincial rights. If a measure had been brought into the Local Legislature of Quebec to provide for a federal franchise, then there would have been a violation of federal rights and federal autonomy, but so long as the Federal Parliament and the Provincial Legislature remain prudently and wisely within the limits of their jurisdiction, where is the violation of rights on one side or the other? I cannot see any. Perhaps I have to regret that I have not the keen intellect of hon. gentlemen opposite, for if I were so endowed I might see more clearly into the matter. I take the question from its very root, when I say that the right of the Federal Parliament to provide for the Dominion franchise is undeniable. This right was inserted in the British North America Act by the legislative power which alone in the world had the right to insert it, that is, the Imperial Parliament. I call the attention of the House to the fact that when the Imperial Parliament had to legislate to give a new constitution to the Dominion of Canada, it would have been absurd and completely nonsensical not to give to this Parliament the right to declare what would be the franchise of the electors to select the members of this House. If the Imperial Parliament had not given this House control of its franchise, it would have been creating a body without a soul. If the principle announced by the opponents of the franchise law were to be carried into application, we would require an amendment to the constitution under the British North America Act to declare that the right of legislating upon the Dominion franchise would be hereafter vested in the

Provincial Legislature: that is the only way out of the difficulty, and for my part, although I claim to be just as good a partisan of provincial autonomy as any member on your left, Mr. Speaker, I state here that I would be opposed, with all my strength, to such a proposition. I do not think I can say any more with regard to the principle of the Bill itself. At all events the question has been decided by our predecessors in this House, and it is now the law of the land for several years. Let me briefly review the objections of the opponents of this Bill. I am just as anxious as any member of this House that the affairs of our country should be administered with the greatest possible economy, but we must admit that if we want to carry on our free institutions, the people of Canada must contribute to their support. With regard to the expenditure for operating this Act, I do not intend to go fully into this part of the question to-night. I know it is a very important question, but I have no doubt that the Government is anxious to see that the expenditure for the working of the Act will be brought down to the lowest figure possible. But there must be no exaggeration one way or the other. Now, a few remarks on this question of expenditure. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) proposes to return to the old system of the provincial franchises. Suppose we do, what would be the consequences? We should have as Dominion electors all those who should be declared so by the provincial laws. But I do not know of any provincial law that provides for the printing of the lists: and perhaps on that subject I may have a few suggestions to make, because I have taken a deep interest in the preparation of the lists, especially in one county of the Province of Quebec, and I have acquired some knowledge of the working of the Act. I could understand hon. gentlemen opposite saying: As the expenditure is large, we will dispense with the printing of the lists; because, if you return to the provincial lists, you will have to do what was formerly done, that is, you will either have no printed lists, or the candidates or their friends will have to get them printed at their own expense. Now, I have ascertained from the blue-book and by information from printers, that, on the average, the printing of a list in a county of say 4,000 electors will cost from $250 to $300.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). That is true; I know enough about printing matters to say that: and if you do not get the lists printed you have to copy them, and the expense has to be paid by some one. I will not raise the question whether after all it is better to have the printing of the lists done by the Government; that is only one part of the argument; but hon gentlemen opposite have altogether overlooked this point. Now, the hon. mover of this Bill, in asking the House to vote to repeal the existing law, claims that he represents the wishes of the people. We know by past experience that hon. gentlemen opposite are always very anxious, though they are the minority, to claim that they represent the majority of the people. But after all, Mr. Speaker, the Franchise Act was carried in this House some years ago by a large majority It was debated here for weeks and weeks: you had then, I believe, a six months session; since then the question has been debated on the hustings of the Dominion, from British Columbia to Prince Edward Island; all the eloquence of hon. gentlemen opposite, all their intelligence, and I suppose I must add, all their sincerity and patriotism, were devoted to the task of convincing the people that this was a most outrageous law; and what was the outcome of it all? That in two successive general elections a large majority of the people of Canada have declared that they still had confidence in the Dominion Government by electing a majority to support them in this House. Whatever may be the pretensions of hon. gentlemen opposite, there is one thing that is undeniable—and I suppose I can claim the unanimous assent of this House to it—that whatever the popular opinion may be, the constitutional majority in this House govern in the name of the people; and when there is here a majority just fresh from a general contest to declare in the name of the people of Canada that the people approve of this legislation, I do not think hon. gentlemen opposite have the right to claim that in this case—and this case only—they represent the real public opinion of the country. Now, I must add this: I took the liberty a moment ago to inform this House that in the Legislature of Quebec I approved of the principle of this Franchise Act, and opposed the contention of the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite in that House that it was a violation of provincial rights. But if at that time I had been able to foresee what was to happen in the Province of Quebec at a later period, I would have been a still stronger opponent of the views of hon. gentlemen opposite. I could not foresee in 1885 or 1886 that in 1889 such an outrageous and illiberal measure as the one carried in that Legislature, depriving a large number of citizens of the Province of Quebec of the right to vote, could be passed in any Legislature of the Dominion. Such a measure, Mr. Speaker, was proposed there; our friends in the Local House fought it to the last; we did all we could to prevent it becoming law; we tried to show—and I think we succeeded in showing—that the Bill was really outrageous, that it was trampling under foot the rights and the liberties of the people of that Province by depriving of the right of voting at provincial elections hundreds and perhaps thousands of those who might be considered amongst the most intelligent, well educated and patriotic electors of the Dominion. We did all we could; we prolonged the session several days, I admit, in fighting the Bill; and we had the satisfaction and pleasure, in being beaten, of seeing five of the supporters of the Quebec Government voting with us against that most arbitrary measure. Still, it was carried, and fresh from the struggle we had down there, as I am, hon. gentlemen opposite need not ask me to consent to return to the provincial lists of the Province of Quebec under such a law as we have there. With regard to the difficulties of working the Act, there may be some. It would have been a most marvellous piece of legislation if it could have been put into operation from British Columbia down to Prince Edward Island without any difficulties being encountered. Still, because a law meets with difficulties in its working, and all human and even Divine laws meet with such difficulties, that is no reason why we are to deny the principle of the law if it is good. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) raises the ob-

jection against the Act, that it is not in the hands of the people. He contends that provincial laws confide to the people the preparation of the lists, whilst it is not so with regard to the federal law. What are the facts as they stand? I am more acquainted with the provincial franchise law of Quebec than with the electoral laws of the other provinces; and in Quebec I know the law provides that the lists shall be prepared by the municipal council, whereas the Dominion Act provides for their preparation by the revising officers. As regards the right of the people to see to the preparation of the lists, I have not perceived much difference between the two systems. If you want, Sir, to be placed on the provincial list, you have to apply to the municipal council and prove your title; and if you want to be placed on the Dominion list you have to establish your right before the revising officer. There is, however, this difference: Observing, as I have done for several years, the working of the provincial law in Quebec, the conviction was gradually forced on my mind that there the system had the effect of introducing party warfare into our municipal institutions. I have seen party-spirit run very high in those institutions. I have seen municipal affairs conducted solely in the interests of party; I have seen that in the preparation of the lists before some of the municipal councils there was not the slightest possibility of justice being done. All this I have seen. With regard to the question of impartiality, I must say, from my experience of the working of the Dominion Act, the revising officers, who act as judges and are responsible, have done their duty honestly, impartially, and patriotically, and with a due sense of their responsibility to the people. I do not intend to detain the House longer. As I said a moment ago, I want to judge the question on its real principle; and I was glad to hear the mover of the Bill say, in concluding his remarks, that he wished the law to be discussed upon its principle. Referring to the principle of the Act itself, I have no hesitation in taking my stand on this ground, that under free institutions the franchise is the very life of Parliament. If that foundation is rendered solid and strong by means of a wide-spread system of education, by means of a well cultivated sense of public responsibility, then the safer and the firmer is the whole structure of institutions depending upon it. Now, the Parliament of Canada is a great representative institution. Whatever may be our differences of opinion, whatever may be our shortcomings, for nothing in this world is perfect, I am sure I voice the whole sentiment of the House when I say that the people of Canada have reason to be proud of their Parliament. In saying this, I am only paying a well deserved compliment to the people of Canada, because this body politic being of their own constitutional creation, they can look pleasantly upon their offspring. But, Sir, the Parliament of Canada, to fulfil its duty, to accomplish its mission, must constantly feel the pulse of an enlightened, sober, mature and active public opinion; and to animate and revive the body politic, the pulse itself must find its existence in the leading principle of our free institutions, which is the franchise. I venture to assert, whatever may be said to the contrary, that since the Act under discussion has been law, since this House has exercised its right to legislate for the franchise of the people, the union of the Parliament of Canada and the people has been brought closer. Now that we have been for the last twenty-five years witnessing with proud satisfaction the cementing of this grand union of the Provinces, now that we have been witnessing the increasing prestige of the Parliament of Canada, I consider it is our bounden duty to maintain this law because it provides that the very life of this Parliament—the very life of this intelligent, devoted and patriotic body—shall be drawn from its natural source and principle, the will of the nation expressed through the instrumentality of the franchise as determined by this Parliament under its constitutional responsibility to the people. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that I will fulfil a great public duty in voting against the Bill of the hon. member for West Huron, because I firmly believe that, at this stage of our national existence, more than ever, we must rise superior to all party prejudices and narrow arguments, and join heartily in the patriotic desire to strengthen as much as possible by all legitimate means the free institutions of which we are so proud.

Mr. AMYOT. I have heard with a great deal of pleasure the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins) trying to attach this question to a great principle. I have heard him with surprise, however, trying before this tribunal the Government of the Province of Quebec. I would ask the hon. gentleman under whose authority and in whose name he rises here to speak against the Government of Quebec? Was he elected as a member of the Province of Quebec at the last election? No; he was defeated because he wished to oppose the good laws of that province. I say that he has no authority to make here the trial of that Government. I hope that system of trying here the Government of the divers provinces will soon be given up. At all events, I deny to the hon. member any authority whatsoever to come here and discuss these questions. The franchise, the qualification to vote and the exercise of the same, are two things which the hon. member who spoke before me wants to join together. This Government, he says, has done right to say who shall be qualified to vote for the members of the Federal Parliament. Some contend that such is the case and others contend that, in a confederate system, every state in the union should have the power to decide who should represent the state in the general federation. In the United States, I think in Switzerland too, and generally it is admitted by all the authors who have written on the confederate system, that each state in the confederation should decide by whom it would be represented in the general Government. But let us admit for a moment that this principle is not the right one, but that the central Government should say who should vote for the representation in the general Parliament. There remains the application of the machinery, and the application of the franchise. Where is the good reason why we should take away from the municipal authorities the power of making the lists? Where is the reason why it is necessary to appoint one officer for a county to decide about the right to vote of hundreds or even thousands of voters whom he has never seen in his life? Let this Parliament decide that there must be so much income to qualify a voter, that he must be of such an age, that he must have resided in the locality for such a time. But where is the reason

that these matters should be decided very often by an unknown party, and at all events by a person directly paid by the party in power and whose appointment is not always in the public interest? I defy any one to say that our municipal authorities in this country are corrupt.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. AMYOT. Are there some dogs in that party who yelp? Is there a man in this House who will state that the municipal authorities of this country are not capable of knowing those who live alongside them? In the County of L'Islet, who is making the lists? A lawyer residing in Quebec, nearly 100 miles from that county. Whom does he know in that county? If the hon. member who represents that county has one of a majority it may be due to the omission of the names of those who would be on the list if the municipal authorities were making them as they should have the power of doing. We complain that the lists are not made by the parties who should make them. We complain that this system costs a great deal of money to the state and a great deal of money to the various counties, and is unnecessarily costly to the candidates. If you choose to have the franchise settled by this Parliament, at all events let it be applied by the local authorities. In the Province of Quebec the municipal system operates perfectly in this respect. My hon. friend says he has seen some unfairness and some injustice in connection with it. So long as humanity exists, there will be some unfairness somewhere, but I prefer the lists which are made by responsible members of local councils, who may be changed every year, lists which are made every year without costing one cent, to lists which are made every three or four years by paid officers of a Government or a party. I have heard the statement of some hon. gentlemen that they would not take the electoral franchise of the Province of Quebec because some employés of the Federal Government have been denied their right of voting. The Province of Quebec has seen fit to say that the employés of the Intercolonial Railway, whose number increases during an election and who are paid by the country, and who are moved from county to county as the Government may desire, that those paid electors, selected by the paid agent of the Government and transported unduly on the public railways of the country, are no longer able to express a free and impartial opinion, and it has taken away their right to vote, as I think justly. Examples have been given of the unfairness of revising officers in the preparation of the list. In one parish in the County of Bellechasse which I represent—the Parish of Beaumont—and it is a small parish, in the federal lists there are about forty names missing which are to be found on the local list. In one parish I was deprived of forty votes of my friends. We were told not to revise the list last year because there would be a revision in 1891, as well as a census and a redistribution of seats. In Bellechasse I was deprived of about four hundred votes, owing to the bad preparation of the voters' lists then in force. Now, if there is a revision, everyone of us will have to go to his county and do nearly the same work as at elections, in order to remedy the fact that the revising officers will not know the parties they will have to deal with, will not know those who will be dead, and who will be replaced by this and that proprietor. Admit or deny the principle that this or any other Government has the right to say who shall vote and how shall be constituted the House of Representatives. Decide as you like on that; but at all events make the provision practicable. Give it to the municipal authorities who are presumed to be honest and who know what they are about. We understand that it would be hard for the governing party to dispense with a lot of officials who think themselves in duty bound to work for those who have appointed them for life. We understand that, and that is the underlying reason why the Government and their supporters cling so tenaciously to the Franchise Act. For my part I would be in favour of any Franchise Act which would be sincerely, honestly and fairly applied, but it will never be sincerely, honestly and fairly applied so long as it is controlled by an officer not a resident of the county, who very often resides far from the county, who is responsible to nobody, and who receives his pay directly from the power that has appointed him.

Mr. DALY. I would not trouble the House to-night upon this question were it not that we have had a Franchise Act passed in the Province of Manitoba lately by the Legislature of that province, a Legislature composed principally of gentlemen of the same political persuasion as hon. gentlemen opposite, and having at the head of its Government a gentleman whom the mover of this Bill is no doubt very well acquainted with, the Hon. Mr. Greenway. I have no doubt that the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron), who has this Bill in charge, will remember the name of Mr. Greenway, and he will recollect that in days gone by Mr. Greenway was his opponent, and he will recollect that he was left at home, and Mr. Greenway sent down here to represent his constituency. It is true that Mr. Greenway was not sent here by the majority of the electors of that constituency, but he came here by the leave of the hon. gentleman who is in charge of this Bill. This Mr. Greenway went to Manitoba, where he has since become premier of that province. He leads a Reform Government there, he leads a Government which hon. gentlemen opposite delight to honour, he leads a Government of which the Hon. Mr. Martin is Attorney-General, a gentleman who opposed me during the late election; and this gentleman, I believe, on different platforms during the Dominion election that took place in our province some years ago, had as much to say against the Dominion Franchise Act as the hon. gentlemen have to say to-night, and as they have said in previous debates. But a change has come over the dream of the Greenway Government in the Province of Manitoba, and they have introduced a Franchise Act there, which exceeds in enormity, I may say—using the terms of the hon. gentleman opposite respecting the Dominion Franchise Act—exceeds in enormity the Act which was passed by the right hon. gentleman and his Government in 1885. Why, Sir, I have no doubt but that when the hon. member for Huron, with very sweet simplicity and charming nonchalance gave his views to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House respecting the repeal of the Franchise Act, he did not tell those hon. gentlemen who support him that this Greenway Reform Gov-

ernment in the Province of Manitoba, have sought to exceed this great iniquity committed by the Government of the right hon. Premier. Why, Sir, we find that they introduced into the Manitoba Legislature, during its last session, a Franchise Bill, and the hon. gentleman would require by his Bill that myself and other representatives from the Province of Manitoba should be elected under the electoral franchise law now in force in that province, and, Sir, so strong was the feeling of the Reformers of Manitoba against that Bill, so enormous was its provisions, that we find that even the Winnipeg *Free Press*, a paper that will be acknowledged at all events, by the one Liberal representative in this House from west of Lake Superior, to be a truly Liberal paper, a paper that has opposed the Franchise Act——

Mr. WATSON. No.

Mr. DALY,—a paper that has made the hon. gentleman from Marquette (Mr. Watson), what he is to-day, a paper that is attacking to-day the Franchise Act which has been attacked by the hon. gentleman opposite to-night, and a paper which says that it hopes the hon. gentleman's Bill will be passed. We find this paper saying that an Act has been passed by the Greenway Government of Manitoba, exceeding in iniquity the Dominion Franchise Act of 1885. Why, Sir, we find in the issue of that paper of 11th May, the following:—

"We have in Manitoba what is called a 'Liberal' Government backed up by a 'Liberal' Legislature. The Ministers, Mr. Greenway, Mr. Smart, Mr. McLean and Mr. McMillan, with the Siftons and Youngs and Mickles of their following in the House, have been heard to denounce the Dominion Franchise Act: they probably think they could not pose as Liberals if they did not. But for their own advantage they carried through a Local Election Act last session which contains all the iniquitous features of the Dominion Act, and more, too. What do the honest Liberals of Manitoba think of that? This Local Election Bill provides for the appointment of partisan officers to compile the list, as in the Dominion Act: it provides for the appointment of partisan lawyers as revising officers, as in the Dominion Act. The registration clerks are expected, as they are given power, to stuff the lists, and the partisan courts of revision are expected to interfere with the stuffing as little as possible. Names will be left off that cannot be got on without great trouble and expense, and improper names will be put on that it will often be impossible to get off. This is the very burden of the complaint which Liberals throughout the Dominion have had to make against the Ottawa law. But our 'Liberal' Government went further than this. It attempted to prevent any revision at all. As originally introduced the Bill provided that, by a trick of the registration clerks, notice of appeal could be delayed until a revision was practically impossible. The Dominion Act, with all its injustice, never contemplated going that far. This cowardly and infamous attempt to muzzle opponents was frustrated by the Opposition who exposed it and forced an amendment."

And I may say to you, Sir, and the members of this House, that the Opposition is led in the Legisture of Manitoba to-day by as good a Liberal as sits upon the other side of this House. Although Mr. Roblin was elected two short years ago to support the Greenway Government, yet the actions of that Government were so outrageous, its dishonesty and its corruption was so great, that that gentleman did not wish to support that Government any longer, and he is the gentleman who has seen fit to raise an objection to this Act which the *Free Press* says exceeds in its enormity the Dominion Franchise Act. And we find that in order to have certain changes in that Act he had a debate precipitated which lasted all night, the only all night session which has taken place in the Province of Manitoba for years. So you see how great was the pressure brought to bear upon the Opposition, only eleven in number, who tried to get certain amendments to this Act. Now, the hon. gentleman who is in charge of this Bill, the hon. gentlemen who have spoken in favour of it, the philosopher from Bothwell, and other hon. gentlemen who support this Bill, have seen fit to attack the provisions of the Dominion Franchise Act. Now, Sir, the one statement that has been repeated from one end of Canada to the other—and I have heard it in this House during the discussion of this Bill—is that we should have "one man, one vote." "One man, one vote," was the cry of the Reform Government in the Province of Manitoba, and we will see how they put it into practice. We find that, according to their Act, the qualification is that an elector shall be of the male sex, twenty-one years of age, and a British subject by birth or naturalization, who

"Is at the date of the issue of the proclamation appointing the registration clerk, and has been for one month immediately prior to said date, a resident of and domiciled within the said electoral division, and has been for six months immediately prior to said date, a resident of and domiciled within the province."

That might be very well, but there are exceptions, and the following parties are disqualified, namely:

"All officials and employés of the Dominion and Local Governments, in receipt of a salary to the amount of three hundred and fifty dollars."

Now, just fancy any person attempting to justify a Government, to justify a party, who will say that we have an Electoral Franchise Act which gives one man one vote, and yet declares by its provisions that a man who is in receipt of $350, and being a Government official, shall not be entitled to exercise his franchise. Any man from England, Ireland or Scotland, who has been in the country seven months prior to the issue of the proclamation may have a vote, and yet a man who has resided in Manitoba for ten, twelve or fifteen years will be disfranchised, because he is in receipt of a salary of $350 from the Dominion Government. Further, all regular soldiers and persons enrolled in military schools and also all registrars, sheriffs, county court clerks and bailiffs in receipt of fees to the amount of $350 per annum or upwards are disqualified. A man might be a soldier, or a registrar, or anything else described in this Act, and might earn $349 a year, and he would be entitled to vote, but because he earns $350 he cannot vote. The thing is simply outrageous, and, instead of those hon. gentlemen attacking the right hon. gentleman and his Government for this Franchise Act, I would like them to educate their brother Liberals in the Province of Manitoba as to what a Franchise Act should be. The hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House take it, I believe, as part of their policy in connection with the franchise that the lists should be made by the municipal clerks. I have no objection to that. It was a principle we fought for some years ago in the Province of Manitoba in connection with our Franchise Act, but we find that the Liberals and Reformers in Manitoba have a different opinion in regard to this from their friends here, because, by clause 16 of their Act, it is provided that

"The Lieutenant Governor in Council shall appoint a proper person, to be called the Registration Clerk."

Not as provided by the Dominion Act, a judge

or a barrister of five years' standing, but "a proper person," and whom do we suppose the Government of Manitoba will appoint as a proper person but a Liberal partizan. According to this Act, I and other representatives from the Province of Manitoba would be subject to the decision of such a "proper person" as to who should be entitled to vote at our elections. I propose that the hon. gentleman who has charge of this Bill shall not inflict upon me such an injustice, but that I shall be elected by the voters on a list properly and fairly prepared. I defy any hon. gentleman on the other side to say that the list for my county was not fairly prepared as much in the interest of my opponent as in mine. My list contained 16,000 names, the third largest list in the Dominion of Canada, and my opponent had as much justice given to him as I had. I ask the member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) the only Liberal member from the Province of Manitoba, if he will dare to say that the revising officer in his constituency did not give him fair play. The hon. gentleman had so much regard for Judge Ryan, who was the revising officer in his constituency, that, although he was declared elected by a majority of 11, he asked for a recount before that judge, showing thus that he had perfect confidence in Judge Ryan. As to the list on which my hon. friend from Winnipeg was elected, I should like to know if that was not fairly prepared by Judge Ardagh: and it is the same in regard to the lists from one end of Manitoba to the other. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite, many of them barristers themselves, do not hesitate to charge judges who have been placed on the bench, to charge their professional brothers with not being fit for the office of revising officer. According to the hon. gentleman, they have the hardihood to say that I am to have my list prepared by "a proper person to be known as the registration clerk," and appointed by the Local Government of Manitoba. This Act goes further and says that these lists shall be revised by these very judges whom hon. gentlemen now pretend are not fit to act as revising officers. The Manitoba Act goes beyond that, and says not only shall county court judges revise the lists but barristers of three years' standing. The Dominion Act says that the revising officers shall be a judge or a barrister of five years' standing, but according to the Manitoba legislation the man to revise the list may be a barrister of three years' standing. In Manitoba we want none of such legislation as is proposed by the hon. gentleman to-night. Further, to show that the Liberal party of the Province of Manitoba are in favour of the Dominion Franchise Act, I may quote sub-clause 4 of clause 18 of the Bill, where it says:

"The registration clerk shall obtain a certified copy, or certified copies, of the last revised list, or lists, of electors in such electoral division, or part of the same, for municipal, local or Dominion parliamentary purposes."

The Act passed by the Reform Government of the Province of Manitoba pronounces that the "Dominion parliamentary" list is one that the registration clerks can take as properly prepared. That is a pronouncement in favour of the Dominion Franchise Act. Further, it says:

"After the date of the closing of the list, the same shall be open to the inspection of any person asking to inspect the same. Before the date of the closing of the list, the registration clerk shall be bound to inform any person enquiring of him, at his office, whether or not he has placed any particular person on the list. Any person so inspecting said list may make a copy of the whole or any part thereof."

Then we find by a further provision that this judge or the barrister of three years' standing who is to be appointed to revise the list, shall revise the list not less than two weeks after the day fixed for the closing of the list by the registration clerk, and according to clause 16 the registration clerk is to close the list not less than two weeks from the date of the proclamation. There are some constituencies in Manitoba 36 miles square, without any railway communication, and you can easily understand what possibility there would be, under such circumstances, of putting names on the list. By clause 22 it is provided that the registration clerk shall furnish copies of the printed list for any person applying for the same for a fee of not more than 20 cents for each copy:

"Provided that such registration clerk must retain a sufficient number of copies of said printed lists for the purpose required by this Act. Such list shall be printed in time for the court of revision, if possible; but such court of revision shall be held whether such list has been printed or not."

I ask hon. gentlemen to bear in mind that the man who is to revise the lists is "a proper person" appointed by the Government, that is, a political partisan; that he has two weeks in which to prepare the list, and that he is not absolutely required to print the list before the court of revision: and then I ask hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, from the experience they have had of hon. gentlemen on the other side, what fairness they would expect from a partisan appointed by a Reform Government under such circumstances. It seems to me the most ridiculous contention in the world that there is anything wrong with the Dominion Franchise Act. We in Manitoba have had every possible hardship in getting names upon the list, and I would ask those hon. gentlemen, if they are fair men, if they are the free men they say they are, if they are desirous of having every man in the Dominion exercise his franchise, to realize that in Manitoba they do not get anything like the freedom under the Provincial Act that they do under the Dominion Franchise Act, because in Manitoba that practically means manhood suffrage. We have no man in the Province of Manitoba, who is a British subject and over twenty-one years of age, who has not the right to vote under the Dominion Franchise Act, because I am glad to say that we are sufficiently prosperous in that Province to insure that every man can earn $300 a year and so has a right to be on the list. That is practically manhood suffrage for Manitoba under the Dominion Franchise Act, and the people are not surrounded with the difficulties which the local Act provides. We find that the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) in the third clause of his Bill says:

"3. The returning officers, deputy returning officers, poll clerks and other officials hereafter to be appointed for the purpose of conducting and holding elections of members for the House of Commons of Canada, shall have the same powers and authority as the returning officers, deputy returning officers and other officials in the several provinces comprising the Dominion of Canada now have under the election law now in force in each of such provinces respectively."

I will call the attention of the promoter of this Bill to clause 125 of the Electoral Franchise Act of the Province of Manitoba under which clause I and other representatives from that Province are sup-

posed to be bound according to the proposition which he makes in this third clause of his Bill. That section of the Manitoba Act says :

"Whenever any deputy returning officer has reason to know or believe that fraud or violence is being practised in violation of the rights of electors, by which undue votes are tendered, or that any person is not qualified or has already voted at said election and offers to vote again, or tenders his vote under a false name or designation, or personates or represents himself falsely as being on the list of electors, such deputy returning officer under a penalty of two hundred dollars, and in default of payment, imprisonment not exceeding twelve months, shall refuse to give a ballot to such person and mention thereof shall be made in the poll list."

Now, Mr. Speaker, fancy investing any deputy returning officer or poll clerk with powers such as are given by clause 125 of this Act. I do not suppose that any hon. gentleman of this House, no matter from what province he comes, desires that such arbitrary power shall be given to such an official. There are other reasons why I oppose this Bill. I am astonished that the hon. gentleman who promotes it, after having been away from this House for four long years, after having spoken 57 times upon the Franchise Act in 1885, after having made a speech which covered 922 lines of the *Hansard* when he first spoke on the Franchise Act—I am surprised that that hon. gentleman after having come back to the House should introduce legislation upon a subject on which he so long and so often aired his eloquence—I can assure the hon. gentleman that he will find on this side of the House the same opposition which he met with in 1885.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. DALY. I can assure him that he will find the same majority.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Oh, no.

Mr. DALY. Yes, he will; we are not half through yet my dear fellow—excuse me, Mr. Speaker. I can assure the hon. gentleman that it would be better for himself and better for the country if he would take up his time in devising more useful legislation than that proposed by this Bill. In order to give my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson), the hon. gentleman who represents the returning officer of his constituency, some information with regard to the local Franchise Act in the Province of Manitoba, I will quote an article from the Liberal *Free Press*. I would ask every one of the hon. gentlemen opposite to listen to this article from a good Liberal paper, one of the best Liberal papers published in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). It is a Tory paper.

Mr. DALY. My dear fellow, if you will read through the paper you will find that it is a good Liberal paper, and I am very much mistaken in the hon. gentleman's politics if he would not agree with a good deal of what is written in this paper.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). It has fallen from grace.

Mr. DALY. Listen to this my good Reform friend from Huron, it will do you good, it is an article written by a good Reformer ; it is headed "Scotched, not killed," and it says :

"The electors of Manitoba must not suppose that because the Government was forced to concede certain objectionable features of the election law, therefore the law as it stands is fair and equitable. On the contrary, the electorate will have to exercise the utmost vigilance over the partisan registration clerk to secure registration of votes; over the partisan revising officer to prevent voters from being struck off on some trumpery excuse, and over the party deputy returning officer who can refuse to accept votes when upon the list, whenever he has to think that it would be inconvenient for such a voter to exercise his franchise. Putting aside the cumbrousness of this monstrosity of monstrosities' in its other provisions, these three avenues for corruption are sufficient to condemn any Act."

It is called a "monstrosity of monstrosities," is this Act which was passed by the Liberal Government of Manitoba. Why, no such charge has ever been made, even by a Liberal, against the Dominion Franchise Act. The article continues :

"We denounce these supporters of the Government who, masquerading in the guise of Liberals, through means of a brute majority, seek to perpetuate in power a corrupt Administration, by thus insidiously destroying the popular vote. We hold that this species of Government interference with the people in the registration of their sovereign will is despotic, and dangerously centralizes power in the Executive, and is, therefore, dangerous to the liberties of free men, as well as in direct contravention of the principles of popular government as provided in our constitution."

Now I would ask every hon. gentleman, before he votes upon this question, as he will have to do to-night, to consider before he gives a vote as some he has given before which will be lost and of no value —I would ask them before they rush in to suffer the same defeat as they suffered on former occasions, to weigh well the words which I have read and which were written by as good a Liberal as they are. I would ask the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) if he can stand up in his place to-night to justify the Franchise Act of the Manitoba Legislature, part of which I have quoted. I do not think the member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) will justify it, nor do I think that any hon. gentleman on the opposite side of the House will justify it. I will leave the further discussion on this question to other hon. gentlemen, believing that I would not have done my duty to myself or to my constituents, or to my Province, if I did not show these hon. gentlemen who are so desirous of having a proper Franchise Act what their brother Liberals can do when they are left to their own sweet will. I have no doubt that if the gentlemen on the opposite side of the House got into power we might expect the same treatment from them as we received from their friends in the Local Legislature.

Mr. LANDERKIN. We will take care of you.

Mr. DALY. I have no doubt that my hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) would like to sit in my seat upon the Government side of the House, and to warm it as nicely as I do, but the hon. gentleman will never be here : he will be dead and gone before that time comes, and I regret it much, for I like my hon. friend and would like to sit side by side with him. He is in the sere and yellow leaf now, and his party will be doubly in the sere and yellow leaf before they occupy a position to the right of the Speaker. I have endeavoured to show to my friends upon the opposite side of the House, including such valiant champions of the rights of the people as the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), what the Reform Government, which they delight to honour, in the Province of Manitoba, can do. When this Bill came up in the Local Legislature, it was opposed not only by Mr. Roblin, a good Liberal, but it was opposed by other Liberals, who now occupy a position on the Opposition side in the Legislature, and by Mr. Fisher, a gentleman whom the hon. member

for South Perth (Mr. Trow), will certify to be a strong Reformer. If the hon. gentlemen who speak so eloquently and so forcibly upon the other side of the House in justification of the measure we are now discussing were in power we would find these gentlemen would take the same steps as the Reformers in Manitoba took with the electors there, and that they would mislead the electors of the Dominion as their friends have done in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, we have listened to the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly), in a speech of some fifteen minutes, condemning almost every clause of the present Electoral Franchise Act. Then he went on to say that the Local Legislature of Manitoba attempted to pass an Act, which he admits they did not pass, containing exactly the same clauses as the Act we are attempting to repeal to-day. That being the case, I think it hardly necessary that I should occupy any of the time of this House in attempting to refute any of the arguments the hon. gentleman has used on that subject. But with regard to the Government of Manitoba, while I do not know that we are here for the purpose of discussing all the Acts passed by that Government, I have simply this to say, that in the last local elections in the province, in which the hon. member for Selkirk took part, only four Conservatives were returned in the whole province. So much for the efforts of the hon. gentleman and his friends. To-day they are in a better position, and I will tell you why. The hon. gentleman has said that he defeated the Attorney-General of Manitoba in the last election. He did so, I admit, and he knows why. At a meeting held in the town of Portage la Prairie a couple of months ago, when Attorney-General Martin was re-elected by a large majority, the hon. gentleman admitted why he defeated the Attorney-General in Selkirk, and I will inform this House what the hon. gentleman admitted at that time. Attorney-General Martin is well known as the father of the Manitoba School Act, and for that reason was bitterly opposed by the Catholics in the Province. He is also known as the father of the Bill to abolish the French language in the Province, for which he was bitterly opposed by the French-speaking electors. Now, there are a large number of Catholic votes in Selkirk, probably 600 out of 6,000; and the hon. gentleman admitted that to make up his majority of 435 he received 200 Catholic votes which any other Liberal besides Mr. Martin would have received. He admitted further that owing to the opposition of the Winnipeg *Free Press* to Mr. Martin, a paper which was formerly a Liberal paper and was largely read by Liberals in Selkirk, over 100 sound Liberals had voted for him.

Mr. DALY. I rise to a point of order. I utterly deny that I made any such statement. The hon. gentleman states what is untrue, and I challenge him to prove it.

Mr. WATSON. We have heard such statements made by the hon. gentleman in this House before. He also admitted that he had received the votes of 150 Canadian Pacific Railway employés in Selkirk.

Mr. DALY. I rise to a point of order. I said I had not received 100 votes from the Canadian Pacific Railway in Selkirk. Everything the hon. gentleman says is untrue and false.

Mr. DALY.

Mr. CHARLTON. I rise to order. The hon. member for Selkirk should be required by you to withdraw unparliamentary langaage. He has said that a member here has stated what is false and untrue, and his language is unparliamentary.

Mr. DALY. If the language I have used is unparliamentary, I will withdraw it, but it is perfectly justified on my part.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker, we have not had your ruling yet.

Mr. ACTING-SPEAKER (Mr. DESJARDINS, Hochelaga). I understand the hon. gentleman has withdrawn.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman has aggravated the offence by reiterating it.

Mr. DALY. I suppose I am called to order by the great moralist of the country. I want the hon. gentlemen to understand that they cannot put me down. They tried it before, and they cannot do it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, is this in order, that the hon. gentleman should indulge in an attack on my hon. friend for stating a point of order?

Mr. DALY. Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, chair.

Mr. DALY. I want to apologize, if you will allow me. I beg to apologize to you, Sir, if I have used language which is derogatory to your position as Speaker of this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. That will not do.

Mr. WATSON. You are probably aware, Sir, that I pay less attention to the interruptions of the hon. gentleman than any other member of this House. We are used to them in Manitoba, and they have very little effect. This may be to a certain extent irrelevant to the discussion; but we are discussing this Franchise Act, and the hon. gentleman has stated why he is here and why I am here. He says that I am here by the grace of the deputy returning officers. I am pointing out that he was elected by 200 Catholic votes, 100 Liberal votes, and 150 Canadian Pacific Railway votes, making 450, which reversed would make a difference of 900 in the count, leaving the hon. gentleman in a minority of 565. It was a God-send to the hon. gentleman that he had an unpopular candidate to oppose him, or he never would have been here. Now, Sir, I have not one word to say in complaint of the action of the revising barrister in my county, Judge Ryan. The hon. member for Selkirk has told you that I had sufficient confidence in Judge Ryan to ask him for a recount, notwithstanding the fact that I was returned by a majority of 12 votes by the returning officer. I asked for a recount simply because my opponent, I learned, was asking for a recount by a judge who was not a resident of my county, but who had jurisdiction over a portion of it. I might say that the hon. member for Selkirk sits by the grace of the judge who revised the lists in his county, Judge Walker, because, in the revision, when he was asked to put 75 Liberal names on the list for one small district, he refused to do so. That is why the hon. gentleman prefers to have a Dominion franchise with Judge Walker as revising barrister. I am not going to discuss the position of Mr. Greenway in the County of Huron, which we have had over and over again. That is the only thing Mr. Greenway's opponents have against him,

that he was once a Tory in Huron. I am sorry he was, but he afterwards learned better, and he has had a successful Liberal Government in Manitoba. The hon. gentleman says he is opposed by a Liberal paper, that is, a paper which was Liberal a year or so ago, but has been in bad company ever since, and which has not to-day any backbone in its body; a paper which in the last election denounced the Liberal party in Manitoba from one end of the country to the other. I am not here to attack or repudiate any portion of the public press. They have a perfect right to discuss public questions as they choose; but to quote extracts from a paper of that kind in denunciation of the Local Government proves nothing. What do you find stated? That the Local Government is losing ground, because to-day there are twelve members of the local House in Opposition. What is the Opposition? The Catholics in the House, on account of the school law which was passed there. I have no doubt the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) will approve of the course of the Government of Manitoba, and I should have supposed that even when it is attacked on the subject of the franchise he would get up and defend it for what it has done in the case of the School Bill. The hon. member for Selkirk tells us that Mr. Roblin is as good a Liberal as there is in this House. Well, the Liberals, as I have said, were very strong in the Local House; a lot of them wanted to occupy prominent positions in that House; all of them could not be taken into the Cabinet: Mr. Roblin could not be taken in. They were hard up on the opposite side for a leader, and they elected Mr. Roblin. Although a renegade Liberal, he was good enough to be a Tory leader. We have been told what the franchise of Manitoba is. I only wish that we had a similar franchise for the Dominion elections.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WATSON. Hon. gentlemen opposite say "hear, hear;" but I repeat I would prefer to have a Dominion franchise similar to our Manitoba franchise. So far as the Civil Service is concerned, there is a difference of opinion as to whether civil servants should be disenfranchised or not. I believe if the question was put to the vote among them, the majority would prefer being disenfranchised, because they are compelled, under threat of dismissal, to vote for the party in power—I care not what party may be in power. Officials who are paid by the country should be independent. It is not advisable that officers holding positions of trust should be removed whenever a change of Government takes place; but I say that when the officers of the Government take an active part in elections they should, at a change of Government, go out with their friends. If they will take part in elections they should understand the penalty they render themselves liable to, for they cannot do their duties properly if they take an active part in political contests. We have a franchise in Manitoba which is practically manhood suffrage. You cannot have an election there with the old lists, for the lists have to be revised within a few months of every election. It would be impossible there to have an election on lists as ancient as those used in the Dominion elections. The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) knows as well as I that in Manitoba thousands of electors who should have been on the lists were not on them, because in that country the electors change their residences quicker perhaps than in any other province. A great many people who were on the lists two years ago have taken their departure for distant points west. A great number of names on the lists should be struck off and a great number of electors who are not on them should be put on. The revising barrister in my constituency was a fair one, Mr. Justice Ryan. It would be hard to find a fairer man. If there was any mistake on his part it was unintentional. But, notwithstanding that fact, the mayor of the town, who is a Conservative and has resided eight or nine years there and owns a large amount of property, was not on the list. That was the mistake, not of Judge Ryan but of the officers employed by him. We have too many lists. An elector imagines that because his name is on the local list it must be also on the Dominion list, and when the day of election comes he finds that it is not. Under our Manitoba Franchise Act the lists are revised within a few months of an election, and a residence of six months in the province and of one month in the county is sufficient. The hon. gentleman from Selkirk, in criticising the Manitoba Act, did not quote the Act as it is to-day but as it was introduced. We are here, however, dealing with an Act which was passed through this House by a brute majority after the Opposition had fought it for some eight weeks in the interests of the people. Everybody knows that if that Bill had passed, as introduced in 1885, the Government need not, if they chose, have allowed a single Opposition member to come back. I do not know what the hon. gentleman meant when he said I was here by the grace of the deputy returning officer. This question of the returning officers would no doubt be before the House at a later date, and then we will discuss who should be returning officers. I was unfortunate in the choice of the returning officer in my county. He was president of the Conservative Association in the elections of 1887. The sheriff was appointed as returning officer, and I must say that I received fair treatment at his hands. But at the last election word was sent abroad that even the lone Liberal from Marquette was to be left at home, and a dead set was made upon me. The returning officer selected was appointed because he was known to be one of the most bitter partisans in Manitoba to-day. In consequence I was put to a great deal of trouble: ballot boxes were missing, but we finally got them back and I was declared elected by twelve majority. A recount was asked before Judge Walker, who stated openly, a week or ten days after the recount, that it was a God-send for me the recount did not take place before him, or I would have been counted out. Friends of hon. gentlemen opposite were making bets after the election that I would not take my seat, but that the judge would count me out. I say that in the Dominion elections a man was selected as returning officer who could not possibly know all the counties, and I suppose the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly), in speaking of deputy returning officers, refers to the fact that a great number of ballots were spoiled in Marquette by the returning officer. There was probably a great number so destroyed in the hon. gentleman's own election, but he does not know that, of course, because there was no recount asked. In my county 622 ballots were thrown out on account of their

having been spoiled by the returning officers: 306 of these were for myself and 316 for my opponent, Mr. Boyd, so that I made a gain of 10 on the recount. I gained the balance by the 46 ballots improperly rejected by the deputy returning officers. It is a great mistake that the Government do not see fit to appoint competent men as returning officers, who would name competent deputies, and not have electors in great number disenfranchised through the ballots being spoiled by these incompetent deputy-returning officers. I trust this House may see fit, comprising, as it does, a number of new members who have not had the experience in a sense that older members have had of the Franchise Bill, to vote for this proposition to do away with that Act—although a few of the men who hold seats by the grace of the returning officer may decidedly object. When it comes to revising a list, it is not only a cause of expense to the country, but to private parties as well. One revision in my county cost $4,500, independent of what it cost myself, and friends, and electors in trying for weeks to have their names put on the list. It is altogether a cumbersome system, and one which we must improve. This House has not the right to dictate to the electors of any Province as to how they shall see fit to send members to Parliament. We do not want any partisan revising barristers. I support the Bill introduced by my hon. friend to repeal the Dominion Franchise Act, and I am satisfied it is the one that will be approved of by a great majority, not only of the Liberals of Manitoba, but of the Conservatives as well.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before this question is put, I must express my surprise that a Minister of the Crown having charge of the department of the Government which has been accused in this House by four or five members of having perpetrated frauds of the most outrageous character in the preparation of these lists by stuffing them, by putting names on which did not belong to them, and leaving off names that should have been there, has not met these accusations which reflect upon his own character and the character of his department; and the fact that the Secretary of State has not chosen to deny these allegations or to meet these charges is in my mind presumptive evidence that the charges are true, and I believe that the statements which have been made by my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Cameron) and other hon. gentlemen in this House, positive statements, statements that went into particulars and were founded on facts, are true. I believe that this Franchise Bill may be used by the Government of the day as an engine of corruption for the purpose of thwarting the wishes of the people of this country. It is a Bill which provides for the appointment of an officer to make the lists and to revise the lists, an officer who is the creature of the Government, who holds his office at the pleasure of the Government, and there is every temptation for that officer to use his powers for the benefit of his friends. I do not charge that it is done in all cases or even in the majority of cases, but I believe it is done in some cases, and further, I believe that the law is of a character to permit, nay, not only to permit, but to encourage the perpetration of these acts.

In addition to having the revising barrister appointed by the Government we have the Printing Bureau under the complete control of the Government, and it is charged to-night on good evidence that that is a greater evil even than the revising officer. It is charged that, under the cover of that Printing Bureau, which we cannot reach, these lists are stuffed, and the grossest frauds are perpetrated. I think it would have been good if the Government had met these charges. It would be well to have a committee to enquire into this matter in connection with the Printing Bureau, and I propose to ask for such a committee, so that we may see if we have a member of the Government who is engaged in trampling upon the rights of the people by such a fraud as is asserted to have been perpetrated in the preparation of the lists in that office.

Then we have a statement that declarations are made by partisan magistrates and dated back in order to place on the lists the names of friends of the Government which had not been placed on the list at the proper time. It is also charged that Tory politicians are allowed access to the books in the hands of revising barristers and their clerks, and that others are not allowed to see them. We have the charge that revising barristers sometimes stoop to the business of corresponding with friends of the Government in outlying stations, urging them to send in their names, and acting as agents of the Government as well as revising barristers. If these things are true, if any one of them is true, there is not an honest member in this House who, convinced of the truth of these charges, could hesitate as to his vote on this measure. Why was this measure introduced in 1885? Was there any public necessity for the introduction of this measure? Was the system which had existed from the time of Confederation up to the year 1885 one that gave rise to popular dissatisfaction? Were any complaints made as to its operation? There was not a breath of complaint. There was no reason for changing the system on the ground of public dissatisfaction, or on the pretence that the policy which had lasted for eighteen years had not worked well, but the Government adopted the new system, presumably for the purpose of furthering their own interest.

I wish very briefly to compare the features of our franchise law with the features of the franchise laws in England, in the colonies and in the United States. I want to point out that our franchise law is unique in its character, and differs from the franchise laws in all other free commonwealths in the world. We have the revising barrister appointed by the Government, we have the list of voters made and revised by him, we have the list printed by the Government in their own office, and it is possible for them to perpetrate any outrage they may choose in preparing those lists. In England, the revising barrister is not the creature of the Government and does not hold office at the pleasure of the Government. As my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has stated, he is appointed by the courts. The lists are prepared by the overseers of the poor. The printing is not done under Government supervision. There is not a feature in the franchise law of England which corresponds with our Franchise Act. In all the colonies, I believe, the revising officers are appointed by the courts and the lists are the work of municipal officers. In the United States, except in one state where the judges revise the lists, the preparation

and revision of the lists are by the municipal authorities. There is not a single Anglo-Saxon commonwealth in the world where the franchise law has any feature in common with this law.

My hon. friends opposite—the Minister of Customs, the Minister of Finance and other members of the Government—saw fit to copy their fiscal system from the fiscal system of the United States. I think, perhaps, they would have acted wisely, in shaping this federal union, to have taken the example of the experience of other federal unions.

Mr. BOWELL. We are not so far advanced as you are.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is true that you are not far advanced. On the contrary, you are very much in the dark. But you have originated a measure which is like nothing in Heaven above or on the earth beneath, or in the waters under the earth. You cannot find a parallel anywhere to this monstrosity, this legislative abortion which we call the Dominion Franchise law. The United States, from which you copied their fiscal system, had the benefit of 150 years of colonial experience, you have had the benefit of ten years of experience under Confederation. They called a constitutional convention in 1787, and that convention considered this question of the franchise under five different propositions. One was that the state should elect the members of Congress; another was that the state should provide the way in which members of Congress should be elected; the third plan was that the people of the state should nominate the candidates, and from these candidates the State Legislature should select delegates to Congress; the fourth proposition was that the United States should have a uniform freehold franchise without any reference to the franchises in the separate states; the fifth proposition, which was adopted, was that the franchise for the election of members to Congress, and for president and vice-president of the United States, should be the franchise in each state which was used for the election of members of the most numerous branch of the State Legislature in that state. That law, as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says, has been in operation 100 years. There has never been the slightest friction, there has never been a single reason why that law should be repealed, as there has been in our experience a reason why this law should be repealed; but in face of that experience, in face of the dictates of common sense, the Government have adopted this law, and it is fair to presume and to assert that the Government have adopted this law for the purpose of securing a political advantage through the control of the formation of the voters' lists, through its own officers, through its own machinery, at great cost to the people, at great inconvenience, and in order to defeat the purposes of justice; and I venture to say that there is not half a dozen members on the other side of the House who, if they consulted their own wishes, would vote for the continuance of this measure—this measure that imposes these heavy liabilities upon every member, and every candidate who wishes to become a member, and who has in consequence to watch the revision of the list; this measure which imposes all this cost, trouble, difficulty and annoyance upon the people of the country; this measure which is so very expensive and so very distasteful to the people, that we have only had two revisions since the law was passed. Sir, I assert that but for the feeling of loyalty to the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government, there is not, in my opinion, a dozen members upon the other side of the House who would dream of voting for the continuance of this absurd measure. I will close by referring for one moment to a circumstance that has come to my knowledge with reference to the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins). I can imagine that he feels a great degree of satisfaction as to the mode in which the law was operated, and the mode in which the machinery of the Government was used in the election. I understand that the returning officer in that hon. member's constituency appointed eighty election agents, not one of whom were voters, every one of whom voted for him, and that as a result of these eighty fraudulent and bogus votes he had a majority of six. Now, Sir, having in this case a practical illustration of the abominable character of this law, this law that men dare stand up and defend because they have profited by its iniquities, I assert that every fact, every circumstance of the experience of the country, of the experience of every member of this House, point to the assertion being true that I have made, that it is time this mischievous law was repealed.

House divided on amendment of Sir John Thompson (six months' hoist):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Adams,
Baker,
Barnard,
Bergeron,
Bergin,
Bowell,
Burnham,
Burns,
Cameron (Inverness),
Carignan,
Carpenter,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Chapleau,
Cleveland,
Coatsworth,
Cochrane,
Cockburn,
Corby,
Costigan,
Craig,
Curran,
Daly,
Daoust,
Davin,
Davis,
Denison,
Desalniers,
Desjardins (Hochelaga),
Desjardins (L'Islet),
Dewdney,
Dickey,
Dugas,
Dupont,
Dyer,
Earle,
Fairbairn,
Ferguson (Renfrew),
Foster,
Fréchette,
Gillies,
Girouard,
Gordon,
Haggart,
Hazen,
Henderson,
Hodgins,
Hutchins,
Ingram,
Ives,
Jamieson,
Lépine,
Lippé,
Macdonald (King's),
Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Macdowall,
Mackintosh,
McAlister,
McCarthy,
McDonald (Victoria),
McDougald (Pictou),
McDougall (Cape Breton),
McGreevy,
McKay,
McKeen,
McLean,
McLennan,
McLeod,
McNeill,
Madill,
Mara,
Marshall,
Masson,
Miller,
Mills (Annapolis),
Monerieff,
Montague,
O'Brien,
Ouimet,
Patterson (Colchester),
Pelletier,
Pope,
Prior,
Putnam,
Reid,
Roome,
Ross (Dundas),
Ross (Lisgar),
Ryckman,
Skinner,
Sproule,
Stairs,
Stevenson,
Tarte,
Taylor,
Temple,
Thompson (Sir John),
Tisdale,
Tupper,
Tyrwhitt
Wallace,

Joncas.
Kaulbach.
Kirkpatrick.
Langevin (Sir Hector).
La Rivière.
Léger.
Weldon.
White (Cardwell).
White (Shelburne).
Wilmot.
Wood (Brockville).
Wood (Westmoreland).—112.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allan.
Allison.
Amyot.
Armstrong.
Bain.
Barron.
Beausoleil.
Béchard.
Beith.
Bernier.
Bourassa.
Bowers.
Bowman.
Brodeur.
Brown (Chateauguay).
Brown (Monck).
Burdett.
Cameron (Huron).
Campbell.
Carroll.
Cartwright (Sir Richard).
Charlton.
Choquette.
Christie.
Colter.
Davidson.
Davies.
Dawson.
Delisle.
Devlin.
Edgar.
Edwards.
Fauvel.
Featherston.
Flint.
Forbes.
Fraser.
Frémont.
Gauthier.
Geoffrion.
German.
Gibson.
Gillmor.
Goulbourn.
Grieve.
Guay.
Hargraft.
Harwood.
Hyman.
Innes.
King.
Landerkin.
Lavergne.
Leduc.
Legris.
Lister.
Macdonald (Huron).
McGregor.
McMillan.
McMullen.
Mignault.
Mills (Bothwell).
Monet.
Mousseau.
Mulock.
Murray.
Paterson (Brant).
Perry.
Préfontaine.
Proulx.
Rider.
Rinfret.
Rowand.
Sanborn.
Semple.
Simard.
Somerville.
Spohn.
Sutherland.
Trow.
Truax.
Vaillancourt.
Watson.
Welsh.
Yeo.—85.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Richmond, Nova Scotia (Mr. Gillies) and the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Hodgins) have not voted.

Mr. SPEAKER. Did the hon. member for Richmond hear the question put?

Mr. GILLIES. I was here, but I did not understand the order of taking the vote.

Mr. SPEAKER. Did the hon. member hear the question put?

Mr. GILLIES. I heard the question put.

Mr. SPEAKER. Then how does the hon. member vote?

Mr. GILLIES. I vote for the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER. Did the hon. member for Carleton hear the question put?

Mr. HODGINS. Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER. Then how does the hon. member vote?

Mr. HODGINS. I vote for the amendment.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Christie) has not voted.

Mr. MONTAGUE. He was not in.

Mr. LANDERKIN. He was.

Mr. SPEAKER. The vote of the hon. member for Argenteuil is recorded against the amendment.

An hon. MEMBER. The member for Ottawa (Mr. Robillard) has not voted.

Mr. SPEAKER. Did the hon. member for Ottawa hear the question put from the Chair?

Mr. ROBILLARD. No.

Mr. WATSON. You have put the question in such a way that I do not think the members understood it. I do not think the member for Richmond understood it.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question was put to the hon. member for Richmond quite plainly.

Mr. WATSON. He was out of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. He was there all the time.

Mr. ROBILLARD. I came in after the vote was taken. If I had been here I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. TROW. I think it is wrong to receive the votes of the hon. member for Richmond, Nova Scotia, and the hon. member for Carleton, if they were not in the House.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. They were there all the time.

Mr. SPEAKER. These gentlemen say that they heard the question from the Chair, and that is sufficient.

Mr. LANDERKIN. No: they were not in the House, and they could not have heard the question when outside the Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER. The votes must be recorded in accordance with the statements made by the hon. members themselves.

House divided on main motion as amended:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Adams.
Baker.
Barnard.
Bergeron.
Bergin.
Bowell.
Burnham.
Burns.
Cameron (Inverness).
Carignan.
Carpenter.
Caron (Sir Adolphe).
Chapleau.
Cleveland.
Coatsworth.
Cochrane.
Cockburn.
Corby.
Costigan.
Craig.
Curran.
Daly.
Daoust.
Davin.
Davis.
Denison.
Desaulniers.
Desjardins (Hochelaga).
Desjardins (L'Islet).
Dewdney.
Dickey.
Dugas.
Dupont.
Dyer.
Earle.
Fairbairn.
Ferguson (Renfrew).
Foster.
Fréchette.
Gillies.
Girouard.
Gordon.
Haggart.
Lippé.
Macdonald (King's).
Macdonald (Winnipeg).
Macdowall.
Mackintosh.
McAlister.
McCarthy.
McDonald (Victoria).
McDougald (Pictou).
McDougall (Cape Breton).
McGreevy.
McKay.
McKeen.
McLean.
McLennan.
McLeod.
McNeill.
Madill.
Mara.
Marshall.
Masson.
Miller.
Mills (Annapolis).
Monerieff.
Montague.
O'Brien.
Ouimet.
Patterson (Colchester).
Pelletier.
Pope.
Prior.
Putnam.
Reid.
Robillard.
Roome.
Ross (Dundas).
Ross (Lisgar).
Ryckman.
Skinner.
Sproule.
Stairs.
Stevenson.
Tarte.

Hazen.
Henderson.
Hodgins.
Hutchins.
Ingram.
Ives.
Jamieson.
Joncas.
Kaulbach.
Kirkpatrick.
Langevin (Sir Hector).
La Rivière.
Léger.
Lépine.
Taylor.
Temple.
Thompson (Sir John).
Tisdale.
Tupper.
Tyrwhitt.
Wallace.
Weldon.
White (Cardwell).
White (Shelburne).
Wilmot.
Wood (Brockville).
Wood (Westmoreland).—113.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allan.
Allison.
Amyot.
Armstrong.
Bain.
Barron.
Beausoleil.
Béchard.
Beith.
Bernier.
Bourassa.
Bowers.
Bowman.
Brodeur.
Brown (Chateauguay).
Brown (Monck).
Burdett.
Cameron (Huron).
Campbell.
Carroll.
Cartwright (Sir Richard).
Charlton.
Choquette.
Christie.
Colter.
Davidson.
Davies.
Dawson.
Delisle.
Perlin.
Edgar.
Edwards.
Fauvel.
Featherston.
Flint.
Forbes.
Fraser.
Frémont.
Gauthier.
Geoffrion.
Gilson.
Gillmor.
Godbout.
Grieve.
Guay.
Hargraft.
Harwood.
Hyman.
Innes.
King.
Landerkin.
Lavergne.
Leduc.
Legris.
Lister.
Macdonald (Huron).
McGregor.
McMillan.
McMullen.
Mignault.
Mills (Bothwell).
Monet.
Monsseau.
Mulock.
Murray.
Paterson (Brant).
Perry.
Préfontaine.
Proulx.
Rider.
Rinfret.
Rowand.
Sanborn.
Semple.
Simard.
Somerville.
Spohn.
Sutherland.
Trow.
Truax.
Vaillancourt.
Watson.
Welsh.
Yeo.—84.

Mr. TROW. I call attention to the fact that the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) has not voted.

Mr. SPEAKER. Did the hon. member for Welland hear the question put from the Chair?

Mr. GERMAN. I did not hear the question put.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.20 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 21st May, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 55) to incorporate the Atikokan Iron Range Railway Company.—(Mr. Mackintosh).

Bill (No. 56) respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Davis).

Bill (No. 57) to incorporate the Buffalo Lake and Battleford Railway, Coal and Iron Company.—(Mr. Macdowall).

Bill (No. 58) to incorporate the Whirlpool Bridge Company.—(Mr. German).

ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 59) further to amend the Act intituled: An Act to amend the Act respecting the Electoral Franchise and the Dominion Elections Act, 1874. He said: The object of this Bill is to make these Acts correspond with the proposed amendments in the Dominion Election law sought to be made by the Bill I introduced a few days ago. The wording of one of the clauses in the Electoral Franchise Act is similar to the clause in the Dominion Elections Act. I seek to limit the number of persons entitled to vote, and confine them to British subjects. Therefore, the amendment of the law in one respect necessitates the amendment of the law in the other respect.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

AMHERSTBURG DRY DOCK.

Mr. ALLAN asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to build a dry dock in the town of Amherstburg? Has there been any survey made or estimate of cost for such work, and is it the intention of the Government to proceed with the same during the present year?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. A petition has been received in the Department from the inhabitants of Amherstburg and surrounding townships, asking for the construction of a dry dock at that port. Nothing has been done in regard to it except a cursory examination, which shows that a careful survey will be necessary in order to ascertain, first, the proper site, and second, the probable cost.

PELEE ISLAND SUB-COLLECTOR.

Mr. ALLAN asked, What is the name of the present sub-collector on Pelee Island? At what date was he appointed? Has he continuously discharged the duties of that office since the date of his appointment? Was any other person appointed sub-collector at that outport, or in any way instructed to discharge the duties of that office during the present year? If so, what is his name, the date of his appointment, and the amount of his salary, and is he still in the employ of the Government?

Mr. BOWELL. The name of the present sub-collector on Pelee Island is F. B. McCormick. He was appointed on the 1st December, 1888. Mr. McCormick has not been continuously discharging the duties of that office since the date of his appointment. No other person has been appointed sub-collector at that outport. Mr. J. H. C. Atkinson was requested to perform the duties of sub-collector on Pelee Island during the absence of Mr. McCormick, who had been ordered to report for duty at Windsor. On the 28th of April, 1891, Mr. McCormick was instructed to resume his duties as

sub-collector on Pelee Island, and Mr. Atkinson to be paid for the time he had acted as sub-collector, at the rate of $400 per annum.

COPYRIGHT ACT.

Mr. EDGAR asked, Whether the Government have decided to bring into force the Copyright Act of 1889? If they have so decided, when may the proclamation be expected, and on what date will the Act come into force?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Correspondence is still being carried on with Her Majesty's Government, and I cannot say anything upon it until that is determined.

DUTY ON SCOTCH GRANITE.

Mr. BARRON asked, Is it the intention of the Government this session to increase the duty on the importation of Scotch granite?

Mr. BOWELL. That is a question to which the hon. gentleman will receive an answer when the Finance Minister makes his Budget speech.

WALKERTON PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Mr. TRUAX asked, Is it the intention of the Government to place a sufficient sum in the Supplementary Estimates, to finish and furnish and provide steam-heating for the Walkerton public buildings? At what date is it expected the buildings will be ready for occupation?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is a sum of, I believe, $8,000 included in the Estimates for 1891-92, which were brought down last Monday, which is intended to complete these buildings. They will be completed within three months from the time when the amount asked from Parliament will become available.

BONAVENTURE PIER.

Mr. FAUVEL asked, What is the reason that although the sum of $5,000 was voted in the Estimates of 1888 and 1889 for the construction of a pier at Bonaventure, in the said County of Bonaventure, that the said works have not been commenced, or any mention made of the sum of $5,000 in this year's Estimates?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The wharf reported on by the chief engineer was a structure 1,200 feet in length, extending to 20 feet in depth at low water at the spring tides. The cost was estimated at $33,000. The work has not been undertaken because of the insufficiency of the appropriation.

WHARF IN THE TOWN OF VAUDREUIL.

Mr. HARWOOD (translation) asked, Whether the wharf constructed near the village of Vaudreuil, in 1888, by G. M. Brabaut, is the property of the Government; if so, what is the price specified in the contract; how much has it cost to date; to whom has the money been paid; do the Government intend to have the wharf completed; and who is in charge of the wharf?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN (Translation). In answer to the hon. member, I have to say that the wharf is not the property of the Government. In 1887-88, the sum of $2,400 was voted to allow the people of Vaudreuil to complete the wharf which was then being constructed at the foot of Ste. Marguerite street. The amount granted was to be used in the purchase of necessary material. The municipality and citizens of Vaudreuil undertook, of their own accord, to supply, at their own cost, the necessary labour, plant, &c., the whole to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works. After its construction, the wharf was to remain the property of the municipality, which would levy and collect tolls and keep the work in good state of repair. The details of the expenditure are to be found in the Report of the Auditor General for 1887-88. The total cost of the work is not known. The amount paid to Mr. G. M. Brabaut is $2,400.

FLOODS IN THE RICHELIEU RIVER.

Mr. BÉCHARD (Translation). Before the House takes up the Orders of the Day, I wish to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works when I shall be able to get the copy, which I moved for at the beginning of the session, of the report of the engineer of the Department on the subject of the floods on the Richelieu River?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN (Translation). In answer to the hon. member, I think that the report referred to can be put before the House early next week. The hon. member knows that there are pressing documents which have to be furnished to the Committee of Privileges and Elections, and the staff of the Department is especially busy in preparing these documents.

PROHIBITION OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

House resumed consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Jamieson:

That, in the opinion of this House, the time has arrived when it is expedient to prohibit the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes.

Mr. COATSWORTH. I do not wish to take up the time of the House any further on this question, having spoken upon it yesterday afternoon. As there are many other hon. gentlemen who desire to address the House on the subject, I merely wish to add, to what I said yesterday, that we have already recognized in our law the principle of temperance legislation—I cannot say that we have recognized the principle of prohibitory legislation, as the legislation up to the present time has been restrictive. Now we ask the House to go a step further in the interest of the country and in the interest of the people, and to pass prohibitory legislation.

Mr. FLINT. I feel it my duty to state my views on this very important question. I agree with almost all that has been said in regard to the manner in which this question should be approached, and I congratulate the House that the discussion has been so far, and is likely to be, conducted in a non-partisan spirit. Yesterday the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) gave a thoughtful and well-reasoned address, and although I heartily concur with many of the observations which he addressed to the House, I cannot agree with him in his allusions to the scriptural argument against the principle of prohibition. Now, I think that the Parliament of Canada, or any other legislature, is not the place in which to discuss the scriptural

bearings of an economic, social or other question. It may be true, or it may not be true, that the tendency and scope of Scripture are opposed to the principle of a prohibitory liquor law, or of any other proposed legislation which may come before this House. I believe, however, that we should discuss this question solely and entirely upon the ground of public welfare, and economic and social considerations. As a complete answer, however, to any assertions that may be addressed to this House from either side that the teachings of Scripture are opposed to the prohibition of the liquor traffic, I may say that those in this country who are supposed to be most conversant with the Scriptures and who devote the most time to their study, are, to a very large extent, with the prohibitionists on this question. We have had an almost overwhelming demand for prohibition emanating from the various great religious organizations of this country, and I think we may feel justified in assuming that in their view the Scriptures, at any rate, strongly confirm the principle they have advocated in their petitions. Another ground that has been taken as an offset, in a certain degree, to the numerous petitions that have been presented to this House, is that they are not representative of the electorate, that they are signed by a large number of persons who are not upon the electoral lists; that while they may represent a deep sentiment of a large number of very good people of the country, they do not represent the sentiment of the controlling classes, that is, the electors throughout the country at large. It is also alleged that it is very easy to obtain signatures to petitions to this Parliament. I am willing to admit that it is, perhaps, too easy to obtain signatures to petitions of almost any kind, but, at the same time, the fact that such an overwhelming number of signatures has been obtained to these numerous petitions which have burdened the Table of the House for the last few days, show that it is somewhat easier, at any rate at the present time, to obtain signatures to petitions of this kind than it has been in the past, or is now in reference to any other subject of legislation likely to come before the House. I think I am safe in assuming that almost every consideration of public welfare justifies the propriety and expediency of prohibition. That principle has been settled not only by the admission of those who have supported it in this House, but by those who have supported the strong amendments to the various prohibition resolutions that have been brought before the House. Almost without exception we have found gentlemen of ability, talent and representative character, standing up in this House and admitting that, as an abstract principle, prohibition is a sound and just one to apply to this Dominion of Canada. But they have only taken exception to certain collateral and subsidiary considerations in connection with the abstract principle, and I wish to treat these objections with the courtesy which they merit. I believe there are very few men, perhaps there are no men in this House, who will stand up and oppose the abstract principle of prohibition of the manufacture, sale and use of intoxicating liquors, except for sacramental and medicinal purposes. But they take objections, and the objections are to them and to many people very reasonable objections, with which, although a strong prohibitionist, I have a great deal of sympathy, objections which are, however, subsidiary and collateral in character. First, they say we have no genuine assurance that the petitions on the Table of the House and the representations made through the press, and by strong ultra-prohibitionists in this House truly represent the wishes and feelings of the electorate and people at large. This is a very difficult question to settle. It is, after all, a matter of opinion. But, at the same time, I think we are safe in asserting that, if we are to treat this question in the same manner as we treat other questions coming before this Legislature for consideration, it has given greater signs of vitality and shown a greater abundance of public sentiment back of it than almost any other question that has come before this Legislature for its approval or confirmation. I do not allude to it for the sake of party purposes, because it would be highly improper to introduce any partisan or political ideas into this discussion, but we remember well when the First Minister introduced into this House, his National Policy, he introduced it in a resolution setting forth its leading principle, which subsequently led up to the measure of the protective tariff we have to-day. It was stated in the House that this measure was brought forward in response to the wishes of the mercantile community and in response to the strong wishes of the people. It would have been easy, in reply, to have asked for the evidence of this, but the Legislature took it upon the word of the present First Minister that a protective tariff was demanded and required by a majority of the people at large. They had no evidence to produce, no plebiscite had been held, no evidence of the public wish was submitted beyond that possessed by the mover of the resolution now under consideration when he submitted it to the House the other day. But it may be said that there may be a certain amount of delusion in regard to the petitions, owing to the fact that young people and persons of the other sex who have no votes under the constitution, may have signed these petitions, and so they may not really represent the sentiment of the electors. I understand that a proposition will be made that this question be submitted to a formal vote of the electorate. In advance of this proposition being made, I do not suppose it will be improper for me to say, that it is to a large degree unconstitutional, un-British and, at all events, a highly unsatisfactory way of obtaining the opinions of this country upon any public question. The manner in which, in this country and under our form of government, the people's views are to be expressed is through the voices and votes of their representatives in Parliament. By the expression of their voices and votes the representatives will be judged, and they must stand or fall as legislators upon the record they make in Parliament. I will point out, however, a practical difficulty, which will press itself on the minds of those who wish to consider this question from a practical standpoint. Suppose the abstract principle of the resolution were placed before the people, we all know, as a matter of fact, that the public do not rally at the polls, so far as consolidating a vote is concerned, in favour of an abstract principle as strongly as they will rally round the embodiment of that principle in the person of a candidate. You must have the personal influence and the personal work of the men who have to carry out the legislation

consequent on the endorsation of this abstract principle at the polls. If this legislation were passed, a prohibitory liquor law satisfactory in itself, meeting in all its details the various difficulties which we are forced to meet in consideration of this question, and having placed it on the Statute-book, then asked for a plebiscite as to whether it should come into force in one or other of the provinces, there might be possibly a substantial reason for such a course. If the votes of the people were taken on the bald resolution, or on a more complete resolution than that submitted by the mover, this Legislature would still be in a helpless condition in regard to crystallizing the resolution into a law of the land. The people who vote would have the same differences of opinion as to the possibility of enforcing the law, and would be face to face with all the difficulties laid before Parliament this session and during other sessions in regard to the enforcement of the law, and we would, therefore, advance no further than we are at the present moment. Consequently, apart from the un-British and unconstitutional character of such an appeal on a question of this kind, it has all the elements of impracticability, and must be ruled out of the discussion. Another collateral objection to the passage of the resolution is the financial aspect of the question, and I must admit that it is the duty of the prohibitionists in this House, and of the representatives of the people here, to consider very carefully, to consider with a great deal of thoughtfulness, the financial aspect of the question. Assuming that the traffic in intoxicating liquors is the parent of a great deal of crime, of a vast amount of poverty, of an immense amount of the suffering in families and in communities, and that it is advisable to prohibit the manufacture, sale and use of them, we meet at the outset a great practical difficulty which it is incumbent on us to dispose of as well as we can do so. I do not propose to examine this matter at great length, but to say, in a general way, that we have had very able arguments from several hon. gentlemen, and those which impressed me forcibly were from the present Minister of Finance, a gentleman of whose ability we are all proud, and who has made some of the most remarkable and strongest utterances ever made in Parliament on this subject. If the Minister of Finance, as representing the financial interests of the country, will rise and tell this House that, from a financial standpoint, it is impracticable and impossible to carry on the government of the country without the revenue derived from Excise and Customs duties on intoxicating liquors, then, I think, we shall have a difficulty to meet that hitherto we have not had. It is true that the sweeping off the revenue of $5,000,000 or $6,000,000 would to a certain extent hamper temporarily the administration of public affairs. It is a large sum to make up from other sources; it is a large sum to deduct from the expenditure of the country. But when we consider this aspect of the case, which has been thoroughly threshed out in this House and on every public platform in this Dominion, that if a prohibitory law is passed, enforced and supported by the people, there will be a saving of from $25,000,000 to $30,000,000 per annum to the consumers of intoxicating liquors, which sum must be expended in other directions, I believe we can easily make up the loss of $5,000,000, and the revenue will not to a very great extent suffer, except during those few preliminary years when the matter is in course of settlement and adjustment. There has been a time in the history of the country, not very remote, when the necessity of adding five or six millions to the revenue was considered a comparatively light matter. We have had since the introduction of the present protective principles and policy a tariff in force, supported by the Government and endorsed by the people, which has added to the revenue three or four times six millions of dollars; and yet we are told on every platform, and with every appearance of confidence and enthusiasm, that the people are richer, happier and more prosperous, although they are paying $15,000,000 or $20,000,000 more into the treasury than they were paying before the National Policy was introduced. Well, then, can we not equally say that if we sweep away the revenue derived from the connection of the Government with the sale and importation of intoxicating liquors, and pointing to the vast amount of money that must be saved in the pockets of the people, that our people will be richer, that they will be happier, that they will be more prosperous, and that the revenue itself will be more thriving than under the present condition of affairs? I believe that the people of this country who are in favour of prohibition, the people who are supporting the enormous number of petitions which have been laid upon the Table of this House, are willing and prepared to make the necessary sacrifices to supply the Government with the revenue which they might temporarily lose in consequence of adopting legislation on the basis of the resolution we are now discussing. Another objection to the passage of a prohibitory liquor law is that it would be impossible to enforce and carry out its provisions. This is an objection which should have a great deal of weight with all candid minds; it is an objection which has had a great deal of weight upon my own mind, and as I have been a student of this question for several years I have felt that the answer to this objection which was given by the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Coatsworth), who spoke so ably on this subject, was a very proper answer. We have reached a pretty pass indeed in the history of the Dominion of Canada when any man can stand in this Legislature and say that a law on our Statute-book, supported by the overwhelming sentiment of the people of the country, cannot be enforced. The resources of civilization are not yet exhausted, and with the people of this country from one end to the other interested in the carrying out of such a law, the burden of proof lies upon those who oppose this legislation to give the reasons in detail and to show the principles on which they have formed the conclusion that prohibitory liquor legislation cannot be enforced.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to interrupt him for one moment? I quite admit that if there were an overwhelming sentiment in the country in favour of legislation of this kind, the great objection to its enforcement would be done away with. That is assuming what I do not think has yet been established.

Mr. FLINT. The point raised by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) has been partly touched upon by me in my previous remarks. As it is to a large degree a matter of opinion, perhaps it would not be proper for me, without a more thorough study of all the ideas which have been entertained on this question, to

dwell any longer upon that particular point at the present time. However, I may point out, that we find in the history of the legislation of this Parliament that it has adopted a great many resolutions, and passed a great deal of legislation directed more or less towards total prohibition as an ultimatum. I hold in my hand the copy of a resolution passed a few days ago by the Legislature of the Province of Nova Scotia upon the motion of the leader of the Opposition in that body, seconded by one of his own supporters who is also a Conservative. The resolution was unanimously adopted in the Legislature of Nova Scotia, and it shows that although it may be strictly *ultra vires* of the Legislature to pass a law upon this subject, both political parties in the Legislature are united upon this resolution, which I believe was animated by a purpose to influence the minds of the members of this Parliament in favour of prohibition, and as illustrative of the wishes of the people of that Province as expressed by their representatives. The resolution was passed on the 13th May and reads as follows :—

"That it appears to this House, in consideration of the very large number of numerously signed petitions relating to the enactment of a prohibitory liquor law, now being presented to the Dominion House of Commons, this House hereby expresses its opinion in favour of such a law, desiring to strengthen and encourage the friends of prohibition in the House of Commons at Ottawa."

This resolution will certainly tend to show that public opinion in the Province of Nova Scotia is overwhelmingly in favour of the enactment of some prohibitory liquor law. Another objection to prohibition which seems to have appealed to many highly respectable and intelligent gentlemen in this House representing large and wealthy constituencies, is the question of giving compensation to those who may be injured in their business of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors. I will not attempt to enter fully into this important and vast question in connection with the subject of prohibition. It has been thoroughly handled in this House by the present hon. Minister of Finance, whose speech on the subject I remember reading with a great deal of interest and a great deal of instruction shortly after it was delivered. As a large number of the hon. gentlemen have probably not read the speech recently and as some of the ideas he expressed on this subject are similar to the views I hold, I will, with the permission of the House, call attention to some of the features of compensation as applied to those who manufacture or are connected with the vending of intoxicating liquors, and to the principle of compensation as applied in the mother country. In England the principle of not injuring any private man in his business or of taking away the rights of property of private persons for the public good without ample compensation is fully recognized. The law books are full of such cases, the statutes are filled with provisions to amply protect in every detail all these persons who may be injured by the course of public improvements, or the exercise of the right of eminent domain which the country possesses. This right is exercised over private property, or it is exercised by the state for its defence, its protection, or for the improvement of public matters ; or it is exercised indirectly by granting to corporations and private companies certain franchises which must be exercised under certain restrictions for the public good. The exercise of this franchise must necessarily frequently interfere with the rights of private property ; railroads must pass through private lands, bridges must abut upon and interfere with the riparian rights of owners, and so on throughout the whole catalogue of these rights of companies under parliamentary power or by the Government itself. I call the attention of the House to the fact that they cannot find an instance in English history where, in the exercise of the powers of the Legislature for the public good in connection with matters of this kind, where private property is not directly taken out of the hands of the private owners, or where private property or private interests are only indirectly affected by the passage of a law for public ends, the principle of compensation has been applied. In the mother country, as well as in this country, they recognize the right of the law, in the protection of the people, to interfere with the trade or the interests or the habits or customs of every class of the people. The cases are numerous and well recognized in which compensation has been refused, especially in the mother country ; because there the habit has grown up through hundreds of years of custom for the son to succeed the father in the same business at the same stand. The system of licensing public houses in the mother country is substantially the same at the present time, with various modern improvements, that it has been for hundreds of years. But, when in the exercise of the public powers of Parliament, these liquor shops have been closed or the licenses not renewed, we find no instance in which the principle of compensation has ever been listened to or dreamed of. We can apply the same rule to the passage of a prohibitory liquor law in the Dominion of Canada. It is true, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Toronto, that a large amount of capital is invested in the manufacture of certain intoxicating liquors ; a very large amount of capital is also invested in the sale of certain intoxicating liquors ; but to what distance will you go in applying it if you once admit the principle that any of these people are to be compensated for any indirect loss they may sustain in consequence of Parliament attempting to protect the people from the overwhelming evils which flow from such manufacture and sale ? The people engaged in this traffic are not in any sense in partnership with the Government ; they are under no contract, express or implied, with the people of this country to carry on this business ; they do not hold the position of public officers. They have never been sustained or encouraged by Parliament, but they have been constantly legislated against from the establishment of representative government in this country in 1758 down to the present time. Look over the whole range of legislation in this country during that period and you will find that the arm of the law has been raised, not to sustain and encourage, but to restrict and repress to the utmost extent those who are making fortunes from the traffic in intoxicating liquors. It is true, the Government has incidentally, to a certain extent, recognized these people by imposing license fees and Customs and Excise duties upon them ; but the imposition of these dues is only incidental, and they have been laid on as heavily as possible with the view of protecting the people. Now, the

hon. member for Toronto, who appears to be very scrupulous with regard to compensation, would stop at the manufacturer; another hon. member would protect the small retail dealer; and between these two extremes, I would ask any hon. member of this House where he will stop in attempting to apply the principle? I believe the people of this country who have fought the liquor traffic for the last fifty years, who have aroused every energy in the legislature, in the pulpit, on the platform and through the churches against this traffic, will never submit for one hour that the honest, hardworking, economical labourers throughout this country shall be taxed to compensate those who have made immense fortunes out of that which has only tended to injure and degrade our people. I believe the principle of compensation cannot for a moment be admitted in connection with the enactment of a prohibitory liquor law. Compensation for what? What have they done for the public good? What can they do for the public good if continued? What will they have given up to the state when the state has destroyed their traffic? The state does not take over their business for the public good. It destroys it entirely. The only compensation those engaged in such a business can expect is that which, by the laws of nature, they are sure to receive. As they have sown so shall they reap. They have grown rich and strong out of the misfortunes and weakness of society. When society frees itself from their grasp —when, actuated by the instincts of self-preservation, it sweeps away their trade, they must fall back, for material comforts, not upon the state which they have injured, but upon the ill-gotten profits they have accumulated. Who will compensate society for its losses, its sufferings? It, too, must reap as it has sowed; and, having destroyed the destroyer through wise and useful laws, it must work out its future salvation by upholding and supporting the laws it has enacted for its own protection. If a prohibition law is enacted by this Legislature, I believe it will be loyally supported by the people of the country at large. One hon. gentleman spoke about a certain tyranny which would be exercised over the minority. Who are those that form the minority? The minority of what? The only minority we know of must be those engaged in the traffic itself, because the people who partake moderately of intoxicating liquors are strongly in favour of the passage of a prohibitory liquor law. And when the failure of the Scott Act in some portions of the country is pointed out, a failure which I regretfully acknowledge, it is not unfair to point out that the Scott Act laboured under disadvantages. It laboured under the disadvantage of being to a certain extent an illogical Act, apart from the defects inherent in its clauses, making it difficult of being carried into effective operation. So long as the Government permitted and derived a large revenue from the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors, and maintained regulations respecting the business, there was a certain want of logic in passing an Act to strike down indirectly that which the Government did not feel itself competent to strike down directly. But let the Legislature and the Government take the question out of that illogical region, and let them say that from one end of this country to the other the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors shall cease,

Mr. FLINT.

and then, I believe, the law will be more easy to carry into force, and the difficulties will to a large degree vanish. That no difficulties will arise no one would be foolish enough to assert. Great difficulties will arise, great sacrifices must be made; but I believe we have in our people resources of intelligence and patriotism and true loyalty to the best interests of the country, sufficient to meet such difficulties and to make such sacrifices as may be necessary to the effective carrying out of this law. We require to have that faith in the country, in its strength and its capacity for true progress and development to enact the law, as well as the courage to stand by it during its first years of struggle and difficulty. We also require what has been already alluded to in this debate, a courteous consideration for the feelings and interests of those who differ from us and whose interests may be to a certain extent injured temporarily by such an enactment; and although I am as strong a prohibitionist as any hon. member of this House, although the surroundings amid which I have been brought up may not permit me to look upon the traffic with as indulgent an eye as other prohibitionists who come from other portions of the country, yet I sympathize with them in their difficulties, and am disposed to have a generous consideration for any interests that may be injured in this case. Let us not worry over the details of this question, which have been purposely left out of this resolution: but let us establish the principle of prohibition prepared to make the necessary sacrifices, and I believe the country will sustain Parliament in enacting, and the Government in enforcing this very salutary law.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I am deeply sensible of the necessity this House is under of taking cognizance of the immense number of petitions placed before us in favour of prohibition. There is not only numerical strength, but there is also the strength arising from the fact that they bear the signatures of some of the most respectable and responsible names in the country. For my part, I quite appreciate the remarks made by our hon. friend the member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint). I quite appreciate the fact that he can look lightly upon the question of revenue; but I have never yet, for the last sixteen years, heard the problem solved as to how the loss in revenue is to be made up. The day has now come when the question must be met in a business-like manner, and it is in no spirit of opposition that I approach the subject. I have an amendment to offer, in which I propose that a committee should be appointed to investigate the question of finance in reference to this matter, to ascertain how the interests of the Provincial Governments should be safeguarded as regards their claims, and report to the House on the whole subject. We are practically without information on these points. The hon. member for Yarmouth figures the loss of revenue at $6,000,000; but no hon. gentleman present can state with accuracy what the loss will be. In view of the commercial situation, and the importance of acting judiciously ere adopting final measures, I beg to move, seconded by the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Roome):

Whereas the numerous petitions presented to this and preceding Parliaments, praying for the enactment of a Prohibitory Liquor Law, indicate a desire upon the part of a large section of the population that the question should receive serious consideration from the people's representatives.

That this House is of opinion that, as such petitions as as reports made by various committees of Parliament, well allege that the social, moral and civil standing of the subject is imperilled by the existence of such trade in intoxicating liquors, immediate steps should be taken to obtain full and reliable information upon all practical and financial details connected with the question.

That this House is fully cognizant of the immense loss of revenue which would, for the time being, follow the enactment of prohibitory measures, not alone to the Dominion exchequer, but to the various Province of the Union, and the possibility of complications arising between the Provincial and Federal authorities consequent upon such reduction of financial resources.

That this House, whilst desirous of moving in the direction of the amelioration of evils complained of, is of opinion that any legislation should be so safe-guarded as not to too suddenly disturb the revenue of the country or the vested interests claiming compensation.

In view of these considerations, the House is of opinion that a select committee should be appointed to report upon all the details involved in the subject, more particularly:

1. The annual loss to the federal exchequer;
2. The amount invested in the manufacture of intoxicating liquors:
3. The amount necessary to compensate those now embarked in the manufacture and sale of liquors, should such policy be deemed expedient:
4. The amount of annual loss to each provincial exchequer:
5. The amount of annual loss to each municipality throughout the Dominion;
6. An estimate of the probable amount requisite by taxation, in lieu of license fees in each province and Federal Excise and Customs duties:

Together with all information obtainable touching the present cost of maintaining the various institutions for the suppression and punishment of crime throughout the Dominion,—

Said Committee to be composed of Messrs. Coatsworth, Curran, Davies, Ferguson (Leeds and Grenville), Girouard, Gordon, Hazen, Jamieson, Mills (Annapolis), Mills (Bothwell), Préfontaine, Ross (Lisgar), Scriver, Taylor, Wallace and Wood (Westmoreland); to report at the earliest possible period.

Mr. ROOME. In seconding this motion, I beg to say that I believe the time has come for this House to take some steps in this matter. It is evident, judging from the number of petitions presented throughout the length and breadth of the country, from religious bodies and the people generally, that the people of Canada are about ripe for prohibition or nearly so. It is, therefore, but right that steps should be taken to put this House in a position to deal satisfactorily with this much vexed question Some years ago an Act was passed through this Parliament called the Canada Temperance Act, but that Act proved not workable for several reasons. First, for political reasons, having been passed by the Dominion Government which is Conservative, and having to be put into operation by the Local Governments which are of a different political stripe, especially the Ontario Government. Therefore, in connection with this Act, there was one political party in opposition to the other, each endeavouring to make political capital out of it. The second reason for its failure was that those engaged in the liquor traffic had not been recompensed to any extent for the loss they had incurred through their liquor licenses having been taken from them. Therefore, they and their friends necessarily opposed the working of the Act, as it lessened the value of their property. The hotel-keepers, who had been compelled by local legislation, to provide suitable accommodation for travellers, and who had, in many cases, spent all their money in complying with the law—which was a hardship on them—threw all the obstacles they could in the working of the Temperance Act. The third reason was that the Canada Temperance Act embodied the principle of local option, and could only be enforced where the people decided by their votes to put it into operation. But, in most of the counties when that question came up, hardly half of the electors came out to vote, so that although it was decided by large majorities, in many cases, to apply the Act, the Act had not the real majority of the electors at its back; and no law can be enforced which has not the support of the majority. Owing to those three causes, the Act was not workable; and in almost every instance, when the question of repealing it came up the people in the counties of Ontario wiped it out by larger majorities than those by which it was carried. If we were to adopt the resolution proposed, we would be deciding to legislate without knowing whether public sentiment is yet fully ripe for prohibition. But if we adopt the amendment my hon. friend has proposed, and appoint a Committee to enquire into the facts, this House will then be in a position to legislate upon this question satisfactorily. We do not know at present whether our Local Legislatures, who are deriving quite a large revenue from the traffic—that derived by Ontario being about $300,000—would be willing to join us in enforcing a prohibitory law, which it would necessarily come within their province to do. There would be two political opinions conflicting as was the case with the Scott Act. If this committee will investigate the matter thoroughly and make a full report to this House, we will be able to pass a law which will be in the interests of the temperance cause. There is no denying that the petitions presented to this House show that the people are alive to the evils which are threatening our country from intemperance. Therefore, we ought to consider the matter well, and I believe a great majority of this House will be found voting in the interests of the temperance cause. We must fight this evil fairly and honestly. There is no use in bringing it up year after year and voting upon it without consideration; but if we have this motion carried we shall obtain the information we need, and I think all who are working in the interest of the temperance party should vote for this resolution.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). In approaching this very important subject, I feel that I am not capable of discharging my duty in proportion to the importance of the subject brought before this House. I acknowledge that there is a great deal of difficulty surrounding this matter. It is a matter which has knit itself into the social interests of the people for a very long time, but the fact that there are difficulties surrounding it is no reason to lead us not to approach the question with candour, fairness, and, above all, without any political bias. From the number of petitions which have been presented to this House during the last three weeks, it is evident, to my mind at least, that there is a strong feeling in favour of prohibition in the country from one end to the other. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) stated yesterday that these petitions were signed by the father, the mother and all the family. The fact is, no one under sixteen years of age signed these petitions, and about 2,000 petitions have been presented, signed by over 500,000 people. I think it behooves the members of this House, whether they are opposed to, or in favour of, prohibitory liquor laws, to consider this question

fairly and squarely. It is a question that must be decided by the people of this country before many years elapse, and if we have prohibition approximately or remotely, it must be obtained, in my opinion, by a union on this question between the two great political parties which now divide the country upon other subjects. Therefore, it is the duty of everyone in this discussion to enter it free from any political partisanship or bias, and to approach the question in the interests of the people whom we represent. This resolution has not been brought forward by the temperance men for the purpose of compromising the Government or compromising a single member of Parliament, but it has been brought forward for the purpose of ascertaining the sentiments of the representatives of the people in regard to this vital question. Even if this resolution were to carry, I do not believe, as the hon. member for Leeds stated, that the Government would regard it as a want of confidence motion. If it were to carry, its mandate would be merely directory. True, the Government would be required to give vitality and life to the resolution at the earliest possible moment. We know that the sentiment of temperance is gaining strength in the country every day. The tide of temperance sentiment is rising, and the waves of popular opinion against the liquor traffic are making for the shore, and you may rest assured that the politician or the party who heed them not will sooner or later be overwhelmed. There must be no compromise in the settlement of this question, because a compromise of principle is a victory for the enemy. I would like to bury this traffic as the old Welsh lady said she would bury the devil, that is, with his face downwards, so that, if he came to life and tried to dig himself out he would only dig himself deeper down. This traffic is eating daily and hourly more into the vital interests of our Canadian people. So I believe it is our duty as representatives of the people, not only in a political but in a moral sense, to pass what are called moral laws if we think the interests of our constituents require them. I have presented petitions from 6,000 people from my riding and its adjacent neighbourhood, and I would be derelict in my duty if I did not express my opinion in favour of their views. But it may be asked, why do we ask for prohibition? We ask for prohibition because, in my opinion, and in the opinion of most of the people of the country, this traffic is a blighting, damning curse upon everything decent, pure and virtuous, because it is the enemy of law, rder, morality, Christianity and civilization. I make this indictment deliberately, and, having made such a sweeping charge, you will expect that I bring my evidence to prove it. I am not of the opinion which the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) expressed yesterday, when he stated that in countries where they drink a large quantity of liquor they are further advanced in civilization. If that were so, it would be advisable for the Government to encourage the consumption of a greater quantity than we are drinking to-day. Of course, that argument is not worth following. What evidence is there to show that this traffic is a blighting curse upon every thing decent, pure and virtuous? First, I take into the witness-box a man who is well known by reputation to everyone in this House, a man who occupies a prominent position in one of the public institutions of this country, and from whom I have received a letter on this subject. I have a letter from Dr. Daniel Clark, superintendent of the Toronto Insane Asylum, in which he says:

"Indirectly alcoholic habits strengthens the hereditary tendency to insanity, and the full results are an unknown quantity and cannot be expressed in figures."

This is what came under his own observation, and he gives it as his opinion that 10 per cent. of the 7,000 cases of insanity in Canada arise directly from the use of intoxicating liquors. Another testimony that I will give, equally valuable in this connection, is that of Dr. Buck, superintendent of the London Asylum, who writes to me as follows:

"I do not know that I have ever seen a case of insanity which I could say was caused by strong drink. At the same time I am as sure as I can be of anything that alcohol is one of the most potent factors in the production of mental disease; but it is not so much the alcohol drank by the patient, though this is often an important causitive agency, as that drank by his ancestors. Insanity as we see it, is largely due to heredity; but if you go back far enough, of course, it has an origin entirely apart from that. That origin I believe to have been very largely a perversion of the higher nerve centres, and nothing interferes with the healthy activity of these more than intoxicating drugs of which alchohol is the chief."

There is the testimony of another eminent man, a man who has no personal interest in expressing such an opinion, but he gives the result of his observations, the result of a number of years of study upon this question. I have a testimony from another source in our country, and I think that when the vital interests of our people are affected, it is due to the Canadian Parliament, it is due to every representative, no matter how much they may be opposed to the methods suggested to remove it, to give a thorough and candid consideration to testimonies of this kind. We have an asylum established in the riding from which my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) in the town of Orillia, county town of the hon. gentleman's riding. In that town there is an asylum for idiots, and I wrote to Dr. Beaton, superintendent of that asylum, to get the facts in connection with the causes of the idiocy of those under his charge. He says:

"My experience, and that of the leading superintendents on this continent, is that a large number of idiots are the children of drunken parents. While, on the other hand, we believe that drunkenness is the cause of physical and mental degeneracy, and that the drunkard's posterity inherits scrofulous diseases, epilepsy, nervous irritability, and, above all, moral obliquity. Therefore congenital idiocy is not the immediate legacy of the drunkard to his posterity."

But let me refer to another source of information to prove that this traffic is a curse to our country. I wrote to Mr. James Massie, warden of the Central Prison in the city of Toronto, a man who has occupied that position, I understand, since 1874, the year in which it was established. In his letter to me he says:

"Drink produces directly more inmates for our prisons, more misery, more suffering among helpless wives and innocent children, more sorrow upon parents and more depravity than anything else in our country."

Sir, that gentleman, who occupies a position which gives him the best opportunity for ascertaining the practical results of liquor drinking, states facts wholly at variance with the opinions of the hon. gentleman for Muskoka, who says that crime does not largely arise from the use of intoxicating liquors in our country. Mr. Massie sends me some statistics to show that what we have stated with

reference to gaols, is true. He says that from the time the institution was established in 1874 up to the time he wrote this to me, 8,118 persons were incarcerated in the Central Prison for various crimes, and after making a careful examination of the previous habits of those parties, he found that 1,728 were temperate and 6,390 were of intemperate habits. Does that not show conclusively that intemperance is a great element in the production of crime? But, Sir, not being yet satisfied with the evidence I had received on this point, I wrote to Mr. J. O'Reilly, superintendent of the Mercer Reformatory for females, established in the city of Toronto in 1880, and he tells me that in 1884, 156 females were incarcerated in that prison, of whom 112, or 71 per cent., were intemperate. In 1885 there were committed to the prison 142, and 94 of these, or 66 per cent., were drunken women. In 1886, 123 were committed, and 78, or 64 per cent., were drunkards; and out of the whole number of 1,075 received into the institution since 1880, a similarly large proportion were invariably intemperate. Sir, here we find even women carried away from the paths of virtue and integrity, and brought down to be outcasts upon the streets, through the operation of the liquor traffic; and still we find hon. gentlemen willing to set the question of revenue over against the virtue and integrity of the women of our country. A letter from another gentleman in the city of Toronto, a gentleman particularly well known to those who come from the city of Toronto—I refer to Col. Denison, police magistrate of that city—says: In 1887 there passed through his hands 10,597 prisoners, and of that number 5,229 were drunk or disorderly. Col. Denison further says:

"One-half of the cases of assault, one-half of petty larceny, one-half of the cases of vagrancy, and a large number of other offences outside of the regular drunk and disorderly list were directly attributable to intemperance."

Sir, I have written to another gentleman who is also well known in the city of Toronto; and here let me remark that if the use of strong drink produces such ravages in the city of Toronto, the best ordered city on the continent of America, how much greater are those ravages likely to be in other large centres of our population? I wrote to Col. Grassett, chief of police in the city of Toronto, and he replies:

"Total commitments in the city in 1884-85 and 1886 were 23,912, of which 11,786 were committed for drunkenness, or 49 per cent. of the whole."

Now I will take the evidence of another gentleman in the city of Toronto, who has had control of the Toronto gaol for a number of years, and who is known by the name of Governor Green. He says that from 1884 to 1888, inclusive, there were committed to the gaol in Toronto 14,516 persons, of whom 11,208 were of intemperate habits, or 79 per cent. of the whole number. And this is his testimony, corroborating that of Colonel Denison:

"A large portion of the crime of this city is committed by parties under the influence of drink. In fact one-half of the petty larcenies, nearly all of the assaults and robberies of the person are attributable to the same cause, and certainly the amount of drunkenness prevailing, and the disorder and immorality resulting therefrom, are alarming."

Sir, let me quote one other testimony from a gentleman well known to the people of Toronto, Dr. Reilly, the resident physician in the Toronto General Hospital, who writes as follows:—

"I am sorry to say that my experience during the last twenty-one years of hospital life has been very large as regards the troubles and diseases caused by alcohol. Acute alcoholism causes acute catarrh of the stomach and the mucus membrane of the intestines, rapid coma, delirium tremens, and several forms of acute mania and temporary insanity, insomnia and epilepsy. Cases of this kind are admitted by the score for hospital treatment. A very large number of diseases admitted here are traced to intemperance."

There is other testimony in regard to the physical degeneration which this traffic brings on the people. Hundreds of diseases would be avoided by the people if they were free from the drinking habit, diseases which send people to our hospitals, poor houses and infirmaries, at the expense of the rest of the community. One more testimony I will give and I will then have done with the city of Toronto. I give the testimony of W. J. Hendry, late principal of the Victoria Industrial School for boys. He said:

"From a record I kept of the boys sent to Victoria Industrial School, I find that 68 per cent. have now, or had one or the other or both of them, parents given to the intemperate use of alcoholic drinks. It is also a sad fact that the present unfortunate condition of the lads is caused directly by the habits of their parents."

I have a letter from Miss Wright, who was matron of the Girls' Home, who makes a similar report, and I have a letter from Miss Scott, who was the secretary of the Boys' Home, giving me similar statements as to the result of the liquor traffic. When we consider all these facts in regard to the traffic and remember that they have been gathered up around one city, we can judge as to the amount of evil caused throughout the country, and the statistics that might be presented from the different centres of population. Sir, I think I have amply proven, by the most reliable testimony and by statistics of the most authentic nature, my indictment against this traffic, that it is a blighting, damning curse upon everything decent, pure and virtuous; that it is an enemy to law, order, morality, christianity and civilization. But the injury is not all in this direction. Allow me to point out the cost to the city of Toronto in dealing with police cases alone; and I call the attention of the members for that city to the calculation I have been able to make, based on the figures supplied to me. Toronto had in 1889, 200 places to sell liquor. Result: Arrest of 5,441 drunks; sent to gaol on an average of 30 days, 2,096; cost for board at 55 cents a day, $34,584; lost on wages—say $1.00 a day, $62,790; time lost by 3,345 drunks let off, $16,725; say five days for each—arresting, convicting and sending to gaol, $6,000; total, $120,099. No one looking over these figures can find any fault with the calculation, because it is based on statistics furnished by those who are actually engaged in the work. But there are many objections brought against prohibition notwithstanding this. Having established the charge I brought against the liquor traffic, I will now proceed to deal with other phases of the question from another standpoint. It is said by some people, and I believe it has been said by some hon. members who discussed the question the other evening, that, this being a moral question, we cannot make the people moral by law. The same argument can be brought against fifty Acts on the Statute-book with the same force and consistency. The statute in regard to the observance of the Lord's Day, that regarding theft or murder, and particularly the Act prohibiting the importation of immoral literature, stand in the same posi-

tion. We do not profess to make a man moral by law, but we profess to assist him in maintaining his virtue and integrity: and on the same principle we wish to prohibit the importation, sale and manufacture of intoxicating liquors in order to prevent those who would otherwise drink, obtaining it. Although the Government cannot make people moral by law, it is the duty of the Government to make it as difficult as possible to do wrong and as easy as possible to do right. It is the duty of the State to make the road to manhood and honour as easy as possible; to plant by the wayside flowers of hope and promise and public approbation. On the other hand it is the duty of the State to plant into the road down to licentiousness, crime and dishonour the rocks of law, and to hedge it with the brambles of public opinion, and the briars of public condemnation, and then place the citizen at the beginning of the two ways and say to him: Take your choice. It is here that the duty of the moral suasionist comes in. He can point out the difficulties placed in the way to crime and licentiousness by the Government and the facility with which the road to honour, to morality and to preferment can be travelled. It is, therefore, the duty of the State to place a premium upon virtue and a discount on crime. It is the duty of the State to remember that the unit of society is the individual, and if it wishes to build up a good society it must cultivate the institutions and customs which elevate and improve the units which constitute society. The prosperity of any country having only institutions which develop health, strength, morality and intelligence is assured. On the other hand, any country that enters into a partnership with any system or traffic which debauches public morals, destroys public health, impairs individual credit, stimulates vice and crime ere long will be a thing of the past. Home life is the keystone of our civilization. If the keystone is weakened or corrupted by any cause, or, in other words, if home life, the sacred guarden of our social fabric, is continuously breathed upon by the scorching breath of this traffic, I fear for the future of my country. It is said by some that the licensing system can accomplish all the good results we can expect. If the charges I have made against the traffic are true, and they are true, then license has been a complete failure, because all of the crimes I have enumerated have been perpetrated under it. But passing to another point, that prohibition will not prohibit, that is a question which has been brought up by some of those who have spoken on this question. If absolute prohibition is meant it is probably true, but otherwise it is not. If the law is intended to prohibit, if the machinery for the enforcement is sufficiently strong, and if the enforcement of the law is placed in the hands of executive officers appointed by the Government, there is little danger that prohibition will not prohibit. Is not the state stronger than a part of it? Any Government that cannot carry into effect a law required by the best of the people, the sooner it goes into bankruptcy the better. But we have testimony on every hand that prohibition has prohibited in some of the States in which it has been enacted, and without detaining the House, by going over many testimonies, I will read one or two of the testimonies given. Governor Dingley, formerly Speaker of the House of Representatives and Attorney General of the United States, in reply to enquiries made by Canada's Commissioners, Col. Davies and Rev. J. W. Manning, who were sent to Maine to investigate this question, said:

"Our cities and large villages where the influence of immigration is most felt are far behind the rural portions of the State in the enforcement of the law. Yet in nearly all our cities, with perhaps of two or three exceptions, the law is enforced to a great extent with evident beneficial results. The great improvement in the drinking habits of the people of this State within 30 or 40 years is so evident that no candid man who has observed or investigated the facts can deny it."

The Hon. Woodbury Davis, Judge of the Supreme Court of the United States, said:

"A prohibitory law tends to make both buying and selling disreputable.

"It holds up the standard of right and puts the brand of infamy upon the wrong.

"He is a blind observer of the forces that govern in human life who does not see the moral power of penal law even when extensively violated in teaching virtue and restraining vice.

"No observing man who lived in this State for the last twenty years and has had an opportunity to know the facts, can doubt that the Maine Law has produced a hundred times more visible improvement in the character, condition and prosperity of our people than any other law that was ever enacted."

This is the opinion of one of the ablest judges in the United States and it disposes of the argument by those who say that no law can be passed by the people of Canada to assist the people to be moral and virtuous. He says that the law upholds the standard of right, and places infamy upon wrong, and in this way it throws the entire traffic into the hands of those who are infamous. I do not believe that any respectable man in the country—and there are many of them who may drink moderately—would be seen going into the back lanes and the byeways to receive a glass of liquor from the hands of those whose business was made infamous by law. It was also contended in this House, that prohibition would interfere with our individual rights. I think the hon. member from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) spoke in reference to this: he said that no majority had the right to deprive him of anything he deemed to be a natural right. To-day he withdrew to a certain extent this contention and said: Oh, yes, when a considerable majority of the people are in favour of prohibition, then it is right and just to pass a law to protect the people. That is the proper principle. The hon. gentleman expressed what is right to-day, but yesterday he expressed what was wrong in principle. The individual right has no existence only in so far as it is related to the well-being of society. What may be considered an individual right to-day may be justly and properly withdrawn to-morrow if society so decide. The Sandwich Islander may say it is his right to be a cannibal, but if he removes into another society where the laws were different for the protection of the lives of the people, that right which he said he possessed as a Sandwich Islander would have been lost to him entirely. No man has any right in this country only in so far as the exercise of the rights accords with the welfare of society, and if the exercise of a so-called right is opposed to the interest of the community, such so-called right has no existence. That is the fundamental principle of national and social custom upon which the laws of our country are based. The greatest possible good to the greatest possible number, the greatest possible protection to the greatest possible number, the greatest possible freedom compatible with the

health, morals and lives of the greatest possible number; that is the fundamental principle that should underlie all the laws of all civilized countries. That is the principle involved in the License Act, which says that a tavern keeper shall not sell liquors from Saturday evening until Monday morning. That prohibition in the Act interferes with what many would call their individual liberties to drink on Saturday and Sunday, and before the prohibited hour on Monday morning. The law says a tavern-keeper cannot sell to minors, nor to Indians, and I suppose that some minors and Indians believe that their individual rights are imposed upon by this law. Suppose an individual in this city of Ottawa wished to erect a wooden building on a certain lot and contended that he had a right to do so and to spend his money in this way; it would depend entirely where he intended to erect that building, the authorities could say: If you build within the fire limits you have no right, but if you build without the fire limits you have the right, because the greatest possibly protection must be extended to your neighbours, and you cannot erect a class of building which is likely to take fire. If a man wishes to erect a slaughter house in a certain locality the health officers can say: You cannot put it there because it would endanger the health of the neighbourhood in the vicinity of your slaughter house. Thus, I might go on giving illustration after illustration to show that it is a principle recognized by every civilized Government in the world, that so-called individual rights should be restricted for the promotion of the public welfare. I wish now to say a few words in reference to the loss of revenue which might arise if a prohibitory liquor law were passed. Let me point out that this revenue is not lost, and that the prohibition of liquor will only involve a different system of collection. It may be said that the $7,000,000 of revenue from intoxicating liquor is paid by the distillers, the vendors and the importers, but after they have distributed that liquor through various parts of the country the people who use the liquor pay for it and it comes out of their pockets in the end. In reality it would only change the collecting of the duty from the importation and manufacture of liquors, to some other article which would be much more in the interests of the people, and avoid the disastrous results of the traffic. But, Sir, what is the opinion of one of the great men of England in reference to the decrease of revenue from intoxicating liquors. The late Lord Iddlesleigh, (Sir Stafford Northcote) in delivering his Budget speech some years ago in the Imperial House of Commons, referring to the loss of revenue from the decrease of duty on spirits, said:

"If the reduction of revenue derived from spirits to a material and considerable change in the habits of the people and to increasing habits of temperance and abstinence from the use of ardent spirits, I venture to say that the amount of wealth such a change would bring to the nation would utterly throw in the shade the amount of revenue that is now derived from the spirit duty; and we should not only see with satisfaction a diminution of revenue from such a cause, but we should find in various ways that the exchequer would not suffer."

There was the expressed opinion of a man who had upon his shoulders the responsibility of raising all the moneys necessary to meet the liabilities of England. I think the principle enunciated here is applicable to us and that we can apply it to this country. If this degrading traffic in liquor is removed and the country become more sober, the people become more industrious, the application of their skill and energy be more assiduously applied to productive sources of national wealth, we shall have coming into this country much more on the one hand than we could possibly lose on the other. Sir Wilfred Lawson, an eminent commoner in England, congratulated the Chancellor of the Exchequer upon his able speech and the soundness of his conclusions. He said, and his observations are worthy of attention:

"The Government had that night exhibited commendable moral courage, and shown that they would not consider private interests, but only regard the great interests of the nation. He was glad also to find the right hon. gentleman exploding the nonsensical notion that the revenue would suffer if the people would drink less. The mode in which we raised one-third of our revenue was something contemptible. A great swarm of collectors was, as it were, sent forth in the shape of publicans and beer sellers, commissioned to gather in from the people the money required for the national exchequer."

That, Sir, was that great man's opinion in regard to this question, and I think I can reiterate it with reference to Canada. If a prohibitory liquor law were passed to-morrow, we should suffer only a temporary inconvenience while the general result would be a great increase in our prosperity. But let me set down Canada's liquor loss and gain account, let me put on one side what the country is losing through this traffic, and on the other side the loss of revenue that would follow its prohibition, and see how the account stands. According to the estimate made by the Hon. Geo. E. Foster, Finance Minister, Canada's annual liquor bill amounts to $33,000,000; then there is the waste of 86,000,000 lbs. of grain last year, amounting to $1,000,000; loss of time of 40,000 drunkards, 25 days each at $1 per day, $1,000,000; waste of time by 15,000 vendors of liquor at $300 a year, $4,500,000; shortening the life of each drunkard of the 8,000 who die annually, say five years each, which equals 40,000 years of human life at $300 a year, $12,000,000; loss of time by criminals, say $500,000; and extra for administration of justice in the various departments, $500,000, which makes the total on the debit side of the account $52,500,000. Credit by the revenue obtained from the traffic, $7,000,000, leaving a net loss to the people of this country of $45,500,000 a year. And remember that this is without taking into consideration one vicious habit or one departure from virtue or from religious or moral principle. But, Sir, we have tried in a great many ways to avoid these evils. We have tried licenses for many years; we have tried the Dunkin Act; we have tried the Scott Act; we are trying the Local Option Act at the present time; but they have failed to accomplish the end we have in view; and, as Lord Brougham says:

"To lessen its force and contract its sphere no means must be spared, if we really mean to stay the progress of destitution and crime. The law-giver is imperatively bound to lend his aid when it appears manifest that no palliatives can avail."

We have tried, Sir, almost every palliative, and they have all failed, and now we come to the fountain head of power and the law-giver to lend his aid to stop the operation of this traffic. Now, in concluding, let me state the conclusions at which I have arrived on this subject, and I challenge any member who may be opposed

to prohibition—and many people are honestly opposed to it—to controvert the position I lay down: It is neither just nor politic for Canada to afford legal protection and sanction to any traffic or system that tends to increase crime, to waste the national resources of wealth, to corrupt the social habits, and to destroy the health and lives of the people. The traffic in intoxicating liquors as common beverages is inimical to the true interest of individuals and destructive to the order and well-being of society. The history and results of all past legislation in regard to the liquor traffic abundantly prove that it is impossible satisfactorily to limit or regulate a system so essentially mischievous in its tendencies. The legislative prohibition of the liquor traffic is perfectly compatible with rational liberty and with all the claims of justice and legitimate commerce. No consideration of private gain or public revenue can justify the continuance of a system so utterly wrong in principle, suicidal in policy and disastrous in results. All good citizens, without regard to class, sectarian or party considerations, should unite to procure an enactment prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the House for the attentive hearing you have given me.

Mr. TAYLOR. I beg leave to move, seconded by Mr. McNeill, in amendment to the amendment:

That all the words after the word "That" in the original motion, and all the words of the proposed amendment be struck out, and the following words added instead thereof: this House renews the expression of its opinion, made in preceding Parliaments, as to the expediency of prohibiting the manufacture, importation and sale of alcoholic liquors for beverage purposes, but declares that, in a question of such far-reaching importance, affecting long-established social and trade interests, involving the loss of many millions of necessary revenue and the consequent imposition of new and heavy taxation, it is essential to the effectual working and permanent maintenance of such an enactment that the electorate of Canada should first pronounce a definite opinion upon the subject at the polls.

Being a practical man, I believe in approaching great questions in a practical manner. The resolution submitted by my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) has been before this House on two previous occasions—in 1887, and again in 1889. In 1887 several amendments were moved to the main motion. Against those amendments I voted, save and except one. Then, in 1889 I moved an amendment in the direction that I believed the people of this country should go in grappling with this question if they meant to deal fairly with it, that is, in the direction of compensation to manufacturers. At the beginning of this session a meeting of the Dominion Alliance was called, which was attended by several members of the House who were not members of the legislative committee of the Alliance; and though we had no voice in the framing of the resolution that was to be brought before the House, my hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) took the position there that the members of the House favourable to prohibition should be consulted upon the form it should take, so that it should be made free from any political aspect that could cause embarrassment to the Government. The members of the legislative committee did not see fit to accept the suggestion of my hon. friend from Yarmouth, but insisted on their bald resolution as they amended it, not as they presented it to this House on two former occasions, for they cut it in two: but the amendment I have now placed in your hands, Sir, is the resolution that should come before this House. The resolution declares that it is expedient to prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor for beverage purposes. That resolution, if carried, in my opinion, is a direction to the House, which the Government would be obliged to act upon the next day: yet the mover states it is his opinion that if that resolution be carried, a notice of three or four or five years should be given those engaged in the manufacture and sale of liquor to quit the business. The resolution, however, does not say anything of the kind, but it says that it is expedient to prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor, and at the meeting of the Alliance to which I have referred, the opinion was in favour of immediate action and immediate legislation. Now, if we are to deal with this subject at all, we should deal with it in a practical way. We should say in our resolution what we mean. Many members of this House, many members of the Alliance committee state than when a question dealing with this subject comes before the House, the question of compensation is one of detail. I have always held that every Government in this country has been a partner with the manufacturers of liquor in that manufacture. The people, through the Government, have been partners: we permit the manufacturers to carry on their business, and we take a certain percentage of the profits, which we employ in erecting public buildings, constructing railways and canals and other public improvements. That partnership has been running from year to year: and if to-day we wish to dissolve that partnership, it is but honest that we should go to these people who have erected plant to carry on their business, and say to them: Your buildings are worth as much to you in carrying out some other branch of industry, your land is worth as much to you for other purposes, but we have on our Statute-books to-day an Act declaring that if any person has in his possession machinery for the manufacture of liquor, that machinery must be destroyed unless he has a license from the Government to continue using it. Now, suppose we pass a prohibitory liquor law. It will then be the duty of this Government to say to the manufacturer, that the machinery employed in the manufacture of liquor must be destroyed. But, if we are going to dissolve the partnership and stop the manufacture of liquor, we should meet the manufacturers half way and pay a percentage of the loss on the machinery which has to be destroyed. The press representatives, at a meeting of the Alliance, took the liberty of saying for me, that I am in favour of compensating the liquor dealers. My resolution last year, my amendment of 1889, was to compensate manufacturers only. I have not in my county any manufacturers of liquor, but a great many hotel keepers. Some people go so far as to say the hotel keepers should be compensated. I do not think so. I do not believe that the travelling in this country is on a liquor basis. The hotels are built for the purpose of accommodating the travelling public. Let us do away with the sale of liquor and travelling will continue, and there will be just as much business for hotels without as with liquor. Therefore, hotel keepers have no right to

compensation. I believe, however, the manufacturers, who have entered into partnership with the people of this country, and the Government of this country, if we are to enact a prohibitory law, should be treated fairly, so that they may not have any rights or grievances should this Parliament forbid the manufacture of liquor. I hold that view, and have always held it. Other hon. gentlemen go further, and say compensation should reach all the way down the line. The amendment proposed by the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh) asks that a committee be formed to gather certain information. That information, I believe, would be of great practical benefit in dealing with this question in a practical, intelligent manner. So far as I am concerned personally, I passed a prohibitory law some twenty years ago, and have lived up to it ever since; and I think what is good for the individual would be good for the country. Yet I will quarrel with no one holding contrary opinions, but if we want to have a prohibitory law a success we must have behind it the strong moral sentiment of the majority of the people. The Scott Act was enacted in many communities where it was carried by the popular vote, but we know it was not a success in its enforcement.

An hon. MEMBER. Why?

Mr. TAYLOR. Because the strong moral sentiment of the people was not behind it to back it up.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). What about politics?

Mr. TAYLOR. Perhaps politics entered into it, as I believe it does into this question, very largely. I complained, as I had a right to do at the meeting of the Alliance, a few weeks ago, with reference to the electoral address published by that society and distributed throughout my constituency during the late elections. That address did injustice to myself and many other hon. members of this House by publishing what professed to be a prohibition record of the House of Commons of Canada in its sixth Parliament, and among those voting against prohibition my name appears. Now, I did not vote against prohibition. My amendment to the motion of my hon. friend from Lanark was in favour of prohibition, and of course it did not carry, and I voted then with the hon. member for Brockville in favour of prohibition as soon as the country was ripe for its enforcement. Yet this fly-sheet was distributed stating that I voted against prohibition, and I could name two or three hon. gentlemen who are mentioned as having voted for prohibition yet who voted against the amendment I moved and against the amendment moved by the hon. member for Brockville, and who would have voted against the main motion had it been put. My hon. friend from North Leeds (Mr. Ferguson) is entered on that sheet as having voted against prohibition, and it appears by the records of the House that he was not here when the vote was taken. I also noticed the names of other hon. gentlemen incorrectly put down as having voted against prohibition. Whether that was done for political effect or not I will not say, but I know it was used against me in my election and did me considerable harm amongst some of the leading temperance people. You can go, Sir, through the journals of this House, and you will find that every vote I have given since I have been in this House has been in the direction of promoting the temperance cause. We should deal with this question in a practical way. If these petitions represent the will of a substantial majority of the people, then it is our duty to pass a prohibition law. I think the proper way would be to submit this question to the people, as I proposed doing in 1889, that it should be submitted at the next general election. My view then was, as it is now, that, in voting for a candidate, whether Grit or Tory, there should be a ballot for the candidate, but that this question should be removed from the political arena, and there should be a second ballot for or against prohibition. The amendment moved by my hon. friend the member for Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh), deals with some questions on which perhaps the people of this country ought to receive information before voting on this question, but these facts and figures could be all brought out before submitting the question to the people to vote upon. But I think, if the temperance people of this country want prohibition, as we do, it is the duty of those who have the best interests of the people at heart to so deal with this question that, when we get prohibition, we can keep it and make it a success. I think, before we pass any such legislation, we should have an expression of the voice of the people from one end of the country to the other. Then, having a majority of the people behind us, the measure can be made a success; but if we have only one-third or one-fourth of the people to support us, it will react, as the Scott Act reacted, and will prove a failure as the Scott Act proved a failure. I have submitted the amendment to the amendment, but at the same time there are some references made in the amendment moved by my hon. friend the member for Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh) as to a committee to gather information that I do not think any hon. member here to-day is in possession of, and that I would like to be possessed of in order to discuss the question intelligently in the House and in the country, which I should like to see adopted. While I favour the amendment of my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh), I do not think it goes quite far enough. I have, therefore, moved the amendment to the amendment and hope it will meet with the approval of the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to know from the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, whether he proposes by his motion that a plébiscite should be had, because his motion is somewhat ambiguous. It concludes thus:

"It is essential to the effectual working and permanent maintenance of such an enactment that the electorate of Canada should first express an opinion at the polls."

The electorate may do that at a general election or by a direct vote on the subject. I should like to know which the hon. gentleman intends, and I should like to see the resolution altered so as to express what he means.

Mr. TAYLOR. The motion speaks for itself, and if that motion meets with the approval of the majority of the House, then the other question will be one of the details to be dealt with by the House. I do not see that we can put it in any other way. I had in the motion the words "at a general election," but my seconder objected to that, and, to meet his views, I crossed it out. So we will

leave that to be dealt with afterwards, if the amendment meets the approval of the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the hon. gentleman had made it clear that this was to be submitted to the people, I would have supported his amendment, but I do not intend to practise any deception upon the electors, and so I will not support it. If the hon. gentleman will make this a motion of direct appeal to the electorate, I am ready to support his proposition, but a motion that this subject is to stand over for five years until there is a general election, I am not prepared to support, and it is one the public will not be satisfied with.

Mr. McNEILL. I would like to say in explanation, and in modification of what my hon. friend opposite has said, that there was no desire on my part to deceive the people when an amendment was suggested. I stated to my constituents that I would be prepared to support a resolution referring this matter to the people at once—and I am perfectly prepared to support such a resolution—and expressed my views to my hon. friend, saying I would prefer to support a resolution leaving the matter to the people at once.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). All the House has to do is to vote down this resolution, and then another amendment can be proposed expressing the views which the hon. gentleman entertains, and which I and many others on this side of the House entertain. I do not admit that it is an un-British or unconstitutional proceeding to refer a matter of this kind directly to the people of the country. I admit that it is an undesirable course to take in the majority of questions, because there is no difficulty in the majority of instances in enforcing a measure which is placed on the Statute-book. But this would be a sumptuary law, and it requires the general co-operation of the community to give it effect. I do not think any greater misfortune could befall the cause of total abstinence than placing on the Statute-book a measure which would be inoperative. I think such a course would do more to retard the progress of temperance principles than anything else that could possibly transpire. I think we would have in the Dominion at large precisely the same experience as the people of New Brunswick had shortly before New Brunswick became a member of this Confederation. There is no propriety in practising any imposition upon ourselves by supposing that we will put this at rest as far as the people are concerned. If the people of the country will assume the responsibility of declaring in favour of a prohibitory measure, I am prepared to assist in putting it on the Statute-book, and inserting in that measure all the provisions necessary to make it effective and operative: but this amendment which the hon. gentleman has moved will not serve that purpose. The question should be put before the electors, a question which I say is peculiar in its character, differing from almost every other question we are called upon in this House to consider, which requires the active co-operation of the people to make it effective, which is not necessary in many other measures in the same way or to the same extent. Therefore, I am not prepared to support this legislation without the assurance that the people generally desire it. Personally I favour it, but I am perfectly certain that the passage of a measure by the House is not of itself sufficient. But, besides this amendment to the amendment, there has been an amendment placed in your hands by the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh), asking that a question affecting the revenues of this country should be referred to a select committee. Now, there are sitting opposite to me a number of gentlemen who have been entrusted by the people of this country, by His Excellency, with the sanction and support so far, of the people of this country, with the responsibility of carrying on the Government of this country. It is the duty of the Ministers to submit to this House ways and means for the maintenance of the credit of this country, and the payment of the expenses of the Government. I am not prepared, as a private member of this House, to permit these gentlemen to shift their responsibility from their shoulders to mine, or from their shoulders to the shoulders of a special committee who have not been charged by the Crown with the duties that were devolved upon them. Why, Sir, there is not one member of the Administration on that committee, there is not a member of the Administration who is ready to take the responsibility of investigating this subject as a member of that committee, and the odium, if there be odium in dealing with this question. Now, I think that is a most unconstitutional proceeding, a most improper proceeding. If these hon. gentlemen have not the courage or have not the ability—and I am not charging them with wanting ability to deal with this subject—then I say they ought not sit where they are. The Minister of Finance has himself brought this question before the House: he has over and over again declared to this House and to this country that the question of the revenue was not one that he was called upon to consider in connection with the question of total prohibition: that if the people of this country sustained him in that belief ten years ago, if they would sustain such a measure as prohibition, he was prepared to carry that measure and to adopt some other means of meeting the public credit and expenses of Government in this country. The hon. gentleman has not declared to this House that his views have undergone any change: he has not stated to this House that he is opposed to this policy of prohibition, which, for a long time, he advocated: he has not stated to this House that he will have any difficulty, as Finance Minister, in meeting the financial requirements of the country, if such a measure as this were carried. He has made no such declaration. On what ground, then, is this House called upon to deal with the subject and to consider the question of ways and means, when the Finance Minister himself has not said one word showing that he would be at all embarrassed or that he sees any obstacle in the way of meeting the financial requirements of the country in case this measure of prohibition is carried? I know no reason why this amendment should be proposed. I know no reason why this House should transfer the responsibility and the duties that they have bound themselves to discharge, from the shoulders of the Government to the shoulders of a special committee. Why, Sir, I am under the impression that that amendment was drawn up by a member of the Government. I would like to know, whether the old blunderbuss was not loaded by some Minister and given to the member for Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh) to fire off in the House.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. No member of the Government, and no other member of the House, has known anything about this amendment.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No doubt the members of the Government will resent the imputation upon their capacity and upon their courage that is involved in that amendment. How is it that the First Minister is sitting here and has not indignantly called upon the House to vote down that amendment? The hon. gentleman is now prepared to issue a commission of lunacy against the Administration and to take charge of their functions. I am perfectly certain that the Minister feels himself equal to the occasion still, and if that be so, why should the Government not indignantly repudiate the amendment which the hon. member for Ottawa has placed in your hands and upon which he asks this House to vote? Sir, we have responsible government in this country, or are supposed to have, or ought to have. Our constitution requires it, and while it may be, to some extent, a stretch of imagination to say that it has been fully and fairly carried out, yet the Government have not gone so far as to say: We will stay where we are, we will take no risks and we will transfer to various special committees the duty and the obligation that rest upon our shoulders. I do not think that the House will be prepared to go that far. Notwithstanding the vote last evening, which led to the singing of a prayer on behalf of Her Majesty from quarters where I am afraid it will not always be very efficacious, still, hon. gentlemen might have saved their anxiety in this House, and I say that I do not think this House will go so far as to repudiate the principle of ministerial responsibility and to undertake to conduct the financial affairs of this country, as they are conducted by the House of Representatives at Washington, by special committees appointed for the purpose. Now, I think that the House is entitled to hear from the Minister of Finance. We heard from the hon. member who moved the original resolution yesterday a speech that savored, it was said, of a good deal of cold water and a very little spirit. I do not know whether that is a just criticism, but I do know that if the Government undertook to support this amendment, to relieve themselves of all responsibility, and to ask a special committee of the House to undertake to show how the ways and means are to be found for the carrying on the Government of this country in case of prohibition, then they will have exhibited indeed a very little spirit, and very little regard for those constitutional principles which are supposed to obtain in this country. Sir, I shall vote against this amendment to the amendment, and I shall vote against the amendment, and I shall favour an amendment to the original proposition referring this question directly to the electorate of this country at a very early day, at as early a day as the public convenience will warrant; and if the public desire prohibition, legislation shall be based upon the results of the decision of the electors themselves. Sir, the right hon. gentleman informed the House not long ago that he was so anxious to know the opinion of the people of this country, so anxious to have them assume the responsibility of the public policy that the Government intended to pursue, that he found it necessary to dissolve Parliament before the period had expired for which it was elected, and to take the opinion of the country upon a question still in the clouds, take the opinion of the country upon a question upon which he had not yet formed very clear opinions himself, or if he had, had not enunciated them very clearly to the electors, because they were differently interpreted by his friends in every constituency in the country. Well, now, if the hon. gentleman felt that that was so upon a question upon which his opinions were still in a nebulous form, it is still more important upon a question upon which opinions must necessarily be well defined, and whatever may be the opinions of this House, it is most important that the public should be decidedly in favour of the measure if such a measure is to be put upon the Statute-book. I think that a reference ought to be had, that there ought to be no doubt, or difficulty, or dispute with regard to the propriety of referring this question directly to the electors: and that being so, it is not in the public interest, it is not in the interest of prohibition, it is not in the interest of the temperance habits of the community which we all desire to sustain and encourage, that either the amendment to the amendment, or the amendment, or the motion itself, should be carried.

Mr. SPROULE. It now being six o'clock, and several members wishing to speak upon this question, I move the adjournment of the debate.

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

After Recess.

House divided on the motion to adjourn the debate (Mr. Sproule).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Adams.	Macdonald (Sir John).
Baker.	Macdonald (King's).
Burnham.	Macdonald (Winnipeg).
Cameron (Inverness).	Mackintosh.
Carpenter.	McAllister.
Caron (Sir Adolphe).	McDonald (Victoria).
Coatsworth.	McDougald (Pictou).
Cochrane.	McDougall (Cape Breton).
Cockburn.	McKay.
Corby.	McLennan.
Craig.	McLeod.
Curran.	Madill.
Daoust.	Mara.
Davin.	Masson.
Davis.	Miller.
Desjardins (Hochelaga).	Mills (Annapolis).
Desjardins (L'Islet).	Montague.
Dickey.	Patterson (Colchester).
Dugas.	Prior.
Dyer.	Robillard.
Earle.	Roome.
Fairbairn.	Ross (Dundas).
Foster.	Ryckman.
Fréchette.	Sproule.
Gillies.	Stevenson.
Henderson.	Taylor.
Hodgins.	Temple.
Hutchins.	Thompson (Sir John).
Ingram.	Wallace.
Langevin (Sir Hector).	White (Shelburne).
Léger.	Wilmot, and
Lépine.	Wood (Brockville).—65.
Lippé.	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allan.	Gillmor.
Allison.	Godbout.
Amyot.	Grieve.
Armstrong.	Guay.
Bain.	Hargraft.

Barron,	Harwood,
Beausoleil,	Hyman,
Béchard,	Innes,
Beith,	Jamieson,
Bernier,	King,
Bowers,	Landerkin,
Bowman,	Lavergne,
Brodeur,	Leduc,
Brown (Chateauguay),	Legris,
Brown (Monck),	Lister,
Burdett,	Macdonald (Huron),
Cameron (Huron),	McGregor,
Campbell,	McMullen,
Carroll,	Mills (Bothwell),
Charlton,	Mousseau,
Choquette,	Murray,
Christie,	Paterson (Brant),
Colter,	Perry,
Davidson,	Rider,
Davies,	Rinfret,
Dawson,	Rowand,
Devlin,	Sanborn,
Edgar,	Semple,
Fauvel,	Somerville,
Featherston,	Spohn,
Flint,	Sutherland,
Forbes,	Tarte,
Frémont,	Trow,
Gauthier,	Truax,
Geoffrion,	Vaillancourt,
German,	Watson, and
Gibson,	Yeo—74.

Motion to adjourn debate negatived.

Mr. TROW. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) has not voted.

Mr. MULOCK. I had paired with the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White); otherwise, I would have voted against the resolution.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. member for Guysboro' did not vote.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. member for Cardwell did not vote.

Mr. SPROULE. In continuing this debate, I may say, by way of parenthesis, that my conduct had no political significance. Owing to the fact that I had a large deputation down here from my county, and that, necessarily, I was obliged to give some time to them, and that a large deputation was here, comprising about 200 men from all parts of Ontario, I thought this was too important a question for the discussion to proceed with so many absentees who desired to show attention to their constituents from various parts of the province. I thought I was justified in asking the adjournment of the debate until there was a full House to hear the discussion that would take place. I regret that the decision has been otherwise, but it is not my province to reflect on the conduct of the House. One motion and two amendments on this question are before the House at this time. The first is in the following language:—

"That, in the opinion of this House, the time has arrived when it is expedient to prohibit the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes."

An amendment has been moved on the line that we are not in possession of sufficient data or information to arrive at a correct judgment, and to say whether or not the time has arrived, or whether or not it is expedient in the interests of the country that we should give effect to the opinion expressed in the resolution. An amendment to the amendment has also been moved to the effect that we should carry out the resolution moved when we have obtained an expression of the opinion of the electors, and that there should be a plebiscite. In my opinion the situation at the present time calls on us to exercise our judgment on the original resolution, and, therefore, for a short time I will direct my attention to it. The question is: Has the time arrived in the history of the country when the sentiment of the people will sustain a prohibitory liquor law? It would be necessary, in order to complete this investigation, to make an examination at whatever sources we take our information. What source would enable us to-day to come to an honest conclusion as to whether or not that time has or has not arrived in the history of Canada? On what basis are we asked to say that the time has arrived? By those hon. gentlemen who have advocated this bald resolution it is claimed that the large number of petitions presented to the House since the opening of the session, containing as they do thousands of names, afford evidence that the country is ripe for this question. I beg leave to take issue with those hon. gentlemen who hold that opinion. While I have every respect for the petitions that are sent to Parliament, while I pay due attention to the requests of the people as expressed in those petitions, I must, after a careful analysis of these petitions, come to the conclusion that they do not convey the sentiments of the large majority of the people who would be responsible for the carrying out of such a law, were it enacted. Why do I say so? Because I find these very numerously-signed petitions are signed not only by the female portion of the community, but by the children down to infants. In many cases the children are so young they have not been baptised and given a name with which to go through life, and therefore the petition is signed baby so-and-so and infant so-and-so, without attaching a name. Is that correct information on which to base a judgment as to whether the people are ripe for the proposed measure? I have no doubt the petitions were numerous and numerously signed, but I take issue with those who hold that they express the sentiments of the vast majority of the people who are responsible for the carrying out of a law that may be put upon the Statute-book. Another fact that makes it easy to get petitions very numerously signed is this: The church is very likely behind the petitions, and requests of the church are often readily assented to without the people analyzing the request contained in the petitions. I believe it is so in this case. I took the trouble to go over some of the petitions, and I found that only one out of twelve or thirteen names were those of ratepayers, the majority of names being those of women and children. With the large number of signatures thus reduced it will be seen how far public sentiment is prepared to sustain the resolution, I mean by the rate-payers of the country. While I hold that the people who feel the baneful effects of that traffic or any others have a right to express their opinions, yet it is incumbent on this Legislature to take into account the class of individuals signing the petitions, and what their position is, and whether it is a guarantee for the effectual carrying out of the principle to be embodied in the law. Then those who say we are to accept the petitions as conclusive evidence go even further and say: We must accept the petitions because of the votes given on the Scott Act. That Act was carried in sixty-eight constituencies, and it was carried after very strenuous arguments by a very large and influential class of the community, including most of the ministers of the Gospel.

They believed that prohibition as provided in the Scott Act would be sufficient for the wants of the people, and that if carried it was likely to be a success. There were those who held a different opinion, but unfortunately their position was so unpopular that they did not like to appear on the platforms against the class of individuals who were urging the Act, even to speak in support of their honest convictions, and the result was that the Scott Act was carried in sixty-eight counties. After a few years they found, exactly as was predicted, that the sentiment of the country was not ripe for such a measure, and to-day we find that the law is not sustained. Then those parties who were largely engaged in carrying out the Scott Act set themselves to work to find reasons why the law was a failure, instead of the success expected. Many of them shut their eyes to the fact, which was patent to every reasonable man, that the great moral sentiment of the country was not ready to sustain that law upon the principle on which it was based when it was carried in these constituencies. It was, therefore, a failure, and in a few years when the people had an opportunity of expressing their verdict a second time, the revulsion of feeling was so great, that the Act was defeated by overwhelming majorities in constituencies which had previously adopted it by majorities of hundreds. That is evidence that the prediction of those who held that the country was not ripe for such a measure were absolutely correct, and that the judgment of those who contended that the country was ready for the Scott Act was certainly very defective, to say the least. The fact that the Scott Act was defeated in almost every county in which the repeal vote was taken is strong evidence, to my mind, that the country is not now ripe for absolute prohibition. It has been stated that the circumscribed area in which this Scott Act was in force was one of the reasons it could not be enforced. That was also said when the Dunkin Act was voted on. I remember when, in the County of Grey, the Dunkin Act was carried by over 900 majority, which was surely large enough to indicate that public sentiment was in its favour. I held then, as I hold to-day, that the sentiment of the country was not prepared to sustain such a law, and we soon found out in that county that this Act did not promote respect for the license laws of the country. We found that liquor was taken into private homes, and opened out in hundreds of places where it was never known before. The result of the law in our county was that there was a greater demoralization among the people than we had ever experienced in the previous history of that county. After several years of experience of this kind, it was not to be wondered at that when the Scott Act was submitted to the county the people refused to pass it; and those who were in its favour were unable to get sufficient signatures to cause the Act to be submitted to the people. In the counties surrounding my constituency, Bruce to the west, Cardwell to the south of us, and Simcoe to the east, the Scott Act was adopted, and we found that in less than a year afterwards there was a complete disregard for law in these counties. There was, in fact, neither law nor order prevailing, and the adoption of the Act brought about litigation, contention, disrespect for law, perjury, which sent people to the penitentiary, complete demoralization to a large class of the community, and the result was that when the Act was submitted for repeal it was abolished in every one of these counties. In view, therefore, of this experience we have a right to carefully examine the question and to ascertain upon some other ground than the number of petitions presented, whether or not the sentiment of the country is ripe for prohibition to-day. An examination of the whole question leads me to the conviction that the country is not now ready for the enforcement of a prohibition law. Another obstacle which we meet with in carrying on this debate is that if we express our honest opinion, although we may be in favour of prohibition when prohibition is surrounded by these safeguards which we believe will prepare the country to sustain it, we are branded by the temperance alliances as opponents to prohibition. We are, in fact, not allowed to fearlessly express what we honestly believe, under penalty of incurring the displeasure of the Dominion Alliance. In proof of this I can point to a fly-sheet which I now hold in my hand, and which was sent out by the Dominion Alliance during the last elections. In this fly-sheet the electors are asked to watch the candidates in the various constituencies, to oppose every man who is not in favour of prohibition, and then the Dominion Alliance gives what it is pleased to call a record of the votes of the members of the late Parliament on this question. Every hon. member, no matter how strong his convictions were in favour of the principle of prohibition, who could not see eye to eye with the Alliance that the country was now ripe for prohibition, was branded as being against that principle. The prohibitionists who honestly believe that, if prohibition were carried out, it should be carried out upon certain considerations, such as compensation, the giving of reasonable time to those engaged in the traffic to get out of it, and allowing time for the country to prepare for the loss of revenue which would be sustained, were put down as opposed to prohibition, although they might have been strongly in favour of it, though not in favour of its immediate enforcement. I have a list here of the members so denounced. It is too long to read, but it includes such names as my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, my hon. friend from Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Ferguson), my hon. friend from Middlesex (Mr. Roome), my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor); men who are total abstainers, men whose lives have been an example of prohibition, men who advocate the principle as strongly as any one in this House; these gentlemen were branded as opponents of prohibition, and the temperance people of the country were counselled to vote against them. Is this fair to hon. members of this House who have endeavoured to grapple with the question, not upon political but upon moral and conscientious grounds, and to exclude from their minds political alliances and political influences when dealing with a great question which so affects the interests of the country? I say that such action on the part of the Dominion Alliance is neither fair nor just. We have this question now brought before the House under a somewhat different phase from that of last year. Then a resolution was submitted to us saying that in the opinion of the House the country was ripe for prohibition, but that the law should be enforced by the Dominion Government. That complicated the question, because it raised a conflict of authority

between the Dominion and the Provincial Governments. We all know it is the duty of the Provincial Governments to enforce the criminal law of the country, and if the Dominion Government assumed the duty of enforcing this law they would conflict with provincial rights, so that thus the Dominion Alliance complicated the question, made it difficult to deal with, and raised other issues not easy of settlement in the future. It was held by some that when that resolution was introduced there was different aims in view; some pointed out that when the Scott Act was in force the Provincial Government—I speak of the Province of Ontario, with which I am best acquainted—never attempted to enforce this law. Why? Because they had a License Act that gave them a revenue of nearly $400,000 a year, and, therefore, they did not feel justified in abolishing that source of revenue. In addition to that they had a class of men called license commissioners and inspectors who were very important political agents through the country whenever an election contest was going on, and they, therefore, did not like to weaken their standing by endeavouring to enforce the Scott Act. In other words, these officers exhibited a supreme disregard for the enforcement of the law in the Scott Act counties, notwithstanding that they drew their salaries from the Provincial Government every year for looking after a license law that was not in existence. Now, it was believed that the Provincial Government was not in favour of supporting the law because it interfered with one of their means of raising a revenue; it was doing away with the work performed by a very important class of their friends, the license commissioners and the license inspectors; and if we had a prohibitory liquor law passed by this House, one of the strongest reasons which might induce me to support it would be that it would do away with that class of people whom we have found everywhere on public platforms, not sustaining the principles of prohibition, but the principles of the Mowat Government and the license system whether it be good or bad. Now, we are asked to pass the bald and bare resolution that, in the opinion of this House, the country is ripe for prohibition, and the question arises whether that is the case or not. What would immediate prohibition mean? It would mean this: If this resolution were carried in this House, it would be a direct mandate to the Government to introduce a law to carry out the wish of this House as expressed in the resolution, and the Government would have to do so. That is the only constitutional course the Government could take in the event of this motion being carried. What would that mean? It would mean that the Government would be brought face to face with the obligation to introduce a law which, by one swoop, would do away with six or seven millions of the revenue of the country; and that must be provided for, whether it comes from this or from some other source. In addition to that, they would be doing away with an important means possessed by the Provincial Governments for raising the necessary revenue to carry on provincial affairs; because, if my memory serves me, the Province of Ontario raises a revenue of $450,000 a year from licenses, and a prohibitory liquor law would do away with that. Thus it would not only cripple the financial position of the Government here, but also that of every province of the Dominion. Now, would the provinces submit to this? Would they not consider it a direct interference with the right bestowed upon them by the British North America Act to impose license fees on every man engaged in this trade, for the purpose of raising a revenue to carry on the affairs of the province? I think many would hold that contention, and the chances are that we should have litigation over the question. Now, it is the part of business men to deal with all questions of this kind on business principles. We cannot say, as some have said with regard to unrestricted reciprocity: Give us the power to get unrestricted reciprocity; we are not going to tell you how we propose to make up the revenue which would be lost thereby, but we will tell you how when we get it. I think the practical business man of the world wants to look farther than that; he wants to see where the revenue is going to come from, so that the country will not feel the financial strain of the sudden loss of six or seven million dollars a year; and if this question is laid before the country fairly, I do not believe the sober, fair-minded portion of the electorate, either in Provincial or Dominion affairs, will be prepared to say that the country is ready to-day to pass an unconditional prohibitory liquor law, which destroys such an enormous amount of revenue, and make it up in some other way, without feeling the financial strain which would result to be almost intolerable. In saying that, I leave out of consideration the question as to whether the country is ripe for such a law, and I think I am voicing the sentiments of the majority of the members of this House in saying that it is not ripe. I agree with the hon. gentleman who moved the amendment to the amendment, that perhaps a plebiscite would give us a more accurate insight into the sentiment of the country than we now possess; but still I feel that there is something rather repugnant to our ideas of responsible government in such a proposition, and therefore I do not exactly favour it. But if we had some expression of opinion from the people, either direct or indirect, that would give us a correct idea of what their feeling is by a large majority, then Parliament I believe would be prepared to carry out the people's will, and bear the consequences whatever they might be. There are some, however, who, while they believe in prohibition, hold that in order to be effective it should be accompanied by compensation; and whether that is agreeable to others or not, it is my view. If you want to pass a law of this kind, which will destroy the property of a great many people, and if you want the law to be respected, you will have to create a healthy sentiment behind the law; and in order to do that you must avoid the possibility of a grievance being brought about by its enactment. Now, would there be a grievance in this case? If we attempted to destroy the property of such large firms as Gooderham & Worts, Labatt, Seagram and others, who have hundreds of thousands of dollars invested in plant under the sanction of the law, without giving compensation, the natural result would be to create a grievance which would be largely instrumental in preventing the effectual carrying out of the law. What illustrations have I to prove that that would be the case? We have the very best illustrations in the efforts made to enforce the Scott Act. Those efforts involved the destruction of the property of many men, which excited sympathy for them

among the people, which interfered seriously with the carrying out of the law, and in many parts of the country we had a very disastrous state of affairs. So it would be in the case of this law. If we want to enforce it and make it successful we must do away with every chance of a grievance, so that it will have the unanimous support of the people: and then, and not till then, it can be enforced. There are those who hold that we have power to enforce a law whether there is a sentiment in favour of it or not: but if we look to history for illustrations of the contrary view, we shall find plenty of them. I need only point you to one illustration which must be patent to every one, that is, the doing away with slavery in the British domains and in the United States. Britain declared the time had arrived when in the interest of humanity we should do away with slavery: but we do not believe we have a right to destroy men's property or vested rights without giving them compensation, and when it is necessary in the interests of the whole people that we should destroy their property, the equitable course is to give them compensation for it. Therefore, Britain virtually bought out those who had their money invested in slavery: and what was the result? The sentiment was unanimously sustained, and wherever slavery was abolished in that way very little trouble followed. People settled down to the new condition of affairs and were satisfied: there were no grievances: there was no need for sympathy with the people whose property had been taken away, because they were compensated for it, and the result was a great success. On the other hand, look at the result of the abolition of slavery by the United States on the other principle, by the force of law alone. They said that, as a nation, having power to do away with slavery, we will pass that law and enforce it, whether agreeable or disagreeable to the majority or minority of our subjects: and they did pass that law. They passed it, and were compelled to support it by one of the most expensive civil wars ever known in the history of the world—a war which cost them lots of money and millions of lives, which wrought destruction to thousands of homes and left in its wake ranklings that will not die out for the next hundred years. Do we find that law respected in the South to-day? No; in the hearts of the descendants of the people whose property was taken from them by that law, we find the rankling feeling prevails that great injustice was done them, and that feeling prevents that law being a success. Do we find, after twenty-one years have passed since slavery was abolished by force of arms, that reconciliation has taken place? No, on the contrary, we find the feeling of enmity is as strong in the South to-day as on the day the law was forced upon them. A great problem has been created by virtue of the means taken to accomplish that one act, which the American people thought should be accomplished in the interests of humanity, and that problem will not be solved in the present or succeeding generation. I say that is a parallel case. Though on a much larger scale, it is a fair illustration of what is likely to happen in this country if you destroy men's property by force of a law in which they may or may not believe, but under which vested rights have grown up and property has been created which would be destroyed without compensation. The calculation given by an hon. gentleman who spoke before recess, showed that in one year the Dominion was subjected to an expense of over $50,000,000 on account of the traffic in intoxicating liquors, which large sum would be saved annually if we had a prohibitory law. Therefore, if for no other reason but economy, we ought to be ready to grapple with this question, provided we can raise sufficient to compensate those engaged in the trade. Such compensation would be only an expenditure of one or two years, and if we accept the calculation given us, it would be in the interests of the country that we should incur that expense and do away with a great evil, and at the same time effect this saving of $50,000,000 for all time in the future. If we are prepared to pass this unconditional resolution of prohibition, we ought to be prepared to couple with it some fair measure of compensation. We ought to be prepared to carry that law into effect and at the same time reconcile those interested, and thus avoid building up a grievance which might prevent the successful carrying out of the law by rendering a unanimous sentiment in its favour impossible. There can be no sympathy with law-breakers when we know they have been compensated for the loss they sustained by the law. For these reasons, I hold that if we are prepared to pass the original resolution, we should be prepared to accompany it with the principle of compensation. Now, an amendment has been offered in the direction of obtaining more information on which to base our judgment. I am very strongly in favour of that amendment. Though there are many features about it which I do not admire, and though in some directions it goes a great deal too far, it has at least this one merit: that it will give us data on which to form a conclusion. When discussing questions of trade and commerce or the labour problem, we require statistics, and the labour unions require statistics to show the trend of public sentiment and enable a proper judgment to be arrived at. We have not in this question sufficient or reliable data on which to base our decision as to whether the country is, or is not, ripe for unconditional prohibition, and I am, therefore, in favour of the amendment which seeks to stave off a settlement of the question only for a time in order that we may be able to deal with it more satisfactorily later. Great problems are not decided in a day. It is the usual course of Parliament not to get rid of a grievance by one fell *coup*, but to proceed gradually in touch with public sentiment. We have an illustration of that in the course taken by the British Parliament in dealing with the Irish land question and the Home Rule question. Some hold that the English people ought to put their hands into their pockets and raise money to give the Irish people power to buy out their lands and become tenant owners. Others hold that the British Parliament should pass a liberal Land Bill; and so, step by step, that Parliament is advancing in the right direction, and no doubt ultimately will accomplish what is desired by the most sanguine of those interested in the welfare of Ireland. In all great revolutionary questions such as the one before us, we are justified in advancing slowly. It is not in the interests of the country that a great revolution should be brought about suddenly. Some may say this is not a great revolution. I say, judging it by its financial aspect, it is a

great financial revolution, and judging it by its social aspects, it is a great social revolution. Therefore the change should not be brought about hastily, but only according as the people are educated to support it. There will be nothing accomplished by too great a haste. We know that by the history of the Dunkin Act and the Scott Act. Temperance people have a right to feel encouraged because the process of education has gone on rapidly and well in the country, and in due time no doubt the sentiment of the people will be in favour of what they ask to-day; but I think some are, perhaps, over-zealous in a good cause and are, perhaps, a little too ambitious to hurry it on to a conclusion. There is as great danger in too much hurry as in delay. Every step in an advance, in a great revolution of this kind, should be made on firm ground, so that we can maintain the ground we have gained and press still further forward. The sentiment of the country is gradually being educated up to the desired standard of supporting total prohibition. Therefore, temperance people ought to be satisfied, and ought not to be, as they appear sometimes to be, disposed to cry down every member of Parliament who honestly expresses his opinions, even if he does not happen to agree with them in every particular. I am in favour of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh), with regard to our acquiring information on which to base our judgment. I hold we can never have too much information. In all walks of life it is information which enables us to arrive at an understanding as to the matters with which we are dealing. Whether in public life, or in the conduct of private corporations or as private individuals the intelligent man always debates in his own mind every phase of the question, bringing to bear the greatest amount of information possible; and when he has done that, the result of his action, whatever it may be, is most likely to be a success. I therefore hold there is virtue in the amendment moved by the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh). We want to know how much revenue would be lost, how far such legislation would interfere with provincial rights, what means a committee of the House, such as has been suggested, would advise for the purpose of making good the deficiency that would be created in the Dominion treasury if prohibition were carried out. We want to know the far-reaching effect of such a measure, and when we know these facts we will be better prepared to form an intelligent judgment and efficiently discharge our duty as representatives of the people. I am, therefore, in favour of the amendment of the hon. member for Ottawa. In saying this I do not wish to be understood that I desire to burk the consideration of the question at the present time or delay it. I know some hon. members, in their anxiety, seek either to turn the matter to political account or to create the impression that the object I aimed at in moving the adjournment of the debate was rather to defeat the question embodied in the resolution. It is early in the session yet, and it was distinctly understood that, in the event of the motion to adjourn being carried, the question would come on next week at the latest, when there would be ample time to debate it in all its phases. It was not either with the object of in any way embarrassing the chance of the resolution being thrown out without a full expression of opinion having been obtained, that I moved the motion to adjourn the debate. I therefore say there is no need for too much turpitude in dealing with the resolution, and as there is virtue in the amendment of the hon. member for Ottawa, I, consequently, am disposed to support it. Although I am in favour of the principle of prohibition, although I am in favour of it, whether it is believed in this House or out of it, or not, as much as are many hon. gentlemen who will vote directly for the unconditional resolution, I am also in favour of making progress slowly, gradually, steadily and forcibly, doing it intelligently and making it on those grounds that afford the surest guarantee for the permanence of every step we make towards what we aim at. For these reasons, I am in favour of the amendment to the resolution, and am not in favour of the unconditional resolution before us. I am not in favour of the amendment to the amendment, submitted by my hon. friend who sits beside me. I give these as my reasons for the vote I am about to give, not because I am in favour of prohibition, not because I do not want to embarrass the Government, but because we have the right to look before us and see what the future of the country is likely to be, how we are going to accomplish the object aimed at and do it without at the same time threatening the interests of the country. I am in favour of prohibition, but only on those lines which, in my judgment, afford the surest guarantee of permanence and success after it is accomplished.

Mr. WATSON. It is not my intention to occupy for any length of time the attention of this House during this debate, but coming from a province that adjoins the territory which is supposed to have prohibition, I feel called upon to say a few words. I am in favour of the original motion moved by the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson), as I believe liquor is a curse to the country and we are better without it. The question of revenue should not be considered when we know the lives and intrests of our people are at stake in this cursed traffic. We have had hon. gentlemen speaking apparently on all sides of this question. They have adopted one part of the speech to temperance people and another to the people who deal in liquor; they have endeavoured to hunt both with the hare and the hounds. But the temperance people in Ontario have taken up this matter, and the Temperance Alliance has seen fit to endeavour to influence temperance people in the constituencies and to direct them as to the candidates they should support. It is only by exercising the franchise and supporting candidates who are honestly in favour of prohibition, not men who are simply pandering for their votes at election times, but men who practice what they preach and are temperance men, that success can be achieved. That is decidedly objectionable to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. He has told us that he does not want to burk discussion. But we saw the hon. gentleman move the adjournment of the debate. Why should we not debate the question to-night, especially when it is one that has been discussed during every session of every Parliament since I have sat in this House, in 1882. It is no new question. The people should be, and are being educated in regard to it, and I believe the country is prepared to see whether, after the failure of the Scott Act, a prohibitory law cannot be passed and enforced. The

hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) started out by reflecting on the people who had sent in the petitions, and on the names signed to the petitions. More petitions have been presented in favour of prohibition than have been presented for any other measure submitted to Parliament. Then the hon. gentleman reflected on those who were the instigators in having the petitions circulated: he reflected on the individuals who had signed them, because a number of the signatures were those of ladies, who are not voters. I am only sorry those ladies are not voters; if they were, we would have a different class in this House.

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to object to the hon. gentleman's statement. I made no reflection whatever on the parties who signed the petitions.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. gentleman referred to the signatures, and stated they were not the signatures of electors, and, consequently, they should not be noticed by this Parliament.

Mr. SPROULE. No, I did not.

Mr. WATSON. I say the signatures of citizens of this country, even if they are not electors—and I believe every signature on the petitions is a *bonâ fide* signature—even if it is found that a majority of them are the signatures of the ladies of our land, they should be respected, and probably more respected than if they were the signatures of others. The hon. gentleman does not believe in the proposition to submit the question to a plébiscite. He is an opponent of temperance on all sides. He stands in well with the manufacturers. He believes there should be compensation. I should like to ask this House what guarantee I have in my business that legislation will not be passed to interfere with it. Men engaged in the liquor traffic have to seek a renewal of their licenses year after year, and they know they are liable to be shut off at the end of any year. They know they have to secure a very largely signed requisition at first to secure a license, and that a very small number of people can prevent the issuing of a license. If we have temperance legislation, I am not in favour of compensating the large distillers; and if I were in favour of compensation, it would be compensation to the smaller dealers who have invested all their means in their business. But we have had legislation within the last two years making changes in the Inland Revenue regulations which benefit the few distillers in Canada to the extent of millions of dollars; and these are the poor individuals whom the hon. gentleman who has just sat down wishes to have protected and compensated. Coming from the Province of Manitoba, a new province where the licensing system has not got as strong a hold as in the older provinces, I think it is a most opportune time to have a prohibitory liquor law passed. There is an agitation in the North-West Territories, which adjoin the county I represent, in favour of some change being made with respect to the disposal of liquor in those territories. We are supposed to have prohibition in the North-West Territories. Unfortunately, on account of the leniency of the Lieutenant Governor in dealing out permits, they have liquor there without any license, I am informed. I am well aware of the fact that many people have gone to Manitoba and the North-West for the purpose of breaking away from their associations in eastern Canada. We are now face to face with the question as to whether we are in favour of prohibition or not. I have no better evidence of that to offer you than the fact that the hon. gentleman who sits beside me (Mr. Davin), I venture to say, could not have been elected in West Assiniboia were it not for the pledges he made on the temperance question—I am satisfied that I am right in making that statement. By pledging himself on that question he secured a large majority of the electors of Western Assiniboia. We were told yesterday by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) that it would be impossible to carry out a prohibitory liquor law effectually for the reason that we had across the border to the south of us, a nation who dealt out liquor under a license system, who manufactured it, and we could not stop them. But I did not hear that hon. gentleman charge the Minister of Customs or his officers with allowing smuggled goods to come into this country. Why, we have people in this country who oppose the payment of customs duties on their goods just as strenuously as the temperance people oppose the liquor traffic, but the hon. gentleman did not charge the Minister of Customs with not being able to prevent smuggling of goods into this country across the boundary line. If they can prevent smuggling in other articles, why can they not do so just as well in the case of liquor? Now, reference was made by the hon. gentleman who last spoke to the very large delegation that waited on the Government to-day, as one of the reasons why this matter should not be discussed and disposed of to-night. Well, I thought that this delegation were here for the purpose of asking compensation from the Government for moneys paid by the different municipalities to assist the railways that had been taken out of the control of those municipalities, and I would like to know if that hon. gentleman is an advocate of paying these people the moneys that, I believe, should be refunded to them, seeing that he is in favour of compensating a few distillers who have made millions of money out of the pockets of the consumers of this liquor, who are generally the poorest people we have in the country. I think it would be in the interests of Canada to carry the motion introduced by the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson). So far as the amendment and the amendment to the amendment are concerned, I believe they are offered merely for the purpose of burking a vote on this bald question. I am in favour of expressing myself in this House, by my vote, in favour of the resolution introduced by the hon. member for Lanark. It seems to me that the hon. gentlemen who moved these side issues, for the purpose of shirking a square vote, are not sincere friends of prohibition. The hon. gentleman who moved the amendment to the amendment stated his reasons. Well, I believe that in that meeting in the Tower Room he opposed the proposed resolution of the hon. member for Lanark on the ground that it would embarrass the Government, and, therefore, he could not support it. However, we are proud to know that there are men in this House, and even on the opposite side—I refer to the hon. mover of this resolution—who, notwithstanding that it might embarrass the Government, are prepared to vote for this resolution. I am sorry there are not more hon. gentlemen opposite like him, who are willing to record a square vote for or against prohibition. Without detaining the House any further, I declare

my intention for voting for the resolution introduced by the hon. member for Lanark.

Mr. CHRISTIE. I desire to say a few words to define my position before recording my vote. I believe the question before the House is one of great practical importance to the prosperity and well-being of this country, and that great good would result from the adoption and enforcement of such a measure. We see that there is a strong public sentiment throughout the Dominion in favour of it. Petitions in favour of it have poured into this House and are pouring in still. I have had the pleasure of presenting several from my own county, from nearly all the religious denominations in that county, all asking for prohibition. I know that there are many good men and good women there who have been long labouring to promote the cause of temperance, giving freely of their time and means, trying to make the world a little better and a little brighter. They are anxiously looking for prohibition. They believe it is the only remedy that would prove effectual in staying the terrible evils which flow from intemperance, and that the time has now come when such a measure should be enacted. Many of us have read that startling book entitled "Darkest England and the Way Out." Now, I believe that here as in England, there is no way out of the evils of intemperance except by removing the cause, and striking at the root of the evil by wiping out the traffic. So long as the people of England expend nearly 140 million pounds sterling for drink, more than they spend for butter, and bread, and cheese, and milk, just so long will there be misery, wretchedness and ruin. There is no other way than prohibition out of the difficulty. Now, matters are not so bad, I think, in Canada, but we are travelling in the same direction, and in the same path. Our liquor bill is rising at an alarming rate. Just as our population increases, as our towns grow into cities, and our cities become crowded, the result will be the same. And it is not only the material interests of the country that would be promoted by prohibition, but I am fully convinced that it would contribute very largely to the health and longevity of our people. On this point I think there can be no diversity of opinion. We have a concensus of opinions from the leading medical men in Canada, in the United States and in Great Britain, all agreeing that total abstinence and prohibition would contribute largely to the health, happiness and well-being of our people. Those medical men have given their testimony in that direction, they have spoken out clearly and emphatically, and I think their testimony is worthy of consideration. I will not further trespass upon the time of the House, and will conclude by saying that I shall have great pleasure in recording my vote in favour of immediate prohibition.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) who moved the amendment to the amendment, had expressed the views which I understood him to entertain, in language so clear as that it could be understood by every friend of the temperance movement, I should have been disposed to vote in favour of his resolution. But on reading his resolution I find that it is couched in such language that it is very difficult to understand what the hon. gentleman really means. In the first place, the mover of the resolution puts one construction on its language, and the seconder of the resolution puts a different one. I myself have read the resolution carefully over two or three times, and am unable to put any construction at all upon it. I do not know what will be the effect of the passing of that resolution, and I certainly think that the Government will not be able to derive from the reading of it afterwards, any certain idea as to what the meaning of the House was. I do think that upon a question of this kind the House should be able to express some clear and definite opinion. We cannot ignore the agitation which has been going on for the past eight or ten years in this Dominion, and the expression which has been given to that agitation in the vast number of petitions which have been laid before this House. We know that in a great many districts, and ridings, and counties at the last election, the question was brought up, not for thorough discussion, I will frankly admit, but brought up incidentally, and by a side wind, so that very many of the candidates were seriously embarrassed by the introduction of this question as a side issue. But it seems to me that the question we have to decide is not the mere theoretical one as to whether prohibition in the abstract is a good or bad idea; the academic discussion of that question is hardly suited to this arena. We are called upon as a practical body of legislators to discuss, not so much the question of prohibition, or prohibition in the abstract, but the proposition stated in the forefront of the resolution moved by the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson), whether or not the time has arrived for giving effect to that principle in Canada. The hon. gentleman in his resolution says:

"That in the opinion of this House the time has arrived when it is expedient to prohibit the manufacture, importation or sale of intoxicating liquor for beverage purposes."

I believe it is admitted on all sides that unless public opinion is strong, unless there is a preponderating weight of public opinion in favour of the prohibition of the manufacture of intoxicating liquor, the passage of a law enacting that it shall not be manufactured or sold will not advance the cause the hon. gentleman has at heart, but will throw it back. It is no use to try and legislate in this direction, to pass a sumptuary law of this kind, unless you are thoroughly satisfied you have the mass of public opinion behind it. We have had a precedent, and we know what we are talking about. It will be remembered that the Scott Act was carried in different counties in the Dominion, and in many of them it was carried by a bare majority. Look at the record to-day. Is there a county in the Dominion where the Scott Act was carried by a bare majority where it is working favourably? Has it ever worked favourably except in counties where a vast proportion of public opinion was in its favour? We know it has not, and that it has proved a failure wherever it was carried by a bare majority. I think, therefore, the first question we have to ask ourselves is, has the time arrived for such legislation? In determining this question we must determine whether the majority of the electors of this country are favourable to the passage of such a law. The mere passage of the resolution or a law in furtherance of the resolution —and I appeal to the real temperance men to

support this idea—would not carry forward or advance the cause a single step, but rather would retard it and send it back. If a law were passed to-morrow, and proved a failure, it would throw back the temperance cause half a century. In this House some years ago, during the second or third session after I came here, I listened to a speech by the veteran temperance reformer, Sir Leonard Tilley, and the arguments and facts which he produced made a strong impression on my mind, and if not trespassing on the time of the House, I should like to read a paragraph or two from his speech. What did that hon. gentleman say? He said that in 1854 he was the leading promoter of a prohibitory Bill in the Province of New Brunswick; that the Legislature of New Brunswick had been flooded with petitions from the people of that province, praying for the passage of a prohibitory law; that an agitation had prevailed there during one or two years: that among those who had taken the forefront in that agitation were many good and worthy men who thought it was their duty to further by their voice and vote this new scheme for the promotion of social reform, and the result was that the Legislature of New Brunswick, acting upon the voice of public opinion, as they thought, expressed in the petitions presented at that time, passed the law. The result was, not that the temperance cause was promoted, not that those who signed the petitions advanced the cause, but within six weeks after the passage of the law, it was found that public opinion was opposed to it; the Lieutenant Governor of the province was called upon to submit the question to the people at the polls; the question was submitted, and an enormous majority of the people voted to repeal the law which six weeks before had been brought into force. What was the consequence? The consequence was, to use the words of this veteran temperance reformer, that temperance in the Province of New Brunswick was thrown back half a century. I should like to quote the argument of the hon. gentleman, which struck me at the time as a strong argument. Sir Leonard Tilley said:

"Never, since I have entered public life, have I voted, nor do I intend to vote, against the principle of prohibition. As early as 1855, I introduced into the Legislature of my own province one of the most stringent prohibitory Bills that was ever proposed in any legislature or parliament in the world. Previous to the introduction of that Bill, we had, as we thought, educated the people of New Brunswick to the point that such a law, if enacted, would be supported and sustained by the people. Reference was made by the hon. mover of this resolution to the number of petitions presented to the House of Commons in 1877: and, if my memory serves me, in the Province of New Brunswick, as far back as 1855, we had more signatures to petitions presented to the Legislature of that province in favour of prohibition than were signed to the petitions presented to this House from the whole Dominion in 1877. They were brought in the House in the size of rolls of carpet by the hon. members who presented them. We thought that we had educated the people of that province up to such a point that if a prohibitory law passed it would be enforced. We had three-fourths of the people of that province signing petitions in favour of prohibition. That law was passed by the Lower House by something like two-thirds majority, and it passed the Upper House by nearly the same majority; and it was passed because of the strong arguments and facts presented and because of the statistics we had collected as to the effect of the traffic in New Brunswick from 1852 to 1855, and which were so convincing that men who differed from us in opinion gave us their support and enabled us to carry the measure by the majority stated. For six weeks that law was enforced."

What followed? Prosecutions followed, appeals were made to the courts, chaos followed, public opinion changed round, and the people who voted for the law demanded its repeal, and the Legislature repealed the law. The conclusion drawn from these facts, and it is a conclusion I should like to impress on hon. members of this House, and it is the conclusion I have arrived at, at all events, is thus stated by Sir Leonard Tilley:

"Under the circumstances, and believing as I do now, that if public sentiment is not sufficiently educated to sustain a prohibition law, the passage would do harm instead of good, instead of abandoning anything by accepting the original resolution, even as amended, I hold that if this motion be carried the cause of prohibition will have made a great step in advance. I can understand the delicacy of an hon. gentleman voting against the last amendment as a temperance man and a prohibitionist, because, as such, he would seem inconsistent, and I noticed cheers when my name was called as voting against the immediate adoption of prohibition: but I did so, because I believe it is in the interest of temperance that we should not enact a law that will not be enforced. I speak with the experience I had thirty years ago, and have had ever since 1856. When the convention was held in Montreal, I was written to by one of the leading friends of temperance, asking my opinion. I was unable to be present, but I wrote a letter in reply, which letter Mr. Ross read at a convention held in Ottawa. What was the opinion I then expressed? I stated that if they decided to submit the proposal to the popular vote they should not suggest less than a three-fifths vote, because, if carried by a bare majority and without public sentiment behind it, the law would fail, and the cause of temperance would be damaged instead of benefited. That has been my conviction since 1855."

I think that the opinion of an hon. gentleman of the age and experience of Sir Leonard Tilley, a life-long temperance reformer, who passed a law with the aid of three-fourths of the New Brunswick Legislature in 1854, which was in force for six weeks, when the people who asked for it demanded its repeal, ought to have some weight with hon. members of this House in considering this question. What did the Dominion Alliance, a body for which I have the very highest respect, say with respect to this matter? It said: "We feel certain a very overwhelming majority of the electors of Canada are in favour of prohibition." I am of the opinion that if the majority of the people are in favour of prohibition, there is every reasonable possibility and probability of carrying the proposition. Hon. gentlemen who have equally as good an opportunity of forming an opinion deny that a majority, or anything like a majority, are in favour of it. That is the issue before us. How is it to be tested? Is it to be tested by assertion on one side and denial on the other? I think not. It seems to me that a resolution should have been proposed, and I intended to have proposed one if the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) had not intercepted me with his resolution, which I do not think meets the case, to the effect that the time had come, in view of agitation which had proceeded for so many years, when the question should be submitted fairly and squarely to the people at the polls on the direct issue of prohibition or no prohibition. It is said that it is un-English, that we have no precedent for it. Well, Sir, I am not aware that it is absolutely essential that we never should take any step in this new country unless we can show an English precedent for it, but we can show precedents in other countries, in Switzerland, as my hon. friend reminds me. I would appeal to the practical common sense of every gentleman of this House and ask him if he believes that any fair expression of public opinion can be had on this single question at a general election. Why, Sir, in the recent

elections in the province whence I come nothing was discussed there but the trade issue, and I believe the same was the case in every other constituency in the Maritime Provinces. At the last moment, just as we were about to go to the polls, the temperance people set before us a pledge to vote for prohibition. The question had not been discussed, the people had discussed another question which rightly or wrongly they considered of paramount importance, and I for one refused to give that pledge. I told them that if I came to Parliament I would be willing to remit the question to the people at the polls on a reference squarely and singly, not mixed up with party politics, not mixed up with the trade question and a thousand and one other questions which are before the people at a general election. I believe that the question of prohibition is of sufficient importance to justify us in doing that, and if the gentlemen who signed these petitions and this declaration believe that an overwhelming majority of the electors are in favour of it they cannot object to go to the people. If the people vote by an overwhelming majority in favour of prohibition I suppose the Government will be obliged to find means sooner or later to carry it out. There will be no doubt about the question then, and there will be no use making assertions and counter-assertions across the floor of the House because the vote will be our guide. If, on the contrary, the majority of the people vote against prohibition, it will be conclusive evidence that it would be against the interests of the country and against the interest of the temperance cause to adopt such a measure now. The hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) will himself admit that if the majority of the people are against this prohibitory legislation such an Act would not further his cause but delay it and throw it back for years. If the vote were against prohibition, the work of himself and his friends would be moral suasion, the educating of the people up to the point of belief that total prohibition was necessary. Until he gets such a majority as Sir Leonard Tilley said was essential to the carrying out of such a law, it is worse than waste of time to attempt to carry that measure through Parliament, knowing that it never will be enforced when it is passed. I will not discuss the general principle, but I do think it a pity—I was going to say a shame—that any attempt should be made by this Legislature, as is proposed by the amendment to the amendment, to evade this great question. The question will not bear evasion, the public opinion of an enormous number of people throughout the Dominion is such, that they are determined that we should pass upon the question, and so let us meet it like men. If we think the question should be remitted to the people at the polls so that they may give a direct vote on it, let us say so. Do not let us try to shirk or evade the question. If the opportunity is offered me I will vote against the amendment to the amendment, because it is not an honest one, because it does not give those who favour prohibition, and those who are against prohibition, an opportunity of expressing themselves at the polls. I will, if the opportunity offers, move a resolution which will meet this question fairly and squarely, and if that resolution is adopted it will be the duty of the Government to take such measures as will place the question before the people. Then if the people vote in favour of it, the Government will be obliged to carry out the principle in the manner which they believe to be best. If the people vote against it, the duty of the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) and his friends, will be to continue a campaign of education and moral suasion.

Mr. CURRAN. The House appears to be more anxious now to come to a conclusion on this question than they were a short time ago when the adjournment of the debate was moved. It is not my intention to discuss the question at any very great length, more particularly as I agree with a great portion of the remarks of the last speaker, excepting what he says concerning the amendment to the amendment. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) was perfectly justified in saying that he did not intend to discuss the merits of the principle of prohibition, for that question was not introduced by him. However, I do think that the House was entitled to a very thorough discussion on the merits of the question by those who brought it forward; a discussion not merely on the sentimental part of the question, not merely that part of it with which every one must agree who knows anything about the state of society in which we live. I do feel that it was the duty of those who promoted this resolution to have cast a great deal more light upon it than they have done, either upon this or upon any former occasion. We have had a great number of speeches on the floor of this House for a number of years past, all detailing the terrible effects of the abuse of intoxicating liquors. No one doubts that, and any one who would doubt it must have his eyes shut. We must be struck in the first place with the diversity of opinion that exists amongst the advocates of this measure. We have, first of all, those who are in favour of prohibition, pure and simple, and who think the time has come when a law prohibiting the manufacture, sale and importation of intoxicating liquors throughout the length and breadth of our country should be placed upon the Statute-book. On the other hand there are those who believe this also, but they disagree with their brethren in believing that if we have prohibition we ought also have compensation for those who are engaged in this traffic: some draw the line at compensating the manufacturers of intoxicating liquors, while others would go further and give the benefit of that compensation to those who have invested their money in liquors which they have purchased for the purposes of their trade. There are as many camps amongst the temperance men as it is possible to conceive. There are others whom I believe to be equally honest with those who are promoting prohibition, and although they are temperance men, and both by voice and example seek to promote total abstinence in the country, yet believe that prohibition would not prohibit, that it would retard the cause, that it is not the true principle to work upon, and they lay down a platform which is the result of years and years of earnest consideration, the first plank of which is that they do not believe that prohibition is the proper method to arrest the terrible effects of intemperance. These men believe that the liquor traffic should be regulated, that the number of licenses should be limited, that the traffic should be isolated from all other branches of trade, and they advocate that there should be a strict

analysis made of liquors offered for sale, either wholesale or retail, and that this analysis should be enforced by the officers of the law. I have met with gentlemen who are prohibitionists but who scout the idea of the analysis of liquors and the other planks of the platform just referred to, and who look upon the persons who advocate them as being almost as great enemies of the temperance cause as those who are directly in the other interest. And it is not uncommon to see those who are members of these moral suasion societies denounced by so-called temperance organs as the greatest enemies of the temperance cause. Now, for years and years we have had this subject before this House; but I would ask anyone who has listened to the speeches we have heard in Parliament, has there been the slightest deviation in the speeches made in this assembly and the speeches the same gentlemen have made in the schoolhouses and on platforms throughout the country? They have talked about the sentimental aspect of the subject, but they have never in their conventions or assemblies or reunions sat down with all the able men working with them, and taken up the practical objections which have been raised against the working of a prohibitory law. One would have imagined that in the course of all these years gentlemen like the hon. mover and seconder of this resolution and those who have supported them in this House, would have sat down to estimate not in general terms how much money society would save if we should do away with the liquor traffic, but they should have particularized: they should have shown where new avenues for trade, commerce and manufactures, that they prophesy will arise, are going to spring up. One hon. gentleman from Toronto summed up in a few words the terrible effects of intemperance. He said there were very few families who had not a relative, or at all events a friend, who was a victim of this terrible disease: but when he spoke of the distilleries and breweries being converted into manufactories of another kind, he never specified what kind of manufactories they would be. There was no plan promulgated. In fact, there seems to have been no study made of the question beyond that appeal to the sentiment of the people which must do good and cause many a young man and many an old man, too, to turn back from his evil ways; but so far from solving the question and meeting the objections which have been raised time and again with regard to revenue and otherwise, there has not been the first syllable expressed either in this debate or in any other that has taken place in Parliament on this subject ever since I have had the honour of a seat in this House. These gentlemen tell us that they are perfectly satisfied that public sentiment is with them, that the majority of the people are in favour of a prohibitory law being enacted without delay, despite all injurious consequences that may ensue to the business of the country. I do not think the leading minds of this country agree with that opinion. We had a moment ago an extract from a speech delivered by a leading Conservative, and an advocate of prohibition when a member of this House. On the other hand, on the question of the necessity of the people being educated up to a prohibitory liquor law, let me quote from an admirable speech delivered by the Hon. Edward Blake, a few years ago, in which, in the most conclusive manner, he showed that the public sentiment is not in favour of prohibition, that the education of the people has not reached that point, that they do not look upon the manufacture nor the drinking of intoxicating liquor as a crime, or sin, or reprehensible act. He went on to show that while a man who would commit a crime in the street, a theft or any other offence, would be immediately pounced upon by the first passer-by and handed over to the police, any number of people might go into an illicit shop by a side door, and although most of the passers-by would know that they were going to drink, there would be no attempt to stop them. Is there any man in this House who would go and lodge a complaint in such a case if we had a prohibitory law? I say there is not. The law would be a dead letter; you would have four-fifths of the people denouncing any man who would become an informer; it would be impossible for such a man to live in the community; and we would have enacted in this country all the terrible scenes which Sir Leonard Tilley described as having taken place in New Brunswick some years ago, when an attempt was made to enforce a law against the will of the majority, although a great many petitions had been presented in favour of it, and were said to represent the public sentiment, just as hon. gentlemen say the petitions presented in favour of this law represent the public sentiment now. Mr. Blake said that the work of educating public sentiment had not yet progressed far enough to ensure the carrying out of the law, and added:

> "Until progress is made in that, I am not of the opinion that Canada is ripe for prohibition. I do not believe, that the law if carried would in the present condition be useful or permanent. Therefore, I cannot honestly vote for prohibition now. I can give no pledge for such a vote at any definite time."

Have we any evidence that the sentiment of the people of Canada is different to-day from what it was when Mr. Blake spoke these words? On the contrary, what has taken place in connection with the Scott Act in many counties shows that public sentiment is in the very opposite direction. The hon. gentleman who spoke last says that the sub-amendment proposed here is one which does not satisfy him, because he does not think, from the cursory reading he has been able to give it, that it would bind the Government and direct them what to do. That is exactly the reason, because I had not time to study that amendment or give it more than a cursory reading, that I voted to-night for the adjournment, which would have given us an opportunity of fully studying and digesting the amendment and the sub-amendment. I take it the sub-amendment of my hon. friend means that an appeal shall be made to the people in order that they may determine by their votes whether or not they are in favour of the principle enunciated in the original motion. Its object, whether that be expressed in proper shape or not, is, I take it, to ascertain whether the time has arrived for enforcing prohibition. I do not think my hon. friend has, any more than the mover of this resolution, taken the proper course. I think the cart has been put before the horse. I think if there be any proposition before the House worthy of consideration, it is that embodied in the amendment of my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh) namely, that the information which should have been furnished by my hon. friend the mover

of this resolution and his colleagues who are advocating this measure, should be sought for and obtained and put in the hands not only of hon. members of this House but of the people before we can come to a decision. Let us have, first of all, a committee to find out what would be the effect of the legislation proposed, what would be the interests affected by it, how far-reaching would be those effects; and the information thereby obtained will be of service at a subsequent period when an appeal may be made to a people possessing a knowledge of all the facts. They will then be able to give an intelligent judgment, they will know how their interests will be affected, they will see whether it will be in their interests to strike down this traffic and everything connected with it, and whether the advantages to be derived from its abolition will more than counterbalance any injury that may result thereby to trade and commerce. When that information is obtained and the people have been consulted, this Parliament will know what to do. This Parliament will feel it had not obtained a snap verdict, but that the people had pronounced with a full knowledge of the subject in all its bearings; and should this Parliament then decide on prohibition, there will be no danger of our witnessing a revulsion of feeling in this Dominion such as took place in the Province of New Brunswick, when a law was passed before the people were ready for it. The people would feel that the great majority of their fellow-citizens had pronounced on the subject, and that it was the duty of all good men in the country to uphold the law which had been passed in obedience to the voice of the majority expressed after mature deliberation. That is the only course that can be logically followed; and if we now follow that course we will have the satisfaction of feeling assured that any law on this question that may be enacted by us will be supported by the people at large and not be a dead letter or a cause of turmoil and serious detriment to the country.

Mr. GILLIES. I rise to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. DEVLIN. I think it is proper that I should express my views on this question, representing, as I do, a county in which it has been considerably debated. We have before the House a direct resolution in favour of prohibition, also an amendment and a sub-amendment. In so far as I am personally concerned, silence might perhaps prove golden, whereas speech may only prove silver, still I do not feel justified in giving a silent vote. We have seen that a number of petitions have been laid upon the Table. I myself have presented some fifty-five or sixty, but when I come to look over one of them I must say it appears to me means have been employed to obtain signatures which perhaps should not have been adopted. For instance, the other day I presented a petition from the village of St. André Avelin in favour of a prohibitory law, and I found it was signed by the members of the regular Baptist church located in that village. Although I have had occasion to pass through that place several times, I never saw this Baptist church; and what is more, I am perfectly satisfied that some gentlemen who signed that petition were not members of the regular Baptist church. So that although I do not find fault with the petitions as a rule, which I did present, I cannot say that they fully represent public opinion in the county from which I have the honour to come. We were told by the last speaker that the Hon. Mr. Blake stated in this House some time ago that public opinion was not yet ripe for such a measure. It is quite possible that public opinion was not then ripe and might be now sufficiently matured. We are also informed that Sir Leonard Tilley held the same view. Well, I think this question can be very easily settled by the means proposed in the amendment which we are about to offer, and that is to refer the matter to the people. It cannot be denied that the resolution itself which has been presented by the hon. member for Lanark has opponents even among temperance people. They do not all see exactly as the hon. gentleman does. Of course we respect those who undertook the work of getting up the petitions which have been laid before this House. We know their work has been considerable, and that great efforts have been made by those heroic mothers, daughters and wives who have given to it so much time, ability and attention. We know that they have presented these petitions, and certainly their opinion is entitled to our respect. I ask, then, can we respect that opinion more than by referring this question to the electorate of the Dominion, and at as early a date as possible? If a prohibitory law shall ever be enforced in this country, it is possible it will not be entirely due to those who, upon public platforms, take a prominent part in the cause of temperance, but it will be due to the earnest efforts of those good ladies who have worked so hard and incessantly on behalf of that cause. They have brought this question before the House and they are determined to see it through, so that it might be just as well to face the matter now as at a later date. I listened with much pleasure and considerable attention to the very eloquent speech delivered by the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald). He drew our attention to the gravity of the case, and dwelt upon the ills attending intemperance. We are all perfectly agreed that intemperance is not productive of good, but it will be a difficult matter for any one to say that temperance is not a virtue. We know that temperance is a virtue if intemperance be a sin, and there are many in this country who are not prepared exactly to accept the opinions brought forward by the advocates of temperance. For instance, in my own county there are a very large number who favour the cause of prohibition, and on the other hand an almost equally large number who are opposed to it. Now, I was not sent here to vote upon that question. I was sent here to vote upon the trade question. I cannot conscientiously vote in favour of prohibition and say that in doing so I represent the views of my county: nor can I conscientiously vote against it and say that that vote will receive the favour of the overwhelming majority of the electorate of the County of Ottawa. It is a question for the electorate to decide, and I think we would be doing our duty to ourselves and to the electors of Canada, as well as to the great cause of temperance, by referring this subject to the people to decide upon at as early a date as possible. Now, I will not detain the House any longer, only to explain my vote upon the adjournment of the debate. I did not vote as I did because I was a

party man; not at all. I expect certainly to be able during the session to vote at times in favour of the Government, when the measures brought forward by the Government are such good measures that they will command my vote. You know, Mr. Speaker, that I represent a county which requires justice from the Government, and the doctrine which is being taught, and which no later than last Sunday I heard announced on a public platform by one who was closely connected with the Government, is that the only thing to do is to support the Government and get the Government favour. Perhaps my course, hitherto, has not been such as to warrant the Government in bestowing much favour upon me; but I wish to say that I am not voting against the amendment proposed by my hon. friend the member for the city of Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh) because it is brought forward by him—not at all; nor because it is one that may receive the favour of the Government. I know that there is much sense in that amendment and that it will command a large vote in this House: but still I think the House and the country have had ample time during the many years that have elapsed since this question was first brought forward, to study it carefully and fully, and I, therefore, feel the time has come for referring it to a vote of the people. Believing that this should be our course, I will with much pleasure vote in that sense when the amendment proposing it is brought forward, and against the amendment now before the House.

House divided on motion to adjourn debate (Mr. Gillies):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Adams,	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Baker,	Léger,
Barnard,	Lépine,
Bergeron,	Lippé,
Bergin,	Macdonald (Sir John),
Bowell,	Macdonald (King's),
Burns,	Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Cameron (Inverness),	Macdowall,
Carignan,	Mackintosh,
Carpenter,	McAlister,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McCarthy,
Cleveland,	McDonald (Victoria),
Coatsworth,	McDougald (Pictou),
Cochrane,	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Cockburn,	McKay,
Corby,	McLennan,
Costigan,	McLeod,
Craig,	Madill,
Curran,	Mara,
Daly,	Marshall,
Daoust,	Masson,
Davin,	Miller,
Davis,	Mills (Annapolis),
Denison,	Montague,
Desjardins (Hochelaga),	Ouimet,
Desjardins (L'Islet),	Patterson (Colchester),
Dewdney,	Pelletier,
Dickey,	Pope,
Dugas,	Prior,
Dupont,	Putnam,
Dyer,	Robillard,
Earle,	Roome,
Fairbairn,	Ross (Dundas),
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),	Ryckman,
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Sproule,
Foster,	Stairs,
Fréchette,	Stevenson,
Gillies,	Taylor,
Gordon,	Temple,
Haggart,	Thompson (Sir John),
Hazen,	Tupper,
Henderson,	Tyrwhitt,
Hodgins,	Wallace,
Hutchins,	Weldon,
Ingram,	White (Cardwell),
Ives,	White (Shelburne),
Joncas,	Wilmot,
Kaulbach,	Wood (Brockville),
Kirkpatrick,	Wood (Westmoreland).—98.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Gillmor,
Allison,	Godbout,
Amyot,	Grieve,
Armstrong,	Guay,
Bain,	Hargraft,
Barron,	Harwood,
Beausoleil,	Hyman,
Béchard,	Innes,
Beith,	Jamieson,
Bernier,	King,
Bowers,	Landerkin,
Bowman,	Lavergne,
Brodeur,	Leduc,
Brown (Chateauguay),	Lister,
Brown (Monck),	Macdonald (Huron),
Burdett,	McGregor,
Campbell,	McMullen,
Carroll,	Mignault,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Mills (Bothwell),
Casey,	Mousseau,
Charlton,	Mulock,
Chouette,	Murray,
Christie,	Paterson (Brant),
Colter,	Perry,
Davidson,	Proulx,
Davies,	Rider,
Dawson,	Rintret,
Delisle,	Rowand,
Devlin,	Sanborn,
Edgar,	Savard,
Fauvel,	Semple,
Featherson,	Somerville,
Flint,	Sutherland,
Forbes,	Tarte,
Fraser,	Trow,
Frémont,	Truax,
Gauthier,	Vaillancourt,
Geoffrion,	Watson,
German,	Welsh,
Gibson,	Yeo.—80.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. TROW. I notice that the member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) has not voted.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I paired with Mr. McNeill, otherwise I should have voted against the motion.

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

Motion agreed to: and House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 22nd May, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ADJOURNMENT—QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved:

That when this House adjourns to-day it shall remain adjourned till Tuesday next, at three o'clock, p.m.

Motion agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 52.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK moved:

That the 52nd Rule of this House be suspended so far as it respects the petition of Sir Donald Smith and others for an Act of incorporation under the name of the New York

and Ontario Bridge Company, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 60) respecting the Lake Erie, Essex and Detroit River Railway Company.—(Mr. Denison.)

Bill (No. 61) respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Carpenter.)

Bill (No. 62) to enable the Victoria and North American Railway Company to run a ferry between Becher Bay, in the Province of British Columbia, and a point in the Straits of Fuca, within the United States of America.—(Mr. Earle.)

Bill (No. 63) respecting the London and Port Stanley Railway Company.—(Mr. Hyman.)

Bill (No. 64) respecting the Berlin and Canadian Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Trow.)

Bill (No. 65) respecting the Montreal and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

Bill (No. 66) to confirm a lease made between the Guelph Junction Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Henderson.)

Bill No. 67) respecting the Victoria, Saanich and New Westminster Railway Company.—(Mr. Prior.)

Bill (No. 68) to amend the Act to incorporate the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Prior.)

Bill (No. 69) to confirm an indenture made between the New Brunswick Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 70) to incorporate the Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Company.—(Mr. German.)

Bill (No. 71) to incorporate the Brighton, Warkworth and Norwood Railway Company.—(Mr. Cochrane.)

Bill (No. 72) to incorporate the Peterborough, Sudbury and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 73) respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Sutherland.)

Bill (No. 75) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

C. P. R. CO.'S ACT OF 1889.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 74) further to amend the Canadian Pacific Railway Act of 1889.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Explain.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. This is to give them a right to issue some further debenture stock, and concerns the application of the stock. It also provides for the acquisition of the Souris Branch Line bonds, the acquisition of the bonds of the Columbia and Kootenay Railway Company, the Manitoba South-Western Railway Company, the Lake Temiscamingue Railway Company, and the construction of the Saskatoon and Saskatchewan Railway Company.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK.

PICTOU BANK.

Mr. McDOUGALD moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 76) to authorize and provide for the winding up of the Pictou Bank.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would enquire of the Finance Minister if we have any interest in that bank? I think they are slightly indebted to us.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think we have much live interest in it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A part of our assets, is it?

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ELECTON OF DEPUTY SPEAKER.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In the absence of Sir John A. Macdonald, I have much pleasure in moving, seconded by Mr. Chapleau, that Joseph G. H. Bergeron, member for the Electoral District of the County of Beauharnois, be appointed Chairman of Committees of the Whole House.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Chairman, the necessity of having a Deputy Speaker might very well, I think be questioned, but the House has settled and affirmed already its decision in favour of that office, and, therefore, I do not see any necessity for testing the sense of the House any longer on the policy. As to the choice of the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), I can only say, speaking not only personally but also on behalf of the Opposition, that we heartily concur in the selection offered. Personally, I certainly congratulate my hon. friend with great pleasure upon his accession to this office, and it is a pleasure for me to recollect that for a great many years I have been with him on terms of personal friendship. In matters not political we always agree, and it is still a greater pleasure for me to remember that sometimes in matters political we agree. I remember that on a most important occasion, a solemn occasion, he and I arraigned the Government for an act which I thought under the circumstances was cruel and unjustifiable. I think it is an indication, since the Government have now placed in his hands more power, that they have come to the conclusion that my hon. friend was right and they were wrong. I congratulate them on their repentance, late though it be. It is consoling to reflect on this additional evidence that not only in the next world but in this world virtue is rewarded.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I might take a different view from that presented by the leader of the Opposition in the observation which he has just offered; but, at all events, he will agree with me that this might be further testimony that the important position of Deputy Speaker, which implies the impartiality of the hon. gentleman occupying that position, will be recognized, not only by this side of the House, but by hon. gentlemen opposite, and that my hon. friend's independence fits him for the position he has been selected to occupy.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Seeing there is still a difference on the question referred to between the hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. Secretary of State as to the propriety of the course taken by the hon. member who is named for this office.

it will be interesting now to know with which hon. gentleman the hon. member agrees.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. One says virtue is rewarded, and the other one might say that it is always well to repent.

Motion agreed to.

ONTARIO MUNICIPALITIES' DEPUTATION.

Mr. TROW. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to bring a matter before the House. A large and influential deputation of representative men, wardens, reeves of municipalities and municipal officers, numbering one hundred and fifty, from various parts of Ontario, and forming one of the best informed deputations that ever visited the Capital, appeared here yesterday with respect to a matter connected with their municipalities, asking for a refund or for money compensation in return for money expended by their municipalities for railway purposes. I notice the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) introduced the deputation very politely to the Minister; and I heard from many of the deputation that they were treated by the leader of the Government, and also by the Minister of Finance, with the greatest courtesy, and they were perfectly satisfied with what had been said to them by the members of the Government. Yet I notice to-day in the Montreal *Gazette* an article headed: "A Treasury Raid Balked.—The Ontario Municipalities' Claims for the Refund of Bonuses.—Plain Talk by Sir John, who tells the Raiders that their demands are absurd and unreasonable." I understand the First Minister told the delegates nothing of the kind; but treated them, or at least a dozen of them told me so, with the greatest degree of courtesy. I merely mention this because it is unfortunate there should appear in the press of the country such very absurd and unguarded expressions.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Perhaps I may be permitted to say, in answer to the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Trow), that I am now attending only to my legislative duties, and that during the session I have no connection with the *Gazette*. I regret very much as he can the unfortunate and, I think, the unguarded head line which appears above the report, a head line that is not borne out by the report itself. For my part I may be permitted to disclaim responsibility for anything that appears in that journal during the session, and to add that I was not aware any such language would appear.

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS—TRANSLATION.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Before proceeding with the Orders of the Day, I would desire to call the attention of the House, especially the attention of the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne), to some remarks made by that hon. gentleman, and which will be found in *Hansard* of May 14, which remarks convey an accusation against one of the officers of the House, that is unjust, and I am sure, after the matter has been brought to the attention of the hon. gentleman, he will at once declare his charge was not warranted. I find the following in *Hansard*:

"M. le Président, avant de passer à l'ordre du jour, je désire attirer votre attention et l'attention de cette chambre sur la manière dont les procès-verbaux et les procédés en général de cette chambre sont traduits. Je n'ai pas l'occasion de me lever souvent dans cette chambre, mais en regardant la traduction des propositions que j'ai pu faire quelque fois, ou des discours que j'ai pu prononcer, je me suis toujours aperçu qu'elle ne rendait pas l'idée que j'avais eu l'intention d'exprimer. J'ai toujours cherché à parler le langage de la majorité afin d'être mieux compris, mais la traduction de ce que j'ai dit n'a aucun bon sens, et s'il fallait envoyer cette traduction à quelqu'un qui connait un peu le français, je passerais pour ridicule si l'on supposait que j'ai prononcé ces paroles dans ma langue maternelle. Ainsi, pour donner un exemple de cette traduction, je vais prendre l'interpellation que j'ai faite aujourd'hui. J'ai posé tout à l'heure au gouvernement une question qui se lit comme suit: 'whether the Government is aware of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company refusing to operate the L'Avenir Branch of their line formerly known as the South Eastern Railway.' On a traduit les mots 'L'Avenir Branch of their line' par les mots 'l'embranchement sur L'Avenir de sa ligne'

"Eh bien! M. le Président, c'est simplement ridicule; et ce n'est pas la première fois que je remarque de semblables erreurs."

The hon. gentleman asked in his notice of motion whether the Government was aware the Canadian Pacific Railway was refusing to operate the L'Avenir Branch of their line, formerly known as the South-Eastern Railway. The hon. gentleman said this had been translated into French by these words: "L'embranchement sur L'Avenir de sa ligne comme sous le nom de ligne du 'South Eastern.'" My hon. friend said this was a ridiculous and improper translation. I must tell him that, so far as I know, and I think I am well informed, the translation was a very proper one; and the only French translation that could be given of the motion as it was prepared. I will refer the hon. member to the reports of the French Railways, where a branch has been translated as "embranchement sur tel point." If my hon. friend wishes it I will quote him: "La Grande Encyclopédie" under the word Canada, vol. VIII, page 1170, col. 2, where the expression: branch line of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway respectively is used as follows: "avec embranchement sur Québec et sur Montréal." I refer my hon. friend also to the dictionary of P. Larousse, art. "Chemins de fer," page 1131 and 1133, col. 4. Also to the following technical works and authors: "Annales des Ponts et Chaussées; Vallée, Delafontaine, Perdonnet, Jacqmin; "Portefeuille de l'Ingénieur," and other authorities, where the words "embranchement sur" is always used when a railway branch to a certain locality is spoken of. I should not have alluded to this matter, which is comparatively a very small one, except that it stands in our debates. I hold in my hand a newspaper from Quebec which says that the translations are very peculiar and absurd, and that there is no means of getting the work better done because it is done under higher authority, namely, those who control the House and the translation department. This is unjust to the painstaking officer who has charge of the translation of the Votes and Proceedings of the House. I am sure that, having heard my observations, my hon. friend (Mr. Lavergne) will be the first one to see his mistake. It is true that the translation may have appeared inaccurate on account of the word "L'Avenir," which is the name of a village in Drummond and Arthabaska, (having been named after a newspaper edited by L'Enfant Terrible, Mr. Dorion, a former member for Drummond and Arthabaska.)" The word L'Avenir means "future,"

and the translation would look like "a branch in the future." It is not our fault, however, that the name of the parish lends itself to a *jeu de mots*. The translation is not only correct in French, but it is the only translation that could be given.

Mr. LAVERGNE. I am certainly ready to apologize if I have acted wrongly in this matter, but, as regards the construction of the sentence in French, I maintain my opinion. I advised the gentleman who made that translation to correct it, but he would not correct it, and did not correct it. I told him I did not pretend to be a linguist, but I thought that the question construed in that form would not be understood, and would not serve the purpose I had in view. He evidently was not willing to correct it, taking the ground that he was right and he would stick to it. I may mention that last year faults occurred in the translation which could not be defended on any grounds. If I had had a few days' notice that the Minister intended to bring up this matter, I would be prepared to support by proof what I said the other day, and we might have been able to settle the matter between ourselves. I must say, however, that I have nothing to take back.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I beg to remind my hon. friend that I did not make my remarks in any spirit of hostility, but only to come to his assistance, and to prevent leaving on the records of this House a remark that was not warranted. I am not myself a great grammarian, but I know the expression was correct and should not have been altered.

Mr. LAVERGNE. I may also point out that my complaint was justified because the word "formerly" was altogether omitted in the translation.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That is another thing.

Mr. LAVERGNE. When I brought that to the notice of the translator it was corrected the next day. The name "L'Avenir" was also badly written.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That is the fault of the printer and not of the translator.

THE POWERS OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the Government Orders are called, I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Finance, and also of the Minister of Justice, to a matter which I find alluded to on page 14 of the Auditor General's Report, and which is of some importance to the administration of that Department. It is in the form of a letter addressed to the Minister of Finance, but it involves a legal question which, I presume, has been brought under the attention of the Minister of Justice. I may state to the House that our intention, when this Audit Act was created, was to make the Auditor General as far as possible independent of all other Departments, and, as the House is aware, every precaution in this direction was taken, and the Auditor General holds office under a tenure similar, if I remember aright, to that under which office is held by judges of the Crown. For the purpose of enabling him the better to discharge his duties, the control of the officers within the Department was expressly given to him. It was given in the original Act, which was passed under the Government of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie), introduced, I think, by myself, and it was confirmed again under the Act of 1885. From this letter I refer to, it would appear that doubt is now thrown on the question whether the Auditor General has power to promote within his Department, and that doubt, as I read the letter, arises from some words having been left out in the consolidation of the statutes which took place some two or three years ago. The matter was never mooted in Parliament; if it had been, I think the sense of the House would have been as in 1885 and on previous occasions, that this power had better be left in the hands of the Auditor General. I would be glad to know from the Minister of Justice in the first place, whether the law has been so altered as to deprive the Auditor General of the power to promote? And I would like to know from himself or the hon. Minister of Finance, if the law has been so altered, whether the Government intends to restore this power to the Auditor General? I think it is a power which ought not to have been taken away without the attention of Parliament having been expressly called to it, and it is perfectly clear the attention of Parliament has not been called to it. The Auditor General, in this letter to which I refer, appears to think it was an accidental change, but there is no doubt it is a change of some moment, and I think, if made at all, it should have been made only after full notice to the House, whose servant the Auditor General is in a very special sense.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. On the spur of the moment I am hardly in a position to say that the law has been altered in the direction the hon. member for South Oxford indicates; but I am able to say, from an examination of the subject which took place when the Auditor General wrote this letter and conferred with me in regard to it, that the law does not now authorize him to make promotions, and I hesitate to say that it was changed in that regard, because I am not sure that the original Act confers that power. But it is a full answer to one part of the hon. gentleman's question, to say that the present state of the law does not permit the Auditor General to promote without the authority of the Governor in Council. I understand that the question, so far as its practical importance is concerned, has been disposed of. The Auditor wrote this letter with regard to certain promotions which, according to his opinion, he was given the power to make by Parliament having, in the first place, voted the salaries to admit of their being made. The Governor in Council having changed the theoretical organization and sanctioned the promotions, the practical difficulty has been in that way disposed of; but the fact is, as I have intimated, that the statute as it now stands does not confer that power upon the Auditor. I think it very likely that the change did occur, as the hon. gentleman understands it to have occurred, in the revision of the statutes. Some alteration in that regard was made at that time. The revisers, so far as I can ascertain, were under the impression that the law even as revised would continue to confer that power on the Auditor General; such, I think, however, is clearly not the case. In moving the adoption of the Revised Statutes, I was certainly under the impression that the revisers had simply consolidated and harmonized the statutes, and that there were no alterations made of any importance whatever; otherwise the attention of Parliament

must have been called to the fact, and any alterations of a substantial character would have been made the subject of a substantive act. The revision was scrutinized, as the hon. gentleman will remember, by a committee which sat on the subject a good while and examined every alteration that was made; but this alteration seems to have escaped their attention. Whether or not it might be desirable to introduce an Act to give the Auditor power to make promotions in his Department requires some consideration. The statute relating to the Civil Service, I think, undoubtedly gives the Ministerial head of each Department power to make promotions from time to time. The Auditor claims that from analogy he is the head of his Department, and should have the like power; as a matter of fact, however, the power of promotion is never exercised by the Minister, but every appointment to the Civil Service, and every promotion is made by the Governor in Council. First of all comes the vote of Parliament creating the office, and then comes the Order in Council to enable the appointment to be made; and even the recommendation for a promotion comes to the Council itself. It may be a subject for careful consideration whether the power of promotion should be conferred on the Auditor General which, although theoretically now vested in the heads of the other Departments, is entirely disused.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would just say, in answer to the hon. Minister of Justice, that the matter was very fully considered, as he will see, if he looks at the Debates at the time the Audit Office was created; and after full consideration it was decided in the case of that particular office that, looking at its peculiar functions, it was desirable that the Auditor General should have full power. The words in clause 15 are these:

"The Auditor General shall have power to promote, suspend or remove any of the officers, clerks or others, employed therein."

As to the rules, regulations and forms which he may use, these must be approved by the Treasury Board. Now, if the Government thought fit to alter that law, that was for them to decide; but I think it ought not to have been altered, and in that the hon. Minister appears to agree with me, without having been the subject of a specific act of the House; and it also appears to me that if by accident it was altered from the law of 1878, which I understood was confirmed by the law of 1885, action should be taken to put it back, unless the Government were of opinion that the law should be formally altered.

SUPPLY—ENQUIRY FOR PAPERS.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. EDGAR. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to have to bring up again the subject, which I mentioned here last Monday, of the non-production by a Department of the Government of papers which have been ordered by the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and for which, as a member of that Committee, I have been making search in the office of the clerk of the Committee, where they were to be brought. The Committee a week ago to-day made an order for the production by the Department of Public Works or other Departments of the Government, of papers connected with some half-dozen different public contracts or matters that were under the investigation of that Committee. On the same day an order was made for the production by the Quebec Harbour Commissioners of papers in their control relating to some of those matters. Strange to say, the Quebec Harbour Commissioners, although at a great distance, have managed to send their secretary up here with the papers, which were in the Committee room yesterday for the inspection of the members of the Committee. Another Department of the Government has sent the Committee some other papers, but we are without a single document from the Department of Public Works. Now, if there is any Department in the Government that should be vigilant in satisfying the requirements of the Committee, it is the Department of Public Works. The hon. the Minister of Public Works, when I brought this matter up before, said the motion was a general one and not divided. Well, there were half a dozen different contracts mentioned in it, and surely the hon. Minister cannot pretend that the Committee expected he would not bring down any papers until every paper required could be procured and tabulated and arranged. Should such a course be followed, we may have to wait until the end of the session, and I do not think the House or the Committee would be satisfied to wait until then. No corporation or individual would have dared to treat the order of the Committee as it has been treated by the Department of Public Works. If any desire existed on the part of the Department to furnish the papers, some of them could have been laid before the Committee before this, and the hands of the Committee would not be tied as they are. The session, I am sure, will be prolonged if this delay continues, because I do not think its business will be brought to a close until the work of the Committee has also reached its conclusion; and the longer the production of these papers is delayed, the longer the investigations of the Committee will take, and the longer will the session be prolonged. Surely, if the hon. Minister of Public Works does not deem this matter of sufficient importance to save us this delay, some of his colleagues or his leader will. At any rate, on the next occasion the House meets, if the papers are not brought down, I shall certainly in some way test the opinion of the House as to the method followed by the Department in its disregard of the order of the Committee.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If the hon. gentleman had only asked me whether I could give some information to the House concerning these papers, he would have been saved the trouble of making the speech he did.

Mr. EDGAR. I made the enquiry from the Clerk of the Committee.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman enquired the other day, and I gave him the only answer I could that day. The Committee gave their order on Friday; they sent their order to the Public Works Department on Saturday, and it was on Tuesday, at three o'clock, that the hon. gentleman put his question, or one day and a-half after the order had been received by the Department. When the hon. gentleman sees the number of documents which have to be brought down in answer to the order, he will see that the Department could not take less time than it has taken to

produce them. Every day, I urge the Deputy head of my Department, to hasten the collection of papers, and the copying of such documents as could not be brought down otherwise. He told me he would do so, and gave me a statement then, which I asked him to put in writing, so that I might read it to the House. His statement is as follows:—

"DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS,
"OTTAWA, 21st May, 1891,

"The Hon. Sir HECTOR L. LANGEVIN, K.C.M.G., C.B.,
"Minister of Public Works.

"SIR,—With reference to the production of the papers called for by the Committee on Privileges and Elections covering correspondence, plans, &c., respecting works at Quebec Harbour, Lévis and Esquimalt Graving Docks, I beg to state that since the letter of the clerk of said Committee was placed in my hands for action, I have caused searches to be made at once for the papers, which searches are now being pushed without loss of time under my personal supervision. You will kindly note that such correspondence dates back to 1877, and can only be found and put together by a careful examination of all the books and journals of this Department since that time, and that the work in question, in order to be complete, must necessarily take some time. I expect to be in a position to send the first instalment of papers to-morrow afternoon (Friday) and the balance next day or Monday next."

With reference to the production of the papers called for by the Committee, the hon. gentleman will see that no time has been lost in bringing them down. For example, we could not cut up the books of the Department, but have to get copies made of the portions required, because the books are wanted for the daily work of the Department. All we could do has been done.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not think the hon. gentleman's explanations are at all satisfactory. The hon. gentleman appears to me not to realize the gravity of the enquiry now pending with reference to these charges preferred by an hon. gentleman in this House. The hon. gentleman knows that when these charges were made as soon as the Committee met, the gentleman who made them stated explicitly that in order to prove them it was absolutely essential a number of public documents under the control of the Minister of Public Works should be put in the hands of the Committee. Now, if the hon. Minister was unable to procure all the vouchers and documents required, he certainly was able to procure some of them. These charges distinctly refer to several specific alleged offences. The hon. Minister knows they refer to the Quebec graving dock, the Lévis graving dock and the graving dock at Esquimalt, B.C. The papers relating to these are not at all mixed together, and those relating to each dock could be brought down separately, so that some progress might be made by the Committee. The hon. Minister of Public Works does not appear to me to appreciate the gravity of these proceedings at all. And I must protest in the very strongest language I can use against serious charges such as have been made against a Minister of the Crown, amounting to high crimes and misdemeanours, being treated in this off-hand manner. I do not suppose that in the history of this Parliament charges so grave were ever preferred before by any hon. member of this House against a Minister of the Crown; and I cannot conceive, when charges of such a serious character are preferred, that, I will not say such negligence, but such carelessness and inattention should be shown in respect of them, as has been shown, with the consent of hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, by the Minister implicated. The hon. Minister seems to think the only charge is that against an employé of his Department, but a charge of a most serious nature has been preferred against the hon. Minister himself. I do not think that in the history of parliamentary institutions a charge of such a grave character ever was preferred against a Minister of the Crown, namely, that certain members of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. paid and caused to be paid large sums of money to the hon. the Minister of Public Works out of the proceeds of their public contracts, and that entries of the said payments were made in the books of that firm. The charges are such as, if proved to be true in whole or in part, will necessitate the hon. gentleman stepping down and out from the high position he occupies and retiring in disgrace. And in what position do we stand here to-day? We stand here to-day hoping that the hon. gentleman's innocence will be proved, but I am bound to say that the hon. gentleman has taken a course which is not calculated to promote that belief. The hon. gentleman took the responsibility of reading, from his seat in this House, his answer to that charge, but did not take the responsibility of denying that it is true. He does not deny that he received the money; he does not deny that he received it at the times and in the manner charged; he does not deny that he received it in his capacity of Minister of Public Works; but he simply denies that he received it for his own personal use and benefit. And I say that a denial of that most serious charge, made in that lame, and halting, and qualified manner, puts the matter before this House in such a position as to throw the responsibility upon the hon. gentleman and upon his colleagues of seeing that greater promptness is exhibited in the production of the documents required. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman himself did not take care, by his own personal orders, that the documents should be brought down the very next day. He cannot have been unaware that these charges, although not formally and officially preferred, had been hanging in the air for some time. He could not have been unaware that the hon. gentleman who took the responsibility of publishing them in the public press proposed to make the charge formally against him, and, although I would be the last to say that a Minister of the Crown is bound officially to notice every charge made against him in the public press, still, when a charge of the kind made against the Minister of Public Works in the public press, is renewed on his responsibity by a member of this House against a Minister of the Crown, I say it behooves him to take steps to show that his conduct is pure and his skirts are clear. When, still further, an hon. member says he requires documents in connection with the charge against the Minister which are under the custody of the hon. gentleman himself, in order to prove the charge, I say that his duty, his stern duty, his uncompromising duty, is to give up every other business which might take his attention and to devote his mind to the production of these documents; provided only he did not feel inclined to accept the suggestion which was already made from this side of the House, to relieve himself of any further control of these documents, and to hand them over to one of his colleagues. If the hon. gentleman had taken that course, and one of

his colleagues who was not charged in this way had said he was devoting all his time in order to bring down these documents, the House might have been satisfied. I am only speaking my own mind in this matter, but I say that I am not satisfied. I believe these charges are being treated in a very light way, and that the gravity of them is not appreciated by the hon. gentleman. Certainly the course which the hon. gentleman takes is not such as to lead us to assume that innocence on his part which we would be otherwise glad to do.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Department of Public Works..... $47,607.50

Mr. DEVLIN. Does that item cover a salary of $1,200 for Mr. Horace Talbot, who is employed in the Department, and resides, I believe, at Gatineau Point?

Mr. FOSTER. This is not for the outside service.

Mr. DEVLIN. He is in the inside service. I find by the Auditor General's Report that Horace Talbot was paid a salary of $1,200 for twelve months up to the 30th June last. I suppose that amount comes under this heading?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; his salary is included in this vote.

Mr. DEVLIN. Might I ask what are his occupations?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. He is one of the clerks in the Department.

Mr. DEVLIN. And I suppose he has been employed for several years?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. DEVLIN. I do not want to make any special charge, but I do say that this employé of the Government, instead of discharging the duties for which he is paid, is generally found during an election time upon the public platform; and I call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact that this same gentleman waged incessant warfare against us in the County of Ottawa, not only during the last election but during the local election in May and June last. I do not think it fair that we should pay salaries to officials who are away from their offices for four, five and six weeks at a time. I have been the victim in the County of Ottawa of this kind of work. It is known that the employés of the Departments have been allowed to go out into that county and do all they could against the Liberal candidates. When questioned regarding this matter, they stated previous to the local election that they had tendered their resignation to the Minister of Public Works. We were somewhat astonished to find the same gentlemen in the Dominion election, and we asked if they had been re-appointed after the local election. The answer was, "yes." Then, what are you doing here now? "Oh, we have resigned again," was the reply. Some time ago fault was found with the conduct of Messrs. Poirier and Tremblay, and they were dismissed because they had actively interfered in a political fight when they were officers of this House; but here are employés of the Government who go out day after day, evening after evening, and are allowed to be absent from their offices for weeks at a time, receiving their pay during that time, and they are not treating candidates in a gentleman-like way. I do not think it is fair that we should be asked to vote such sums of money to these men. The gentleman to whom I have alluded was not only actively engaged in the County of Ottawa, but I believe he was in Sherbrooke, and also in the County of Richelieu working for the Minister of Public Works himself; and it is said that his name was mentioned as a candidate in the County of Montmagny. This is the work we have to put up with, and yet, if an employé known to have Liberal views were to go out at all to take part in a contest, he would be summarily dismissed. I think we should have fair-play in this matter, and that the Minister of Public Works should explain the conduct of these employés.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister has heard the statement of my hon. friend (Mr. Devlin), and I notice that this same Horace Talbot was paid twelve months full salary up to the 30th June, which covers a part of the time my hon. friend refers to. If that is so, if he has received twelve months' pay for services rendered to the people only during a portion of that time, the Minister is bound to explain why leave of absence was granted to him to stump the country, either in the interests of the candidates for the Local Legislature or in his own interests. There is no reduction made in his pay for absence on special service. It is possible that we may find that this gentleman was also compensated in other ways. I would recommend my hon. friend to look carefully into the list of those who are receiving double pay to see whether the name of Mr. Horace Talbot figures there. In any case, I submit that the Minister of Public Works is bound to offer some explanation of the reasons which induced him to send the officers of his Department to electioneer for the benefit of the local candidates during the late provincial elections.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I was not aware that Mr. Talbot had interfered in the elections, as the hon. gentleman says he has. I understand that Mr. Talbot resides at Gatineau Point, and being a resident of the County of Ottawa, he may have taken part in the elections. But, of course, he was not sent by me or by my Department. Whether he spoke or took any part in the elections, I do not personally know.

Mr. DEVLIN. He certainly did take part in the election; he spoke on a public platform on the 3rd day of March last, two days before the election—spoke bitterly. He was not only there, but he was in the County of Richelieu taking part, I understand, in the election; he was certainly in the County of Montmagny. Another one whose name I may mention is Mr. Chas. Leduc, who, in the month of May last, and the latter part of June, was absent three or four weeks, taking part in the local election in the County of Ottawa, and he was able to go from his office here and proceed to Maniwaki, 100 miles, and returning from there, to come down to the lower end of the county and in fact stump it from one end to the other, to interfere actively in the election, notwithstanding that previous to that time, and since that time, he has been an employé of one of the Departments. We have got to put up with his conduct, but if one of our own friends were to do the same thing, he would be summarily dismissed. The state of affairs now

is such that our friends in the service are actually afraid to say for whom they might vote.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the subject is deserving of the serious consideration of the House. We have adopted here, to a very large extent, the English practice of permanent officials in the public service. Now, it is of the first consequence, if that system is to be maintained in this country, that those officials should abstain from actual participation in the political affairs of the country. We would not tolerate for a moment any active canvassing on the part of the judges of any of our courts, and it is just as necessary that those who are employed in the political service of the country, and who are paid by moneys that are taken from all classes of the population, should be equally neutral in politics. It is impossible that a public official can be an active politician and at the same time a faithful official. A man who will take the public platform in favour of the Ministry by whom he is employed, is an official who will intrigue against his political opponents, should they be placed in charge of the Administration; and so it will come to this, that the leaders of any party who may take charge of the Government of the country for the time being, in order to be assured of faithful public service, will find it necessary to dismiss from office all those who are politically opposed to them. So you will have the rule that to the victors belong the spoils, and that there must be a change of officials in every department of government with every change of administration. Now, Sir, these men were paid for a certain public service; they are required to undergo an examination; they are appointed in consequence of personal qualification to discharge certain duties, and if a Minister of the Crown takes an official out of his Department and sends him away for a month or six weeks to engage actively in canvassing the country, at the same time this official is receiving his salary from the public treasury, it is clear either that there must be a larger number of persons employed in order efficiently to carry on the Administration, or that there must be great neglect of the public service. It does seem to me that we must take the opinion of the House on the question, and say whether it shall be open to the Administration to enlist men from the public Departments of the country, who are receiving salaries out of the public treasury, to engage in political canvassing as the heads of a party. I do not think that should be tolerated. It is clear from the statement made by the hon. member for Ottawa County, that this is a practice which prevails, at all events, in the Department of Public Works. We shall no doubt learn, before these Estimates are voted, how far this practice obtains in other Departments of the public service.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend has laid down quite correctly, I think, the constitutional rule that prevails in England. I have myself always believed that it would be in the interest of the public service that civil servants should not vote; that is my individual opinion, but I am aware that the House, on two or three occasions, has pronounced against it. In any case, I am clear on this point, that no public servant ought to be allowed to do more than vote. I would not in the slightest degree excuse a public servant who interfered on our side, any more than I would the public servant who interfered in behalf of hon. gentlemen opposite. My hon. friend is perfectly right in stating that, if this kind of thing is permitted, or is winked at, or is not punished, by hon. gentlemen opposite, their friends will only have them to blame if, in the event of any change of Government, extremely sweeping alterations should be found necessary to be made in the Civil Service. I have myself always been extremely adverse to introducing what is known as the American system, holding that it results in greater mischief to the public service. But it is absolutely necessary, if this is to be avoided, that cases like this should not be permitted to occur. I think my hon. friend stated that this gentleman, Mr. Horace Talbot, has been habitually and systematically in the habit of interfering with elections.

Mr. DEVLIN. He is only one of several.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No doubt of that. This gentleman has been receiving money from the public service, and he has been using it for purposes which were never contemplated when the grant was made—at least, never contemplated, as we must suppose, by the House. There is another reason. If a Minister of the Crown chooses to put himself under obligations of a political kind to an officer of his Department, everybody knows that that gentleman becomes, to a certain extent, his master's master; everybody knows that promotion in such cases will go by favour, not by merit; and it very often happens that this person who has performed political services for the Administration, establishes claims which render it perfectly easy for him to neglect his duties. I have heard of a good many cases in which that has been done, and in which the Minister has been tongue-tied, has been unable to act, because he had seen fit, on various occasions, to ask one of his subordinates to interfere in election contests. Whether that has been the case, what salary Mr. Talbot is receiving, what his grade of promotion, etc., my hon. friend may, perhaps, find it necessary to enquire. But there is no doubt that you will assuredly pave the way for the introduction of the American system, and for the dismissal of a great number of officers, in the event of a change of Government, if this kind of thing is permitted to go on, and to go unpunished.

The CHAIRMAN. Shall the resolution be adopted?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; it is not carried. I am not going to waste any more time on Mr. Horace Talbot at the present moment. I observe that in course of the late discussion, at which I was not able to assist myself, that a question was raised as to the Chief Engineer of Public Works, Mr. Perley. I desire to know whether Mr. Perley has been suspended or whether he still continues to act in this Department?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. He has not been suspended and he still continues to act as Chief Engineer.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is exceedingly improper that we should be asked to pass this item to pay Mr. Perley's salary, and allow him to remain in the position he now occupies. It appears to me, from the course adopted by the Government, that a very grave question arises, and it is this, whether Mr. Perley is chief in command, and whether the

Minister under whom he serves, dare dismiss him under the circumstances, or not. That is the conclusion to which anyone must arrive. Very serious charges have been made; they have been preferred by an hon. member in his place in Parliament. When the resolution was before the House, three or four days ago, a very extended discussion took place in regard to it, and in the midst of the discussion the First Minister asked for an adjournment. The Opposition were quite justified in coming to the conclusion that when the item was again reached the Government would be able to announce they had suspended Mr. Perley, and the House would then be asked to pass the item. We have reached the item, but we are in precisely the same position as we were before. No change has been made, notwithstanding the very pronounced opposition in the House to passing the item under the existing circumstances, and in view of the very grave charges that stand recorded against that man by a member of this House; and yet the Government come before the House, under the same conditions as then existed, and ask its consent to the passing of the item. It is not showing proper courtesy, to say nothing more, to the Opposition to ask hon. members to consent to it. This is a very grave question, and it is one which the Opposition have a perfect right to discuss and criticize thoroughly, together with the course which the Government seem determined to pursue. A very serious question has also been brought forward by my hon. friend near me, with regard to the active efforts put forward by civil servants in opposing him in his constituency. This practice is carried out to a very considerable extent. On the discussion of another item some days ago, when the Minister of Finance asked for an increase of $200 to the salary of an official, it was pointed out by another hon. gentleman that the civil servant was down in a constituency, I believe in the constituency of the Minister of Finance, discharging very important duties in his behalf at the late election. No doubt the $200 increase of salary has been added as a thank-offering for the earnest, devoted and zealous efforts put forward to secure the Minister's return. And we have the same practice going on from one Department to another. We have examples of civil servants drawing, not the money of the Government, but the money of the people, the money of Reformers as well as Conservatives, pocketing round salaries each year, and then having the daring to go into constituencies and oppose the return of men brought out to represent the people. I repeat that it is extremely discourteous to ask the Opposition, in face of all the charges made against Mr. Perley, in face of the fact that he stands under a cloud next to the Minister of Public Works himself, to pass this item and to consent to the passage of this item of $4,000 to keep this man in his place and continue him in the public service notwithstanding the charges against him. It is exceedingly discreditable to the Government to ask us to assent to this item.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With respect to the statement by my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), that the subject would be brought up as to the extent to which it is legitimate for civil servants to interfere in political contests, I have nothing to say just now. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) says that it is very discourteous for us to move this vote for the salary of the Chief Engineer of Public Works from the 1st July next until the 1st July, 1892. The reason why the vote was postponed the other night was that the House was exceedingly thin, and by a sort of arrangement across the floor we agreed that the Committee should rise and report progress and that the question on this vote should remain as it was. Now, however, it comes up in the ordinary way. As I have already taken occasion to say, this is not a question of Mr. Perley personally at all; it is a question of whether Parliament will provide a salary for the Chief Engineer of Public Works. That Department must have such an officer, and that salary is to be given to the officer who happens to be the Chief Engineer on the 1st July next. It is to be understood that Mr. Perley's conduct is to be under review this session by the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and I hope that long before the 1st of July next, the truth or falsehood of the statements concerning Mr. Perley will be investigated and decided upon by the Committee in the first place, and by the House in the second place. If any improprieties are proven against Mr. Perley the House will deal with that, and another Chief Engineer will be appointed; but there must be a Chief Engineer, and this is not a vote for Mr. Perley, but for whoever happens to be Chief Engineer at the time. Now, as to the question of suspension I at once say that I will never agree to suspend a respectable man who hitherto has had a good character, who still holds a responsible position and who has been trusted for years, because charges are brought against him and not yet proven. I would not keep my place for a moment if that were done, and if such a practice is introduced, it must be introduced by a Government of which I am not a member. I will stick to the English practice, that every man should be considered innocent until he is proven guilty.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am rather surprised at the last proposition laid down by the Prime Minister. Certainly, the appropriation we are now asked to vote is an appropriation to be paid after the 1st July.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. To be "earned" after the 1st July.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, "earned" after the 1st July, and it may be earned by someone else than Mr. Perley. There is no doubt that no one is disputing that proposition, but the proposition in which the House is interested is to know what action the Government have taken with regard to a person who if he remains in office will earn this salary of Chief Engineer. The First Minister has just stated that until the truth of this charge is established he will not suspend Mr. Perley; but supposing Mr. Perley were charged with murder, would the hon. gentleman apply that rule—how would it be in that case?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If he were charged with murder he would be charged before a magistrate and there would be sworn evidence against him, and he would be put upon his trial and he could not perform his duties.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But he might be bailed out, and I suppose that if he should be bailed the hon. gentleman would still continue him in office. I do not understand the English rule to be as the hon. gentleman has laid down. What makes the matter important in this particular is that Mr. Perley is charged with certain acts which affect him in his character as Chief Engineer.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have not seen such charges.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Well, I understand such charges have been made.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman does not know the charges, and yet he asks for a suspension. He does not know what the charges are, or whether there are any charges at all.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The charges are before the House, and it is pretty clear the First Minister has not read them. Now, what is the English practice. I will take the case of Lord Melville. In 1805 Lord Melville, who was then First Lord of the Admiralty, was impeached by the House of Commons for certain irregularities committed while holding the office of Treasurer of the Navy. After a criminatory vote had been carried by the House, Lord Melville resigned his position as a Minister of the Crown, although his trial had not yet taken place. The rule that a man is to be considered innocent until guilt is established did not prevent his resignation, and it was deemed expedient to erase his name from the list of Privy Councillors, although he was afterwards acquitted of the charge perferred against him. That is the English rule.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There was first the criminatory vote.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It was just such a vote as was given here.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It was just such a vote as might follow condemnation by the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and Lord Melville did not resign until then.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It was a vote which put Lord Melville, better known as Sir Henry Dundas, on his trial. We have certain charges made against persons here, and the question has been referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and the enquiry of the Committee is exactly such an enquiry as takes place upon an impeachment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh!

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says "Oh!" but I say that is the case. It is for the purpose of ascertaining whether the party is guilty or innocent of the charge. It is a preliminary trial, for the Committee on Privileges and Elections have no power to punish. They report to this House, they perform the particular functions that are performed by the House of Lords in the case of impeachment, but the fact that they have not power to give an effective judgment with a view to punishment does not at all alter the case in this particular. I stated to the House the other day, and I stated, I think, with perfect fairness, that when these charges were made the persons who are to prepare the necessary papers with a view to bring them before the committee, should not be the persons who stand charged. It is a well-settled rule of law that a man is not to be a judge in his own case, and when you place in the hands of the Chief Engineer any part of the collection and arrangement and preparation of the papers which an hon. member of this House said were necessary for the purpose of establishing the case against him, you are departing from that rule, for you are making him to some extent a prosecutor against himself. It does seem to me that the last proposition laid down by the First Minister is indefensible, and entirely at variance with the principles of our law and with the rule that is followed in the United Kingdom.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am afraid that my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is not observing his usual accuracy, or rather that his memory has failed him when he referred to the case of Lord Melville and his impeachment. That case and the one under discussion are not analogous at all; on the contrary, if the hon. gentleman will look back at the history of that case he will find that when Lord Melville was First Lord of the Admiralty there were charges brought against Sir James Trotter, a subordinate officer of the Admiralty, and an attempt made to connect Lord Melville with them, somewhat, perhaps, under circumstances similar to this case. Lord Melville, upon these charges being brought against him, did not resign, and Mr. Pitt did not ask him to resign, and he remained in office for more than a year, perhaps for two years, while the evidence was taken inculpating him, as the majority on the committee believed, as being connected with, or conniving at, or submitting to the impropriety of Sir James Trotter. During all the time of that investigation, which is similar to the investigation by the Committee on Privileges and Elections, Lord Melville remained First Lord of the Admiralty. It was not until the committee reported, censuring Lord Melville and connecting him with the improprieties committed by Sir James Trotter to such an extent that the House of Commons took it as a condemnation and impeached him of high crimes and misdemeanours, that he resigned. In addition to that, Lord Melville was a political officer as the hon. gentleman knows, and ought to command the implicit confidence of Parliament, and he could not with propriety retain his office. I remember another case, that of Lord Henry Lennox, who was Chief Commissioner of Works. When he was charged he rose in his place voluntarily and he said that he desired to resign and to fight his battle alone. He denied the charges and he said he wished to fight his battle independent of Parliament, and not to cloak himself with any supposed influence he might have as being a member of the Government, and he did not wish that anything connected with the charges against him should in any way, directly or indirectly, affect the Government, or that they might be supposed to be conniving with him, or supporting him against the charges. However, the case of Lord Melville is precisely a case in support of my argument and contention.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That may be, but I think that every member of this House who will look at this matter with reasonable partiality, will feel that it is an unfortunate thing that a gentleman who is charged with very great crimes and misdemeanours should be the person whose official duty it is to submit these documents for the investigation of this Committee. I state—and this as

my own individual opinion—that I believe that the hon. Minister of Public Works would have better consulted his own dignity, would have better consulted the dignity of the Parliament of Canada, and the interest of the Government, too, if he had for the time being changed office with some of his colleagues. That, however, I am not disposed to insist on further than to state that I believe he would have done well to have done so. But the hon. First Minister, if I understood him rightly just now, stated that no charges had been preferred against Mr. Perley. Well, I find the hon. gentleman who brought this matter forward, among other things states:

"That the said Thomas McGreevy used his influence as a member of this House with the Department of Public Works, and in particular with Henry F. Perley, Esq., to induce him to report to the Quebec Harbour Commission in favour of the payment of the said sum of 35 cents per cubic yard.

"That the correspondence on this subject between Henry F. Perley and Larkin, Connolly & Co., before the Quebec Harbour Commissioners were consulted, took place at the suggestion of the said Thomas McGreevy, and was conducted with his knowledge and participation in such a manner as to conceal from the eyes of Parliament and of the public the corrupt character of the contract, in connection with which he had received $27,000."

I think these are very strong charges against Mr. Perley.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Against Mr. McGreevy.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They implicate Mr. Perley very grievously.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. An inference may be drawn from these statements affecting Mr. Perley, but they contain no direct charge against him. They charge that Mr. McGreevy used his influence with Mr. Perley, but it is not said that Mr. Perley yielded to the seductions of Mr. McGreevy.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, I will call the hon. gentleman's attention to another clause:

"That in the execution of the works of this contract extensive frauds were perpetrated, to the detriment of the public treasury, and sums of money were paid corruptly to officials under the control and direction of Henry F. Perley and appointed by the Quebec Harbour Commission."

Mr. FOSTER. That is, that the officials were under the control of Mr. Perley, not that the payments were made under him.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, if you connect together the three statements I have read, you will see that Henry F. Perley—he may be innocent or not, I express no opinion as to that—is deeply implicated as an accomplice in the charges made against Thomas McGreevy and the hon. Minister of Public Works. I will not offer an opinion on the legal merits of the case, but I do not believe that any layman reading these documents would form any other opinion than that Henry F. Perley was to all intents and purposes, I was going to say in the dock, along with the other parties charged.

Mr. McNEILL. I want to say just one word on this matter, and that is, that I do think it would be more generous on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite to allow this matter to stand over until Mr. Perley had his trial. Mr. Perley, as we all know, has been for many years one of the most trusted officers in the public service of Canada. I have had some dealings with Mr. Perley, and though there are some personal reasons why I should not speak very favourably of Mr. Perley's conduct towards myself, for I must say that on more than one occasion I have received rather scant courtesy at his hands, yet I will say this, that from what I have known of him during the seven or eight sessions that I have been in Parliament, it will take very strong evidence indeed to persuade me that Mr. Perley is other than an ornament to the public service of Canada. My belief is that Mr. Perley is one of the most upright and honourable men to be found in the public service to-day; and, believing this, I must say that I think it would be more generous if hon. gentlemen would hold their hands and allow this matter to go before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, where there will be an opportunity afforded to Mr. Perley to defend himself, who I believe is being almost killed—as anyone will see who knew him a year or two ago and looks into his face to-day—by the pressure of this charge against him.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend misapprehends the point altogether. Nobody on this side wishes to find Mr. Perley guilty; I myself certainly do not. We are simply objecting—and this is a totally different thing—to the man who is accused, no matter who he may be, being called upon to prepare the papers or to decide what particular papers may come before the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I understand that it will be part of Mr. Perley's official duty to say what papers will come down in return to my hon. friend's demand for the production of those documents, and I think the hon. gentleman who spoke last will admit that this important and delicate duty should be put into the hands of anyone rather than those of any of the persons accused.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman makes a mistake in supposing that Mr. Perley has anything to do with the preparation or custody of the documents. All the papers are in the hands of the Deputy head, Mr. Gobeil, and Mr. Perley can only have access to them through the intervention of Mr. Gobeil.

Mr. EDGAR. The charge made before the House by the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Tarte) was levelled against two members of the House, one being a member of the Government, and it brings in Mr. Perley incidentally, and not in a direct manner. But the hon. First Minister has referred to cases in which Ministers of the Crown had construed the bearing of charges made against them. If he had looked at the case of Lord Ellenborough in 1858, he would have found that on the publication of a despatch to Lord Canning, then Governor of India, from Lord Ellenborough, which caused tremendous excitement in the country, Lord Ellenborough at once avowed that he was solely responsible for the publication of that despatch, and he sent his resignation directly to Her Majesty and not to Lord Derby, the Prime Minister, in order to shield his colleagues from responsibility for his act; and in the debate that took place on the subject in the House of Lords, Lord Derby laid down the principle that Ministers were only responsible for the acts of their colleagues if they failed to disavow all responsibility for the act as soon as public attention had been drawn to it. Now, in this case, a gentleman very near to the hon. First Minister, is charged with matters very much

more serious than the publication of a despatch. These are much more serious matters, also, than those with which Lord Henry Lennox was charged with; and I admit it is a question of taste, as regards the Minister of Public Works and the First Minister and the others, whether the Minister of Public Works should continue in control of his Department, in which are the papers required for this investigation. The First Minister will remember also the case of Mr. Stansfield, who was accused in 1864, in the press and publicly, of participation in a plot to assassinate the Emperor of the French. An attempt was made in the House of Commons to censure Mr. Stansfield, but the House voted down the motion. As soon, however, as the motion of censure was defeated, the Minister rose and said he would assume the entire responsibility, and retire, thus relieving his colleagues from any imputation or injury. In fact, he said his remaining there would not strengthen his colleagues, and therefore he preferred to leave. It is largely a matter of taste. If the First Minister chooses to allow things to go on as they are going, it is certainly not for us to say anything more. That is his affair and not ours. If it suits him it suits us. I would be sorry to press my opinion on so experienced and able a statesmen as the First Minister, as to what would be his duty or the duty of any of his colleagues under the circumstances.

Mr. DEVLIN. I must thank the right hon. the First Minister for his promise to investigate the matter I brought to his notice. I wish to say, however, it was not through any spirit of hostility to any member of the Civil Service that I mentioned this case, but in order that a matter which is of serious importance should be looked into. I would further ask the First Minister to extend the investigation, so that it may include all the various employés of the various Departments who have taken part in the late Ottawa County elections, both Federal and Local.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I hope the hon. gentleman who spoke just now, does not imagine there is on this side any feeling against Mr. Perley, whose name has been mentioned in connection with these charges. That gentleman's public career has been an honourable and distinguished one. So far as his name is known in the Maritime Provinces, I can bear testimony to the fact that there it has always been a synonym for upright conduct. There are peculiar circumstances with Mr. Perley's state of health and his family relations calculated to evoke sympathy; and I am sure that sympathy is felt in a very great measure by every hon. member on this side. I may add, that I hope it will be shown that Mr. Perley has not been guilty of improper conduct, and in that case no man in this House will be more glad or proud than I will, and I am sure my colleagues around me entertain the same feeling

Department of Railways and Canals... $56,000

Mr. FOSTER. There is an error in the Estimates. The number of second class clerks in the column 1890-91 is printed as eight, whereas it should be nine, so that the increase is two and not three as appears there. There are nine statutory increases at $50; one at $37.50, and one at $12.50. There is an additional second class clerk at $1,125, and another at $1,112.50. There is also an assistant to the private secretary at $300, making in all $3,450. There is a decrease in the estimated salary of the Deputy of $1,400, and two third class clerks, making a decrease of $4,900, and a net decrease in the whole estimate of $1,650.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. the First Minister propose, in future, to dispense entirely with the Deputy Minister, and confine himself to the services of Mr. Schreiber?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Trudeau has been for many years the Deputy head, Mr Schreiber the Chief Engineer of Railways, and the lamented Mr. Page, Chief Engineer of Canals. Mr. Trudeau being an engineer, and especially a hydraulic engineer, as well as Mr. Page, he and Mr. Page acted together for years in connection with the construction of canals and the improvement of the St. Lawrence and other waterways, so that when Mr. Page suddenly died it was thought better that Mr. Trudeau, while still retaining office as Deputy head, should be Mr. Page's successor as Chief Engineer of Canals to carry out the plans which had been settled pretty much by them in concert. Mr. Trudeau is now the Deputy head of the Department of Railways and Canals and also the Chief Engineer of Canals, and will continue to be so until it is found that the work is too much for him and some engineer is trained to take the place of Mr. Page. In the meantime the salary of the Deputy head is saved.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it as deputy or Chief Engineer that Mr. Trudeau is paid?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He is the Deputy head and Chief Engineer, but draws only the salary of Chief Engineer, which is $6,000. He draws the larger and drops the smaller salary.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have no doubt Mr. Trudeau is a good officer, but I rather suspect that the hon. gentleman, if he finds it necessary to replace the Chief Engineer, will find that he has landed himself in a dilemma: for, unless Mr. Trudeau is built on entirely different principles from most men, it would be very disagreeable for him, after enjoying a salary of $6,000, to fall back upon one of $4,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He will not do that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not if he can help it, I am quite sure; but the difficulty is this: that if Mr. Trudeau is to continue as Deputy head, and a Chief Engineer be afterwards appointed, you will have the anomaly that you will have one Deputy head drawing $6,000, and a great many others drawing $3,200, and you will find a strike for higher wages on their part.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not see any fear of that. Mr. Trudeau is now receiving $6,000, and as long as he remains in the service he will continue to receive that salary. It is rather an anomaly that the Deputy head, the permanent head of the Department, should receive less salary than the two engineers. Mr. Trudeau is an experienced engineer himself, and the only consequence will be that if it is found he requires assistance, he will still be Deputy head and Chief Engineer, and will get an assistant who will be quite satisfied to take the $4,000 and wait for an increase, as Mr. Trudeau, like his political head at

this moment, is not a young man, and we may both retire together.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that in the year before last we only spent $44,000, and this year we are asked for $56,000. Now that we have completed a great many of our public works, we ought to be able to make a considerable reduction in the expenditure of the staff required in this Department. Certainly the same amount of work that was going on a few years ago is not now being discharged by the Department of Railways and Canals. A great many railways are now built which formerly necessitated the employment of a large staff, and, though there is some reduction, I think there should be a larger reduction in this expenditure.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In regard to railways, there will be, and there ought to be ere long a reduction in the engineering staff, because there is no new railway work going on except the Extension Railway and the railway running through Cape Breton. As to canals, however, there is an increased amount of work. The Williamsburg Canal and the Cornwall Canal are now worked up to high pressure in order to have our great waterway finished as soon as possible, and we are entering upon the construction of the Sault Ste. Marie Canal, so that there will be no reduction for some years to come in that branch.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman did not refer to any increased expenses on the Trent Valley Canal.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That depends upon the support we get from both sides of the House, including my hon. friend.

Mr. BARRON. The First Minister telegraphed that a grant was to be made this year to complete the Trent Valley Canal.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman's memory is not quite correct.

Mr. BARRON. I have seen the telegram, and it says that the Trent Valley Commissioners have reported in favour of the completion of that canal, and that Parliament will be asked this session for a vote for that purpose. So I suppose there will be a considerable sum for that work in the Supplementary Estimates. I would call the attention of the Minister to the fact that the railway bridge at Fenelon Falls, to which reference has so often been made, is still there, preventing barges of any size from going down.

Mr. FOSTER. This does not come under this item, which refers only to the officers in the inside service.

Mr. BARRON. I only desire to call the attention of the First Minister to this matter now so that he might see that it is attended to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They have been called upon for many years without effect, and I am afraid that, unless the Government takes decided action, matters will remain as they are.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps, under present circumstances, more decided action may be taken. I may point out that my hon. friend has not been altogether forgotten. The completion of the Trent Valley Canal is provided for by a vote of $76,000 in the current year, and according to the Estimates before us, we have spent no less than $2,000, and a re-vote of $74,000 will be asked, which I hope will satisfy my hon. friend.

Department of the Geological Survey.. $48,310

Mr. FOSTER. There is an increase here of $980. There are 23 statutory increases, amounting to $1,150, and one at $30, making a total increase of $1,180. Four new technical officers have been appointed, and one third class clerk has been promoted to second class, and there has been an increase given to Messrs. Ingall, Curran and Tyrrell. Then, some clerks have been dropped, and one has had his salary reduced by $50, making the net increase $980.

Mr. WELDON. The people of Albert County are very desirous that the men of the survey should make their way down to the southern part of that county again. There was a good survey made some years ago, but it was a very hurried one, and there is a feeling now that a survey would do a great deal to direct the attention of the public to the great mineral resources of the county.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the meaning of there being twenty technical officers in place of six? What is the effect of making these fourteen gentleman technical officers? Does it place them under a different regime?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Last year we passed an Act by which we made the Department of the Geological Survey a separate Department, and by clause 4 of the Act, at the suggestion of the Director, we authorized the appointment of all these officers as technical officers. They are only really classed as they were previously, but the Act requires that they shall be technical officers and specifies what their qualifications should be. It causes no change in the expenditure.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice that technical officers, those having special qualifications, generally receive higher salaries and are removed to a certain extent from the provisions of the Civil Service Act.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Their salaries have not been increased, except in the case of the two or three mentioned by the Finance Minister. This was brought about by strong representations made by the gentlemen themselves, who drew my attention to the inequality of the salaries they were receiving with those received by others occupying almost similar positions, not only in Canada, but in the United States; and on the strong representations of the Director, I assented to placing this slight increase in the Estimates. Within the last few years we have lost some of our most valuable men. We have lost Mr. Harrington, who is now receiving $2,500 at McGill College; we have lost Professor Spencer, who is receiving $3,000 as State Geologist of Georgia; we have lost Mr. F. D. Adams, who is now receiving $1,500 at McGill College, and Mr. Kenrick, who is receiving $1,000 at St. John's College, Winnipeg, and about $1,400 as Assistant Dominion Analyst for Manitoba. We lost last year Mr. Lawson, a gentleman well known to hon. gentleman here; he is now Professor of Geology in a university in California. I think that we should endeavour, so far as possible, to keep our able men with us, and we are choosing the best and most

talented young men from the different universities, particularly those who show an aptitude for geological pursuits, and we are taking them into service, so far as we can, in order to give them an education which we hope, by-and-bye, will place them in the high position which many of our men now occupy. That is the policy we have pursued in the Department, and I hope there will be no objection taken to these slight increases.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not disposed to take exception to paying this class of officers well, but I want to understand exactly what we are doing. I believe there are twenty gentlemen altogether under the head of technical officers. Am I to understand from the Minister of the Interior that these are all in one class, and that they may, by process of time, ascend to a point equivalent of that of chief clerk?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; if they serve long enough they are all entitled to the statutory increase, which would bring their salaries up to $2,400.

Office of the High Commissioner for Canada in London, salaries..... $7,384

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). These items pertain to the inside of the Department of Finance, the Minister tells us. I just wish to enquire whether the High Commissioner is engaged in the inside or the outside service at present, and when would be the proper time to discuss him.

Mr. FOSTER. He is not present just now. He certainly does not come in this category, anyway.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who looks after these officials during the miscellaneous absences of the High Commissioner on special services? Are they so well trained that they are able to run alone?

Mr. FOSTER. They are able to go by themselves.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, does not the hon. gentleman think that if we are so fortunate as to have officers of this class who are able to go by themselves, who do not require to be looked after, who can run the office quite as well, and perhaps a good deal better, when my lord the High Commissioner is away on special service, as when he is there—does not the hon. gentleman, who gives these gentlemen so high a character, think that he could leave them there without a High Commissioner at all, and that he would be justified in letting them run the office alone all the time?

Mr. FOSTER. They can do their own work, but not the High Commissioner's.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is certainly a part of the High Commissioner's work, particularly that part which goes towards making things pleasant in Nova Scotia—this work, probably, these gentlemen cannot do; but all the practical work that he does, what he is paid to do, what he is sent there to perform—all that, I rather think, these gentlemen could do just as well without him as with him. I am glad to have the testimony of the Minister of Finance to the fact, and I hope the House will make a note of it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I notice that the High Commissioner serves in another office. I do not know whether the Government constituted the office for him or not, but it appears to me to be a type of the eternal fitness of things. I see from the *Empire* that Sir Charles Tupper has been appointed director of water works and gas works to a corporation which has just been organized with a capital of two million. Now, if he is going to manage the gas works there, how is he going to manage the gas works here? Does he get an extra salary for this? Is this $2,000 for his extra salary? I think that if we want a High Commissioner at all, if there are duties for him to discharge, it would be quite as well for him to attend to them instead of going into trade outside the High Commissioner's business. He is paid a handsome salary, and still he is going into trade and taking the management of these corporations. How much are we granting now in order to keep up this enterprise in which he is engaged? Is he going to employ servants paid by the country in order to manage these companies and these works? That is something the House ought to know. I do not know whether the Government are in this concern or not. I do not think they will manage it as successfully as Sir Charles would if he were here. But they should let the House know about it, and if he is under their instructions, if he is guided by them, if he is moved by them, and if they still control him, we ought to know whether they are with him partners in this gas enterprise.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think my hon. friend has brought up a matter which may require a little consideration at the hands of the Government. Now, I doubt exceedingly the wisdom or the propriety of the High Commissioner of Canada, an officer who receives a handsome salary from us, and a house which we have furnished for him regardless of expense—I greatly doubt the propriety of his officiating as a guinea pig in London. I do not think it is consonant with our dignity and——

An hon. MEMBER. What is a guinea pig?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I must refer my hon. friend to the *habitués* of the Stock Exchange. Practically speaking, it means this: that gentlemen who occupy certain official positions are very often in the habit of—what shall I call it?—hiring themselves out to financial institutions in London, for which they receive various sums, some larger and some smaller. In the case of high commissioner guinea pigs, a guinea a week—from which practice they take their name—may be allowed. A plate of guineas, I have understood, is handed round to the various directors at the ordinary meetings, and each of them is allowed to extract one; perhaps, in the case of a high commissioner he may be allowed to extract a little more. Anyhow, I doubt exceedingly whether it is desirable, or prudent, or in the interests of the people of Canada, to retain our High Commissioner.

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

After Recess.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 50) to incorporate the Steam-Boiler and Plate-Glass Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Hyman.)

Bill (No. 51) to incorporate the Vancouver Dock and Ship Building Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

Bill (No. 52) to incorporate the Macleod Irrigation Company.—(Mr. Davis.)

Bill (No. 55) to incorporate the Atikokan Iron Range Railway Company.—(Mr. Mackintosh.)

Bill (No. 56) respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Davis.)

Bill (No. 57) to incorporate the Buffalo Lake and Battleford Railway Company.—(Mr. Macdonald.)

Bill (No. 58) to incorporate the Whirlpool Bridge Company.—(Mr. German.)

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. LANDERKIN. Before resuming the discussion on this item for the office of the High Commissioner in London, it may not be out of place for me to make a reference to the Chairman (Mr. Bergeron). The hon. gentleman has occupied a seat in my neighbourhood during one Parliament, and I am glad to see the elevation to which he has attained. If his services and his abilities are not in due time properly rewarded, I hope he will bolt from the party again. During the time I have had a seat here I have had three or four members sitting beside me, all of whom have attained eminence. I do not know whether the Government have the idea that those who sit beside me are specially fitted on that account to occupy high positions, or not. Mr. Royal was made Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories; Mr. Mercier sat beside me one session and subsequently became Premier of Quebec. I do not know whether this Government made him so or not. Now the hon. member for Beauharnois has been elevated to the position of Deputy Speaker; from the fact that he sat near me three or four sessions, his qualifications cannot be doubted. In coming to the item to which I called the attention of the Committee before Recess, I will refer to the notices which appeared in the newspapers in regard to this subject. I shall also refer to the dual offices that are held by persons appointed to offices by the Government, and consider the advisability of permitting those who are paid by this House, and paid fairly well, to enter into the management of other concerns and business in the old country, thus taking their time and attention from the duties and responsibilities of the offices conferred upon them by the Government and this House. From the newspaper report I notice that Sir Charles Tupper has been appointed Director of the Water Works and Gas Works Securities Corporation, which has just been organized with a capital of £2,000,000 sterling. It is gratifying to know that our High Commissioner is not financially in distress; that he is able to incorporate probably by himself—it does not say he is the manager—a company with a capital of ten million dollars. The object of the new corporation is to buy up water works, gas works, and other concerns of the kind in Canada and the United States. I draw the attention of my ultra-loyal friends opposite to the words "United States," not that I consider it a very treasonable thing myself, but I do not know how hon. gentlemen on the other side may find this compatible with their recent utterances on this subject. You would imagine at least that an officer appointed by the Government of Canada, drawing salary and pickings to the amount of $25,000 or $30,000 a year, would invest his money in enterprises in Canada. I think that is the position which hon. members opposite would have supported during the last election; but they would probably subscribe to a different doctrine now. It is gratifying to know that legislation of an Imperial character will be passed in order to allow this company to go into operation. It is further indicated by the telegram that legislation in the colonies will be required in order to allow our High Commissioner to spread himself through Canada and the United States. If the office of the High Commissioner does not require to be kept open during the whole year, then it is a question for the House and the Government to determine during what period of the year the office shall be kept open. If the High Commissioner can undertake to manage the duties of his office and also this gas concern with a capital of $10,000,000, it is clear to the members of this House and to the people that the time has arrived when this question can no longer be shirked but that it must be dealt with freely by the people. It is not for me to discuss the ways and means whereby the money was secured to the extent of $10,000,000; but the High Commissioner may have provided all the funds himself. That is the question. I do not know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that considering this is the first night you have occupied your position, it would be fair to call upon you to decide whether we should discuss in this House, how and by what means he who has been kept on a salary of almost starvation price can establish a gas company with a capital of $10,000,000. Remember, Mr. Chairman, that I do not doubt his qualifications to manage this company. I do not deny but that he may possess qualifications for this office, but the question for the people of this country to consider is, whether it is longer necessary for us to keep a High Commissioner to discharge the duties of a company involving so much capital as this. It is known to everyone in Canada that the High Commissioner was absent from London quite a portion of this year. He was engaged in the elections here, and it is well known that since the elections he has been keeping himself prominently before the people through the press of the United Kingdom, and he has maintained that prominence at the expense of the Ministers of the Crown here. He would indicate from his utterances that they are his servants instead of his masters: that is the position he has kept prominently before the people of England and the people of Canada. Now, whether he has been always wise or politic in his utterances it is for the House and the Government to decide. He draws his salary from the people of this country independent of party: he has made statements in reference to the Liberal party of this country of such a character that it becomes the duty of the Government to take cognizance of his utterances and to put a stop to them. The Liberal party in this country pay him three-fourths of his salary, because they represent three-fourths of the best interest of the country, and if the High Commissioner continues to use language so offensive to them it becomes the duty of the Government and the duty of this Parliament to say that no gentleman shall occupy a position in which he attempts to degrade and insult those who pay him the larger portion of his salary. During his election campaign the High Commissioner used utterances which were not of a character to be approved of by fair-minded people,

no matter to what party they belonged. I believe he spoke at Windsor, in the County of Essex, and it is gratifying to those who sit on this side of the House to know that the Government lost a supporter in that constituency and that we gained a supporter by a majority of some 700 votes. That is one good thing at least for which we should feel a little grateful to Sir Charles Tupper and cause us to be a little lenient towards him. He also spoke at London in favour of the Minister of Agriculture, and my distinguished young friend (Mr. Hyman) was returned by a large majority from that constituency. Now, if the High Commissioner had gone on in that way I might be inclined to excuse some of his vagaries and some of his language, but no matter how eminent his services may be, I cannot forget what is due to the people whom I represent, and to the people of this country generally. After the election was over, Sir Charles Tupper assailed the Grand Trunk Railway, a great enterprise in this country. He made an onslaught on the Grand Trunk Railway Company, because, as he states, they did not consent to convey the voters to the polls and to use their influence to support the Government. I wish to draw the attention of the Government to a speech which he made at Amherst against the Grand Trunk Railway, and I want to ascertain what is the intention of the Government in reference to this speech. I will read the speech.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it as read.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I know the gentlemen on the other side of the House do not like this kind of literature. I know they feel a little ashamed of it, for well they may feel ashamed, and if they do feel ashamed I must congratulate them, because where there is shame there is some hope of reform. However that may be, Sir Charles Tupper said:

"Among the great odds that the Government had to contend with in Ontario was the enormous power of the Grand Trunk Railway, and Sir Charles proceeded to handle that corporation without gloves. He said he never could have believed that they would have been base enough to be guilty of the disgraceful conduct that had characterized them during the recent compaign. The Grand Trunk railway was deeply indebted to the Canadian Government."

That is something I never knew before—

"That corporation had received enormous assistance from Canada"——

That is more sensible than to say they received it from the Government—

"That corporation had received enormous assistance from Canada—far more in proportion to the benefit received than had been given the Canadian Pacific. When he was Minister of Railways the Grand Trunk had come to him, explained the danger and peril they were in at their inability to reach Chicago, and by purchasing from them for $1,500,0 0 the River du Loup section of the road, in which they were sinking money, he had enabled them to reach Chicago and saved them from paralysis."

He would have allowed the company to take paralysis if he knew they would not support him all the days of their lives.

"But had he known as much then as he knows now he doubted very much if he would have done it. But the Grand Trunk had never forgiven the Government for the construction of the Canadian Pacific.

"Sir Charles said he would let the world into a state secret."

I believe he would, or any other secret if it was going to injure those who opposed him. I believe he is sincere in this matter:

"In 1880, authorized by Sir John Macdonald, he had offered the Grand Trunk Railway Company, through Sir Henry Tyler, all the privileges and franchises now enjoyed by the Canadian Pacific if they would build that road. Sir Henry Tyler was willing to undertake the contract if the thousand mile section between Nipissing and Port Arthur was omitted. Sir Charles Tupper pointed out that that section was an essential part of the line. Canada could never become a nation without it: so the privilege of constructing the Canadian Pacific was refused by the Grand Trunk. Sir Charles pointed out the essential character of the Lake Superior section. Had it not been for it, Canada would be completely at the mercy of the Americans in case of non-intercourse. Sir Charles Tupper's last act as Finance Minister was to induce the Government to give the Grand Trunk a large subsidy to aid the construction of the Sarnia tunnel; yet, when Sir Henry Tyler was denouncing the Government recently and threatening what he would do when the elections came on, at the same time congratulating his shareholders on the completion of the tunnel, he never referred to the Canadian subsidy. Sir Henry had been true to his threats and the Grand Trunk management had commanded their employés to vote against the Government. This corporation exercised great influence, but even if they thought they had ground for complaint against the Government, he never believed the Grand Trunk would be base enough to go back upon England, to go back upon its English shareholders, to go back upon Canada and to support a party and a policy whose avowed mission it was to strike down British institutions in North America and bring about the political union of Canada with the United States."

I would like to call the attention of the hon. First Minister, who, I am glad to see, is now in his place, to this extraordinary utterance of his High Commissioner, and I would like to ask him if he thinks it is compatible with the daty of the Government to allow one of their officers to insult a party which is as loyal to every tradition of this country as any other party, and if he does not think the Government should take some action to prevent any officer in the pay of the people insulting those who have shown their loyalty on every possible occasion. Now, the president of the Grand Trunk Railway makes a reply to this speech, and shows the reason why the High Commissioner made this assault:

"Sir Henry Tyler publishes to-day a long, effective and temperate reply to Tupper's charges. He shows how on February 25 Tupper had a long interview with General Manager Seargeant and warmly appealed for the support of the company in the present emergency, promising in return that if the Government were sustained the company should have the fullest and most friendly support from the Government if and when required."

Now, did Sir Charles Tupper go to Mr. Seargeant at the instance of the Government to promise that, in the event of the Grand Trunk supporting the Government, they would receive every consideration they might require? Then Sir Charles comes back to the charge. This is his last shot:

"Sir Charles asserts that it is now proved that the Grand Trunk Railway went to a shameful extreme to aid the ruined gamesters in attempting to subvert British institutions in Canada."

Ruined gamesters! This is the term that the High Commissioner, who receives from the people of Canada about $30,000 every year, applies to the great Liberal party, which represents half the people of this country; and the Government, regardless of its duty, apparently is willing to allow that insult to go unanswered on the floors of Parliament. I say it is an insult to every man, woman and child in this country to allow a paid officer to make statements so offensive to any portion of the people of Canada. If that officer were in the employ of friends of mine, I would say that it would be unworthy of them to retain him in office any longer. I think it is time this sort of thing were stopped, for it appears that he not only threatens the party on this side of the House, but he threatens the Government. He is going to do

wonderful things with his majority if the Government do not do what he wants done; he is going to bring his power and influence to induce his following to go in and ask the Government what they like, promising that they shall receive it. Now, it does appear to me that something should be done by the Government to stop such utterances as these being made by the High Commissioner against the people who sustain and support him. It is bad enough to have to pay such an outrageous salary to him, but it is worse to allow such utterances to be made by him without a word of protest from the Government. It seems singular that a gentleman who is as loyal as Sir Charles Tupper says he is should now be managing this gas company, which intends to do business in the United States. That would seem to be an ultra-loyal piece of business. And in this connection it does seem strange that the Grand Trunk, which goes to Chicago, is a disloyal road, leading to annexation, while the Canadian Pacific, that goes to New York, is ultra-loyal. That is one of the things I cannot understand. It will require a little light from the hon. First Minister or some of the other Ministers. Now, I hope this item will be fully considered before it is passed. If the High Commissioner is going to run this gas company, perhaps we could relieve him of his duties for the rest of this year. We are not going to have another election this year, and I do not think the Government will require his services, so that perhaps we could let this item drop. Let him attend to the gas; let him monopolize all the gas in this country and in the United States, and perhaps his sustaining power will be such with the aid of that imponderable, elastic agent that he will be able to keep the Government under his heel for all time to come.

Mr. McMULLEN. There are one or two questions which I want to ask with regard to this item before it is passed. In the first place, I notice that the estimates for the incidental expenses of the office of High Commissioner when it was first established in 1881 amounted to $3,000, in 1882 they amounted to $5,294, in 1883 to $5,250 and in 1884 to $5,453. Now, while Sir Alexander Galt performed the duties of High Commissioner, these items included the rent of his house and all other expenses; but since Sir Charles has been appointed, we have bought for him a residence at a cost of $48,000, and we have to pay taxes on that residence which are no doubt included in the vote we are asked to pass, namely, $8,790. I cannot well understand how the amount could have run up from about $4,500 at which it stood when Mr. Galt performed the duties, to nearly $9,000, and the disparity is greater when we consider that in Sir Alexander Galt's time we had to pay the rent of a house which was included in the amount of contingencies, whereas the sum now granted to cover contingencies does not include any item for rent, because we have none to pay, having bought a residence for Sir Charles Tupper. I have carefully read over, and I recommend hon. gentlemen opposite to read over the report of our High Commissioner in London, and I fail to see in any part of it any ground whatever for continuing the office of High Commissioner in London, unless I except one good act which Sir Charles Tupper has done, namely, the sending out to this country a delegation of tenant farmers for the purpose of inspecting the lands of our Dominion and the improved lands in the several Provinces. That I consider was a very good move, and I hope it will have the result of inducing a number of these people to buy up lands in our older Provinces and settle on them, which lands can be procured cheaply, and thus allow those holding them to go out to our North-West and open up that country. With that exception, for which I give our High Commissioner every credit, I do not see a single item in the whole report to justify the continuance of this institution. Our High Commissioner gives us a list of a number of charitable institutions formed in the British Isle for the purpose of sending out emigrants to this country and providing for those who are in a destitute condition, so as to enable them to settle on our lands. But all that information could have been easily gathered by our emigration agents in England. The High Commissioner also refers to the fact that there is an unlimited market in England for dried meats and hams and other articles of that kind, which information could also have been obtained equally well from the Trade Returns of England without any expense. He has also drawn attention to the export of eggs to England, and has apparently made some little effort to secure a market there for our eggs and poultry; but it is very singular that notwithstanding the fact that he is in London with a large staff of officials, we had, in order to work up if possible an export trade in eggs and poultry, to send over Mr. Saunders, the chief in charge of the Experimental Farm here. Sir Charles admits that Mr. Saunders has given this matter considerable attention, and that, owing to his efforts, some exports of eggs have been made with, as he says, very profitable results. I do not know about that. Our High Commissioner then proceeds to instruct us as to the way in which fowls should be dressed and put up, as to the portions upon which the feathers should be left and those from which the feathers should be plucked. I never imagined, when we were asked to appoint Sir Charles Tupper as High Commissioner, that he would be called on to devote his valuable time, at an expense of ten thousand dollars a year with perquisites of fifteen thousand, to the task of instructing our people how they should put up their poultry and eggs for shipment to the other side. That appears to be rather a peculiar business for a man of his qualifications and position to be called on to discharge. When he was appointed High Commissioner, I well remember the right hon. the First Minister, in asking us to provide for his salary and contingencies and for the purchase of his house, thus making the High Commissionership a permanent institution, promised that such appointment would save us more money annually in the way of commissions on loans and payments of interest than the entire salary and expenses would amount to. I have carefully followed Sir Charles Tupper's reports from that time to the present, and have never been able to discover that he has saved us one farthing financially in any manner whatever. Last year the attention of the hon. the Minister of Finance was drawn to this matter, and he then put Parliament for the first time in possession of the fact that the Government had made arrangements with some financial company in London for a term of years to act as our financial agents, so that while the right hon. the First Minister was hold-

ing out as an inducement to this House the prospect of Sir Charles Tupper discharging that duty, and thus saving us the commissions, we were under contract with a financial company in London to act as our agents, not only during that year, but for four or five years afterwards. While, therefore, we have had our High Commissioner and a full staff of officers in London, and were induced to vote the expense necessary to keep up that department, under the promise that we would be thereby saved all this commission, we were then paying and have been since paying some $35,000 or $36,000 in commissions annually to a financial company for the purpose of meeting the interest on our bonds and redeeming our debentures. I challenge any member of this House to take up the High Commissioner's report and point out where he has rendered any service which will warrant our continuing him in office at a cost of $35,000 a year. Take, for instance, his recommendation concerning emigration. He says:

"I have gone into the question of immigration at greater length than usual in the case of reports of this kind; but, in view of all that has been said from time to time on the subject, it is desirable that the fullest possible information should be placed before the public, especially as I hope large sums will be voted henceforth annually to immigration, in view of its importance to the Dominion."

He recommends that we should devote larger sums to the purposes of immigration in the future. Now, to show how much the Government appreciates his recommendations, in the very Estimates they have brought down this year they have reduced the sum devoted to immigration by $51,000. Yet Sir Charles Tupper recommends in his report that it should be increased. I do not know whether the Government are of opinion that our High Commissioner does not understand what he is talking about, or that he is not capable of discharging the peculiar functions of the position he occupies, but I do say this, that while we have a High Commissioner in England we should make the best use of him we can. That Sir Charles Tupper is eminently qualified to fill that distinguished position I do not deny for a moment, and I should like to see him remain there as long as hon. gentlemen opposite are on the Treasury benches. I have no objection to that, but I do object, as my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Landerkin) has said, that he should leave the duties of his department for two or three months at a time, and run up and down the country in a special train addressing the electors with a view to show that the Grits should not get into power and that the present system should be perpetuated. I think it is not only unfair, but it is a very imprudent and a very barefaced action on the part of the Government to take a high place functionary, who is receiving $25,000 a year from the people of this country, away from his duties and bring him out here to speak in a manner which is insulting to one-half of the people of this country. I think his assault upon the Grand Trunk Railway was exceedingly imprudent. I do not think this country can afford for a moment to ridicule or to override by legislation the privileges and rights of the Grand Trunk Railway. It was the pioneer railway company of this country, and the people of England spent their money lavishly to open up the country through which that railway passed. I think it is unbecoming of Sir Charles Tupper to assail that company so wantonly and so unwarrantably as he has done in the London *Times*. However, we may have some more to say upon this subject before this session closes. At present, I say that, if we have no more duties for the High Commissioner to perform than are shown in this report which he has published, there is not sufficient justification for continuing his office. If the people of this country say that there is an evident necessity for the existence of the office of the High Commissioner in London, I am content, but I say that there is not one tittle of evidence as to the value of that office with the exception of the delegation of tenant farmers that he sent to Canada in order to endeavour to secure an influx of that class of people into this country. Apart from that, there is not anything in his report to justify us in keeping him in the position he occupies; and, if he is to remain there, we ought at all events to keep down the cost of the office instead of increasing it from year to year. In the last five years this increase has amounted to nearly $10,000, and I hope the Government will not propose to continue this increase in the future.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentlemen who have spoken in regard to this question, have shown more animus than wisdom against the High Commissioner. They seem to have forgotten the very important duties which he has performed. There is scarcely a month in which his name is not seen in the public press, not only of Canada, but of England and the European nations, bringing before them the importance of Canada. In that way, he is assisting the interests of this country, and the enterprises in which the people of Canada are engaged. Take his action in regard to the scheduling of cattle from this country. The export of cattle is one of the most remunerative lines which we have, and but for the action of the High Commissioner, no doubt we would be standing in the same position as the United States, and our cattle would be scheduled, and our farmers would have suffered in consequence. This is only one instance, but the effort has been made again and again to interfere with the carrying on of our present prosperous trade on the same lines as heretofore, and every time the High Commissioner has taken a stand for the interest of Canada, and by his great ability, and integrity, and intelligence, and energy, he has frustrated every effort which has been made against the interests of Canada. Should we then refuse to vote him the paltry salary which he is getting? Is it because of this small expense that these attacks are being made upon him to-day? I think it is rather because of the part which he took in the interests of Canada and the preservation of this Dominion during the late election. There is no man who has earned his money so well, and has done so much for the people of Canada in England as the High Commissioner, and he is the last man with whom we should be disposed to part. We should be glad to pay him not only this salary, but a much higher salary, because no man has done so much as he has to bring Canada before the English people. He has the interests of Canada at heart, and we should not only willingly support him to the extent we have up to the present time, but to a larger extent than we have done. In regard to immigration there are many members here who would agree with me that, although the Government has been induced to cut down the expenditure on that account, we should

not carry out that species of economy, especially as we have those vast fields in the North-West for incoming immigrants. I think we should have taken the High Commissioner's advice, and increased, rather than diminished, the vote for immigration. The High Commissioner has shown the same ability and statesmanship in that question as he has in other questions in which he has interested himself in regard to Canada. I would be very sorry to see any reduction made in his salary, or to see him brought home and taken away from the great work he is discharging in the interests of Canada.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman refers to the services Sir Charles Tupper has rendered in preventing our cattle from being scheduled in the old country. Surely, he must have read of the visit of Mr. Plimsoll to this country, and that, at the meeting held in Montreal, Mr. Plimsoll said that if the people were under the impression that the reason for our cattle not being scheduled was any action of Sir Charles Tupper, or was because Canada was a dependency of the British Crown, they made a great mistake. He said that there was no person known to him in England as the High Commissioner of Canada or as Sir Charles Tupper. He said this was the first time he had heard of it, and he said, further, that the moment the people of the United States showed that the disease of pleuro-pneumonia was eliminated, they would have their cattle admitted to the British markets just the same as Canadian cattle.

Mr. SPROULE. I am sure the hon. gentleman from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) knows, that, when an embargo was placed on our cattle, Sir Charles Tupper went down to the cattle yards and combatted that attempt to exclude them. Are they aware of that? Certainly we see that the public press knows it, and whether hon. gentlemen opposite know it or not is a matter of small concern. The Canadian people do know it, the Canadian farmers know it; they know that an embargo was placed upon these cattle, and, had it not been for Sir Charles Tupper, it would not have been raised. At different times since the same effort has been made to bring us under that schedule, and in every instance he has ably prevented it and defended the interests of the country.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If we give the High Commissioner credit for all that is claimed for him, it could only be said that he was doing what was part of his duty. What we want to enquire about to-night, what we want some information upon—and I think this Committee will not be satisfied unless that information is given—is what Sir Charles Tupper was doing when he neglected duties of that kind and came to this country and took an active part in the elections. We want to know who instructed him, who invited him. We want to know if it was done with the sanction of the Ministry; we want to know if it was done at the request of the Ministry; we want to know if the example of a gentleman in the Civil Service, occupying the highest position in that service, is to be accepted as a guide for all other officers that are in the Civil Service? We find the First Minister to-night, replying to my hon. friend from Ottawa County (Mr. Devlin), professing some surprise that a gentleman occupying not a very high position in the Civil Service should have been found engaged in electioneering in the late elections in one or two counties; and if I understood him aright, he promised to enquire into that. If we may interpret his words aright, it seems to me that we would be justified in inferring, from what he said, that it was contrary to the wishes and to the policy of the Government that those who were in the employ of the Government, the servants of the public, should be found taking an active part in election contests. If that be so, I say we want to know by what authority, at whose request Sir Charles Tupper, the High Commissioner, came to Canada, leaving his duties, spending weeks and months here—not now to enlarge upon some of his utterances, which I may find occasion to do later on. We want to ascertain why it was that he was here. Who invited him? Was he requested to come? Was it with the sanction of the Government that he did so? Is it the intention of the Government to declare that it is one of the right and proper duties of the High Commissioner, for which the people of this country pay him? I do not know whether the Finance Minister is asleep or not, but he is supposed to be leading the House on this occasion; and although I do not suppose that I would be justified in demanding that consideration at his hands for myself, yet I think I may say that this Committee will require that either he or some other member of the Administration shall answer some questions that are pertinent in reference to this matter. It is necessary that we know on what basis we are proceeding, what line of conduct is to be followed, what the duties of those engaged in the Civil Service are, and then we can rightly comprehend as to whether there is any necessity of enquiring into the action of those in the Civil Service who have been found engaged in political work. If that is the policy of the Administration, if that is the British practice that is followed, or professed to be followed, by hon. gentlemen opposite, we wish them to say so, and the answer we want is a definite one, as to whether Sir Charles Tupper violated that which was due to his office, defying British precedent, to say nothing of decency in the matter; whether he did it on his own motion, or whether he came at the request of the Government. We want to know the position Sir Charles Tupper occupies in this country, virtually; we want to know if he claims to be the virtual head and the leader of the Government of this country; we want to know whether he is the virtual power, while the nominal power alone is in the hands of the Ministers? These are points that we want to have answered. I think that sitting still and not answering them, will not, perhaps, conduce to the Committee getting on, for I think I am not alone in the desire that I have for this information. Having got that, we will be better able to understand and to discuss this question, as to whether it is desirable to have a High Commissioner's duty wholly confined to what was supposed to be the duties of his position, or whether it is better that periodically, every year, he should take an annual tour through this country at the expense of the people, in order to abuse and vilify more than one-half the people of this country. We want to know whether it is part of the High Commissioner's duty, while he professes to be engaged in his duties on the other side of the Atlantic, to write down the credit of this country, to engage in enterprises that have for their object, as we have

heard investments in the neighbouring States, and at the same time to act as scribe for one of the papers over there, attacking one of the largest interests we have in this country, and using the power and influence that his position gives him, in order to damage that corporation? Let us know what the position and the duties of the High Commissioner are, and in what relation he stands to the Government and to the people of this country.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Shall the resolution be adopted?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; Mr. Chairman, we certainly have a right to know under what circumstances the High Commissioner, who is a paid official of the people of this country, spends many months of his time on this side of the Atlantic? Was it in the discharge of his duties as High Commissioner, or did he come here at the special request and instance of the Government of this country? That is what we want to know, that is what we have a right to know. It is a very doubtful matter whether it is desirable for us to pay money for the maintenance of a High Commissioner at all, if a part of that High Commissioner's duties are, as has been stated, to come over here and abuse his paymasters. I say that he had no right to do it. I say that he set a most disgraceful and indecent example to all the members of the Civil Service. He is one of the chief officials of the Civil Service. He knows that; he, himself, standing in his place here, has repeatedly declared that he believed it was contrary to the rule, to order, and to propriety, for members of the Civil Service to interfere with elections. Now he, one of the leading officials, has set the example to every civil servant throughout this Dominion, of leaving his post, so far as we know, without the authority of the Government, and coming over here to interfere in the elections. The Government should, in justice to themselves, say whether or not Sir Charles Tupper came here by their request, or of his own proper motion. I understand that he was paid his salary as High Commissioner during the whole time of his sojourn here. Had he chosen to resign, as I think he did on a previous occasion, his high commissionership, that would have been another matter. But he did not; he came here while he was our paid servant, and in so doing I say he violated all propriety, and all the rules which we have heretofore understood governed the action of civil servants.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If the Government decline to answer that question, would they give us a little light into the journey that Sir Charles Tupper took to Washington when he took two of our Ministers along with him? It is said they did not stay very long in Washington, but they went down there, and I understand they had quite a retinue with them. It seems when they went down there they expected to stay all summer; I was told they had enough trunks with them for a circus troop. But when they went down there the interview that took place with the Government of the United States, I am told, did not last all summer, but lasted only three minutes. The Government might tell us a little about that, if they will not tell us about the other. Did they take Sir Charles, or did Sir Charles take them? That is a very proper question to ask. Did they take Sir Charles to Washington, or did he take them? Did they take the trunks, or did Sir Charles take the trunks? As is very properly suggested by an hon. friend of mine, that is a "grand trunk" question. We ought to know about this, because arrangements had been made before the election to have this meeting after the 4th March, but, after they got there, they were told that no arrangement was made; the Grand Trunk had run off the track, and the connections failed to be met. The arrangements were made before the election, but they did not materialize. I do not think it would take more than three minutes for the Minister of Justice to tell us all about that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Carried.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If Mr. Chairman did not lean over his papers so much, he would see that this vote is not carried, and you, Sir, as an old parliamentarian, will, I am sure, give every opportunity to Ministers to give information, and we want to have some information in regard to this matter as in regard to others. We want to know whether Sir Charles Tupper left his position in London and spent weeks here, away from his office, at the request of the Government, or, whether he did that of his own accord and in violation of his duty?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think it is simply disgraceful that the Government will sit silently upon their seats and that the members supporting the Government sit with a muzzle upon their mouths and dare not open their mouths upon this subject. I think the charges which have been made against the High Commissioner are so important that they require an answer from the members of the Government. I believe, with the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), that this office should be abolished altogether. I do not think the country is getting any benefit from it, and all the benefit which may be supposed to be derived from it could be obtained from our thousand-and-one immigration agents in England and other countries. We have an army of immigration agents appointed and paid high salaries to send immigrants to this country, and the result is that very few remain here and we are not able to keep our own natural increase of population, even with the immigrants added. My opinion is that the services of the High Commissioner are of so little worth that the office should be abolished. Besides that, I think his course in leaving his position in London and taking part in the elections here is such as to demand his dismissal. It does not add to the dignity or responsibility of any Government that they have an officer so high in position as the High Commissioner leaving the duties which the people of Canada pay him a large salary to perform, coming out here and abusing a large portion of the people of this country. I say that the course of Sir Charles Tupper, in tramping this country from Halifax to Toronto in a special train at the expense of the people of Canada, and the language he has used in regard to the political opponents of the Government ought to lead at once to his dismissal; not to speak of the abuse which he has heaped upon one of the greatest corporations in this country, the Grand Trunk Railway Company. I think that corporation has done more for the Dominion of Canada than any other corporation in this country, and the only reason for the abuse which Sir Charles Tupper heaped upon it was that that corporation would not turn its influence in favour of the Government

of the day. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company were more pliant. They lent their whole influence to the Government. They provided special trains all along their line from Vancouver to Halifax to bring voters to vote for the Government, but because the Grand Trunk Railway Company would not do that, because the employés of that company were told to vote as their conscience directed, they are abused by a gentleman who receives $25,000 a year from the people of this country. I know that the Grand Trunk Railway Company did not try to influence their employés. In my county, in which the Grand Trunk Railway runs from end to end, the employés were told to vote as they saw fit. I am sorry to say that the majority of them did not see fit to vote for me. But the Canadian Pacific Railway sent out a mandamus to their employés that they must vote for the Conservative candidate. This is the position taken by these two great corporations, and I think that this great functionary in London, who is supposed to be doing such great things for the people of this country, when he comes here and abuses this great corporation which I believe has done more for the people of Canada than any other corporation, simply because they did not see fit to turn their influence in his favour, should be dismissed. If for no other reason, he should be dismissed as a warning to all, for all future time, that gentlemen appointed to that position should mind their own business. I think it is the bounden duty of the Government to give us some information on this point. It is very pertinent to ask whether this gentleman came here of his own accord or at the request of the Government, and whether the Government approved of the course he has taken in the election, and of his course in abusing and vilifying this great corporation all over the world. I think it is outrageous that the Government should sit quietly and silently in their seats without giving any explanation on this subject.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Perhaps the question is too broad to ask whether Sir Charles Tupper was brought out at the request of the Government. But we will narrow the question down. I see that Sir Charles Tupper held a meeting in Kingston, at the close of which he said, according to the supplement of the *Empire*:

"I must not conclude without expressing to you Sir John Macdonald's deep regret at not being able to be present here to-night. Nobody here regrets it more deeply than the humble servant of Sir John Macdonald's Government, who has been endeavouring to-night briefly to outline the position of our country. But in not coming here Sir John only showed that he thinks of the country before himself. He would have given anything to stand here to-night, to enjoy the pleasure of witnessing your beaming countenances and listening to the rallying shouts of warm support of the Liberal Conservative party."

Some hon. MEMBERS, Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I quite agree with that. I know that Sir John would receive the warmest reception from a great many of the electors of Kingston. But here is the point I am at:

"He directed me to say to you that he was so busily engaged at Ottawa, sending telegraphic messages all over the country, making arrangements for the undoubted security and success of the great party to which he belongs, that he found it impossible, except at an enormous sacrifice, to be here. He felt that if he was able to come, he might be returned by acclamation; but he would subject himself at this inclement season of the year, to the hardships of a contest, rather than fail in a single duty to the country. (Applause.) That is why I have the pleasure of standing here to-night before this magnificent meeting of the electors of this noble constituency, which for so many years has returned to Parliament a statesman who was looked up to throughout the Empire. (Loud applause.) I envy the electors of this noble constituency the privilege which they possess, of holding the services of so distinguished a gentleman as Sir John Macdonald."

Might I ask the First Minister, did the High Commissioner tell the truth to the people of Kingston: did he say truly when he said that Sir John Macdonald had sent him to that meeting and had sent a message with this gentleman who is a leading civil servant of this country? That is a question that can be very easily answered, and if the First Minister will favour us with a reply then, perhaps, we might be able to follow it up with enquiries in other directions.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, Mr. Chairman, I cannot resist the seductive tones of my hon. friend and I may answer him: Sir Charles Tupper did go there at my request and he made the speech at my instance, and I fancy that his speech must have had a considerable influence, because in the previous election I was elected by a majority of seventeen, and after Sir Charles Tupper made this speech I was elected by a majority that only wanted seventeen of 500. You see I was pretty wise in my generation in asking Sir Charles to go there and make a speech for me.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). You would be wise if you stopped him at that point.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will go a little further, and I will say that Sir Charles Tupper came out from England to give us the advantage of his skill, and influence, and eloquence, at my special request.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). We have succeeded at last. I knew the First Minister would answer, but he was in the back benches when the question was brought up, and his colleagues did not evidently care to assume that responsibility; but he has given the reply. The First Minister is, therefore, guilty of violating all that he has taught this House to believe is a great British principle. He has set an example that has opened wide the gates to permit and warrant any of the civil servants of this country taking part in elections. I would ask the First Minister how he forgot that he had set this illustrious example when my friend brought up the case of these minor officials in the city of Ottawa? How is it that the great Commissioner who kept our cattle from being scheduled in England, who is engaged in promoting a turkey and egg trade there, and whose presence in England is said to be of such vital interest to the country, could come over here and remain for such a length of time? Why is it that the country should have to go to the extra expense of sending to England another—not a High Commissioner, but an egg commissioner—to take charge of this matter which we are led to think Sir Charles ought to have done? The First Minister congratulates himself upon his choice, and I dare say Sir Charles is a powerful speaker. Sir Charles spoke at Kingston, and the First Minister's majority was largely increased, but I think it is only his generous nature that gives the credit of that to Sir Charles Tupper. I think, perhaps, that the majority was due in a great measure to the popularity of the Prime Minister in his own constituency, and that the Franchise Bill

and the making-up of the voters' lists helped the majority somewhat, although I do not in the least want to detract from the popularity of the right hon. gentleman. If the High Commissioner had been so eloquent and so powerful it is a pity he should have expended all his eloquence and all his constituency-gaining power in the city of Kingston. The First Minister, while showing great shrewdness in sending Sir Charles to Kingston, has not yet told us whether it was at his instance the High Commissioner went to London and to Windsor, and to other places, because the High Commissioner did not gain votes there. Either the First Minister lost his shrewdness or Sir Charles lost his power of gaining votes by his eloquence. I believe, however, that the High Commissioner would have done better in London if the First Minister had not been there himself. I am told by a friend of the hon. gentleman that at that meeting Sir Charles was speaking only a short time when there were cries from the audience that they wanted to hear the old chieftain, and the eloquence of the High Commissioner was evidently not what they went there to hear. I rather liked that, because I thought that a great many actions of the High Commissioner were an assumption that he was lord and master of this whole Dominion, that he was the leader of the Cabinet, that he was the Prime Minister of the Prime Minister himself, and that he was running the Prime Minister as well as running the country. I was glad to see that the faithful followers of the First Minister rather repudiated that idea which was conveyed by Sir Charles, and that the electors of London gave him his answer by defeating the Minister of Agriculture and returning my hon. friend (Mr. Hyman). Neither was it a shrewd move of the First Minister to send Sir Charles to Windsor. It is true the right hon. gentleman was not there to divide the attraction, and Sir Charles had it all to himself and hesitated to let anyone else speak.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Oh! Solomon White spoke.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But is not Mr. White an annexationist?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Of course he is.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Well, that is extraordinary. At all events, Sir Charles objected to have anyone speak against him and he had the whole meeting to himself, with the privilege of charming it by his eloquence, but the result was that the gentleman he supported, and who was, I think, the chairman of the Central Committee of the great Liberal-Conservative organization of the whole Province of Ontario, was defeated and my hon. friend from Essex (Mr. McGregor) was returned with 600 or 700 majority. Now the First Minister might tell us whether he lost his shrewdness in taking Sir Charles beyond Kingston, or whether Sir Charles lost his eloquence.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will tell you what he did: he lost his voice.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Well, if he lost his voice I do not know whether he has recovered it yet or not, but I do know that he is using his pen, or gets someone else to use it for him, and his writings with the pen are not any more creditable to him than his public utterances in Canada. The paid servant of the Canadian people using his voice in his own country to denounce one-half of his fellow citizens as guilty of disloyalty, in attempting to put a brand upon them that no man has a right to attempt to put upon others, has passed the bounds of decency. He is a man whose words could be treated lightly if it were not for the harm they were doing the country. The man who is now using his pen—if we may accept the reports we get—to write what he is putting his name to in the London press, whether written by himself or others; the man who is saying to the people of the mother land that in this important Parliament the Liberals are a party disloyal to the country, a party that are seeking annexation and political union with the United States; the man who being in the pay of the Canadian people, dares in a London newspaper to apply to the Liberal party of this country the name of "ruined gamesters" and insinuates that they were engaged in an attempt to sell their country,—the man who does that passes the bounds of decency, and the Ministry ought to say whether or not they endorse the sentiments that their High Commissioner is giving utterance to. The Government ought to say what is the position they take in reference to this matter: they ought to be bold enough to rise in their places, if they endorse these utterances, and in the presence of the representatives of the Liberal party in this country, make that charge if they believe it to be true. If, however, they believe it is, as they must know it to be, a foul libel upon the Liberal party, then I call upon them to repudiate the utterances of the High Commissioner; I demand that they should recall him from a position he has not dignified by his utterances and writings. I call upon them in the interests of Canada to recall him, because he is doing harm in the mother land to this young nationality, to this Dominion of Canada, when he uses his position as a servant of the Canadian people, and the mouthpiece of the Canadian Government, to declare to the people of the old land that one-half of the people of this country—for I hold that the Liberal party comprises one-half of our people, and I will not say the least important half—are not true to their country, that they are not loyal, that they do not seek the best interests of their country, that they are engaged in an attempt to hand over their country to another nation, to bring about a political union between them. I say, Sir, that utterances like these by him who is considered the mouthpiece of the Canadian Government are calculated to injure this country, of which the hon. gentlemen opposite are the guardians, and they ought to have an answer in regard to this matter. We want to know whether they assume the responsibility of Sir Charles Tupper's utterances and writings; we want to know whether or not they endorse his attacks upon one of the largest institutions we have in this country; we want to know whether or not they sanction his endeavour to destroy the credit of that country; we want to know whether or not he is giving expression to these utterances in accordance with the feelings and wishes of the Canadian Government. Sir, we have a right to know this, and we have now before us the information given by the hon. First Minister himself that he, proud as he claims to be in always following British precedent, sent to London and requested the High Commissioner of Canada, a public servant of the people of Canada and paid by them, to leave his duty there to come to Canada and

engage in electioneering, in stumping this country from end to end—endorsing his utterances, as far as Kingston is concerned, and, I suppose, appearing in company with him in vilifying a large portion of the people of this country, in endeavouring to excite hostility against them, and in giving utterance to sentiments calculated to damage this country in the eyes of the mother land and other nations. The hon. First Minister has told us that it was at his request that Sir Charles Tupper came and engaged in this work; and I suppose, unless he repudiates it, that we have to assume that it is with his consent, concurrence and approval that Sir Charles Tupper is engaged at present in England in attacking one of the most important institutions of this country, and in libelling one-half of its people as not being true to it and its institutions. That is the position in which our High Commissioner has placed himself, and do you think it wise that we should continue him in that office? Do you not think, if we are to have a High Commissioner in England and part of his duty is to take part in an election contest and stump this country in order to provide eloquence for a party who you would have thought would be able to provide it for themselves, that he should be appointed High Commissioner for the Conservative party in Canada, and that we should have another High Commissioner to go to England who will understand his duty to be to look after the interests of Canada there, and strive to do it good instead of harm? It seems to me that that question is involved when we are asked to pass the vote now before us; and we are entitled to a further explanation from the Ministry as to whether or not they look with approval upon the conduct of Sir Charles Tupper since his return to England. Perhaps the hon. First Minister will vouchsafe to us his views on this point as candidly as he did on the other. He is the most trusted member of the Cabinet; when he speaks he speaks with the approval of his colleagues, and I have noticed sometimes that when he refrains from speaking, his colleagues do not show a disposition to take the responsibility upon themselves. Therefore I may be pardoned if I single him out and ask him to be kind enough to answer this further question: Having approved of Sir Charles Tupper's conduct here, and having brought him here, does he approve of his conduct at the present time in the mother country?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the Government will find it to be to their interest to give a little more attention to the discussion of this question than has yet been given by the limited answer of the hon. First Minister. His answer has gone this far, that the Government have assumed the responsibility for the appearance of the High Commissioner in this country as a partisan of the Conservative party and a paid orator for the promotion of their party interests. We know that if a citizen of one country goes abroad and commits an offence against the law of another country, and his Sovereign chooses to assume the responsibility of his act, that relieves him of any liability to criminal prosecution for the wrong he has done; and looking at the relation in which the High Commissioner stands to the Government, the hon. First Minister's answer has to some extent relieved Sir Charles Tupper of what would otherwise be a very grave political offence. But, Sir, there is something more to be considered than the mere fact that the High Commissioner has taken part in the elections of this country. It is true, when the Government proposed to create the office of High Commissioner they told us that the appointment of a representative of the Government of Canada in England would relieve the Government here of a great deal of their responsibility in the negotiation of loans and in other public purposes which made it sometimes necessary for Ministers to cross to the other side of the Atlantic. Well, experience has not proved that statement to be well-founded; and if the High Commissioner can leave his office, as he frequently does, without detriment to the public service, it is perfectly clear that the public service does not require a High Commissioner. But, Sir, the offence with which the High Commissioner is charged from this side of the House is not that he has obeyed the Government and neglected his duty as the paid official of the people of this country, but that he has devoted himself largely to misrepresenting and vilifying those who are politically opposed to the Government. In fact, he is the official vilifier and unveracious calumniator of those who represent the Liberal party on this side of the House. The High Commissioner is the last man who should have brought the charges which he has against the leaders of the Liberal party. This gentleman has been singularly fortunate in his efforts to provide at the public expense for those who stand near to him. It has been stated that he and those immediately connected with him draw not less than $30,000 a year from the public treasury of this country. He has, no doubt, a very great interest, therefore, in upholding the party with which he and his friends are, for the time being, identified, and he does not appear before the people of this country to give evidence against the Liberal party as a disinterested witness. His interests are far too great personally for him to be looked upon as a witness whose evidence can be taken with the utmost confidence. Where did he learn that the Liberal party or its representatives in this House were "ruined gamesters"? He should be the last public man in this country to employ such a phrase. He is the last man connected with this country who should speak in that way of those who sat opposite him for nearly a quarter of a century in this House. There ought to be, Sir, at all events, something like *esprit de corps* among those who are here, even though politically opposed to each other in Parliament. But there is nothing of that spirit exhibited in the attacks made by Sir Charles Tupper on the leaders and representatives of the Liberal party in this House. The hon. gentleman employed his position in England, not merely to attack the Grand Trunk Railway Company and damage it as far as he possibly can, but he employs his official position and the standing it gives him before the public of England for the purpose of calumniating and traducing those who are now sitting on this side. It may be a very short time or it may be a considerable length of time, but some time or other he must know that, in the fortunes of political warfare, parties will change seats in this country. What sort of impression is the statement of this calumniator, made before the people of England, calculated to leave in their minds of the leaders of the Liberal party in this country? Have we no pride of country, no interest in the character

of those who sit opposite to us? If we are to be regarded as representatives having an interest in our country, is it to our advantage to go abroad and to have presented to us the statements said to be made by men belonging to our country, holding high official positions, that we are ruined gamesters, that we are men not to be trusted, that we are men who sought to sell our country and are ready to sacrifice the interests, and future hopes, and prospects of it for the purpose of removing those who sit opposite to us from office? I, as a representative of a section of the Liberal party in Ontario, feel very little interest in the question whether I sit on this side of the House or that, but I feel a very great interest in the promotion of what I believe to be a wise policy in the public interest. I have no interest whatever in traducing the character of those who are politically opposed to me. That is what the High Commissioner has done before the English-speaking public, not only on this continent, but over the whole British Empire, in order that, wherever the name of Canada is spoken, the leaders of the Liberal party may be spoken of as ruined gamesters; as men who undertook to ruin this country for the purpose of securing their temporary success as a party. I denounce such statement as a foul calumny: I denounce it as a malicious falsehood, and I call on hon. gentlemen opposite to unite with me in denouncing such language, and with the view of bringing this matter fairly before the country, I move that this whole item be struck out—that it be not concurred in.

Amendment negatived: yeas, 20; nays, 37.

Contingencies, including amount $2,000, required to pay for the contingent expenses of the High Commissioner, taxes and insurance on official residence, income tax, rent, fuel, light, stationery, &c.....$8,550

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). With reference to these contingencies, I wish to ask for information to which I think we are entitled. When the High Commissioner was taking his tour through Canada, it was stated in the press that he travelled by special train. I would like to know whether that was the case, and if so, what was the cost of that train and out of what fund it was defrayed?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not aware that any of the High Commissioner's expenses were paid out of the public service, but I will enquire.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I suppose his trips from England to this country and back again find a place in the expenses?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That may be, but I cannot say.

Mr. McMULLEN. We have a right to know whether he came out on the special invitation of the First Minister and for what particular purpose. Did he come out for the purpose of attending to elections or other matters of an official character?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have already stated what I asked him to come out for.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The right hon. gentleman stated candidly that he came out to attend the elections. The First Minister has been, however, altogether too modest. I, as a citizen of Kingston, beg to state that it was to the First Minister's own special and earnest care of his constituents, he was indebted for his increased majority. The First Minister had been a good nursing father or mother, whichever he prefers to be called, to the citizens of Kingston for the last three or four years. Such has been his care that a short time ago, when I had to go down to that constituency on private business of my own, the first thing I heard was that the hon. gentleman, in his anxiety to prevent the people from suffering from distress and destitution, caused no less, I think, than one hundred and twenty cars to be built, about the 5th or 10th of February last, in certain car works in that city. About the same time likewise, the hon. gentleman, in his disinterested regard for the welfare of my fellow citizens, was solicitous in procuring some important railway subsidies for projected railways in the neighbourhood of that city. Well, they have as good a right to it—no more and no less—than a good many other roads the hon. gentleman has subsidized.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You did not do much for them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes; we did, in a fair and square way.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. gentleman would not thank you for it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not know that, but the hon. gentleman was too modest in attributing to the words of Sir Charles Tupper what is due to his own good deeds. The hon. gentleman has ordered measures to be taken for the construction of a graving dock in that port of Kingston, and that graving dock, I believe, is under the charge of a certain Mr. Connolly, a member of a firm of which many members of this House are likely to know more before many days than they have before; and I am told that, somewhere about the 15th February, a little after the date of the speech referred to, this worthy man, Mr. Connolly, caused it to be proclaimed in the city of Kingston that anyone who wanted work had only to come to him and he would get it, if the work only consisted in wheeling the rubbish from one side of the dry dock to the other. It is evident, therefore, that not only is this due to the words of Sir Charles Tupper, but also to the good deeds of the First Minister, and the zeal which was shown in bringing in so many expatriated Canadians from Watertown and other parts of the United States to swell the hon. gentleman's majority. I might ask if this includes the hon. gentleman's club fees? I understand the hon. gentleman's club fees were paid amongst his contingencies.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Was his board paid when he was here?

Post Office and Finance Departments—
To pay the officers engaged in balancing and computing interest on depositors' accounts to 30th June, 1891. $3,600

Mr. McMULLEN. Is this paid by the job or by the hour?

Mr. HAGGART. I think it is by the hour, after their usual time, but I am not certain.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is very important, because, if they are paid by the hour, the officials have the opportunity of lengthening out the work to suit themselves. If they were paid by piece-work, they would rally to the work, and a certain amount of work would be done for a certain amount of money.

Mr. HAGGART. They are all trusted officials, and I think they are paid by the hour.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think it is a very unwise course to pay them by the hour. You are offering a premium to them to leave over an amount of work, so that they may charge extra pay for that service. No doubt, some of it is work that cannot be done within the hours. I believe that, in connection with the Savings Bank branch, the books used by the officials during the day cannot be used for the purpose of balancing up for the end of the year until after hours, but it should be let by piece-work, or a certain amount of work should be done for a certain amount of money.

Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would suggest to the Department some plan by which the balancing of accounts could be done by piece-work.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is quite clear that the Postmaster General is not posted with regard to the work done in his own Department, because I asked one of the chief clerks in the Savings Bank Branch, and he told me that part of the work is done by piece-work. I know that part of the work is done by piece-work, and the hon. gentleman says it is done by the hour. I advise the Postmaster General to post himself before he gets so saucy about it.

Contingencies—Governor General's Secretary's Office..... $13,500

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How would the contingencies of one of the Departments compare with the others as to the number of hands employed? Would they be about equal?

Mr. FOSTER. I think so. In the printing, it is much larger. In the Post Office Department, for instance, a large quantity of the contingencies is due to printing. In the Governor General's Office or the Privy Council, there is a very large item for telegrams, and especially for cablegrams, which are costly and numerous, particularly during the last two years. You will see how that runs by the Auditor General's Report, page B-63 and afterwards.

Privy Council Office—Contingencies... $11,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see that last year the hon. gentleman did not confine himself to the vote spent, about $14,000.

Mr. FOSTER. This year we are trying to keep it down to the amount.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice one or two curious items in this. What on earth are the leather boxes for, fifty-two in number, for supplying the Privy Council?

Mr. FOSTER. They must be for covering the documents in the office.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I hope those refreshments were not wholly of a spirituous character.

Mr. FOSTER. Apollinaris, mainly.

Contingencies—Department of Justice. $5,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to know how it comes that this varies so enormously from the actual expenditure? In the Minister's department for the year 1890, I see that $10,141 were required, while he only asks for $5,000 this year. I would be very glad if he confined the expenditure to it, but the disproportion is enormous between what was actually expended and what is asked for. There is no particular advantage in cutting this down nominally, and then spending a great deal more than we are asked to grant.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Perhaps the penitentiary branch is included in the Department of Justice.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is. In the Auditor General's Report, both are included.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How are the travelling expenses of inspectors of penitentiaries fixed?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Fixed by Order in Council, the same Order in Council that fixes the travelling expenses of other civil servants. An inspector is allowed $3.50 a day for travelling, besides actual boarding expenses; and in British Columbia, $5.

Contingencies — Department of Interior..... $18,000

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In looking over the report of the Minister of Interior, I notice that there was a sale of some property by auction in Montreal, that the auctioneer did not pay over the proceeds of the sale; that after election time had expired, something over $2,000 were got out of the auctioneer, and that subsequently, I think, endorsed notes were taken for the remaining $8,500; that the parties all went into insolvency, and that nothing has been received. How does that account stand now?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think the account stands exactly as the hon. gentleman has stated, and he has correctly related the circumstances. The auctioneer who was engaged to make the sale of that property, was represented to me at the time, by gentlemen who knew Montreal well, as one of the most responsible auctioneers in the city of Montreal. He had been previously doing work of that character for the Government, and I had no hesitation, from what I had heard of him, in engaging him to make a sale of that property. The Deputy Minister attended the sale, the terms of which I do not exactly remember, but I think a percentage was paid at the time of the sale. A certain time had been given to the auctioneer to make up his accounts, but when it was found that he was not making the remittances that were due, application was made for them. He continued to be slow in making his remittances, and after some pressure, he paid the proportion which the hon. gentleman mentioned, some two or three thousand dollars, into the bank as part payment of the sale, leaving a large balance. I came to the conclusion there was something wrong, and I put the matter into the hands of the Department of Justice, who proceeded against him. In the meantime he had gone to England, and was away from Montreal for eight or nine months. When he came back, the matter being still in the hands of the Department of Justice, a proposition was made on his behalf, offering these notes which, it was represented to me, were the best security we could get for the money. I accepted the arrangement, but eventually the parties who owed us the money went into liquidation, and I fear the account will be a dead loss.

Contingencies—Department of Indian Affairs..... $8,000

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If the Minister of the Interior would look at B—66 of the Auditor General's Report, under the head of travelling expenses, he would see "Mr. Dingman, $1,606.86." Is he the inspector of Indian agencies?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; he is the inspector.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not understand that amount. I thought he had been in Brantford all the year.

Mr. DEWDNEY. He was a great deal of the time; but the travelling expenses had been incurred, except those for travelling between the head office and Brantford, in visiting the various reserves, going as far as Quebec in the east. Last year the same question arose, and I brought down a return showing exactly what travelling expenses had been paid by the inspector, and I shall be glad to bring down a similar return this session.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Who was in charge of the Brantford office when he was not there?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The agent, Mr. Gilkinson.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). He is the agent.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes, he was the agent until very lately—until he was superannuated.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What position did Mr. Dingman occupy then?

Mr. DEWDNEY. When it was found that the affairs of the office were in rather a bad shape, he was sent there to put matters on a more satisfactory footing. It required all the time he could give in order to put the office in a satisfactory state. I believe it is now in a pretty good position, but not as good as it should be.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is another item which reads very curiously. I do not know what explanation the Minister may choose to make in regard to it. It reads as follows:—"Advertising Notice, re-addressing communications to the Hon. E. Dewdney as Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, and not as Minister of the Interior, or L. Vankoughnet." Are we to understand that for the purpose of advertising the fact the hon. Minister was not to be addressed as Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, or was to be so addressed, and not as Minister of the Interior, it was necessary to spend $2,805 not to speak of the odd cents? That is the way the entry reads. Perhaps there may be some mistake, and I should like to know whether the money was spent for that purpose.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I must say that when this paragraph in the Auditor General's Report was brought to my notice, it was the first time I had heard of this matter, and I can assure the hon. gentleman it surprised me as much as it does himself. Immediately on the matter being brought to my attention, I made enquiry as to the circumstances connected with it. I was reminded by the Deputy that a month or two after I had been in office my attention was drawn to the fact that there was great difficulty in getting letters belonging to the different branches sent directly to those branches. The head branch of the Interior Department is in the Eastern block, and the other is in the new building. In view of this inconvenience, I authorized the Deputy to take measures to correct it. I found that, on the strength of those instructions, he communicated with the Queen's Printer, and requested him to advertize in various papers in the Dominion for a certain length of time, so many insertions daily and so many weekly, and to his astonishment he found that the accounts paid by the Queen's Printer amounted to this most extraordinary sum. This is a plain statement of the fact, which astonished me as much as it has astonished the hon. gentleman, when brought to my knowledge.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It appears to me that in the administration of the Department of the Interior there does not appear to be any desire for economy. I observe that $18,000 are asked for contingencies, which is about double the amount for an ordinary Department. On reading the report of the Department the other day I found that in all the branches the receipts and the work are both decreasing: that the number of letters sent out and received is very much materially less than formerly: that the receipts are very much lower, in fact, ridiculously low: and if one may judge from reading the report, the general work of the Department cannot be much more than 50 per cent. of what it was formerly. I do not know whether the Minister or the Deputy is responsible for the extravagance. Six or eight years ago, when there was a great boom in the North-West, and when very large receipts were expected from the sale of Dominion lands, and when the Department was apparently energetic in endeavouring to sell the lands, there might be some excuse for an increase in the departmental contingencies; but that excuse ceased now that the receipts have declined, and the work of the Department has decreased so materially, as appears from the report. I cannot understand why there should be such an enormous amount for travelling expenses. Besides the Minister's expenses, which I presume are necessary, there are the expenses of Mr. Burgess, the Deputy, Mr. Pereira, Mr. Deville, Mr. King, Mr. Rothwell, Mr. Hume and others, ranging from $100 to $500 or $600. I should like to know what is the necessity of incurring such large travelling expenses, and whether the hon. gentleman can give any assurance to the Committee that, in view of the decreased receipts, the Department will be conducted on more economical principles?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think the hon. gentleman will allow, from what occurred several days ago, that we propose a very large decrease this year, a decrease larger in proportion than the falling off in the receipts.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Not in contingencies.

Mr. DEWDNEY. No: I find that the contingencies have ranged from $22,000 to $17,000 odd last year. In regard to the travelling expenses of the gentlemen mentioned, I may say that, first, there are my own travelling expenses. I went as far as the Pacific that year, and I do not think my travelling expenses were exorbitant, but economical. Mr. Burgess had instructions that same year to go to British Columbia to enquire into certain important matters pending there. He was taken ill when on his trip and detained there some weeks, which accounts for the apparently large amount of his expenses. With respect to $94 for

Mr. Pereira's expenses, I do not exactly recollect whether they were incurred when he was travelling with me or not. Mr. Deville, as Surveyor General, must necessarily do considerable travelling, and I do not consider the amount charged by him is excessive. Mr. King was one of our inspectors at that time, and had to do a certain amount of travelling. Hon. gentlemen must remember that our work is in the far west, and is an expensive journey, and if any one is detained in that country, he must necessarily run up a pretty large account for travelling expenses. Mr. Rothwell was sent by me to Banff Park, when the Park regulations came into force, to consult with the superintendent with regard to the issue of leases and so forth. Mr. Hume is secretary to the Deputy Minister, and he went with him to British Columbia.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I suppose the hon. gentleman will be able to effect a saving next year. I presume when he went to attend to his election this year, at his own expense, he would look over the affairs of the Department at the same time, and there will be no travelling expenses for that.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Mr. Johnson is our lithographer, and I presume this amount is for travelling expenses in visiting the establishments, chiefly in Montreal, where our lithographing is done.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Minister expressed his surprise at the amount paid for these advertising notices, and, I suppose, being in that state of mind, he cannot tell us much about it. Has he noticed, since this money was expended for advertising purposes, if the communications coming into him were more properly addressed than formerly?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There is a great change for the better in that respect, but it has not yet been altogether corrected.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would ask the Minister if he thinks it really necessary to have this army of extra clerks who appear to be in the Indian Department? There appears, from the Auditor General's Report, to be a regiment of clerks in that Department. It would almost seem to be a refuge for the incapable. Can the Minister give us any assurance that nine-tenths of these will be released from their attendance and their salaries saved to the people?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I propose to do away with almost the entire number of our temporary clerks and to increase the permanent list. We can make a reduction of expenses in that way.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That principle would not seem to make any reduction, but, on the contrary, it would increase the permanent expense. I notice that the work of the Interior Department appears to have greatly decreased. Now, why cannot the Minister run the Department on the old permanent staff and save $5,000 or $6,000 a year to the country.

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is not possible to do that. The temporary clerks are now drawing larger salaries than if they were on the permanent list, because in the latter case they would only receive the minimum of their class on first appointment. I am endeavouring to carry out the suggestion of the hon. gentleman as far as I can.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I took occasion in a general way to make an investigation into the departmental expenses by comparing one Department with the other, and it appeared to me that the only Department which decreased the expenditure for clerks for a number of years past was the Finance Department. I presume that in this Department the work would be increasing rather than diminishing.

Mr. FOSTER. It has increased.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In other Departments, and I specially refer to the Interior, where the work is largely decreased, the expenses for clerks has been increasing every year. Judging from the statements made by the different officers, the work of that Department cannot be more than half what it was seven years ago.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I can assure the hon. gentleman that the work of the Department of the Interior is not decreasing, but increasing, yet he will find that we are decreasing the expenditure. Owing to improved communication we are able now by amalgamating offices to do a good deal of the work in the Territories. If the hon. gentleman had looked into the work of the Indian Department he would find that it has been steadily increasing. Since 1882 the increase has been a hundred per cent.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It was not that Department that I spoke of, but the Department of the Interior, and I formed my judgment from the hon. gentleman's own report.

Mr. FLINT. I would like to ask a question with regard to subscriptions to newspapers. It seems to me, as a new member of the House, that this item is very large, considering that it applies to every Department of the Government. I would like to ask if there is a reading-room in connection with each of these Departments, and whether all these papers are taken in the city of Ottawa or scattered through the different offices throughout the country? It seems to me, from a superficial glance, that there might be a reasonable saving in this item, for in the nature of things there must be an enormous number of papers taken which are scarcely of any value. I can easily understand that in some of the Departments newspapers of a valuable character require to be taken, and the country should pay generously for them; but there appears to be included a vast number of small country papers which can be of no value at all, and they must be taken merely for the purpose of gratifying their publishers. I would like to ask also whether, as a rule, these papers belong to one political party. I have not added up all the items, but there must be something like $10,000 spent in newspaper subscriptions, although we have two or three large reading-rooms in the city. However, I am asking for information, and I would like to know what is the custom or rule, or the necessity for such an extensive subscription for country papers throughout the Dominion?

Mr. FOSTER. The reason for it is that information must be had. If my hon. friend had been here for a number of years, he would have heard this discussion of newspaper subscriptions at every recurring consideration of the Estimates. Two years ago I stated that an effort was being made to reduce them, and that effort has been at-

tended with considerable success. It is being repeated this year, and I have every reason for believing that the accounts for the current year, and certainly those for next year will show a great improvement in this respect. A large number of these papers have to be taken, in some Departments for one reason and in some for another; and it is not always the big papers that are the most necessary. For instance, in the Marine and Fisheries Department, the local papers about the coast are specially needed. In the Finance Department we require to take some financial papers both from our own country and from Great Britain, some of which are expensive. I am free to confess that this item has been larger than was necessary, not only under this Government but under preceding Governments. I suppose if we came down to a fair and honest expression of opinion, we would say that we could do with a very much less number; and the question now is how we can fairly reduce the number, not by a too heroic and sudden a process, but this happens to be a very opportune time for economy in this respect.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The chief sinner, I think, is the Department of Agriculture, which pays $1,368 a year for newspapers. Those overworked officials must have a great deal of trouble in reading those papers. The Department of Interior is almost as bad with $686; but, considering that there is an army of 87 officials there, you must give them something to do. But when we pay these sums for newspapers for a single Department, the thing is becoming ridiculously absurd. Promises of reductions have continually been made, but I have been long enough here to know the value of these promises. However, it is very little boodle to give them. If that were all the complaints we had to make, it would not be much.

Mr. DEVLIN. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance whether Liberal newspapers as well as Conservative, are received in the Departments?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, they are at times—the valuable ones.

Mr. DEVLIN. I am not at all surprised at the item being large; we find it amounts altogether to something over $10,000. I think all the newspapers are not received for information. I have heard that for a number of years something was practised on one of the Departments that shows that the papers are not always read. An enterprising editor, by changing the heading of his paper, got a Department to take the same paper under two names for a number of years.

Mr. FOSTER. We found that man out and stopped it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is a story that one official wanted to receive some real information and got the *Globe* newspaper, but as soon as it was found out the paper was summarily stopped. I think the hon. Minister of Marine knows something about that.

Mr. FOSTER. The *Globe* and *Grip* are taken.

Contingencies—Department of Public Works..... $7,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a charge here for framing an address to the Queen. What has the Department of Public Works to do with that?

Mr. FOSTER. It ordered the frame for Mr. Mulock's address.

Contingencies—Post Office Department. $35,000

Mr. DEVLIN. I find that the Postmaster General invited sealed tenders for the contract to carry the mails between Chenneville and Papineauville railway stations from the 1st July next. I have every reason to believe that various tenders were received. I know, as a fact, that some parties came all the way from Chenneville, got the blanks, and made out the tenders. They were reliable men and had excellent names upon their tenders, but they were informed that the old contract would be renewed after they had been put to the inconvenience and expense of coming up here.

Mr. HAGGART. Whenever tenders are opened the contract is given to the lowest tenderer. In no case since I have been at the head of the Post Office Department, when tenders have been opened, has the contract with the former party been renewed.

Mr. DEVLIN. Can the hon. gentleman inform me now what is the amount paid to the contractor for carrying the mails between Papineauville and Chenneville?

Mr. HAGGART. I have not the names of the post offices even off by heart.

Mr. DEVLIN. I will read a copy of a letter which I received from Mr. Lindsay, the superintendent of the Department, in reply to one I wrote asking for an explanation. I received this reply:

"The Deputy Postmaster General desires me to say, in reply to your note asking for blank tenders, that the Postmaster General has decided to renew the contract from Chenneville to Papineauville for the mail service, and, therefore, the forms you ask for would not be required."

Yet I find that a notice was posted up in the lower end of the county asking for such tenders.

Mr. HAGGART. That was done through error, as the hon. gentleman can see. The contract was renewed before the notice was put up.

Mr. DEVLIN. I got the reply I read, the day before yesterday, and the notice is dated the 3rd March, 1891.

Mr. HAGGART. The contract is often renewed before the tenders are opened. Sometimes tenders are advertised for, and before the tenders are opened and received the old contract is renewed. It is always renewed on the report of the Inspector, and the recommendation of the Deputy in my Department.

Mr. DEVLIN. Then there is no necessity for inviting tenders, and great inconvenience is caused to the parties who tender. No doubt in this case the contract was renewed because the contractor was a very devoted friend, I will not say of the Department, but of the party controlling the Department.

Contingencies—Department of Marine, $4,000

Mr. TUPPER. The estimate has always been too small. The expenditure last year was $3,667, and I think, it has never been kept within the $3,000. In making up the estimate, there was no

use in keeping it within the $3,000 when $4,000 was expended.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I remember that, at the time when this Department was divided, I predicted that the officials would devote themselves to showing that they could spend as much money as other Departments, and they do not think they are as important unless they do spend as much money. I should like to ask if the Minister does not see his way clear to putting the Department back on the basis on which it was some years ago, instead of having two Deputy heads? I think the business was conducted more satisfactorily then than it is now, and I believe the hon. gentleman will agree with me.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the Committee rise and report the resolutions.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would ask the Minister of the Interior whether there is any foundation for the statement that his Department has recently sustained a loss in connection with the revenues from Crown timber at Calgary?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; I am sorry to say we have.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. gentleman know the amount?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think it is a little over $3,000.

Committee rose and reported the resolutions.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 26th May, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 77) respecting the Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company.—(Mr. LaRivière.)

Bill (No. 78) to confirm an agreement between the Shuswap and Okanagon Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and to confer further powers on the Shuswap and Okanagon Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

CHIGNECTO MARINE TRANSPORT RAILWAY.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, to-morrow, to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to provide that the time for the completion of the works of the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company, Limited, shall, as respects their title to receive the subsidy heretofore authorized, be the 1st day of July, 1893, instead of the 1st July, 1890; also that all penalties, forfeitures and deductions incurred by the company under section 2 of chapter 4 of the Acts passed in 51st Victoria be remitted, and that said section 2 be repealed.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Printing Bureau—Cleaning, &c.....$2,000

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). An understanding was arrived at when the Committee rose that one item should be reserved to afford an opportunity of discussing the various contingencies of the different Departments, and in order that any hon. member who desired to offer observations on the subject of contingencies should have an opportunity of doing so in Committee to-day.

Mr. FOSTER. That was true, and I suppose the observations will be forthcoming when we take the item up.

Mr. CHARLTON. This is the last item, and the House is very thin to-day. The expectation was that this would be allowed to stand, so as to give an opportunity for discussing it.

Mr. FOSTER. It was allowed to stand for the last night only.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I was not here during the discussion with regard to the High Commissioner, and I would like to get some information with regard to this matter. Item 24, page 9, reads:

"Contingencies, including amount of $2,000 required to pay for the contingent expenses of the High Commissioner, tax and insurance on official residence, income tax, rent, fuel, light, stationery, etc."

Now, in the Public Accounts Committee last session a question was asked with regard to this expenditure, and an effort made to ascertain what this money was paid for, but we were unable to get that information. I see, however, that in the Auditor General's Report we have some explanation of this expenditure. At page 72—B, it says:

"Gas rent, $14.94; ground rent of official residence, $332.15; house duty and tax, $97.00; income tax, $250.00; parochial rates, $349.47; stationery, $559.60."

These items are mentioned in the Estimates, and it would therefore appear that the High Commissioner gets this $2,000 in addition to all these other contingencies. I think, therefore, that there ought to be some way of obtaining information, either in the Public Accounts Committee or in the House, which would enable hon. members to ascertain how these $2,000 were spent. The High Commissioner receives a salary of $10,000 per year, and if that is not enough let the Government make the salary $12,000 a year, and we will at least understand what the money is voted for. We should have some information to enable us to say whether this vote for $2,000 ought to be voted or not.

Mr. FOSTER. I find in the Estimates for contingencies, High Commissioner's office, London, for the year 1890-91, the following:—"Rent of office and fuel, $2,812; cleaning, gas, repairs, $175; printing and stationery, $650; postal expenses, $800; miscellaneous petty cash, $960; travelling expenses, $150; income tax, $122; newspapers and periodicals, $255; messengers' wages, $603, making a total of about $7,000. These are the contingencies in the High Commissioner's office itself. This vote of $2,000 is for contingencies of the High Commissioner for expenses pertaining especially to his office. I find that in Sir Alexander Galt's time we paid $4,000 to him, out of which he provided a residence for himself, but after the purchase of the official residence it, of course, became unnecessary

to grant that sum. The official residence was furnished by the Government and is a fixed charge on the Dominion revenues, so that, instead of paying the High Commissioner, after Sir Alexander Galt's time, $4,000 for house rent and incidental contingencies, I understand an arrangement was made by which $2,000 was retained by the Government in consideration of house rent and the other $2,000 is a grant to the present High Commissioner, on a par to the grant to the former High Commissioner, for contingencies and expenses incidental to his being there in his official capacity. This he receives monthly, and the vouchers are to be found in the Auditor General's office.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. We tried to obtain the vouchers last year and we could not.

Mr. FOSTER. The one-twelfth part of this $2,000 is paid every month, just the same as the salary is paid, so that there is no necessity for any more vouchers than for the salary. The items are not given.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Are we to understand then, that the High Commissioner stands on a higher level than a Minister of the Crown in this country, because if any Minister of the Crown incurs contingent expense in the management of his office, if he travels or hires a cab, he has to produce a voucher for it; but here we are voting $2,000 to our High Commissioner in England, who is at liberty to spend this money in whatever way he pleases, and he is not responsible to the Parliament or the people of this country. I say that this is not a proper method of proceeding. If $10,000 a year is not sufficient to pay the High Commissioner, let the Government ask for $12,000 and let them deal honestly in the matter. Take the list of contingencies we paid the High Commissioner last year as found in the Auditor General's Report: "Aid to distressed Canadians, $25.53." I can imagine that the High Commissioner might have paid that amount out of the $2,000 instead of charging it to the public service. "Burdett's Official Intelligence, $6.80." That is another matter which might have come out of this $2,000 vote, but did not. "Cables and telegrams, $195.55; cabs and travel, $86.83; carpentering, $67.20; commission on postal orders, $17.60. These might all very well be considered contingencies, but they do not come out of the $2,000. Then there is a gratuity to Mrs. Wilkinson of $68.13. I think that might be paid out of contingencies. So might gratuities to postmen and others, $29.57. Then we have income tax of the High Commissioner, $260; ground rent of official residence, $332.15; house duty and tax, $97.33; newspapers, $196.04; newspaper cuttings, $24.33. I think all these might very well come under the head of contingencies, and that, even down to the winding and regulating of the clock, $10.34, the amount might be paid out of the allowance for that. It may be asking too much of the Government, but I say that the High Commissioner has no right to be placed on a higher level than a Minister of the Crown here, and I believe that if he pays these amounts, he ought to give an account showing what he has paid. Sir Charles Tupper has a salary of $10,000, and he ought to give a strict account of the expenses he incurs under the head of contingencies. If the contingencies do not amount to $2,000, he should refund the extra amount, but at all events he should give an explanation of the amount he expends. If this $2,000 is given to him as a gratuity, we should understand it. Let us know that we are paying him $12,000 instead of $10,000, besides all his other perquisites.

Mr. FOSTER. What perquisites?

Mr. McMULLEN. The perquisites he has under these items, and also the perquisites he has in coming here to Canada and travelling through the country free and interfering in elections. The Finance Minister said that the information on this subject was given to us in the Public Accounts of last year.

Mr. FOSTER. I said no such thing.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then I hope the hon. gentleman will be able to give us those details this year.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If the income of the High Commissioner is increased by the amount he has invested in the gas company, I should like to know if we will be compelled to pay the increased amount on his income tax.

Mr. FOSTER. That is too gassy a question.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think that is a very proper question, and I think we ought to know if the electors of Canada will have to pay the amount of that increase.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Taking the Minister's explanation as to the reason for the amount of contingencies being reduced from $4,000 to $2,000, because of the purchase of the official residence, one would imagine that the ground rent and the income tax would be included and should be paid out of the $2,000 now allowed to the High Commissioner. If the whole $4,000 had been taken from him it might be different, but we find, of course, now no item for rent, but $2,000 is still left to the High Commissioner, and one would think that out of that he would pay the ground rent; and that item is fairly open to criticism.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I think the information which is asked for by this side of the House is perfectly reasonable. We want to know for what purpose the amount voted for contingencies has been spent. We do not charge that it has been spent improperly or corruptly, but we ought to know how it was spent. If it has been spent properly, the Government have no reason to refuse to tell us how it has been spent. If I were asked by my constituents how that money was spent, I ought to be in possession of the facts so as to give them a proper answer, and I do not think it is right for the Finance Minister to ask us to pass this item without a proper explanation. If Sir Charles Tupper has used this money in order to entertain his friends, let us know it, or if he has used it for any other purpose let us know it. I think the question put by the Opposition is a perfectly proper question, and the Government will not perform their duty in refusing to give us the desired information. If the information is given, I am convinced that we can pass the item without further trouble.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought I gave a fair statement of the case in reply to another hon. gentleman. We know that this money has been paid to Sir Charles Tupper as well as his salary of $10,000. We know that we allowed Sir Alexander Galt $4,000 for contingencies. Of course he had to pay

the rent of an official residence, while now we have purchased an official residence. Consequently, instead of allowing $4,000 for contingencies, we only allow $2,000. We do not ask how that was spent any more than we asked how the $4,000 was spent. As far as this country is concerned, we know that amount was paid. I do not think it will take hon. gentlemen very long to understand that there is a considerable amount of incidental expenditure in connection with the High Commissioner's office. Sir Alexander Galt did not give the items for his expenditure. He found that it would be impolitic in some cases to give these items. There are various expenditures which the High Commissioner has to make as representing the people of this great country. This $2,000 is given to him as an allowance, and has been given to him for the last nine years, in lieu of the amount which was previously given to Sir Alexander Galt, less the amount for house rent, because we purchased the official residence.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the hon. gentleman will look at the Auditor General's Report, he will see that what he mentions is not exactly adhered to. Sir Alexander Galt paid his own income tax, he paid his own rent, he paid many charges which are included in the contingencies of the present High Commissioner. The present High Commissioner not only has a house furnished him, but he is receiving nearly as large an allowance as Sir Alexander Galt was receiving, and the latter had no house furnished to him at all. The hon. gentleman will see, therefore, that so far as the High Commissioner is concerned the understanding to which he refers, and which was stated to us at the time the house in London was purchased, is not adhered to. Now, I would like also to ask how it is that while the appropriation made last year for the expenses of the High Commissioner's office amounted to $7,163, the amount actually expended was $15,970. I do not see from what source the difference between these two amounts is made up.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend, if he looks closely, will see that it is he who has made the mistake. The amount voted was over $15,000, and the amount expended was also over $15,000.

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. Finance Minister says practically that the $10,000 is paid as salary, and that the $2,000 additional is also practically paid as a salary, because we have no more vouchers for the one amount than for the other. It may be, as the hon. gentleman suggests, that it is not politic for us to know in what manner that $2,000 has been expended. If the hon. Finance Minister will add that $2,000 to the High Commissioner's salary, making it $12,000, I do not suppose any more questions will be asked.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the difference between that and what we do at present?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear. We do not see the difference.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think there is much to see.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Will the hon. Finance Minister state what object there is in paying $10,000 of salary, and then giving $2,000 in addition? Would it not be better to put the total amount at $12,000 rather than give the country the impression that the High Commissioner was only receiving $10,000?

Mr. FOSTER. That is a matter of taste.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Let us hear what your taste is about it?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is precisely what it is, a matter of taste, and I suppose the Government want a guarantee that the $2,000 shall be a matter of taste.

Sir DONALD A. SMITH. I would suggest to the hon. Finance Minister that it would really be better to include the amount as salary; but while I have a very proper idea of economy, I do think that, instead of putting it at $10,000 or $12,000, $20,000 would be by no means too much to pay—I am not speaking of an individual, but for the position of the representative of Canada in London. There are so many demands made on any gentleman in that position, that I think it would be only showing a proper regard to the dignity and the position of Canada to make a good allowance for the High Commissioner.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think everything must be judged by its relations to other parts of the Government. Something may be said from the point of view of the hon. gentleman: I know that those possessed of great wealth look at $10,000 as a very small sum; but when we consider that the Prime Minister of this country, whose position is at least as honourable and I fancy ten times as difficult and onerous as that of the High Commissioner, receives but $8,000, it seems to me absurd to suggest that the High Commissioner should receive $20,000. You ask that an officer who lives in England, and who, however you may attempt to surround the fact with verbiage, holds a sinecure——

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)—very largely, should have a salary larger than that of the hard-worked head of a Department. If it is not a sinecure, perhaps the hon. Finance Minister would enlighten this House as to what practical duties the High Commissioner has discharged during the last eight or ten years. We have had this matter discussed here session after session, and with the exception of an effort made by the High Commissioner a few years ago, to stop an edict, the effect of which would have been to hamper the importation of our cattle for the time being, I know nothing practical which that gentleman has done. He may have done a great deal; but from his report, which I have read, year after year, I have failed to find what he does. I remember that, some years ago, a mission was undertaken for the purpose of improving our trade relations with Spain, and predictions of no mean kind were uttered in this House as to what the results of those negotiations should be; but thus far they have been nil. Will the hon. gentleman tell us in what other direction they have not been nil? I know that in election times he comes here and does a great deal of good to his party, and a great deal of harm to his country; but I do not think that anyone, looking at the matter from a non-partisan point of view, will say that for that work he should receive $20,000 a year of salary, to say nothing of the other expenses of his office. I do think that before the hon. gentleman startles us with such an extraordinary suggestion, he must be prepared to show that our condition in Canada is so essentially prosperous that we should be justified in moving in the direction of

increasing the salaries of our hard-worked officials: before we increase those of persons holding sinecures. Look at the salaries paid to our judges, who are in many cases overworked; look at the salaries paid to our county judges, many of whom are underpaid. If the country is in a financial condition to increase the salaries of any of our officials, I think these are entitled to consideration: but I do not know that the hon. Finance Minister would be prepared to say that the financial condition of the country is such as to enable him even to move in that direction. But before we have these propositions for increasing salaries, which are easily made, but difficult to carry out, we should have satisfactory assurances from those in charge of the finances of the country that our financial condition is better than the official blue-books and the statements in the *Gazette* would lead us to believe.

Sir DONALD A. SMITH. The hon. gentleman has compared the emoluments of the High Commissioner with those of the hon. First Minister and the other Ministers of the Crown. The hon. gentleman does not require to be informed that many representatives of European nations, those in Austria, in France, in Russia, in England, get much higher salaries than the Prime Minister in any of those countries; and that is undoubtedly considered necessary to their position, representing as they do their Sovereign, as the High Commissioner of Canada represents the Dominion.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Misrepresents.

Sir DONALD A. SMITH. And I think it would be really in our own interest that the position of High Commissioner of Canada,—I say again, I am not speaking personally, not speaking of the individual—should be made such as to enable him to entertain, to some extent, out of the proceeds of his salary, as is done by almost all other representatives. The hon. gentleman incidentally said that there was a notice on the paper from me in respect of increasing the salaries of the judges. I do trust this will be taken into consideration by the Government, because I think we owe it to ourselves that the salaries of our judges should be increased; and while I hope I am as much actuated by a proper desire for economy as the hon. gentleman or any other member of this House, I should certainly not be opposed to seeing the emoluments of the Ministers of the Crown and of our judges increased, but at the same time we ought to exercise every care in introducing into every portion of the Civil Service those only who are fit to do the work to be assigned to them. If such care be observed, we should be able to pay well all those who are capable of doing, and who do good work for the Dominion.

Mr. MULOCK. I think we will all agree with the sentiments expressed by the hon. gentleman who has taken his seat. We all want the country to pay properly for all services rendered. The difficulty in this particular case is to discover what services have been rendered for any portion of the salary to the country as a whole. However, I have not risen to discuss that question, but rather to reply to a few remarks that fell from the hon. the Minister of Finance, who, I think, through not having looked into the matter carefully, has fallen into a mistake. The hon. Minister tells us that we are now carrying out, as it were in a partial way, the arrangement made when Sir Alexander Galt was appointed High Commissioner. Now, as I understand the position of the matter, when Sir Alexander Galt was our general agent, he received for about one year $4,000. For that $4,000 he was to pay his own rent and taxes, fuel, light and other incidental expenses. That arrangement lasted for about one year. After that an Order in Council was passed giving him $3,500, out of which he was to supply himself with house rent, etc. That was the state of affairs when the present High Commissioner made the arrangement by which Canada purchased a house in England. We paid for that house and furniture some $42,000, and it was then stated in this House that the $4,000 for contingencies was not to be continued because we had furnished the High Commissioner with a house. But to-day we are in this position: that, although we have furnished the residence, we are still voting $2,000, or half the contingencies. Now, when Sir Alexander Galt got his appropriations, he had to furnish his own house and to pay his own rent and taxes and other incidentals: yet, to-day, we are asked to vote half the expense of the appropriation, and at the same time to supply the High Commissioner with a residence and all the expenses connected therewith. If you look through these items in the Auditor General's Report, you will find that, in addition to getting the $2,000, Sir Charles Tupper has been paid for those incidentals that were formerly paid out of the appropriation. When the purchase of the house was made, Sir Leonard Tilley, Minister of Finance, pledged himself, on the floor of the House, that the interest upon the whole investment was to be deducted from the allowance. The interest on the purchase of the house and on the cost of the furniture and other expenses was to be deducted from the allowance. But to-day the Government are maintaining one-half of the allowance, thus not carrying out this arrangement of Sir Leonard Tilley's. If you take, say 5 per cent. interest on the investment of $42,000—I do not know if there is anything additional to that on original capital account—that amounts in itself to $2,000, half of the original $4,000 the Finance Minister has spoken of; and, in addition, we are paying other incidentals, such as $349 rates, $250 taxes, $332 gas, and so on. So that you are practically making an increase of salary and not carrying out the arrangement Sir Leonard Tilley had made. I think the item should be struck out and put on its proper footing. If we wish to give an increase of salary, let us say so. If we want to pay necessary expenses, the vouchers should be here. That is the only honest way of keeping the public accounts. If the salary is too low, let us say so, but not cover up an increase of salary in this way.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I hope the hon. the Finance Minister is convinced that not only the Opposition but his own friends agree to the proposition I made, that the $2,000 should be added to the High Commissioner's salary rather than be paid in the way it is. The hon. member for Montreal West (Sir Donald Smith) must be convinced, from his own argument, that there is something wrong in this way of voting money; and I trust he will see the force of the demand made. If Sir Charles Tupper is to be paid $12,000, he should honestly and above board be paid the money, and not be

paid $2,000 under the cover of contingencies. I cannot say I agree in the opinion of the hon. member for Montreal West with regard to the payment of enormous sums to the High Commissioner. However, we are not now considering that matter, and when it comes up for consideration it will be ample time to discuss it, but I fancy there is no chance of it coming up this session. I trust the Finance Minister will see the force of the argument that the $2,000 should be put on a proper footing.

Mr McMULLEN. The hon. the Minister of Finance has stated that this item of $2,000 is in keeping with a like amount paid to Sir Alexander Galt when he was our agent. I have searched the Auditor General's Report for a like sum passed *en bloc* to Sir Charles Tupper and his predecessor. I find that in the first year of Sir Charles' appointment he was allowed $3,500 for fire, light and taxes. Now, these are all charged in the items recited in the Auditor General's Report, and the $2,000 is charged in addition. Now, with regard to the remarks that fell from the hon. member for Montreal West (Sir Donald Smith), I am prepared to say, that when Canada is prepared to use a High Commissioner in England to such an extent that his residence in London will pay the country for keeping him there, I have no objection that he should be paid a fair salary for his services, and I am willing also to allow him such an amount as will enable him to discharge his duties with credit to Canada and to himself; but at the time Sir Charles Tupper was appointed High Commissioner, I claimed that the House and the country were misled. The First Minister stated that, by sending a High Commissioner to England and by giving him an official residence, we would save more in the interest we paid in various other ways than his whole salary and expenses would amount to. From the first time he undertook his duties as High Commissioner, Sir Charles Tupper has not discharged those duties as it was promised he would discharge them when he was appointed, and, consequently, we were misled. When the attention of the Finance Minister was called to this two years ago, he stated that we were under contract with our financial agents in London to allow them to put through our financial transactions, and that, until that contract expired, we would not be able to use our High Commissioner in the way it was intimated to us we could use him five years ago. It is very extraordinary, when the First Minister and the Finance Minister were urging that we should appoint Sir Charles Tupper as High Commissioner because we would save money, that it has been found impossible to take advantage of his residence in London to act as our financial agent. Anyone who reads his report of this year will find that, with the single exception of the delegation of tenant farmers which were sent to Canada, there is not an item of his action which properly belongs to the duty of the High Commissioner. He makes extensive reports in reference to charitable societies and emigration societies, he makes many references which belong to the duty of an emigration agent, but we were led to believe that he would perform much more important duties than those in connection with emigration. He deals also with the matter of educating our people as to how they can ship a number of small commodities which we used to send to the United States, such as eggs, and butter, and so on. I recommend hon. members to read Sir Charles Tupper's report, and there they will find the class of duties in which he is engaged. The duties he performs could be attended to by a man with a salary of from $1,000 to $2,000. Taking the turkey question, he says:

"A considerable number of turkeys have also arrived recently, and have sold readily at good prices: so far as I can ascertain from persons engaged in the trade, there will be an unlimited demand for them in future. They are regarded as being more like game than the British farm-fed turkey, which arises, no doubt, from the touch of wild blood which they contain."

What a grand idea must have struck our High Commissioner in trying to secure an extended market for our turkeys in England, because, as he says, a touch of wild blood makes them more palatable to the English Lords. I never knew that we sent the High Commissioner to England for the purpose of extending the trade in turkeys. However, I say that he has never performed the duties in England attaching to his position for which we pay him $12,000 a year. I never could get at the secret. I do not suppose that anyone on this side of the House could get at the secret why he was ever sent to England. Perhaps the question of who should be the chief of that party in the future, may have had something to do with his crossing the Atlantic. There were two men on this side who were possible leaders, and we had to send the one to the other side of the Atlantic at an annual cost of $25,000, and to keep the other here. That appears to have been the reason why Sir Charles Tupper was sent to England, and I do not hesitate to say boldly that it is an outrage to keep a man like him there at such a cost performing merely nominal duties. I do not deny that in point of ability Sir Charles Tupper is a credit to Canada, but, whatever may be the amount of his ability, we do not have the value for the money we pay. The duties which he performs are not in proportion to the amount we have to pay him. There appeared to be no particular objection to paying $10,000 for such on official. Sir Alexander Galt and others had received a similar amount. But we bought him a residence and furnished his house with everything required from garret to cellar. We pay for that house, and we give him $2,000 in addition to that. Now the hon. member for Montreal West says it is necessary, in order to enable the High Commissioner to entertain those whom he is called upon to entertain in the high position that he occupies. If that is so, let the people of Canada understand that it is for that purpose the Government are asking for the money. Why should we ask the people of this country to consent blindly to part with $2,000 for purposes that are not openly acknowledged? The people have a right to know where the money goes. If it is intended to give wine dinners, say so. If it is intended for other purposes, say so. Let the people of this country know what the money is being spent for. I say they have a perfect right to know that. They have a right to know why we are paying Sir Charles Tupper $12,000 instead of $10,000. Perhaps that $2,000 extra is given him in order to equip him thoroughly and prepare him for his periodical visits to the Dominion of Canada when the elections come round, and to discharge the duties of chief advocate of the cause of Toryism in this Dominion. Perhaps that is what it is given

for. If it is given for that purpose, we would like also to know it. Now, I wish to say that I quite concur with the remarks already made, that if we are going to continue Sir Charles Tupper in London, we had better, in the interests of this Dominion, endeavour to make better use of him than we have been doing for the last five years. We have spent from $100,000 to $120,000 on the High Commissioner in London for the last five or six years, for which this country has virtually received nothing, unless on one occasion, for which he gets credit, when he prevented our cattle from being scheduled so that they would have to be slaughtered within two weeks of their arrival, the same as the American cattle. Now, that is the only thing, I believe, that he ever accomplished, and that was done three or four years ago. Still we keep him there in the discharge of functions which are of no benefit to this country, and I hold that we should either bring him back or else assign him duties in the performance of which he could be of some advantage to us as High Commissioner. Before sitting down, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance, when does the contract terminate with these gentlemen in London that are now discharging the duties of financial agents for us? When may we expect that Sir Charles Tupper, or any other person discharging the duty of High Commissioner in London, will perform those duties himself in the interest of this country, duties which we were promised would be performed by the High Commissioner when we were asked to consent to his appointment?

Mr. FOSTER. I have a great desire to give the hon. gentleman information, and I will answer his questions categorically. That contract expires on the first day of July, 1892, in this way: That on that day, we can either get a year's notice, or we can give a year's notice of the termination; so that either way it may terminate on the first day of July, 1893. With regard to the second question, as to when the time will come that Sir Charles Tupper will do such and such things, I am not prepared to give that information. I want to say, however, as long as I am on my feet, that the hon. gentleman seems not to object to the payment of $12,000 on the ground of economy. He does not at all find fault that it is necessary that $12,000 should be paid, but he does not want it to be paid $10,000 plus $2,000—it must be $12,000 in a lump sum; and the reason he does not want it paid in $10,000 and $2,000, is because, he thinks he ought to know the items for which the $2,000 are spent, and he has not been furnished with these items. Now, it seems to me that the arrangement I stated here was a full, open and fair arrangement made in 1882 or 1883, whenever Sir Charles Tupper went there. I did not say that the same arrangement was carried out as we had with Sir Alexander Galt. I stated that Sir Alexander Galt received $4,000 for certain purposes, so he did; and although the Order in Council mentioned $3,500, that was only part of the $4,000 he received, and he was getting besides that, $500 contingencies pure and simple. I stated that when Sir Charles Tupper became High Commissioner that arrangement was made by which $2,000 should be retained by the Government and the other $2,000 should be paid to him for certain incidental expenses. That is exactly the arrangement that was made with reference to the salary, an open and full arrangement, and I do not see why we should cavil about that. Now there is another point. There seems some strange difference between my hon. friend who spoke last and my hon. friend from Charlottetown. My hon. friend from Charlottetown complains that the High Commissioner has nothing to do, and does not do anything, and my hon. friend who has just spoken complains that the High Commissioner does too much, and that he ought not to do those things that he does do. For instance, the hon. gentleman trys to belittle the work of the High Commissioner because he deals in such small matters as the egg trade, and the poultry trade, and the cattle trade. Not many months ago, Sir, it was not thought in this country, by the party in Opposition, that the egg trade and the poultry trade were small matters. I remember that scarcely a paper of theirs, scarcely an orator of theirs, ever published an editorial or made a speech in which these matters were not prominently brought forward, and the farmers and the farmers' wives, it was said, would be irretrievably ruined because the McKinley Bill would destroy their trade in eggs and poultry. Now it seems that these trades are not so important. I do not think the farmers of this country will look upon it in that way. I do not think that it demeans our High Commissioner, be he Sir Charles Tupper or whoever may succeed him, to look after these interests, which are very large when you come to look at the incidence of them, and the great majority of the people whom they affect. Sir Charles Tupper is not too high a commissioner to look after these matters of trade, which are of vital importance to the various interests of this country. What he has done with reference to the cattle trade is well known, and there is no member on either side of the House, I suppose, who will withhold from him the meed of praise which is his due with reference to that matter. With reference to the egg and poultry trade, my hon. friend, usually so well informed, seems to have fallen into a strange error. I may say to him that Mr. Saunders, Director of the Experimental Farm, never went to Great Britain to look after the egg and poultry trade. The hon. gentleman must have found his information in some strange way; however, it is totally incorrect. The services that Sir Charles Tupper and his assistants there effected were valuable services, and they have resulted in large benefit, and will result in much more benefit, to this country, so far as the trade in eggs and poultry with the mother country is concerned. My hon. friend finds fault, as well, because Sir Charles Tupper is not all the time engaged upon high and lofty matters; he thinks, that instead of fiddling around with eggs and turkeys and the like of that, he should be making loans. Well, Sir, when we made the last loan, the most advantageous loan that ever was placed on the British market, Sir Charles Tupper had an important part to perform, and he did it well, and the result was that, as I said before, we placed a loan on the British market at a rate less than any colony had ever placed a loan there before, and on very advantageous terms, as well. My hon. friend may try to belittle the work that a gentleman representing Canada, in so important a centre as London, has to perform, but he cannot go counter to the general sense of the intelligent people of this country who have only to reflect for a single moment to understand in how

many varied and important ways a gentleman of the ability, such as my hon. friend acknowledges Sir Charles Tupper to be, a gentleman of the unwonted activity which the hon. gentleman also concedes to Sir Charles Tupper, can perform in London in the interests of Canada; and those who have to deal with the English Government know what great services he has rendered to this country in promoting our trade interests. They know how important it is that we should have some person there who understands this country and who is able to work in its interests; and, although the hon. gentleman may cavil as to the $10,000 and the $2,000, I apprehend the time will never come when the Government of Canada will cease to have an able and true representative of its interests at the seat of Government in London.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Minister of Finance says that Mr. Saunders was not sent to Great Britain for the purpose of enquiring into the egg and poultry business; he said that Mr. Saunders went there upon other business.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say that.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, what did the hon. gentleman say?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know that I am bound to repeat myself so many times, but I will do so out of sheer kindness to the hon. gentleman. I said that Mr. Saunders, the Director of the Experimental Farm, never went to England on any such mission as my hon. friend says he did.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, we will see what Sir Charles Tupper says, and then we will find out whether the hon. gentleman is right, or Sir Charles Tupper. Here is what Sir Charles says in his report:

"The operations of the McKinley Tariff have created a desire in Canada to render the country more independent of the United States markets for poultry and eggs, and inquiries and experience have demonstrated that an unlimited demand exists in Great Britain for such products. Before Mr. Saunders, the Commissioner deputed by the Government to visit this country, and to report upon the subject, arrived, much information was collected respecting the trade, and I trust that its dissemination has been of use to Canadian shippers."

Mr. FOSTER. I will help the hon. gentleman out of the dilemma. There are a great many people by the name of Brown, and there may be several by the name of Saunders.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is possible there may be other Saunders than one. If I made a mistake in saying that he was superintendent of the Model Farm I withdraw that statement. I do not for a moment belittle the duties which Sir Charles may have to perform, but I do not think it necessary that a man receiving a salary of $12,000 a year should be called upon to discharge such duties. They could be discharged by a great many people who are in our employ in England, and who are sent there for different purposes. It was announced in Parliament that Sir Charles Tupper would be engaged in performing very different duties, and would prove valuable as our commercial agent; and I hope, when this promise is carried out, we will obtain some value for our money, for we have received no value for it in the past.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Minister of Finance has sought to justify the continuance of the office of High Commissioner and the present occupant of it, on the ground that he has performed great service in respect to the egg and poultry trade. The hon. gentleman has, however, undertaken a larger contract than even he is capable of performing, if he seeks to convince the House that the spasmodic efforts of the High Commissioner with respect to the egg trade would justify the payment of $18,000 a year for the continuance of the office. The egg trade is a very important one, and its importance was always recognized by the Opposition. We complained that the Government would never recognize its importance: but we hold that the importance of the trade lies not with England, with which it is not carried on, but with the United States, with which it is conducted, and if the hon. gentleman opposite would devote his attention to removing all obstructions to the continuance and extension of the trade between here and the United States, he would be doing service to the country, instead of Canada paying $18,000 to a High Commissioner to endeavour to build up a trade which we know cannot be successfully carried on with the mother country. The hon. gentleman was on safer ground when he attempted to justify the continuance of the office of the High Commissioner on the ground that Sir Charles Tupper had been engaged in promotings ome Canadian loans. But the hon. gentleman made the statement, which I cannot allow to go unchallenged in this House, that the loan floated by the High Commissioner was the best loan ever floated by Canada. I am speaking in the recollection of many hon. members in this House when I say that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) delivered a speech last session, or at least the session before, in which he exposed the hollowness of that pretension so thoroughly that not a member on the Government side has ever replied to his speech since. He showed that the loan to which the Minister refers was, taking into account the money market of that day, one of the worst loans Canada ever floated. The Minister of Finance never attempted to answer his speech, but remained dumb. I will challenge him now to answer it, and he will have an opportunity in the Budget speech to reply to the scathing criticism which that loan met at the hands of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). Apart from that matter, what has the High Commissioner done? I suppose the Minister of Finance has taken pains to make the House acquainted with all the services the High Commissioner has performed. We have had reference made to floating the loan, and to the High Commissioner's pottering, to use the hon. Minister's choice language, respecting this egg and poultry business. I think the hon. Minister will find that a very large majority of his own side of the House will fail to support the vote on these grounds. It has been suggested by some that the salary should be voted, and should be even increased, on account of the duties of the High Commissioner connected with entertaining. Who is the High Commissioner going to entertain? If he is going to entertain any of his political friends in this country he would hardly ask the Dominion to pay for it, and if the money is to be voted to the High Commissioner on the special ground that he is going to entertain the parcel of ruined gamesters, I suppose it would hardly receive support in this House. So the question of entertaining had better be left out of the argument. With respect to the proposition of the hon. gentleman for Montreal,

that Parliament should not only pay but largely increase the office, I have examined the authorities to ascertain what the United States pay their ambassadors and ministers abroad. While we pay the High Commissioner $18,000 a year, the amount of salaries paid to the ambassadors of the United States to France, Great Britain, Germany and Russia is only $17,500.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend was speaking of the representatives of European countries in Europe.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not think the Parliament of Canada should be asked to draw its comparisons from European countries, and to avoid those of a neighbouring republic entirely.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not saying we should draw or should not draw our illustrations from that source, but I am simply stating what my hon. friend used as his comparison.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I will state what I think is the most analogous case afforded by that country which stands in the closest relations to us, and which ought to afford, and may afford some slight grounds, although it should not be the controlling one in fixing our salaries. I repeat that the salaries paid for the four great diplomatic prizes in the United States is $17,500 a year. When the Minister of Finance interrupted me I was about to say that, speaking subject to correction. I do not think there is a large amount for contingencies voted to those ministers or ambassadors. My hon. friend beside me (Mr. Mills) says there is not. If that is the case, as a matter of fact we are paying the High Commissioner a larger sum than is paid to the ambassador of the United States to France, Great Britain, Germany, Russia or Mexico. The hon. gentleman is prepared to shake his head at anything.

Mr. FOSTER. At almost anything you say.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am speaking from the book. The United States only pays $12,000 a year to their ministers to Austria, Brazil, China, Italy, Japan, Spain; to Turkey, Chili, Argentine Republic, U.S. of Columbia and Peru, $10,000, and to Persia, Portugal and other smaller countries, $5,000. It seems to me that if we are going on the basis of comparison, our High Commissioner receives a larger salary than any of the ambassadors of the United States to foreign countries.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I desire to enquire if the hon. gentleman has been convinced and intends to change the method of voting this money?

Mr. FOSTER. I have listened very attentively to the arguments advanced. I will try and give them all the weight which is their due, and will consider the question very carefully.

Mr. MULOCK. A good deal has been said as to what the High Commissioner has been doing. We have not had explained to us why the High Commissioner has not done something to develop our horse trade with England. When election times come on, he and his friends state there is a limitless market in England for horses. They have sung that tune for some time, telling us there is no necessity to take our horses to the American market, as there is an outlet for suitably bred horses in England. Why does not the High Commissioner take practical steps to establish this trade in the way which he says is possible? Two months ago, there was held in Toronto, a sale of horses suitable for the English market. The sale was advertized for months. The promoters of the sale, I understand, are good supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite, and much time and money was expended in scouring Canada in order to gather a very fine collection of horses. I observed in the press, a short time ago, a letter from one of the leading horsemen of Canada—who was also a member of the Conservative party at one time, if not now—in which he stated that these horses were all specially suited for the English market, and yet not one of them found its way there. Why is this? The reason is that when this enterprise was being got up, the High Commissioner, instead of attending to Canadian interests in England, which he is engaged and paid to do, was out here stumping the country in the interests of the Conservative party. Why was he neglecting the opportunity to advance Canadian interests in England; an opportunity which may not come around for years again? Why was he not at that time giving practical effect to what he says is a great possibility for Canada, namely, the development of the English market for our horses? Let us see from the Public Accounts what it costs the country to maintain the present High Commissioner in office. In the Auditor General's Report for 1890, page B—73, I find that we spent last year, $15,973, or $16,000 in round numbers.

Mr. FOSTER. That is for office and all.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes; and if you add $10,000 for salary, you have $26,000 a year. If we include the interest on the $42,000 spent for the High Commissioner's residence, without including depreciation of property, we have a total cost of some $30,000 a year, or a quarter of a million dollars altogether since the present High Commissioner assumed office. We have to pay this $30,000 a year, while the duties of the office lie so lightly on the shoulders of the present incumbent that he can for a considerable portion of the year be absent either in Canada or other parts of the world other than in England, while, apparently, Canadian interests in England must suffer. There is something wrong in this. Either the duties in that office demand his undivided time and should have it, or they do not, and, judging from the practices of the present High Commissioner, the indication is that these duties do not require his whole time. If we look at the Trade and Navigation Returns, it would appear that Sir Charles Tupper is not giving his whole time to his duties, and that, in consequence, the interests of Canada are suffering. In my opinion, the proper way to deal with this matter is to strike at the root of the evil and to recall the present incumbent of the office, because he is above his masters, the people. He is assuming to be the people and to speak for the people, yet he attacks a considerable portion of the people at home, and he attacks Canadian interests abroad. These are no part of the duties of the High Commissioner, and if the Government properly appreciated their duty to the country they would have recalled Sir Charles Tupper the first moment he dared to degrade the condition of the people of Canada by slandering a considerable portion of them. In my judgment, no man could have been guilty of a greater violation of the duties

of his office than to use his position as a representative of the people, clothed as he is with the apparent authority of his office, to slander a very large proportion of these people. There is no compromise in the matter at all. The High Commissioner has shown himself unfit for his office, in failing to appreciate the judicial position he stands in as representing all classes of the people and as bound in duty to promote the interest of Canada. His position demands from him neutrality as between parties in this country; and as he has failed to observe this, he should be back in Canada, where we can meet him face to face, if he should be returned to this House, and call him to account for the breach of trust he is guilty of. The Administration is responsible for this, because they aid and abet his conduct and keep him in his office. I believe they have good reason to do so, for they are afraid to have him here. They do not care to serve under two kings, and so they keep him away; they, perhaps, would like him here, but they cannot trust him here. Sometimes he is in the Government, and sometimes we cannot tell whether he is in the Government or out of it. On one occasion he was Minister of Finance and High Commissioner about the same time.

Mr. FOSTER. Not at the same time.

Mr. MULOCK. He had the High Commissioner's patent in his pocket, and he sat here as Minister of Finance voting his salary as High Commissioner. He is nothing more than a general poo-bah for the Government of this country. I see it stated in the papers that he is coming to Canada at once, and that he is to have a seat in the Cabinet. Perhaps the Minister of Finance would tell us what portfolio he would take.

Mr. FOSTER. Ask the *Globe*.

Mr. MULOCK. I suppose the *Globe* could tell if it desired, but that authority would not satisfy the hon. gentleman, and I will not quote it. I return to the grave proposition which is fairly entitled to consideration, namely: Whether the people of this country are prepared for maintaining in office, in a prominent position in the Empire, a man whose public acts are principally devoted towards slandering a large section of the people of this country?

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). I do not propose to refer to the item in the Estimates under consideration, but some matters of business have been brought before the House in connection with this matter to which I will briefly allude. It has been stated that an export trade in eggs between Canada and Great Britain is impracticable. I deny that, and I deny it upon the best possible evidence, namely, the practical results obtained from shipments of eggs to the English market. I also deny that the Canadian export poultry trade to Great Britain is impracticable, and I deny that also on information obtained from genuine experiments. Eggs have been exported from the Province of Ontario to England within the last ten months, and the exportation has been successful. Quantities of eggs have been shipped to the English market at a profit within the last six weeks and returns have been already made, which returns I have now on my desk.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read them.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). I will read them when the proper time comes. Our eggs are quite equal to, and indeed superior to most eggs placed on the British market from the continent of Europe. The market is not the cause of any loss in shipments to England, the price is not the cause, but it was the lack of experience of our egg men in ocean shipments which resulted in the trade not being so profitable as it otherwise would have been. That difficulty has been overcome by the experience of a few shippers, and to-day Canadian eggs are being laid down on the Liverpool market with as small a percentage of breakages as they are laid down in Boston. There is no difficulty about the shipment, there is no difficulty about the carriage, no difficulty about the quality of the eggs, or no difficulty about the price obtained; but the difficulty lies in Canada, and is accounted for by the opposition shown to this trade by the Opposition here, who seem to be opposed to any trade between Canada and Great Britain. I know as a fact that Mr. Sanders has been successful in his shipments of poultry to England. If my friend Mr. McMullen, instead of reading the names he referred to, spelled them, he would find that one is "Sanders" and the other "Saunders," and that there is quite a difference between them. Mr. Sanders, after his visit to England, made a shipment of seventy-five tons of turkeys purchased in one week. He exported them at a disadvantageous season, shortly after the holidays, and when the choice fowls were all taken out of the country, and yet they competed favourably on the English market and the returns left him a respectable profit. I saw it stated in the papers, that the fowl arrived in a condition unfit for food, that they were condemned by the meat inspectors, and that the exporter was a heavy loser; but, notwithstanding that, I know to the contrary that there was a profit on the shipment, and I know that from the returns which I also have in my desk. Now, as to the horse trade with England. I know as a matter of fact, that, within the last six weeks, a contract has been made by a Canadian gentleman to supply 5,000 horses to one omnibus and carriage company in the city of London; that is about one-third of the annual average of our horse export for the last ten years. When one company in one city in England can make a contract for that supply, I think that we can say that the horse export trade of Canada is on pretty safe grounds.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Have you that in your desk, too?

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). I have it in my desk, and when the proper time comes I will read it.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I wish in a few words to give the testimony of one of the large egg dealers in the Province of Ontario, Mr. D. D. Wilson, who is called the egg king in the west. Last June he shipped a carload of eggs to England, and at the same time shipped a carload to New York, to his agents there. The eggs sent to England were selected or picked eggs, all the small ones being left out and only the best taken; but those sent to New York were sent just as they came from the farmers. Mr. Wilson went to England to push the sale of the eggs there. He found that they arrived perfectly safe. For them he netted four cents a dozen less than he did from the eggs that he sent to New York at the same time. That is his own testimony, and

it shows that the English market for eggs is not so profitable to the Canadian exporter as the United States market. He says that in England you can always find sale for eggs at a price, but not at the best price. In 1878 Mr. Wilson made a test of the English market for eggs. He sent 300 barrels, and he lost $5 on every barrel.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). By breakage?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). No; but by reason of the low prices obtained for them. According to the usage of the English market, eggs are sold there by the hundred, and 120 are required to make a hundred, in addition to which buyers demand 5 extra eggs, so that you have to give 125 eggs for every 100 you get pay for. It is also known that five weeks elapse from the time eggs are laid in this country until they are sold in the British market, so that they have to be sold as stale eggs, and compared with eggs brought from France they only bring second prices. You can always get a market, for there is a demand for all you can send; but the market is inferior to that found in the United States. So that, although Sir Charles Tupper has been doing all he can to establish a market for eggs in England, the experience of those engaged in the trade is that our egg trade in England will be a failure. With regard to horses, it is admitted by everyone who deals in horses that the United States is the best market for the kind that we raise in Canada. Although we have had to pay 20 per cent. on our horses sent to the United States, we have sent from 17,000 to 19,000 to the American market every year, while we only send about 160 to the free English market. A few years ago some parties were sent to this country to purchase horses for the English army, and even for those which they selected they paid an inferior price to the price obtained for Canadian horses in the American market. The consequence is that the Canadian farmer has ceased to sell horses for that purpose, and he sends his horses to the United States market instead. I would ask the hon. member for Leeds how it is that after the 6th October last, when the McKinley Bill went into force, the price of horses in this country fell $15 to $30 a head, if the English market were as valuable a market as he says for Canadian horses, and if we could realize as much for Canadian horses in the English market as in the American? With regard to poultry, it is the experience of men engaged in that trade, that the nearness of the American markets, the great centres of consumption, gives a greater margin of profit to Canadian exporters than they could obtain in England. That is a principle in political economy which I hope my hon. friend will bear in mind. In these three articles I am satisfied our market is on the other side of the line, where we can realize larger profits for producers than we can in England.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid that we are forgetting that the item before us is that of contingencies, and we are drifting into a discussion of the best market for eggs, horses and poultry. This discussion came up incidentally in connection with the work the High Commissioner has been engaged in, and to a certain extent it might be considered legitimate; but we have now had a speech on each side on the pure trade question, and I think I must appeal to the Committee to come back to the item of contingencies.

Mr. FLINT. Although perhaps somewhat out of the line of the item before the Committee, I wish to make a few remarks on the question of the High Commissioner's office. The discussion with regard to the salary attached to that office has drawn from the hon. member for Montreal West (Sir Donald Smith) the declaration of his opinion that the salary ought to be much higher than it is at present. While I do not rise to attack his opinion on that point, I might even go so far as to agree with him, provided that the occupant of that office were under the control of the Government, that he would so act as to elevate it rather than degrade it, and that he would represent before the people of Great Britain all the people of Canada in all their varied interests, rather than act as the representative of one political party in Canada, using his immense talent and great energies, not only in attacking the political party on this side of the House, but in misrepresenting on the subject of loyalty the opinions and sentiments of a large minority at any rate of the people of this Dominion. I am not attacking the occupant of the office, because we all know that he is an earnest politician, that he has led parties in this country, that he has been to a great degree an ornament of this House, and that he is a strong supporter of the present Prime Minister; but I think that we have reason to feel disappointed in the Government in permitting the highest civil servant under their control to assume the position he does without rebuke. It is not Sir Charles Tupper who is to blame, because he is only acting according to his temperament and under the responsibility of the Government, for which we have the word of the right hon. Prime Minister; they have endorsed all he has done during the election and since in bolstering up and furthering the interest of one political party. Now let us look at the position from an English standpoint. We must consider, not only our own feelings in this matter, as Liberals and Conservatives, but the position of honest independent Englishmen, viewing the Dominion of Canada through the spectacles provided for them by the official representative in London of the Canadian people; and I ask you if the time has not arrived when this House should show its disproval of such conduct by refusing to vote the large appropriations asked for? The High Commissioner—not Sir Charles Tupper the individual politician, but the High Commissioner of Canada—left his office and came to this country to take a leading part in the recent elections. Had he confined himself during that campaign to the consideration of the trade question or any other great question agitating the country, much that has been said need not have been said on this occasion, but we all know that he took a peculiar ground, never before taken by any of the political leaders of this country. He took the ground that the leaders of one of the great political parties in this Dominion were at heart traitors, and engaged in a treasonable conspiracy to wrest this country from the British Crown and annex it to a foreign State. This position, completely unsupported and untrue in itself, should, taken by the High Commissioner representing Canada in England, be repudiated in the strongest possible terms by gentlemen on both sides of the House.

I will not detain the House by entering at length into what that gentleman said in his able and vigorous manner throughout the campaign, and which impelled into the politics of this country a bitter feeling it will take a long time to get rid of, but will briefly refer to the manner in which he has been contradicted by the people of England to whom he uniformly appealed in order to prejudice them against the party to which I have the honour to belong. How have his charges, made directly or indirectly, that we were traitors to the British Crown and engaged in a plot with certain persons in American political life to take this country from British control and annex it to the United States, been met in England? These charges, which were telegraphed to all the prominent English papers, called forth in the columns of the London *Times* a protest from so distinguished a statesmen and Conservative as Sir George Baden-Powell. That gentleman was in Canada during the elections, and there heard the charges hurled by Sir Charles Tupper, and his supporters, and the Conservative press, against the Liberal party; and so strongly did he feel the injustice done to the Liberals of the Dominion, that he wrote a long and able letter to the *Times*, a few passages from which I shall quote. On the 29th February, 1891, Sir George Baden-Powell wrote as follows:—

"It so happens that when I was in Canada last autumn, I had the privilege of seeing a great deal of the leading men of both parties, and especially of the Liberals, staying, for instance, with Mr. Goldwin Smith in Toronto, enjoying the hospitality of Mr. Longley in Halifax, and talking over the situation with many another Liberal in Victoria, Vancouver, Montreal, Winnipeg, Ottawa and other places."

He then goes on to say:

"It becomes absolutely clear that both parties in Canada are not only distinctly loyal to the British connection, but also loyal to Canada, and that any ministers or leaders who swerve for one moment from either type of loyalty will at once lose the votes and support of their followers."

This is the opinion of Sir George Baden-Powell:

"Such are, in brief, the conclusions arrived at after much discussion with men of all parties in Canada. And above all, we know that the leaders and voters of both political parties will give short shrift to any who are wanting in loyalty to the Canadian nationality or to the great Empire, of which the Dominion is rapidly becoming one of the most important and principal constituent elements."

Well, Sir, that is the opinion of Sir George Baden-Powell, to which he gave circulation in order to check the false impression which was being created in England by our High Commissioner against the leaders and rank and file of the Liberal party. But let me quote the London *Times* itself in an article dealing with the colonies. On the 30th March, after the English and Colonial papers had been filled with the diatribes of Sir Charles Tupper, our High Commissioner, that great exponent of English public opinion thus sums up its views on the matter, after a careful review of the whole situation, and, I presume, a careful examination of the leading speeches on both sides:

"In listening to the echoes of the election which are carried over the Atlantic, it is hardly possible to doubt the strong political dislike to the constitution of the United States which continues with other causes to stimulate the sentiment of loyalty to British connection. Not one party alone, but all parties cherish the Canadian constitution which they regard as the nearest approach to liberty which has yet been realized. They look upon it in every way as more admirable than that of the United States."

I do not blame our official representative for being a politician; but I blame the Government which, after placing him in the position he occupies, compelled him to give expression to his views. The Government are responsible for every utterance he made during the elections in this country and in Great Britain since the elections with regard to our political affairs. But after the excitement of the campaign was over, and when the echoes of the struggle had died out, the feelings of our High Commissioner became to a certain extent abated; and the London press received a telegram recording an interview held in New York with the High Commissioner, just as he was about to leave for England. We find that the High Commissioner felt compelled to take back many of the utterances he had made during the campaign. On 8th April, 1891, the following telegram appeared in the London *Times* from New York:—

"Sir Charles Tupper in an interview with a representative of the *Tribune*, on being asked whether he regarded complete reciprocity between Canada and the United States as unfair to Great Britain's material interests, is represented to have replied that the only terms upon which complete free trade could receive the sanction or support of anyone in the United States would, in his judgment, inevitably sever Canada from Great Britain and could not fail to be regarded in England as indicating Canada's desire to adopt that course. He declared that the number of annexationists in Canada was utterly insignificant, and that any man who had shown any tendency in that direction had been defeated at the polls."

How much more moderate is this very proper expression of his views, if they were honest, than the fiery statements he made from the platform throughout the country during the elections. It is merely an expression of opinion—an opinion which that gentleman has a right to maintain if he sees fit. He declared that the number of annexationists in Canada was insignificant. This admission is a direct contradiction of his wild statement during the campaign that the result, if the Liberals obtained office, would be inevitably annexation, that they were the head and forefront of a conspiracy entered into with prominent men of the United States to bring about annexation. Since the election, this very High Commissioner, feeling bound to eat his own words, took back, in the presence of the people of England, all the assertions he made during the campaign. He said that the number of annexationists is utterly insignificant, and that every man who showed any tendency to annexation had been defeated at the polls. He withdrew the charge of treason against our party, for we find that a number of the most eminent and prominent gentlemen on this side of the House have not been defeated, and, consequently, could not have shown any tendency towards annexation. Unrestricted reciprocity, he added, was dead. Well, this is the position that our High Commissioner has been compelled, in the face of the people of England, to occupy; and I ask this House if it is such a position as should be rewarded with increased salaries and emoluments. When the High Commissioner of Canada descended from the lofty position in which he was placed with the almost unanimous approval of the Canadian Legislature, and degraded himself by resorting to the lowest tactics of party warfare, either the position should be abolished or the salary reduced so as to administer to him and the Government which sustains

him an effectual rebuke. But not only has he, during this election and since, been occupying an inconsistent position before the people of England in regard to his statements as to the loyalty of the great political parties in this country, but he has entered into a controversy in England where both their feelings and their capital are involved in the welfare of one of the greatest corporations of this country. Whether the charges he has made are true or false, what position does the High Commissioner occupy in England when he enters into a controversy with these people, who are interested in this great corporation? This is a controversy which has become very bitter, which must be prolonged, and must destroy any usefulness which the High Commissioner may have had in the mother country. I am not going to quote at any length the extracts I have in regard to this gentleman, but it is clear that, owing to this controversy, and the bitterness engendered by it, owing to the charges which have been flung backward and forward, the High Commissioner's usefulness is gone in the mother country, and the Government ought to withdraw him from the position he occupies. The *Railway News*, referring to this matter, says towards the close of an article :

"But what about Sir Charles Tupper's position? He is the highly paid ambassador from the young Dominion to the old mother country, paid out of the taxation of the Dominion, contributed by the citizens of all shades of opinions, and probably the largest contributor is the corporation of the Grand Trunk Railway; and yet he considers it within his privileges to forsake his duties as a servant of the State and to engage in a fierce and undignified advocacy of one set of politicians against another."

Importing into the mother country the charges which are made by one party against another in this country, which should be threshed out in the courts of this country and not made a laughing-stock in the press of the mother country. Further, this article says :

"The conclusion is inevitable that the interests of himself, his relatives and his friends outweigh all considerations of the discharge of a great public duty. What would be said of any other public servant in the world (outside of the South American Republics) acting in such way."

The London *Truth*, referring to the same subject, charges him correctly with misrepresentation, which, if the office is to be upheld in the way it should be, must involve the High Commissioner in another controversy with that journal. *Truth* says :

"Does he expect the shareholders to yield to his desire to discredit the present management of the line and to place in their stead a docile set of officers, who will repeat the 'jobbery, corruption and mismanagement' which was the result under the control of his predecessors? Heaven save the Grand Trunk shareholders if the property once passes under the influence of Canadian politicians, whose methods are now very well understood in this country."

Why are Canadian politicians so vilified in the mother country? Must it not be to a large extent due to the charges which have been flung broadcast by the representative of the people of Canada? Should it not rather be the duty of the High Commissioner to soothe the feelings of the people of the mother country, to defend the people of this country whom he represents from charges of disloyalty against the Crown and against the Empire? I contend that the office of High Commissioner has not been sustained in the way it should be by the present incumbent of that office. It is true that he does not lack ability or experience, but the Government, by inviting him to take part in the late campaign, have involved themselves in agreement with all the statements which he has made; and I believe that we ought either to wipe out of existence altogether the office which he holds, or to place in that position a man of integrity, a representative of the veracity and ability of the people of Canada, irrespective of party politics.

Mr. DICKEY. I do not rise to discuss the question which has been before the House, but simply to refer to some remarks which were made by the hon. member for Queen's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies). I do not know that the comparison between the cost of the consular service of the United States and the cost of our service in England can be of any practical value, but it is well that the facts should be stated. The hon. member for Queen's asserted that the cost of the consular service of the United States in England was $17,500, and he affirmed that there were no contingencies. I have in my hand the Appropriation Bill presented to the United States Houses for the next year, and in this I find that the salary of the Minister to Great Britain is $17,500—the amount which the hon. member for Queen's stated was the whole expense of the consular agencies in Great Britain. I find also, that the secretary in that office receives a salary of $2,625, and the second secretary receives $2,000. Further I find this :

"For the purpose of enabling the President to provide at the public expense all such stationery, blanks, record and other books, seals, presses, flags, and signs as he shall think necessary for the several legations in the transaction of their business, and also, for rent, postage, telegrams, furniture, messenger service, clerk-hire, compensation of cavasses, guards, dragomans, janitors, and porters, and so on, $105,000."

Then there is a further vote :

"To enable the President to meet unforeseen emergencies arising in the diplomatic and consular service and to extend the commercial and other interests of the United States, to be expended pursuant to the requirements of section 291 of the Revised Statutes, $80,000, or as much thereof as may be necessary."

In addition to that, we find that there is an allowance made for several consuls. There is one in London who receives $6,000. There are also consuls at Birmingham and Manchester, who have clerks receiving from $2,000 down to $960 each. Then you also find this item :

"Expenses of providing all such stationery, blanks, record and other books, seals, presses, flags, signs, rent, postage, furniture, statistics, newspapers, and so on, $150,000 in connection with consular agencies."

So, whether the comparison be useful or not, it is certainly only fair that the House should be made aware that, so far from $17,500 covering the expenses connected with these services on the part of the United States, which Sir Charles Tupper performs on the part of Canada, it does not represent more than one-fifth of the amount they expend.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not suppose that the members upon this side of the House, or the party in this country which is represented by the members on this side of the House, have any objection to the office of a High Commissioner in London. On the contrary, it is generally agreed that the office is a very useful one. The objection is not to the office itself, or to the fact that the High Commissioner is paid liberally, and we believe it would be better that the $2,000, which has been referred to, should be incorporated in his salary, and that the country should understand that he receives $12,000, instead of $10,000, with a sort of smug-

gling arrangement by which he gets $2,000, the country being led to believe that he spends that for other purposes than the expenses legitimately chargeable to his salary. But I repeat, that we do not object to the existence of this office; all we demand is that this office should be properly filled, that it should be filled by a gentleman who will honestly discharge the duties of that office, who will confine himself to the discharge of those duties, who will not act, when he is High Commissioner for the Dominion of Canada, representing all the people of Canada, as a mere partisan, coming to this country to defame and decry one-half the population of the country, to vilify and malign certain public men of this country, thereby prostituting and debasing the functions of his office to the purposes of a mere partisan, and a partisan of the most violent and reprehensible character. These are the reasons why we criticize the salary and matters connected with the position of High Commissioner in London. If the office is to continue in existence, we want that position to be filled properly, we want that position to be filled honourably. We do not want a gentleman in the position of High Commissioner in London who can be called upon, when his services are required, as a mere canvassing or electioneering agent, who will leave his duties for which he is paid in London, to come here and bolster up and further the purposes of a political party. These are not the functions of such an officer, and, by discharging his duties in this way, he casts odium upon his office and he leads the people to believe that the office had better be abolished; for the people readily see that Sir Charles Tupper, in coming, as he has upon two different occasions, to this country to engage in the active business of a political campaign, himself a High Commissioner, representing the whole people of Canada, himself occupying a position where, if he is needed at all, ought to be in London to attend to his duties there, leaving those duties, abdicating for the time being his position, coming to Canada and travelling up and down in special trains through this country, and accompanying Ministers of the Crown in making partisan addresses in various parts of the country, stigmatizing the character of public men, denouncing them as traitors, adopting all the disreputable tactics of mere party politicians—the people, I say, readily see that these are not the duties of a High Commissioner, and by allowing the High Commissioner to discharge his duties in this way, you will make his office odious to the people of the country.

Mr. FOSTER. Order.

Mr. CHARLTON. This gentleman evidently has a good deal of spare time. He can come to Canada in the way I have represented he has come, and travel about with my friend the Minister of Customs, with my friend the Minister of Finance, with my friend the Premier of the country, with my friend the Minister of Justice, he can travel with these gentlemen either in groups, or alone, in a special car up and down this country. In addition to the amount of leisure which he seems to have been able to devote to this business, he evidently had sufficient time to engage in speculation. He is a director in gas companies, he is a director in water companies, he has an interest in the dead meat business. I believe he had something to do with floating a loan upon the English market for the Caraquet Railway, and the English stockholders will naturally not remember that hon. gentleman with feelings of kindness and gratitude for the part he has played in the placing of these various loans and financial schemes which have resulted, not in advantage to the English public, but in advantage to manipulators and speculators only. I say that we do not ask to have this office abolished, but we ask to have it properly and honestly filled. We say that it is a scandal to have this office filled in the way it has been. We say that it is not a mere partisan office, that it is not an office the holder of which is entitled to act as a mere partisan, and that if he has duties to perform which require that he should remain in England, then he ought to remain there and perform them, but, on the contrary, if he has not duties that require him to remain in England to perform, then that fact is sufficient reason for abolishing the office. The whole question resolves itself simply to this: Has the office of the High Commissioner in London, and the functions pertaining thereto, been filled in a decent, creditable and proper manner? Has the office been filled in such a way as to justify the expectations and satisfy the desires of the people of this country?

Has Sir Charles Tupper acted in deed and truth as High Commissioner of this Dominion? Has he acted in the interest of all parties in this Dominion? Has he acted for the people of Canada as a whole? I say that he has come to this country and defamed and vilified our public men, and hundreds of thousands of the people of this country. I say that is not a part of his functions, and that in doing these things he deserves the rebuke of the people of this country. I say that if this office is to be filled in this way in the future, we had better abolish it. If you are going to use it as a mere annex and appendage to the party in power, for the purpose of increasing the influence they may wield, we had better abolish the office. Why, Sir, the conduct of this hon. gentleman in seeking to obtain the influence of a great corporation in this country, and, failing to obtain that influence, then going to England and seeking to injure the reputation of the public officials of that corporation, seeking to injure the interests of that corporation in making himself an offensive partisan in a quarrel of this kind, in bringing himself into collision with the stockholders and officers of a great corporation in Canada, the motive actuating him being perfectly palpable—because he could not control those people, could not use their influence in the interest of the party that he came here to assist—I say it is a scandal, and we have reason to complain, and we do complain, of the manner in which the High Commissioner of Canada has discharged his functions, and we say the mode in which those functions have been discharged by Sir Charles Tupper deserves the rebuke of this House.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. Minister of Finance, in his remarks with regard to the duties of the High Commissioner in England, stated that it was one of his duties to attend to the egg and poultry business, and that he did not consider that a matter that was at all out of the sphere of his duties. We admit that; but I would like to know from the Minister of Finance, if it is a part of Sir Charles' duties to attend to the matter of securing extended markets

for such things as poultry and eggs, why did he and his colleagues consider it necessary to appoint a commissioner in the person of Mr. Sanders, to go to England at an additional expense to this country, and attend to that very particular thing? Now, if Sir Charles is supposed to perform those duties in England, certainly he should be able to do them without putting the country to the expense of sending Mr. Sanders there for the specific purpose of investigating and reporting upon the probabilities of our being able to secure a market in England for eggs and poultry. Now, with regard to the remarks that have fallen from several hon. members who have recently addressed the House, on the whole question of Sir Charles Tupper's tour to Canada during the recent election, and the manner in which he has so evidently shown himself a political partisan, not only in Canada but in England, I say that it is unfair and it is more than the Government should expect, that we should consent to the passage of this item, meekly and quietly, in face of the abuse, and criticism, and the undeserved epithets that he has applied to the Reform party in this country in his recent visit to Canada. Why, Sir, supposing any member of the Opposition went home to England while Sir Charles was privileged to hold the office of High Commissioner in London, I would like to know if we ought not be in such relationship with the High Commissioner that at least, although differing from him politically, we might feel at liberty to call upon him, to take advantage of his being there as a representative of Canada, and use him for any purpose that might be proper and right and in the line of his functions? Now, I would ask, in presence of the existing strained relations between Sir Charles and the Reform party of this country, how can we expect that any member of that party can call upon Sir Charles in London, or ask him for the slightest assistance? Why, Sir, after his coming across the Atlantic and pouring out the abuse, the criticisms, and the epithets in which he has indulged, on stump after stump, in regard to the Reform party in this country, how can we forget and forgive such language on his part, and how could we call upon him, or take advantage of his being in London, to ask him to perform any service pertaining to his functions as High Commissioner, in the interest of any person that might call upon him, or in the interest of Canadians generally? We could not do that, we are shut out from doing that. If he is in the habit of entertaining his friends to wine dinners and that kind of a thing, of course we would be shut out from participating in any of them. If you were to alter his designation and call him High Tory Commissioner for Canada in London, that would be a proper name. We should then understand the position he fills. He is really the High Tory Commissioner there, and he shows he is High Tory Commissioner when he comes here; for in making statements that cannot possibly be sustained by facts he is unsurpassed, of which we had a sample last year. He outdid all the members of the Tory party. It is not desirable that the High Commissioner should occupy such a position in the eyes of the people of this country, and it is unfair to expect that we, the Opposition in this House, should quietly submit. I should like to see hon. gentlemen opposite submitting to the insults and abuse to which we have been subjected. I hope the last visit of the High Commissioner to Canada, when he was asked by the First Minister to come here and facilitate the election of his party and the continuance in office of the Tory party, will be the last exhibition of this kind we shall have in this country, whether the Commissioner be a Conservative or a Reformer. I hope the next High Commissioner who is appointed will so carefully keep within the limits and bounds of the duties of his office, that he will not make himself subject to the well deserved criticisms which have been visited on the High Commissioner on this occasion. Well does the High Commissioner deserve from the Opposition the most severe criticism, within the limits of parliamentary procedure, for the manner in which he acted towards the Opposition during his visit, and for the manner in which he acted on all occasions since his appointment to the office. The best course hon. gentlemen can adopt, is to remove the present High Commissioner. We have no objection to fighting that gentleman fairly face to face. We have done so, and are prepared to do so again; but when another High Commissioner is appointed it is to be earnestly hoped he will not disgrace his position, as has been done by the present occupant, by discharging the two-fold duties of High Commissioner in England and high Tory advocate and stumper for the party in Canada. One position is sufficient. I hope that after 1st July, 1893, we will be able to increase the duties so largely that the High Commissioner will no longer be able to visit Canada during two or three months of the year, and the contention be subsequently made in Parliament that the duties of the office did not suffer. Sir Charles Tupper would not dare repeat the unwarranted attack he made on the Reform party during the late election, and we are going to let him know this.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh!

Mr. McMULLEN. Hon. gentlemen need not begin to indulge in any cat-calls. We are here to stay, and the more hon. gentlemen engage in those amusements the longer will be the session, and there is an hon. gentleman now presiding over the House who will not allow them to be indulged in. We have criticized the actions of Sir Charles Tupper as he has merited, although he has not yet received as much as he should receive. It may be he has been led into a trap by the First Minister, who is a wonderful man for leading people into traps. I have watched the right hon. gentleman's course for 25 or 30 years, and I have found that when a man attains a strong position, he leads him to commit an act which makes him thoroughly unpopular. Whether he has led the High Commissioner into a trap by inviting him on two occasions in Canada to perform the duty he did perform, it is perfectly certain that if the High Commissioner expects to raise himself in the estimation of our people or of the people of England, or to cultivate that cordial feeling that statesmen should cultivate, he cannot do so by adopting the scurrilous course the Commissioner adopted during the late campaign. The High Commissioner should have more respect for the dignified position he holds, than to make himself subject to such criticisms as have been passed upon him. I have made a challenge to hon. members opposite, and I repeat my challenge. I challenge any one to take up the report of the High Commissioner, and

to peruse it from beginning to end, and then say that the duties are such as should attach to the office of High Commissioner, to whom is paid a salary of $25,000 a year. The report refers to two or three little matters that have been attended to by the High Commissioner, from which this country has derived a little benefit; but taking the whole volume, it is a compilation of information gathered from different sources, from the Trade Returns of England and other sources, that could be easily compiled by the humblest man in his office. That report is nothing in return for a salary of $25,000. If the United States pays a large amount for salary, and also a large amount for contingencies in connection with their office in London, the country gets something better than we obtain. If we compare the duties of the chief agent of the United States in England and the duties of the High Commissioner for Canada, we find the duties are more onerous, more important and more valuable which the United States have performed for the money they vote for their commissioner than we obtain from the payment of salary and expenses from the High Commissioner. Let us get some duties for the High Commissioner to perform, and in the meantime the Government should withdraw not only the items for the High Commissioner, but the incumbent of the office, and place there someone whose record is unstained by any action, public or personal, one to whom we could look up to with respect, and one to whom the people of England could look up to with respect, and one in regard to whom we can feel we have in England a true and loyal advocate, not in the interests of the Tory party, but in the best interests of the country as a whole, and one who will entertain kindly feelings towards Conservatives and Reformers alike, as anyone occupying the office of High Commissioner should do.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Hon. gentlemen opposite will, perhaps, not feel any great concern respecting the abuse poured out on their political opponents, but this feeling is not shared by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. I think they might fairly reprobate it, and they would do so if they were just to their opponents, but we do not expect that. We are not afraid of what may be said about us or of meeting any one in debate on this question; the gentleman himself to whom allusion has been made is a very powerful debater; but I am not aware that the Opposition are afraid to meet him in debate either on the public platform or in the House. This is something which the Ministers ought to consider in reference to the discharge of the duties of that office, and which ought to have some weight with them, if they care anything about utterances made against political opponents. The Minister of Finance has told us that the High Commissioner was very useful during the negotiation of the last loan and that he was able to render that assistance which permitted the Minister to place the loan on terms so favourable as described by him. I have to take exception to his favourable description of the loan, because I think he forgot some terms and conditions peculiar to that loan which made it very acceptable in the minds of the loan-taking public. We are told that one of the principal reasons assigned for the appointment of the High Commissioner was that he would be in England, ready to lend assistance when visits had to be made to that country with reference to any financial undertaking. The First Minister admitted the other night that it was at the request of the Ministry, Sir Charles Tupper came to this country to take part in the elections, and in making that confession he removed part of the charge as it might be urged against Sir Charles Tupper and took it upon the Government. That was very well, but I pressed another question on the right hon. gentleman, to which I received no answer, and to which I think it would behoove the Minister of Finance to give a little thought and attention. That question was: Whether the present conduct of the High Commissioner in England while there professing to discharge his duties as such, has met with the approval of the Government? I ask the Minister of Finance this question; he can answer it in a word. I would ask him, if he thinks that the credit of Canada and the securities of Canada, if he should now desire to negotiate another loan, were such that he could hope to place the loan upon the London money market on as favourable terms as he did when the last loan was effected? I would like the hon. gentleman to answer that question.

Mr. FOSTER. I will answer you when you get through.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would like to get the answer now.

Mr. FOSTER. But it is not right for two members to stand up at one time.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then I will sit and wait for the answer.

Mr. FOSTER. The question, as I understand it, is whether I think it probable that Canada could float as favourable a loan to-day as she did in 1888? My answer to that question is this: If the condition of the London money market and the money markets of the world were just as favourable now as they were then, I believe the loan could be put upon the British market even more favourably than then. If my hon. friend has read the financial papers he must know that at the present time the state of the market is not nearly so favourable as it was in 1888.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I have read the financial papers and I can say that the Minister has given a very fair answer, but my question was not directed towards ascertaining such an answer as the one given. I recognize that the condition of the money market has much to do with effecting a loan, and the answer I have received from the Minister of Finance is that he believes, all things being equal in the money markets, we could effect a loan to-day on as good terms as in 1888. Very well; the High Commissioner for Canada has been in England, the High Commissioner has been telling the people in England that one-half the people in this country are virtually rebels and annexationists, and I take it that if Canadian security is as good to-day as it was in 1888 the people of England believe the High Commissioner does not tell the truth of the people of Canada. There must be one of the two alternatives: your credit cannot be as good in London to-day as it was then, and Sir Charles Tupper cannot be believed at the same time. I say, if you take the latter alternative, that you have a man as the mouth-piece of the Canadian Government in London, a man representing that Govern-

ment, whose word is contemned, despised and disbelieved by the people of England, and in maintaining him in office you are lowering the dignity of the Dominion of Canada. Canadian credit is injured in England, or else you have a High Commissioner representing this country whose word, not being believed, brings upon this country dishonour.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The High Commissioner has, no doubt, a pretty difficult task in England. He is sent to that country, where free trade is the policy, and he is trying to popularize Canada, that has copied the protective trade policy of our American neighbours. He, no doubt, finds it very difficult to make the people of England believe that the present Administration in Canada, which introduced the American tariff, have any love for British instincts or British customs. Hence, Sir Charles Tupper's duty is a difficult one, and sometimes he has to slap his own Government very severely, as well as he slaps the Opposition. Consequently, he appears to be slapping all round. While speaking about the result of the election, after his return to England, he gave the present Government a direct slap in the face. In trying to popularize the great High Commissioner in England, he indicated that it was not the policy of the Government, but the blunders of the Opposition, which won the election. He held that the policy of the present Government was obnoxious, and that, if the Liberals had gone in for a revenue tariff, the Government would have been beaten, because the policy of the Government was a bad one. After giving this slap in the face to the Government, he tried to make things even by using highly improper language and unfortunate epithets against those politically opposed to him. The fact is, that Sir Charles Tupper tries to defy the Government and the Opposition as well. He appears to be an Ishmaelite: his hand is apparently outstretched against every man's hand except the hand of the High Commissioner. There is one man he appears to love, and there is one man he likes to speak of, and to praise, and to admire, and to adore, and that is Sir Charles Tupper. This is the gentleman who has done grand things for the chicken trade, the poultry trade, the egg trade and the other interests of the Dominion. Why, we could have all that done better by a market gardener, with but a fraction of the expense; everything in connection with that would properly come within the department of a market gardener, and not within the department of the High Commissioner for Canada. The High Commissioner for Canada is above the law, and above the Ministers of the Crown, and above the Governor General even; for they give detailed statements of their expenditure in every department, and he does not. High and exalted as our Governor General is, and representing as he does Her Gracious Majesty the Queen in this country, he gives details of his expenditure in his office; but the High Commissioner does not! The latter gentleman gets $2,000 in one lump, and the Government are afraid to ask him for vouchers or details lest they should offend this high and mighty Commissioner. Not a single word of explanation will they ask him; and when you ask them how he spends the money they grin and they fawn upon the High Commissioner, but they dare not ask him for a voucher. When it is moved for in the Public Accounts Committee, as it was moved last year, not a single voucher were they able to bring down. He defies the Government: he says virtually: I am your master and you are my servants; I will give you no return. Give me the money that I want, or I will call out my forces and I will condemn all of you: you are obliged to give me what I want or otherwise out you go. That is about the reason why this Government allows the High Commissioner of Canada to disgrace Canadian interests and the Canadian people as he has done during the past year, circulating statements that are false. Canadians who love their country were glad to find, after he had been hurling tirades against the Grand Trunk Railway Company, that when the shareholders met the old board were re-elected by an overwhelming majority, showing that, however great the influence of the High Commissioner may be over the Government of Canada, he has very little influence or power in England, and very few people there believed the statements he made for the purpose of damaging a railway which has done so much to develop this country. I, as a Canadian born, feel keenly on this subject. I feel that the Government, by their fear of the High Commissioner, are laying down a precedent which should never be set under a limited monarchy, in allowing any officer to take the reins in his hands and defy the Government and Parliament. All he wants is the means to enable him to indulge in unlimited extravagance in the old country, to entertain his friends and to abuse those with whom he differs. It is well enough for us to have our different views about the policy that should prevail in the country; but every man, be he a Conservative or a Reformer, should stand up for British ideas and customs, and fair-play is one of them; and any officer who is a servant of the people and who endeavours to traduce the Opposition, is no longer fit to hold any high position or to receive public money from the people of this country.

Mr. MULOCK. I think there are some matters on which we ought to have information from the Government. It is known to all hon. gentlemen that during the visit of the High Commissioner to Canada before the last election, he was reported to have endeavoured to negotiate a treaty or an alliance with the Grand Trunk Railway Company for political purposes. It is said, with what truth I do not know, but on the authority of persons high in office, that he approached the manager of the railway in Canada, and in one way or another endeavoured to secure from him the support of the railway company for his party, no doubt making offers in return. He was here at that time, I understand, at the request of the right hon. First Minister. Therefore, in engaging in the political campaign, he was the duly accredited agent of the party opposite. First, then, I would like to know from the Government whether it was with their authority that he approached the Grand Trunk Railway Company? I do not know what his method was, whether he used persuasion or something stronger, whether there was a system of intimidation or some attempt at corruption; but whatever his method was, I should like to know whether the proposals he made to the Grand Trunk manager on that occasion were made with or without the knowledge of the Administration. Further, I think it is due to the country

that we should know whether or not the attitude of the High Commissioner towards Canada and towards various interests in Canada, since the election, meets with the approbation or the ratification of the Administration. It is one thing, of course, to hold the officer responsible; but since the Administration retain him in office, they are adopting all his doing, and assuming the responsibility for conduct on his part which should properly secure his dismissal. Is it, then, with the sanction of the Administration that he is attacking a great financial corporation to which Canada is deeply indebted for its early development, even if it is not dependent upon it now as it was in years gone by?

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

After Recess.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MULOCK. Since Recess I have no doubt the Government have been able to obtain the information they could not give us a few hours ago. I was pointing out, before the House rose, the responsibility which the Government is bound to take in connection with the action of the High Commissioner. I think there is a principle involved in this matter, which it will not do for the Administration to pass by in silence, for when we come to consider the practical effect of the action of the High Commissioner in regard to the Grand Trunk Railway, we find, according to the published statements, that his utterances have been destructive of the property of a vast number of the capitalists of England. We find that the effects of his onslaught upon that great corporation has been to depreciate the value of the securities of that company in the English market, and to the extent of that depreciation to injure the value of those securities to the holders. Does the Government endorse such action? The High Commissioner is reported to have said that the Grand Trunk Railway management has been characterized by reckless extravagance and by recklessness of management. In making the grave charges he did, he spoke, I presume, in his official capacity as High Commissioner of Canada. It is impossible for any one not thoroughly versed in the details of railway management, not having accurate knowledge of themselves, to make any such statement. If we give credit to the High Commissioner of having spoken only what he knew to be the case, then he has stated a fact which, of course, it is wise the public should know, but if he has merely stated suppositions as facts, he has abused the position he fills. If you admit for a moment that the agent of any country—and we boast of Canada being a great country, and the greater the country the greater the influence of its representative—if we admit for a moment that the agent of a country like Canada can in another country become a stock jobber, can become an instrument to depress or raise securities to his interest and advantage, Canada may as well enter the stock exchange at once and become an ordinary gambler in securities. If you propose, Sir, to allow the influence of the Government to be used to destroy capital, let it be known to the capitalists of England that if they choose to invest in Canadian securities, they run the risk, unless they place their political influence at the bidding of the Administration, of having their property depreciated. Why, if the people of England do their duty in this regard, they will call upon the Administration of England to insist on the Government of Canada withdrawing this Commissioner from a position which he abuses to the injury of the English people. The Administration of England, to-day, I have no doubt, will, if they have not already done so, discharge their duty towards the people of England, who have invested their millions in Canadian securities, by causing such representations to be made to this Government, that English investors will no longer be exposed to such dangers. The Administration cannot too early make its position known upon this question, for its silence will be taken as an acquiescence in the acts of their agent. Their maintenance of him in office is a ratification of all that he has done; and if the Administration is dumb, there ought still to be voices among their followers, which will make themselves heard in the interests of the country. Or have things come to this pass, that a Cabinet can muzzle a whole party, which boasts of being so independent, patriotic and loyal? Has it come to this, that the great loyal party of Canada is engaged in destroying the wealth of the people of England for the sake of continuing themselves in office? I can understand men, under some circumstances, holding to party loyalty, but I am unable to understand how, on an occasion like this, the whole party can be muzzled under the leadership of the Minister of Public Works, who, I presume, is leading the House to-night. It is due to the people of Canada that the action of our High Commissioner should be repudiated, or if it is not, that fact should be made known. So long as this cowardly conduct on the part of the Government continues, we can assume but one conclusion, and that is, that the Government, whilst too cowardly to assume the responsibility for what has taken place, desire to profit by it, and must be held responsible. I am not in favour of great corporations, which come to Parliament for powers, using those powers for political purposes. In my judgment, it is equally wrong and equally unfortunate whether it be the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway that plunges itself into the vortex of party politics in Canada. In either case, they are going out of their true course; but I do congratulate Canada that it does not happen at this moment that the two great corporations are united in raids on the public treasury. The High Commissioner gave a parting shot, I suppose, a parting indication of the reign of debauchery he would inaugurate, were he placed in control of the Treasury benches, when he said to the Maritime Provinces, just after the 5th of March last: "The people of Ontario and Quebec are evenly divided, the Maritime Provinces hold the balance of power, and now is your opportunity to knock at the Treasury benches." That was the doctrine enunciated by the agent general of the Administration; and having uttered these words, he goes off to England, to attack English interests in the way I have indicated.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton.) Where did he make that statement?

Mr. MULOCK. I will read it for you before the evening is closed, but I have not got it by me just now.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). Better send for it.

Mr. MULOCK. I am glad these hon. gentlemen have at last found their tongues, and I will repeat later on the exact words the High Commissioner uttered. This is the first time we have heard from them, and even now I am glad to see that an hon. gentleman so retiring as the hon. member for Cape Breton has sufficient courage to admit that the utterances in question are unworthy of the gentleman to whom he owes his seat in this House.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). He never said it.

Mr. MULOCK. We will see whether he said it or not. I was not present, but I cut the extract out of a good Tory paper, if I recollect aright, and I shall endeavour to place it within the reach of the House at the earliest possible opportunity.

An hon. MEMBER. You cannot do it.

Mr. MULOCK. Who says I cannot do it? The man who says that shall have an opportunity of making that statement good when I present my proof. I do not think there is any man except my hon. friend from Cape Breton, who would have the hardihood to assert that the High Commissioner did not practically make that statement. At all events, it was so stated in the press; and whether or not, let me ask, was the action of the High Commissioner, in his negotiation with Mr. Seargeant, of the Grand Trunk, such as to indicate that he was incapable of making such a proposition? Did he not propose to the Grand Trunk that they should throw in their allegiance with the Administration and that they would be duly rewarded? When did he ever show delicacy in disposing of public money for political gain? We cannot forget what happened in 1872; we cannot forget what the High Commissioner's role has been since he has been in public life, either in the old Province of Nova Scotia, or in the Council of the Dominion Parliament. It would be against his whole record if he did not indulge in the doctrine I have referred to. But, Mr. Speaker, we can take care of his utterances in Canada; we know the High Commissioner in Canada; he is known here, and, therefore, to the extent he is known he is comparatively powerless. It is not so in England. His office clothes him with an authority which gives a weight to his words which perhaps they would otherwise not enjoy, and, therefore, the Administration is the responsible party on this occasion, and it is due to the people of the country that the true position of the Administration on this question shall be made known. There is only one way in which the Government can properly do its duty; there is only one way in which the Government can repudiate their responsibility and again restore Canada to her proper position, and that way is at the earliest possible moment to recall from this position of power and responsiblity an agent who so far mistakes his true position as has the High Commissioner. That is the only compensation which can be made to Canada, and unless that compensation is made the Government is responsible for what has taken place. I venture to say that the Government has taken upon itself a responsibility which, in the near future, they will wish they never had assumed. Under these circumstances, I feel, whatever others may feel, that whilst it may be said we are voting money for an office, I cannot ignore the fact that this is money for an individual as well, and although the item itself is one of comparative insignificance the occasion is one which should not be passed by in silence by those who do their duty to their country. I rejoice, therefore, to see that the question is receiving some attention from those who look after the interests of the country, even though the Government appear desirous to remain silent upon it.

Mr. McMULLEN. This being the last item under the head of contingencies, it is no use calling "carried," because it will take a considerable time to speak on other items connected with this vote before they pass. I am glad to see the Minister of Customs in his seat, because it will be my duty to put a few questions to him before I am finished. Now, with regard to the attitude which the High Commissioner has assumed with regard to the Grand Trunk Railway. I must say that, in my humble opinion, it is exceedingly unfortunate that any such differences should have arisen. It is quite clear from what has been published in the press that after the High Commissioner came to Canada he sought an interview with the general manager of the Grand Trunk, and in order to hold that interview he went to the general offices of the Grand Trunk Railway in Montreal. After the interview, possibly because the Grand Trunk would not come down to the terms stipulated by him, all these differences have come before the public in the press, and have been published by Sir Henry Tyler, as head of the Grand Trunk Railway, on one side, and by Sir Charles Tupper, our High Commissioner, on the other. It is exceedingly unfortunate that this state of things should have arisen, because it is not in the interests of the country that large corporations of that kind should be approached by a man who occupies the position either of a High Commissioner or of a Minister of the Crown in the way in which Sir Charles approached the Grand Trunk. If the Government are enabled by the High Commissioner, or by any other person who chooses to cast in his lot with them as political agent or political aid, to terrorize into obedience the public corporations of this country to support the Government, or else to understand they will be visited by that Government with punishment if they do not, it is, in my opinion, an exceedingly improper and imprudent example to inaugurate in this country. I maintain that it was against the interest of the country for the High Commissioner to make that attempt on the Grand Trunk. Suppose the High Commissioner, on the occasion of his next visit to this country in the interest of the Tory party, should decide to approach the banks of this Dominion and ask them to cast in their lot with the Conservative party or else to be visited with punishment in some direction or other, how disastrous would be the result. This is an unwise and imprudent policy, and it would not be right if an attempt of this kind should be passed over without thorough and searching criticism. I am glad to be able to say that the Grand Trunk stockholders in England do not appear to have been very seriously swayed by the action of Sir Charles Tupper, for in spite of his denunciations they gener-

ously supported and re-elected the old board of directors of the Grand Trunk Railway. It is our right and our duty to condemn in the strongest language we can use such conduct on the part of a High Commissioner, no matter to what party he belongs. We should endeavour to show the great public corporations of this country, the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway and others, that they are free to discharge their duties and that they cannot be terrorized into obedience by any Government, be it Grit or Tory. The attempt of the High Commissioner to inaugurate a system of this kind was decidedly wrong, and he deserves all the chastisement he has received from this side of the House for his conduct on that occasion. I hold that we are deeply indebted to the Grand Trunk Company, being the pioneer railway of this country, for what they have done to build up the country; we are deeply indebted to those people in England who invested something like 170 millions of money in that institution to give it a standing, and make it capable of rendering the efficient service that we have enjoyed under its operations; and I say that we have no right to permit any effort to be made to trample upon its rights and privileges. Why, Mr. Chairman, had the previous Government who occupied the Treasury benches of this country been permitted to complete the Canadian Pacific Railway, that railway would have been owned largely by this Dominion, it would have been, to some extent at least, the property of this Dominion. But the hon. gentlemen opposite placed the Canadian Pacific Railway in such a position that it was completed by a corporation, and that corporation now virtually owns the country. It is quite clear from their actions during the last election that the Canadian Pacific Railway and the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches are very closely connected, and very deeply interested in one thing, and that is, that the present party should occupy power in this country, and hold their present position in the interest of that particular company. Now, I have nothing to say against the Canadian Pacific Railway. They deserve all credit for the enormous improvements they have made, and the manner in which they have completed their line. I wish them every success, and I am glad to see them occupy the very distinguished position they hold on this continent as one of the leading railway systems. At the same time we want them distinctly to understand that no railway company is to be placed in such a position that they can dictate to the people's representatives, or dictate to this House; and no railway company ought to be placed in such a position that they are subject to be dictated to by the Government that are in power for the time being, no matter of what political complexion they may be. I say that the course Sir Charles Tupper took with regard to the Grand Trunk Railway was not at all the course he should have taken as a representative of this country in England. It was derogatory to himself, it was not creditable to him as the representative of the people, and it is a slur upon the people and upon himself that he should have descended to the means that he used towards that company to try to force them to support the Tory party in this country during the last general election. I hope that it will not be repeated. I earnestly hope that he, at least, will not be permitted to repeat it; and I am quite sure that should it ever fall to the lot of the party on this side of the House to have to send a gentleman to England as Canada's representative, he never will be allowed to indulge in the threats and the insinuations with regard to any railway company, in which Sir Charles Tupper has indulged with regard to the Grand Trunk Railway. I did not wish to allow this opportunity to pass without making these few remarks with regard to the Grand Trunk Railway; and after other members have made the remarks that they desire to make in addition to what has already been said, I may have a few questions to put to the Minister of Finance and some others to the Minister of Customs, because I find there are a great many items that can well be cut down, and should be cut down. I congratulate the Minister of Finance on making an effort to put in the pruning knife, and I am glad to see that he has effected some reform, though I am sorry to see he has not used the pruning knife more frequently. We are glad to see him going in the right direction. At the same time I think it is our duty, when passing these items in connection with contingencies, to point out where we consider the pruning knife might be used more than it has been in the past. I quite understand how hard it is, particularly in the case of those who have been drawing Dominion pap for so many years, to withdraw from them the advantages they have been deriving for years past; but once the knife is put in and the pruning commences, I contend that it ought to be continued. I believe that is the only means by which we can bring the expenditure of this country within the limit of the means of the people of this Dominion—by persistently cutting down the expenses in all directions. We can well afford to do it. We have been on the highway of extravagance for the last 12 years. Year after year increased expenditures appear in the contingencies; item after item has been added to the annual expenditure. Why, Sir, we have had hundreds of officials added to the list of those who have been drawing extra allowances, year after year. Last year some 480 or 500 civil servants drew extra allowances for extra work. This system was only initiated a few years ago. The system of drawing extra allowances has only had four or five years of a start, and if we keep it up for a few years more we will have every civil servant in Ottawa drawing extra allowance. There are several items that should be subjected to the operations of the pruning knife, and before they are finally passed I wish to point out those items which, in my opinion, should be curtailed.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. There are some other points with regard to the expenditure which I wish to refer to briefly. I am glad to see the Secretary of State in his place, because there is a matter to which I wish to call his attention; it was referred to in the Committee of Supply during the last session. He will remember that his attention was called to the fact that a large sum of money was paid for advertising the sale of the Statutes, and I think he promised on that occasion that he would look into this matter and put a stop to it. Until then the sale of the Statutes had been advertised almost wholly in the city of Hull and in the city of Ottawa, and in one or two places in Quebec. That would indicate that the Secretary of State believes

that it is not necessary that the people resident in other portions of the Dominion should be aware that the Statutes are for sale, as he confined his advertising to those particular localities. This year I see that he has expended the sum of $660.20 in advertising the sale of the Statutes, and he has confined his advertising to about the same papers that he confined it to in the previous year.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is an old habit.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. An old habit ought to be eradicated when it is a bad habit. Now, the advertising is confined on this occasion to the city of Hull, and one or two papers in Montreal that I never heard of—at least, they are not leading papers at all—and some papers in Ottawa that I have not heard of. Of course we have heard of the *Citizen*, and there is the *Journal*. Then I see the *Naturalist*—I never heard of the *Naturalist* published in the city of Ottawa. It must be a new paper altogether. Then there is the Quebec *Canadien*, the St. Jérôme *Nord*, the Three Rivers *Journal*. I think the Secretary of State made a promise with regard to this matter last session, and I would like to have some explanation from him.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It has been advertized in the *Empire* for six or eight months.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Don't you pay the *Empire* anything?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No; they advertize free.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Now, cannot the hon. gentleman get the same terms from these other papers? If he can, I will say that he is discharging his duty well. But I really think some explanation ought to be given regarding this expenditure.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is a matter of advertising. There are very few papers in which the advertisement does not appear; it is not a very large amount, and it goes to the ordinary accounts for advertising, the amount of which is distributed among the several departments. The notice has been advertized in all of the papers, some advertisements being free and some paid for.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Then there must be something wrong in the Auditor General's Report. If the hon. gentleman will refer to page 65-D he will find this expenditure is given in detail. The advertisement only appeared in certain newspapers. I never saw it in any newspaper, and I very much doubt if the *Empire* would insert it for nothing.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman does not read the newspapers in which our advertisements are published.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is it necessary that the work should be done at all? I do not think it is.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It has been done.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. This is no justification. The hon. gentleman promised last session to remedy the matter. If the Secretary of State refuses to give any information, I will proceed to speak on another point.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have given the explanation. The accounts were paid because the advertisements were given out and were published. I cannot give any other explanation. The advertisements were sent out, were published, and were paid for.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Then the hon. gentleman exercises no judgment in giving out advertisements, according to his statement. The hon. gentleman says they were paid for because they were given out, not because they were necessary. There is another matter to which I desire to call attention, namely, the large amount paid annually for newspaper subscriptions for the several departments. I do not know why those papers are taken. There must be a large reading room in every department, and the clerks in the offices cannot be doing anything except reading newspapers, and this may possibly account for the extra clerks required each year. No less than $10,533.50 were paid for newspaper subscriptions for the departments last year, as follows:—Governor General's Office, $474.94; Privy Council, $529.15; Justice Department, $595.46; Militia Department, $816.05; Secretary of State's Department, $745.11; Interior, $724.07; Indian Affairs, $269.15; Audit Office, $8; Finance Department, $580.37; Inland Revenue, $562.76; Customs, $483.15; Post Office, $735.96; Agriculture Department, $1,486.72; Marine Department, $376.70; Fisheries Department, $175.17; Public Works, $1,073.75; Railways and Canals, $897.90. We have in connection with the Senate and House of Commons a reading room to which all the newspapers are sent and kept on file. It would serve the public interest very much better if, instead of there being a reading room for each Department, the clerks in the Departments were compelled to take a little exercise after performing their work and come to the reading rooms here. I do not think this country should pay them large salaries and at the same time furnish them with material which would induce them to neglect the work they are paid to perform. This suggestion was made last year, and, as it is a good one, it should be carried out. No doubt a large number of these newspapers would follow the course stated to have been followed by the *Empire* in reference to advertisements, for the Tory newspapers obtain not only $10,000 a year for newspaper subscriptions but also bonuses from other sources. Last year they received $133,775 for printing. The Secretary of State told us the other day that all the printing was being done by the Printing Bureau. If so, how does it come about that the Auditor General states in his report, and I refer the Secretary of State to page 131—A, that up to the end of the last fiscal year $135,775 was paid for printing outside the Bureau. Yet the Secretary of State declared only last week in this House that all the printing was done at the Printing Bureau. Surely he must have known that such was not the case. When a Minister makes a statement for the information of the House and the country, he should be in possession of all the information that the public documents give.

Mr. FOSTER. Those are items for a year ago.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. That was what I was talking about at the time. No doubt when we look at the next report of the Auditor General we will find a similar statement, because I called the Minister of Finance's attention to the fact that every year, during the last eight or nine years to my knowledge, the amount expended under this head reached from $150,000 to $200,000 every year. Then there is the advertising given to newspapers supporting the

Government, because I want to be understood by the House, it is already understood by the country, that an advertisement is rarely found in any newspaper that does not support the Government. The supporters of the Government are supported by the Government. The clerks in the Departments do not read the Grit papers. If they did so, they would be disgusted with the management of the country's affairs and even civil servants would help to turn out the men who now occupy the Treasury benches. But they do not get the requisite information, for the Government take care to provide only good Tory reading in the Departments, and it is because they are educated to support the Government that so many of them do so. The expenditure for advertising appears to have been $46,701. Newspapers which have received these vast sums for subscriptions, printing and advertisements, might well afford to send to each Department of the Civil Service copies of their papers free. It is the common thing for newspaper proprietors to send copies of their papers to advertisers, and to be liberal with such, in order to see that advertisements were inserted in proper places and the number of times ordered. The Secretary of State should take this into consideration and close the reading rooms in the different Departments, and benefit the health of the clerks by asking them to devote their whole attention to the public service during the hours from nine till four, which are not very long hours, and they do not require the eight and nine hour movement here, and after the closing of the Departments come to the House of Commons reading room and peruse the newspapers. If they did so, they would obtain an intelligent view of public affairs, because the papers are not confined to Conservative but include Reform papers, and the Minister would thereby not only improve the physical health of the clerks but their intelligence also, and the public service generally would be benefited.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to ask the Secretary of State——

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I would like to know if the Government intend to take action in this matter in reference to what I have just spoken. It was before the House last session and they promised to make some improvement.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have taken a note of the hon. gentleman's remarks, and I will answer him after my friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has spoken.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice there is an item of $4,000 here for the Civil Service Examining Board, and I would like to know if there is any necessity for continuing the services of that board. How many civil servants have we now in the Dominion who are without office, but who have passed the examination and are eligible for an engagement?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I must answer my hon. friend as I answered him last year. There are I believe over 3,000 in the position he has indicated, but when we remember that the expense of these examinations is in a large proportion covered by the fees imposed on the applicants I do not think it is a bad expenditure of $2,000 to have an examination made on subjects which are worthy of study by not only those who intend to enter the Civil Service, but by those who may enter into banks and other positions in life. I maintain that the small sum which comes from the public treasury for this purpose is insignificant in comparison with the good which is done the young men of the country by a system of examination which causes these young men to devote themselves to the higher classes of education, as they are required to do for the examination.

Mr. McMULLEN. I may state in reply to the hon. Minister that we have institutions of all kinds in the country which subject the young men to a more searching examination than is required by the Civil Service Act.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Question.

Mr. McMULLEN. When we have 3,000 or 4,000 young men eligible for admission to the Civil Service I think we might rest for a year or two without continuing this expenditure of $4,000 for Civil Service examinations. I believe that this system spoils the young men rather than improves them, for the reason that when they pass this examination they devote all their time to exercising influence in all directions to try and secure a Government position.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. They do not need an examination for the purpose of using such influence.

Mr. McMULLEN. Suppose they do not; yet, when they pass the examination, it is a step further in the direction of trying to secure a position. They bring influence of all kinds to bear upon members who are supposed to be able to get them into the service, and, as a result, we have to-day more clerks in the Departments in Ottawa than are absolutely necessary to carry on the business. This is because the claims of the young men who have passed the examination are pressed upon the heads of the Departments and are backed up by such influences that they cannot be refused. As a consequence, we have men engaged in the Departments and drawing salaries from the country, who are utterly worthless. I maintain that these examinations should be discontinued for a year or two. In this connection, I might point out that Mr. LeSueur, who was superannuated some fourteen years ago, and who draws superannuation allowance of about $1,100, is paid $400 a year as a Civil Service examiner, and $700 as secretary to the examining board, making about $2,200 in all, including his superannuation. This, in my opinion, proves that this civil servant was superannuated before his services should have been dispensed with, and that he was superannuated for some cause other than ill-health, because he seems to be able to discharge these other duties fourteen years after he retired from the service.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I find from the Auditor General's Report that a little over $2,000 only is paid out of the public treasury for the Civil Service Board of Examiners. It is intended, in future, to increase in a certain measure the fees to be paid by candidates, so as to meet the whole expense of the board. I understand that it is not well to leave even such a small amount to the charge of the public treasury as is now asked for when such a large number of eligible candidates are on the list, and I shall, therefore, propose to increase the revenue from this source. The fees collected from the applicants amount to over $1,800 now; this year they will amount to $2,000, and I hope that next year the fees will

meet the entire expenditure of the board of examiners. In reference to the statements made by my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Somerville), I may say that nobody more than himself should have known that the charges he has made against the department are not altogether warranted. The expenditure for printing which has been quoted by my hon. friend as being a contradiction of the statement I made the other day is not justified by the figures. Almost the entire expenditure is not for ordinary printing, but for printing done under contract for the Intercolonial Railway, by the Burland Lithographic Company for the Finance Department, and a class of work which cannot be done at Ottawa. It is put under the head of "printing" although it is not actually printing. Three-fourths, if not four-fifths, of that amount is for printing which could not have been done in the Government Bureau, and for lithographing which must be done outside. Nobody knows that better than my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Somerville).

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I am glad to get any information from the Secretary of State, but the information he gives me is not in accord with my information in regard to this matter. I am perfectly confident that when we established this Printing Bureau at an enormous expense to the country, the Opposition, at all events, supposed that it was established for the purpose of doing all the printing required by the Government. The Intercolonial Railway is part of the machinery of the Government of this country, and there is no reason why the printing required by it should not be done at Ottawa. That railway uses blank forms of all kinds and these blank forms can be stereotyped and printed here at a cheaper rate than is now paid for this work which is given out to the favourites of the Government in Halifax, St. John, Quebec and other cities, where the newspapers have enormous accounts against the Government, in some cases amounting to $8,000 and $10,000 for one single establishment. There was no use in establishing the Printing Bureau at all if the work on which such large profits are to be made was to be given out to these private contractors, the patronage of which enables the Government, to the detriment of the public interest, to help those who support them. Now, the hon. Secretary of State says a large proportion of this work is lithographic work. It was stated to me as a fact, and I believe it to be a fact, that the Post Office Department at the present time are using forms for post office orders which were got from the Burland Lithograph Company as photo-lithographs, when they are really letter-press printing done in the city of Montreal, but paid for as lithographic work; and this same work could be done at the Bureau at a much lower cost. If this is the way the hon. Secretary of State and his officers are humbugged by this company, it is time he and the country knew it. The blue-book itself shows that a very small portion of the total amount expended for printing was for lithographic work at all. In fact, there is not a word about lithographic work. Not a solitary item in the amount I gave was paid for lithographing—not one dollar, not fifty cents; let the hon. Minister look at the book and see for himself; and yet he gets up and tells the House and the country that a large portion of this amount is for lithographic work. I think he ought to be more particular when he makes these statements.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is not right to use big words, and words that might be offensive, in a discussion of this kind. But I must say that my hon. friend appears to be very well informed about the internal management of the Printing Bureau. He must have very good friends there. He is nearly as well informed as myself.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Better.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No, because I mentioned, and probably the hon. gentleman has heard of it, that the work of which he spoke and which used to be given to the Burland Company has been taken away from it, because I ascertained that the Printing Bureau could do the work by a new process and I ordered it to be done there. My hon. friend has probably heard that these post office forms and some of the Inland Revenue forms can be printed at the Printing Bureau; this was done two or three months ago; and my hon. friend has only taken advantage of what I had ordered, and what is being done now. Now, my hon. friend has said that there is not a dollar of lithography charged in this printing account. If my hon. friend will look at page A—29, he will find that there is one item of $43,000 charged for lithographing for the Finance Department done by the British American Bank Note Company. At page A—28 there is $10,000 paid to the Halifax *Herald* for railway printing which the manager of the railway considered could be done more conveniently and more cheaply there than at the Printing Bureau here. The same thing applies to the payment of $10,000 to the Moncton *Times*. Then, there is another item of $19,000 paid to the Burland Lithographic Company, and there is an item of $5,000 paid to the Montreal *Gazette* for work on account of the Geological Survey. So that as I said, more than three-fourths, if not four-fifths, is for work which could not be done by the Printing Bureau here. I may say to my hon. friend that I have every year taken notice of his warnings, and I will thank him for every item he sees on which he can give me his friendly advice, which I shall be glad to follow.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend made a statement a little while ago which certainly surprised me, coming as it did from an hon. gentleman so well informed, especially in printing matters. He stated that in this sum of $135,775 not one dollar had been paid for lithographic work. Now, if my hon. friend will turn to B—23, he will find the items which make up the sum of $43,101 charged to charges of management, under the head of printing notes. Of this amount not one dollar is for printing, but all is for lithographing. This shows the House, and those who read these criticisms, the methods adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite in the House, and if such methods are adopted here, what must be the methods used outside on the platform, where no such rein is held over their criticisms.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I am willing to acknowledge that I made an error; but we had the hon. Secretary of State the other night declaring that all the work was done at the Printing Bureau. When I make an error I am willing to make correction of it; but hon. gentlemen opposite do not get up and admit that they made an error. The hon. Secretary of State does not admit that he made an error the other night.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I stated that the printing was done outside for some good reason. I never stated that railway tickets, and railway advertisements, and railway time tables were printed at the Printing Bureau; because the superintendent of railways informed me that this could not be done here with equal economy or equal advantage to the good management of the railways. I hope, however, we will be able in the future to do it as we have succeeded to do with the stationery for railways. The printing item for railways alone is $47,000; agriculture comes in for $16,000, a great part of which is for pamphlets published for the benefit of immigration in England. We have $43,000, $47,000, $16,000, $10,000, out of $133,000, which are certainly warranted by the declaration I made the other day, that all the ordinary printing was done at the Printing Bureau.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I am not at all satisfied that the hon. Minister has apologized as handsomely for his mistake as I did for the mistake I made. Furthermore, he said I obtained my information from the Printing Bureau, and know as much as he does about the management through some one employed in that department. I wish to disabuse his mind of that impression. I obtained no information from anyone in the Bureau, so that he need not mete out condign punishment to any one he may happen to suspect.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not object.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Nobody in the Bureau gave me information. I furthermore tell the hon. gentleman I am glad to know he has discovered that this Lithographic Company has been imposing on him, and is prepared to have his letter press done in the Bureau, where it ought to have been done long ago. I represented to him that he was paying, as lithographic matter, for what was not lithographed at all. With regard to the statement that a very large amount of money is squandered on outside work which ought to have been done in the Bureau, I still stick to my text. Anyone who examines the pages A—28, 29, 30 and 31 of the Auditor General's Report, where a detailed statement is given of the papers to which money has been paid, will see at once that the accusation I made of money being squandered for the purpose of supporting the party press is well founded. That system should not be allowed to continue. But to come back to the original question, I would like to know when the Secretary of State is going to do away with these reading rooms in the Departments?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The Minister of Finance may give some information on that subject, but my hon. friend knows that if this is a sin, it is not a sin of recent date. I think these reading rooms existed before this Administration came into power.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. That is no excuse for you.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. And they may have existed on a larger scale than they do now. My hon. friend must not flatter himself that the improvement was made in the Printing Department at his suggestion; the reform was made before I was given notice of it by him. My hon. friend says he does not take any information from the Printing Bureau. I must say I do not object to his getting information there as much as he likes. I invite every hon. member to visit the Bureau, and I am only sorry that more hon. members do not visit it to see the manner in which it is conducted, for I am sure that after their examination they would make no complaint on this score. My hon. friend, who is a practical printer, may find fault with my political management, but I have confidence he cannot find fault with the way the Bureau is conducted. The hon. gentleman or one of his colleagues stated that Mr. LeSueur should not have been superannuated, but I did not superannuate him. He was superannuated long ago, I think in 1877, by the friends of the hon. gentleman. If he was superannuated too young, it is not the fault of this Administration; and the duties he has performed as one of the Civil Service Board of Examiners are certainly duties for which credit should be given him.

Mr. MULOCK. A few moments ago when I intimated that the High Commissioner had told the people of the Maritime Provinces, after the general elections, that their opportunity had arrived, that statement seemed to be doubted.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). Read the words.

Mr. MULOCK. I spoke from recollection, having in my mind simply what I read in the *Empire* at the time. I have since endeavoured to find in the file of the *Empire* what the exact words were, but some friend of the Government has so fallen in love with them that the paragraph has been cut out. I have referred, however, to an authority which ought to be undoubted since it has received over $8,000, for Government printing during the past year, the Halifax *Herald*. In its issue of March 11 appears a report of Sir Charles Tupper's speech at Halifax, which no doubt will be accepted as authentic. In large black letter type at the head, are the points intended to strike the attention of the people; and after exposing the dastardly conduct of the Grand Trunk Railway people in springing at the throats of the Government and joining with the enemies of Canada, the head note proceeds to say: "Thanks to the votes of the people of the Maritime Provinces Sir John can now send commissioners to Washington" I believe, that was done—"and Mr. Blaine will gladly negotiate a fair and just treaty of reciprocity and a settlement of all irritating questions." And then the newspaper proceeds to give prominence to the point in the address, which concerns the subject under discussion: "The great opportunity of the Maritime Provinces." I have not gone through this four column speech to find out what the great opportunity of the Maritime Provinces is; I have, at all events, struck upon that portion which formed the foundation of the *Empire's* report. My recollection of the *Empire's* version was: "Now is the opportunity of the Maritime Provinces to obtain justice."

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). Those are the words you used.

Mr. MULOCK. Surely you are not going to repudiate the authority of the Halifax *Herald*. The report continues:

"You see to-day, as the result of this great and vital contest, Ontario and Quebec pretty nearly balanced, the one party with the other, and you find the Maritime Provinces, Eastern and Western, the smaller outlying Provinces, the North-West and Manitoba, smaller than ours, holding the balance of power. These small Provinces are in a position to claim the very highest and first con-

sideration at the hands of the Government for the noble manner in which they have sustained the institutions of our country."

Will the hon. gentleman say what is meant by these significant words? We have not yet got the supplementary estimates; we have not yet the estimates for railways; we have not yet seen what appropriations are made for public works, this Parliament has not yet run its course. But we see what has been done in preceding Parliaments, and we know as well as if the demands had come down what is going to happen. We know perfectly well it means a raid on the treasury. We know that is what Sir Charles Tupper's words mean if they mean anything.

Mr. FOSTER. A free translation.

Mr. MULOCK. If there is any other translation, I should like to hear the Minister of Finance tell us what it is.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). These are the words: "The Maritime Provinces hold the balance of power, and now is the time to knock at the door of the Dominion Treasurer."

Mr. MULOCK. Yes, and I repeat the words. Those are significant of the views of the High Commissioner. If those words are not correct, will the hon. gentleman tell us what he did mean?

Mr. FOSTER. Put your own interpretation on them.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the meaning of the "great opportunity of the Maritime Provinces?"

Mr. FOSTER. Sir Charles Tupper did not say that.

Mr. MULOCK. The newspapers said that. Tell us what it means?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Will the Minister of Finance make an explanation?

Mr FOSTER. Will this explanation suit the hon. gentleman? We went over the whole question Friday night, and it was up for discussion quite a time. I made my statement then. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will take that as it is in *Hansard*, so that I need not take up the time of the House on it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There was no discussion, and the discussion was reserved especially for to-day.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), with his usual courtesy, states that there was no discussion on the question of newspaper patronage. If my hon. friend asks the member for Yarmouth, or the member for Ottawa, he will find to the contrary.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The Minister of Finance can easily say whether he intends to remove the evil or not.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, as I stated on Friday. If the hon. gentleman will take the trouble to look at the amount expended under this head for the last financial year, and this year, he will find we have effected a large saving in most of the departments. In the Governor General's department, where the expenditure was $800 or $900 a few years ago, it was brought down last year to about $500. A similar saving was effected in some other departments, resulting from an attempt to cut down the large amounts that had been previously paid. However, the Government is giving attention to the matter at the present time, and an arrangement has been made by which it will be seen, when the accounts for next year are brought down, that a very large saving will be effected in this item. It is the intention of the Government to bring the expenditure down to a fairly reasonable basis, and to an amount with which I do not suppose hon. gentlemen opposite can find fault.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not like the Minister of Finance to repeat his answer twice, and I think he can properly claim to be relieved in that particular; but neither on Friday nor to-night has he answered the plain question asked, whether he endorses the action and proceedings of Sir Charles Tupper, High Commissioner in London, in the newspaper controvery he is carrying on?

Mr. FOSTER. What proceedings?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Writing to the newspapers, attacking the Grand Trunk Railway, and denouncing half of our people as ruined gamesters, proceedings which tend to destroy credit—that is if his word is believed in that line.

Mr. FOSTER. I have an indistinct recollection that the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) raised this question, but the very eloquent and impressive speech of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) drove it entirely from my mind, especially as I am unaccustomed to receiving compliments at his hand. I remember indistinctly one question, as to whether or not the Government stood by Sir Charles Tupper in his attempt to bring the Grand Trunk into line during the last election, his attempt, in other words, to bulldoze the Grand Trunk. The hon. gentleman aswered his own question, or rather put his own question out of court, because he referred to it as a matter of report, and the time of the House need not be taken up with such reports as that. If the hon. gentleman had continued his search he would have found another report, quite as well founded, the statement made by Sir Charles Tupper, in which he distinctly affirmed that he made no such advances or proposals to the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Minister of Finance, with that courtesy which has distinguished him on more than one occasion, ventured to impute to-night that I had not stated the truth—that is what his insulting remark amounted to—when I stated there had not been any discussion on the newspaper question on Friday evening. I knew what I was talking about. I observe that the discussion does not take one column of *Hansard*. A few remarks were made by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), stating that he was a new member of the House and asking for some information. The Minister of Finance made a speech not lasting two minutes, in which he said—and it does not cover twenty lines—he hoped some reduction would be made. I made a remark about the Department of Agriculture having spent $1,300 a year, and the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Devlin) said a word or two. No discussion took place, no explanations were given. It was intimated on that occasion, and the Minister of Finance knows it was intimated, that explanations would be asked about all the departments; and when he threw his insult across the floor he was stating what he ought to have

known was not correct. The statement I made, that there had been no discussion, was literally true. There had only been a little desultory conversation. The hon. gentleman had better be a little more careful in his statements. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville) for example, and some other members were not present when the conversation occurred on Friday night, and they appeared to be under the impression that the usual yearly discussion with respect to the newspapers taken by the different departments, ranging in each case from $300 to $1,300 a year, had taken place. There was not that discussion. It was understood by myself and my friends that the discussion was left open and would be renewed to-night, and therefore the hon. gentleman was wrong in his denial of my statement, and I was perfectly correct. There was not a discussion on Friday night covering more than a column of the *Hansard*. The hon. gentleman can call it a discussion; but it was not that discussion which always occurs over that expenditure each year. I suppose the hon. gentleman will not call a question and a reply a discussion. The understanding arrived at on both sides was that all these matters should be open for discussion to-night, and the item of payments to newspapers was supposed to be one.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot help but return the kindness of the hon. gentleman, and thank him for the very courteous remarks addressed to me. I still think I am correct in what I said. I stated there had been a discussion. I do not know what standard the hon. gentleman has as to what constitutes a discussion, and I will leave that matter with the House. At least four, probably five or six members spoke. The hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Devlin) spoke and addressed some question to me. The hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) also spoke and addressed some questions to me, and other members spoke. Now my hon. friend complains because my remarks did not fill more than twenty lines of *Hansard*. That is not a demerit. There may be a contrast between the hon. gentleman and myself in this particular, and it may be possible for me to put into twenty lines quite as much of the real gist of a matter as my hon. friend does in forty lines.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. A short time ago the Minister of Finance assured the Committee that the Government had made quite a reduction in the expenditure for newspapers in the Departments for the last year. The hon. gentleman said that if I would examine the Auditor General's Report for the past year and compare it with the present year I would find a considerable reduction. I have turned up the report for 1889. It shows an expenditure under this head of $10,099.99, while for this year, 1890, the expenditure was $10,533.58. The Finance Minister is progressing the wrong way, and if apologies are in order the Minister of Finance should now get up in his place and declare that he made a mistake, as I acknowledged I made a mistake a little while ago, unwittingly. I want him to do the same. Here are the sums, I can refer to the page. If he will look at page 64—C of the Auditor General's Report for 1889, he will find that $10,099.99 was the amount paid for subscriptions to newspapers in the departments. If he will look at page 74—B of the last Auditor General's Report, he will find that last year $10,533.58 were paid. Now, if that is the way he is improving, what is the Government going to come to? I think that when he seeks to give this House information, he ought to be a little more accurate, he ought to examine the records. The Government were delighted a little while ago when they caught me napping, and for once, they thought they had made a point. Now, the Minister of Finance is much larger game than I am, and I have caught him, and I call upon him now to acknowledge that he committed an error.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What would he say on the stump if you were not there to watch him?

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend, if he will consider for a moment, will give me credit for saying that there were considerable deductions in some of the departments.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. That is exactly what I meant to state, and I want my hon. friend to do me the kindness to look at those I mentioned. Take the Governor General's Department, for instance. I said that it came down from somewhere in the region of $900 to $500.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. But it went up in other departments. You did not tell us that.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; but I blame some of the Departments for not carrying out the system, while in others it had resulted in economy, and I have proposed an arrangement by which next year the effects will be seen in all the departments. Now, whatever apology is necessary for that amount of poor understanding on my hon. friend's part, and for poor expression on mine, I am willing to make.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. But I think they are commencing at the wrong end. I think the Governor General ought to be in possession of public information; he ought to get the newspapers.

Mr. FOSTER. He has all he needs.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. But you have cut him off.

Mr. FOSTER. I may say that it was with the thorough co-operation of His Excellency that it was done.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We have had this statement made from the Treasury benches four or five successive years; at least that length of time their attention has been called to this gross abuse of spending nine or ten thousand dollars for subscriptions to newspapers for the benefit of the Departments. Four or five times over a reform has been promised, and as my hon. friend shows, the only reform they have practiced is to spend seven or eight hundred dollars more.

Mr. MULOCK. Since the Minister of Finance condescended to take up part of my remarks, I will venture to summarize by asking a question. He tells us that the High Commissioner did not, according to his own statement, make the proposals to the Grand Trunk Railway which were attributed to him. I did not say that he did, I simply said that he was so reported. I asked the Minister of Finance, and I now renew the question, if he would tell us what is the attitude of the Government in regard to the action of the High Commissioner, about which I believe there is no question. I will say nothing at this moment about the High Com-

missioner's attack upon the Grand Trunk Railway in the English press, or his onslaught on a portion of the people of Canada; I will limit my question to the point I mentioned.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Shall the item carry?

Mr. CHARLTON. Surely this is a question of sufficient importance to merit the courteous attention of the Government. We have a right to know, and the country has a right to know, what view the Government take of the conduct of the High Commissioner. We assert that his conduct was improper, that he has been guilty of conduct not in accordance with the duties of his office, that he has been meddling with that which does not concern him, that he has been making an attack upon a very important corporation of this country, that that attack was not only unwarrantable, but it was unjust, and we want to know what view the Government take of that matter. It is an important question; it cannot be burked or treated with silent contempt.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course, the natural inference, when the Government have nothing to say after hearing their officer assailed, is that they cannot possibly defend them. That is the natural inference, that is the inference which everybody in the country will draw. Sir Charles Tupper, the High Commissioner, has been solemnly arraigned here before the High Court of Parliament for having attacked the Grand Trunk Railway, for having brought unreasonable charges against it, for having threatened it, for having attempted to bulldoze it, and the Government, recognizing that his conduct has been very improper, have nothing to say in his defence. I do not know that my hon. friends need require any other answer. It is quite clear that they cannot say one word in his defence.

Mr. DEVLIN. I did not bring up this question the other night about newspaper subscriptions; it was started by somebody else, I think. I merely asked the question whether the Liberal papers were received in the Departments as well as the Conservative papers. Afterwards I expressed the opinion that the item of subscriptions for newspapers seemed large. There are some other items to come up shortly in connection with this question which will be very interesting. We have heard a good deal said about the statements made by the High Commissioner. I do not know if the High Commissioner charged the Liberal party with having used American gold in the elections. I know as a matter of fact that in our county we saw very little American gold, in fact there was none of it except what may have been in possession of the Conservative party. It was said that they possessed all the American gold that was in the constituency.

Mr. FOSTER. I must ask you, Mr. Chairman, whether this is pertinent to the discussion. This afternoon I appealed to the House to keep ourselves to the discussion of the subject of the item before us, and the House, I think, agreed with me, and they dropped the discussion on trade. I think now it is not necessary to go into the question as to whether American gold was or was not used in the election. I do not think that is regular on this item.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What the Minister of Finance says is quite right, but the matter is largely in his own hands. When questions that demand an answer are asked, questions of importance that the country expects to be answered, and the hon. gentleman sits down and all the other Ministers refuse to say anything, then confusion arises. If they would answer the questions that are put in the interests of the public, that we have a right to ask, then the discussion would be kept within proper bounds. The Minister of Finance surely sees that when he refuses to answer a plain question that the Opposition are quite within their right in asking, that their duty demands they should ask, and when he will not answer, and none of the other Ministers will answer, when they are unable either to grasp the situation or are without sufficient information or courage to answer, then some one tries to see whether they have any information on any other subject, and so it goes on. If the Minister of Finance would answer questions that are pertinent, then we could keep the discussion within reasonable bounds.

Mr. FOSTER. We do not refuse to answer any questions that are pertinent. Any questions with reference to the expenditures in the Estimates are pertinent, and we ought to answer them, and I will try, so far as I am concerned, to answer them. But there are a great many questions, outside of these entirely, that I think are not pertinent questions.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). In discussing this matter of the High Commissioner, the Minister of Finance himself admitted that he is occupying that position now in England. The hon. gentleman knows, as a matter of fact by common report, that the High Commissioner is writing letters in the newspaper press, is engaged in a controversy and is attacking the Grand Trunk Railway, that he is engaging in a course that tends, as far as he is able to make it, to injure the company and to depreciate the value of its stock. The question asked is: Does the Minister sanction the High Commissioner in following that line of conduct? It is a plain and intelligent question, one wholly within the scope of this discussion, and we are entitled to an answer to it.

Mr. FOSTER. Then if the hon. gentleman is determined not to go any further with the Estimates until I have answered the question, I will give the answer. The attitude of the Government at the present with regard to that is one of attentive consideration.

Mr. CHARLTON. That is not a satisfactory answer; it is an evasive answer. A certain line of conduct followed by the High Commissioner has been pointed out; it has been pointed out that he is guilty of certain offences, the offences the people understand perfectly well, and the Minister of Finance well understands them. The High Commissioner is acting as a partisan, as a party bully. He strove to coerce the Grand Trunk Railway corporation into a certain line of conduct, and failed. He carried to England the animus engendered by that failure, and he is now making attacks on that corporation. He is certainly doing that in violation of his duties of High Commissioner, and his conduct is derogatory to his office. This action reflects on the Government. It is a serious matter and cannot be dealt with in this trifling way, by the Minister of Finance rising and telling the Committee that the matter is under consideration.

This is not a satisfactory answer. We want to know whether the Government approves or disapproves of the action of the High Commissioner? The country wants to know, the country demands to know, and we are here to-night to ask an answer to this question.

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER. I believe the point of order was raised, that on Friday it was understood that all items except the last one were all to be passed, and they were passed. Accordingly hon. members should not now discuss any item except that respecting the High Commissioner? Hon. members who during the afternoon and evening have been discussing newspaper patronage have been out of order, as I understand there is nothing now before the Committee except the item respecting the High Commissioner.

Mr. LAURIER. I am sorry to remind you, Mr. Chairman, that you did not occupy the Chair at the opening of the sitting to-day, when it was understood that all questions regarding contingencies of all the departments were open for discussion. We have discussed not only the High Commissioner, but matters connected with the Printing Bureau, and others.

Mr. FOSTER. It is true that the arrangement made was that all the items should be passed, except the last one, but that discussion on any of the contingencies of the departments should be allowed. My point of order against the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Devlin) was of a different kind.

Mr. DEVLIN. After referring to some other matters I touched upon the question of the expenditures of the office of the High Commissioner. I still think I am perfectly in order in touching upon that question. For my own part I believe the course of the High Commissioner, and I say it frankly, in coming to Canada, was perfectly justifiable. Why do I believe that? Because he was called out by the Prime Minister. I do not suppose that when the invitation was extended to him by the Prime Minister the High Commissioner knew exactly the object of the mission. No doubt he thought it might be in connection with some interest with which he was connected as High Commissioner, and not a political mission. But I believe also that when he ascertained what the mission was he should have returned to England and continued to have performed the duties for which he was specially appointed. Nevertheless, it is nothing new for the High Commissioner to interfere in political matters, notwithstanding his exalted position. In 1886, he was invited to open the exhibition at Charlottetown. On that occasion he took opportunity to deliver a purely political address. In 1878 he promised a treaty of reciprocity. In 1886 he proceeded on behalf of the Government to Charlottetown, although he was not exactly a representative of the Government, and he promised a treaty of reciprocity would be entered into within two years. The promise did not mature any more than in 1878. We know that on that occasion he had very few, if any, good words to say for the Opposition. By him, as well as by many others immediately connected with him, the party of which we are members has been branded as a party of traitors. But traitors to whom? Is the number of traitors not a very large one? We know that the Province of Quebec has declared by a very large majority against the continuation in office of the present Government, and against the policy of the present Government. So when Sir Charles Tupper charges us with being traitors, he makes a like charge against a large majority of the province. This is a serious accusation to bring. It is an unjust accusation to bring against a people, who on many occasions have shown themselves more loyal and more truly devoted to the institutions governing us, institutions which we received from England, than some of the people who have been denouncing us as traitors. Not only have the people of the Province of Quebec been placed under this stigma, but the people of Ontario have likewise suffered, because one-half of the electorate of that Province belong to the Liberal party. It is very easy to bring forward such accusations, but it is an entirely different matter to substantiate them—and this has not been done. In common with hon. members on this side of the House, I protest against the course which has been adopted. I do not think we should pay large sums of money to one whose duty, presumably, it is to look after the interests of Canada in the mother country, to negotiate a treaty with Spain or some other country, and yet who disregards those important duties and comes out here and calls us strong names. I take objection to the statement made by the Minister of Finance, that we had fully discussed the question of subscriptions to newspapers. That was my object in rising. I did not bring up the discussion, nor was it understood that the discussion was closed with the few remarks made on that occasion.

Mr. CASEY. If the Minister of Finance thinks the House and the country are going to be satisfied with the trifling answer he made to the demands of this side of the House for a reply, he is utterly mistaken. He may understand the duties of his position, or he may not, but he does not understand public opinion in adopting such action. Here we have a civil servant, a man who, although he has been a Cabinet Minister, and is the father of another Cabinet Minister, holds the same relation as a junior clerk to the Government, and the Government who are responsible for his actions are questioned in regard to the course he has taken. It was asked whether the Government endorsed his action and the Minister of Finance said that "the Government would take it into their attentive consideration." What are the public to think of such an answer to this question? They will take the Minister of Finance into their attentive consideration and what their consideration of him will be goodness only knows. It is a perfectly childish answer to give to a gentleman in this House, and if the hon. gentleman had been here long enough he would know that. I repeat that Sir Charles Tupper is as much a member of the Civil Service of this country as any clerk in the departments, and he has no more right to take part in a political campaign and to address nasty language to one-half of the people of this country than the youngest clerk in the service. Whether the members of the Government choose to remain silent or to give offensive and slangy answers to questions, they are nevertheless responsible for the acts of the civil servants, and it may be necessary before this matter is disposed of, to point out that Sir Charles Tupper having violated

his duties as a civil servant is no longer fit to continue in the service. I wish to impress upon the Minister of Finance that his answer has been insulting to the House and that no member of experience in parliamentary practice would have given such an answer. I was a member of this House in the old days when the rules of Parliament were enforced and long before the hon. gentleman ever thought of coming here, and I know that no experienced Minister would have given such a reply. I may tell the Minister of Finance that to satisfy the public he will have to answer "yes" or "no" to this question: but whether the answer be in the affirmative or negative the Government are responsible for the conduct of this civil servant. I will not enter into the details of the question of Sir Charles Tupper's attack on the Grand Trunk Railway further than to say that the Government is responsible for the insulting and insolent conduct of the High Commissioner towards almost half of the electors of this country, and towards one of the greatest corporations of this country, a corporation which took a greater part in developing Canada than the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance, or whatever other Minister is in charge of the matter, what reply he has to give to the question I asked the other night in reference to the High Commissioner being appointed a director of a gas company which is going to do business in the United States. I would like to know if the High Commissioner is acting by the consent and authority of the Government, and if it is not possible that the High Commissioner who draws a salary from this country can find wide enough scope for his energies and financial skill in the Dominion of Canada. I would like to know if he has accepted this position with the endorsation of the Government, or if it is a matter which the Government have under their serious consideration. I would like to know if the public servant who belongs to a company carrying on business to the extent of ten million dollars and operating in the United States, does this with the consent of the Government. I will read the statement from the *Empire*:

"Sir Charles Tupper has been appointed director of the Water Works and Gas Works Securities Corporation, which has just been organized here with a capital of £2,000,000 sterling. The object of this new corporation is to buy up water works, gas works and other concerns of the kind in Canada and the United States. There is every prospect of an early settlement of the question of the power of the trustees to invest in colonial inscribed stock. A simple bill approved by the colonial representatives in London is being drafted for the Imperial Parliament. Legislation may be also necessary in Canada and the other colonies."

Have the Government been consulted about the legislation which it is said will be necessary? Has the Minister of Justice been consulted about the legislation necessary in order to enable our High Commissioner to direct his capital, which was paid by the people of this country, to the purpose of developing concerns in the United States, and if so, has the Government given its consent to that?

An hon. MEMBER. Answer the question.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Well, if they will not answer that question, I might ask how many members of the Government are interested in business matters in the United States? When these gentlemen are calling us disloyal, I would ask them if it is compatible with their professions for them to apply the capital which belongs to the people of this country to develop the industries of the United States, when we have great undeveloped resources in this country awaiting capital. Surely the Government should not be disloyal to Canada, yet there is no greater disloyalty than that the members of the Government or their High Commissioner should invest our capital in the United States. I say "our capital," because it is our capital. The High Commissioner got that capital from us; when he went into politics he was as poor as a wet hen, he was said not to be worth anything, all the money he has was made in public life and that money he now invests in the United States.

Mr. LAURIER. It seems to me that my hon. friend the member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) is now drawing the attention of the House to a question of very great importance, and that he is treated with too great levity——

Mr. FOSTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAURIER,—by the other side, I mean to say. I ask any hon. gentleman in this House if it is proper for a person occupying the high position Sir Charles does in England, which is practically that of our ambassador to the Court at St. James, to enter into any such scheme as is now being mentioned by my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Landerkin). If the emoluments of Sir Charles Tupper are not sufficient for the dignity of his office, then let the emoluments be increased if necessary. But I claim that Sir Charles Tupper should give all his attention to the business of the country, and to nothing else. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House should remember that at one time the Minister of the United States at the Court of St. James, General Schenck, was connected with a certain concern which turned out to be not altogether savoury to the public, although General Schenck had done nothing for which he could be impugned. Moreover, we have seen the name of the hon. Minister of Public Works and the name of Sir Charles Tupper coupled with that of the Direct Meat Company which was not what it should have been either. Therefore, simply as a measure of caution, the Minister who represents Canada at the Court of St. James ought not to be engaged in any such transactions, and I submit for the honour of Canada that if the emoluments of Sir Charles Tupper are not sufficient, let them be increased, but let him give his whole time to the business of Canada and to nothing else.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has certainly treated this matter in a way very different from the very light and trifling and gassy manner in which it was treated by my hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Landerkin). So far as I am concerned, and I think the same is true of the Government, the first intimation we have had of Sir Charles Tupper being connected in any way with such a company was when we heard the statement from a newspaper read in the House. It is simply a newspaper report, and as a newspaper report it has not reached the Government in any authoritative or official way, and I do not think we are called upon to treat as serious matters without consideration, what may be simply reports of newspapers. With regard to the Dead Meat Company, I am not aware that Sir Charles Tupper had

anything to do with that in an intimate way. I think that he had nothing to do with it, except in the mere writing of a letter which conveyed no promise of influence or support. The same is true, I think, of Sir Hector Langevin, so far as my recollection goes.

Mr. LAURIER. I am very glad to hear that the only defence the Government have on this occasion is that they have received no official notice. They will have official notice by-and-bye, and we can anticipate the course they will take.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I wish to point out to the House that the hon. Minister of Finance is not justified in dealing so lightly as he does with a letter which Sir Charles Tupper addressed to a number of promoters in London whom he knew were connected with the getting up of this same Dead Meat Company. If the hon. gentleman is not aware of it, I can tell him that Sir Charles Tupper's conduct on that occasion has been animadverted upon in terms of deserved severity by several of the most distinguished financial journals in England; and he will find that the conduct of our High Commissioner has very considerably discredited us in the eyes of English investors. As I pointed out when I brought this matter to the attention of the House last session, the statements made in that letter were of a most reprehensible and scandalous character. It was also extremely unfortunate that the hon. Minister of Public Works should have allowed his name to appear as a director of any such company; and although the House received his assurance that he had not read the prospectus, he never took steps to disassociate himself from that enterprise until his connection with it became a matter of censure on the floor of this House. But Sir Charles Tupper had seen that prospectus, and knowing the conditions of things in Canada, had been extremely indiscreet, to use the mildest term, in writing a letter which was used on the stock exchange to induce people to put their money into a thoroughly rotten enterprise, which was a disgrace to Canada and all connected with it.

Mr. CASEY. I just rise to point out the number of things which the hon. Minister of Finance disclaims a knowledge of. We may be here for several months, but I think it will take a good many months at this rate to find out all the things the hon. Minister of Finance does not know.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am very sorry I did not impress the hon. Minister of Finance with the earnestness with which I addressed the House on this subject. I am very sorry that this matter escaped the notice of the Government, because it appeared in the *Empire*, which is published in the interest of the Government. It is rather hard for the *Empire* to be told in the House of its friends that it is not read. I also notice that the hon. Secretary of State told the House that the *Empire* advertised the sale of the Statutes for six months and got nothing for it. That is rather a reflection on the circulation of the paper; and if the friends of the Government will not do so, I wish to stand up and say a word for it; and I hope the members of the Government will be more considerate of those great men at the helm of that paper. I think it is a matter we should enquire into seriously, and if the hon. Minister of Finance has mistaken the tone and temper in which I addressed the House on this question, he has greatly misunderstood me. I made this enquiry because I believed I had a perfect right to do so, and I think the country will agree with me that it is not a proper thing for an officer of the people of Canada enjoying a salary of $10,000 a year and perquisites amounting to $2,000 more, to take that money and invest it in Yankee enterprises. I appeal to the people on national grounds to stand up for Canada, and when men holding high positions receive large sums of money from the country they should have the patriotism to invest it in Canadian securities and Canadian enterprises.

Mr. MULOCK. I would just call the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance to a matter of some importance, which I think might well receive the attention of the Agent General of Canada in England. At all events, I think it is better entitled to his consideration than those outside enterprises which have been referred to. By the *Canada Gazette* of May, the current month, it appears that our trade with Great Britain is undergoing a very serious change. I think it would be well if the Minister of Finance could spare one moment while I call his attention to a matter with which he is no doubt already familiar.

Mr. FOSTER. I read it to-night.

Mr. MULOCK. I am sure every one who has read it has done so with a great deal of sorrow and some alarm. In the *Gazette* in question appears an article entitled: "British trade with Canada," according to which our imports from England for the four months terminating in April last amount to £1,567,420.

Mr. FOSTER. I think I ought to appeal to my hon. friend that this is travelling out of the record. It will come up very well in the discussion on the Budget.

Mr. MULOCK. I acknowledge the force of the objection, and will just make one point. According to the statement, our trade with exports to Great Britain are only one-sixth in April, 1891, what they were in the corresponding month last year.

Mr. FOSTER. This is really quite unfair. If the country is to be put in a fair position with reference to the point raised, there ought to be a rejoinder; and to proceed with the rejoinder now would only open up a discussion on a subject which we are not at all discussing.

Mr. MULOCK. I will not quote the figures, but would simply say that the appearance of those figures—

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman might just as well read the figures as make the statement.

Mr. MULOCK. I would ask the Finance Minister to see that the attention of the High Commissioner is given solely to the interests of Canada and that he will not allow this state of affairs to continue if it can be remedied.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I see that the item of telegrams is increased very largely. I do not know whether the business of the country requires more telegrams to be sent now than formerly, but the expenditure seems excessive, amounting to $16,223 last year. In the Militia Department, no less than $1,706.73 were used in telegrams, and as we had no war last year the hon. Minister should explain this extravagance. I do not see that

there was such haste required in the management of his Department as to necessitate this extensive telegraphing. In the Governor General's office $1,704.72 were spent. I was under the impression that a lump sum was allowed the Governor General for travelling and other expenses such as this.

Mr. FOSTER. Not telegraphing.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The Privy Council spent $1,249.91, which included, I suppose, the cost of telegrams sent Sir Charles Tupper. The Secretary of State's Department, spent $781.50; the Justice Department, $1,167.48; Public Printing and Stationery, $82.20. In this respect the Secretary of State was very economical. Indian Affairs, $703.51; the Audit Office, which I believe is the cheapest branch of the public service, only spent $14.29; the Finance Department, $837.50; Inland Revenue, $606.91; Customs Department, $1,061.87. Customs has been a little extravagant, although the hon. Minister is generally very economical. Post Office Department, $731.64; Agriculture Department, $1,028.63; Marine Department, $752.87; Fisheries Department, $502.97; Public Works, $710.30; Railways and Canals, $353. The fact is the total expenditure in telegrams last year amounted to nearly as much as it costs for the services of the charwomen, which cost us $17,997.20. Some of the Ministers ought to explain why this expenditure is going on increasing. Last year we expended $15,643.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am glad to say that the telegraphing which the hon. gentleman complains of is that which is required on a peace footing, and that we are not at present in a state of war. When we had trouble, there was as much expended in a month on that service as it now costs for a year. The amount may seem very large, but every district in the Dominion contains a portion of the militia force, and the requirements of the service entail a considerable use of the telegraph. I believe the hon. gentleman will see that the amount is smaller than it used to be, and I hope, if we continue to enjoy profound peace, it may be reduced still further.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I cannot see that it is smaller. On the contrary, it is larger. The statement of the hon. gentleman is on a par with that made by the Finance Minister, and it takes the Opposition all their time watching the blue-books to keep the Ministers straight. The expenditure in 1890 in the Militia Department was $1,706.73, and in 1889 it was only $1,188.16, so it is going on increasing instead of decreasing.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The country is increasing.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I doubt that very much.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance whether any allowance or any sum of money in any shape is paid by the Government to the Reuter Association to send cablegrams of our doings across the Atlantic?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know that there is.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are you sure that none is paid?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know of any at the present time.

Mr. LAURIER. Is the Minister in a position to say that there is not or simply that there may not be?

Mr. FOSTER. I only say that I am not aware that there is, and I do not think there is.

Mr. LAURIER. Where ignorance is bliss, 'tis folly to be wise.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Are special rates charged for these cablegrams, or do the Government pay the ordinary rates?

Mr. FOSTER. The ordinary rates are paid, except by the Meteorological Department. A large amount of telegraphing in some of the departments is easily explained. It is a short and sharp way of doing business, particularly if it is important. In the Governor General's Office and in the Privy Council Office this amount is growing because of the quantity of telegraphing that has to be done in regard to important matters, such as the Behring Sea question and other questions of that kind. It is a difficult thing to bring this down. There is a tendency on the part of members of Parliament to send telegrams "collect" to members of the Government, when they desire some information.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. For example, telegrams on election matters? Would that come within the purview of public business?

Mr. FOSTER. No; that would not be under public business.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the hon. gentleman quite sure of that? As to the Meteorological Service, I think they are specially charged to that department.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to know if this charge includes the telegraphing of the Land Board at Winnipeg as well as that of the department here?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I can hardly give that information now, but I do not think it does. I think the Land Commissioner pays his own telegraphing out of his contingent account.

Mr. McMULLEN. I can quite understand that the amount of $2,412 would not be unreasonable if it included the two branches. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will give the Committee the information when we come to some other item.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; but I think most of the telegrams sent from Winnipeg are paid for here.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see by the Auditor General's Report that $50 was paid for advertising in the Christmas number of the Ottawa *Citizen*. What was that for?

Mr. BOWELL. I think that advertisement contained all the instructions or information necessary for immigrants coming to this country, telling them what was necessary to do in making their entries, what articles were free under the Tariff Act, and so on; and, as that Christmas number was principally for foreign circulation and a large edition of it was printed, it was deemed advisable to give the information through its columns. While I am on my feet, I desire to refer to a matter to which my hon. friend from North Brant (Mr. Somerville) has called attention. He objects to the large amount of $1,081.67 for telegraphing. If he would reflect upon the amount of business transacted by the department over the wires, I do not think he will find that a very large amount, especially when he compares it with the amount which was expended before the completion of the Pacific Railway line. In 1877, when there were but

two companies, the amount paid was $1,510.66. Although the telegraphic connection had not extended throughout the country as it has been now, the amount expended was nearly 50 per cent. more than it is to-day. The member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), in the indignant tones which he usually uses, referred to what he termed the gross and extravagant expenditure in reference to this matter, but he has forgotten the amount which was expended when he was Minister of Finance. In the year ending the 30th June, 1877, I find this result. I may frankly admit that the mode of keeping the accounts at that time was different from what it is now, and that there is a considerable difficulty in making up a correct comparison. However, in the Public Accounts of 1877, I find the following amounts paid for advertising and printing. There are, however, additional items for printing, printing paper and binding, but simply for advertising and printing, I find that the Governor General's office paid $1,302.81; the Privy Council, $745.75; the Secretary of State, $799.70; the Department of the Interior, $435.36; the Department of Justice, $590.65; the Department of Militia, $903.07; the Finance Department, $681.55; the Public Works Department, $729.20; the Department of Marine, $1,996.11; the Department of the Receiver General, which does not exist now, $435.89; the Department of Customs, $6,856.97; the Department of Inland Revenue, $621.96; Department of Agriculture, $545.15; the Post Office, $2,370.69; and the Treasury Board, $66.52. The Inland Revenue was $545.15; Agriculture, $545.15; Post Office, $2,370.67. The Treasury Board this year spent $8; the last year to which I called the attention, 1877, the expenditure was $66.52. Now I do not give these to the Committee for the purpose of comparing them with the expenditures made by our predecessors, but I desire to call attention to the fact that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who was primarily and mainly responsible for these expenditures, particularly so far as his own department was concerned, was the last man in the world who should have used the strong language that he did with reference to the expenditure to which he called attention. I have not had time, since sitting here, to go into a further examination of the figures to show what amount was spent for printing, publishing, binding and other items, nor do I intend to say they are included in the items referred to in the Auditor General's Report for this year. I refer merely to the question of advertising and printing.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. gentleman desires to make a comparison between the expenditures under the régime of Mr. Mackenzie and the expenditures under the present Government, I think he will do well to direct the attention of the House to the fact that while there was just as much in reality to do then as there is to-day, their total expenditures were $23,500,000 against $36,000,000 by his Government. If he wants to go into details I call his attention to the fact that our total expenditure for Civil Government, contingencies and all, amounted to $823,000 against $1,404,000 which is asked to-day. I would like to call his attention to the fact that the same diminution exists in every single department, that although there has been comparatively a little increase in the population, although circumstances have so altered that to a very great extent the expenditures of the country ought to be less in many important respects than they were then.

Mr. BOWELL. So they are.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They are not by any manner of means, the expenses are larger to-day. There is not a single department of the service, I think, not even including his own, in which they are not larger than they were.

Mr. BOWELL. Do you refer to the Customs Department?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Customs were, I think, in 1878, a matter of $714,000; they are about $900,000 at the present time, at least that is what the hon. gentleman asks: and, in every imaginable direction, wherever you go, whether it be Indians, or Mounted Police, or Customs, or Excise, or Civil Government, or Militia, or Public Works, be they what you please, you find an enormous increase, you find the very grossest extravagance; and I tell the hon. gentleman that in every department down to that of his colleague of the Public Works, down to the Department of the Interior, down to Civil Government, down to every solitary thing they have to deal with, there has been an enormous increase. Whether he has stated correctly or not the facts as to the Customs Department, I am not in a position to say, because I am aware that on two or three occasions when these matters have been under discussion, it has turned out——

Mr. BOWELL. Do you mean in reference to this statement I have just made?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. BOWELL. Here it is, you can examine it for yourself.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am perfectly well aware there were alterations made in the way of doing business, and in conducting his accounts. But comparing the two statements in the gross, taking the $23,500,000 which we expended, take the $36,000,000 that his Government expended last year, the $37,000,000 they ask this year, without including the Supplementary Estimates, there is no single point that he can show in which the record of the Mackenzie Government will not compare honourably and favourably with anything that has occurred in his department or any other.

Mr. BOWELL. I must be permittted to compliment the hon. gentleman on the dexterous manner in which he has evaded the question before the Committee. He has not uttered a single word in reference to the question which we discussed, but has gone off into a description of the growth of the country and the general expenditures on public works, and everything else. I do not propose to enter into that question, although we are quite prepared to defend the expenditure to which he has referred, and if he fancies for a moment that this country, extending, as it does, from one end of the continent to the other, can be carried on with the same expenditure with which it was carried on at the time he occupied the position as Finance Minister, why, all I can say is that I will make him a present of that idea. I know that no other man having ordinary common sense would ever come to any such conclusions. But I desire to call the attention of the Committee to one fact, and that is

that he spoke in indignant tones of what he termed gross expenditures, and used some other strong language with reference to the advertising and printing accounts of the different departments. That is the only point to which I drew the attention of the Committee, and I repeat again that in answer to that point the hon. gentleman never uttered one word. I tell the hon. gentleman that if he is prepared to discuss that question I will produce figures to show that so far as my own department is concerned, and more particularly that portion of it over which I have immediate control, that relating to Civil Government, tens of thousands of dollars have been saved, aye, from forty to fifty thousand, during the time I have presided over that department, compared with the expenditure that took place under the Mackenzie Administration. And if I do not sustain this statement then the hon. gentleman will be quite correct in throwing out those insinuations which are so characteristic of him when any hon. gentleman dares to impugn, or discuss, or contradict any statement, or to expose any misstatement he may make, or to insinuate that he does not correctly state the facts. The statements I made were copied from the Public Accounts of the year to which I referred. I know from past examinations that any investigation of the whole five years of the Mackenzie Administration would compare unfavourably with the Administration of the present Government, even as respects the contingent account to which we are referring. If he will look at those accounts he will find that the statement made by the Minister of Finance is literally true, in reference to the reductions which have gradually taken place in this newspaper and advertising account. If he will compare one year with another I am quite certain he will find that there is a great decrease going on. The question has been brought to the attention of each member of the Cabinet, in order to ascertain if a reduction cannot be made, in what may be considered an unnecessary expenditure, to as great an extent as possible, and I believe that next year we will find a still greater reduction than has yet taken place.

Mr. TUPPER. If the Minister of Customs needs any support in reference to one point he took in this debate, and which the hon. member for South Oxford challenged, I would like to draw the attention of the ex-Minister of Finance to the important fact that in 1878, under his economical administration, the Marine Department and the expenditure for the maintenance of the different lights, fog-horns, buoy service and all the aids to navigation in this country, amounted to $786,156; and in 1890, $807,417 only. The present expenditure and that of the year 1878, taking the relative responsibilities and charges upon the Government, that is, the legitimate charges, are practically the same. I take it that was his argument, at any rate in connection with one department. Let me point out to him these significant facts. Where is the difference between 1878 and 1890? The amount expended in 1878 was $786,000 in round numbers, and the amount expended in 1890 was $807,000. But there is this additional responsibility on the department in 1890 as compared with 1878: In 1878 we had to maintain 427 light stations; in 1890 we had to maintain 599 light stations, with the additional charges for repairs and ordinary maintenance and salaries and so forth. In 1878 we had 518 lighthouses as against 705 lighthouses in 1890. In 1878 we had four fog-horns to look after, and we had 32 to look after in 1890—an extraordinary and marvellous increase, which was demanded by the development of the navigation of the country. It is extraordinary that in this country we have been able to safeguard the navigation in the way we have done. But that there has been an extraordinary increase in these facilities every mariner and every man who knows anything about navigation is aware. I rose simply to point out to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) the extraordinary disparity which exists between the charges upon one department of the Government in a year and another, and to show him why that was so. I have shown him that in 1878 the expenditure was, in round numbers, $786,000 in the Department of which I am the head, while, in 1890, it is only $807,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does the hon. gentleman refer to?

Mr. TUPPER. The whole expenditure of the Marine Department in 1878, which covered all the expenditures of every kind in each year.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does that include the fisheries?

Mr. TUPPER. No: I took only one instance for an example. That is sufficient evidence of the fallacy of the argument of the hon. gentleman.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This statement may be true as to one department, but we know that where it was costing $23,000,000 in 1878, is costing $36,000,000 to the people of Canada in 1890, and there are $37,000,000 demanded for 1892. Does not the hon. gentleman see that there has been an enormous increase in almost every part of the revenue. Does he want me to go through the whole, from the administration of justice to civil government, and from civil government to the Fisheries Department? We find that for what we paid $93,000 in 1878, we are now paying $328,000.

Mr. TUPPER. You do not mean the Fisheries Department?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; we were always able to make a decent bargain with our American neighbours. We sent our High Commissioner, Sir Alexander Galt, to Halifax, and succeeded in extracting $5,000,000 from the American Government.

Mr. BOWELL. That was under a treaty negotiated by Sir John A. Macdonald.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If Sir John Macdonald had the carrying out of that treaty we would not have got anything at all. We remember that he got the navigation of the Stikeen and Yukon Rivers under the Washington Treaty. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tupper) says that the increase in expenditure in his department is justified. Let us take the other departments. Let us take the Department of Justice, the Indian management, our Mail Subsidies, the Militia, the North-West Territories, our Mounted Police, our Penitentiaries, Pensions and Superannuations, our Public Works, and that magnificent specimen of the operations of the present Administration—the Department of Railways and Canals, also let us take the Post Office, which, perhaps, is the least objectionable of the whole; but still it

shows a considerable addition to the public burdens. Now, let us see what the result is. Let us compare the expenditure under the Mackenzie Administration with the expenditure under the present régime. The Minister of Customs knows that he cannot get in the Public Accounts a proper statement of the difference in the cost between advertising and printing at that time and this. The amount appears to have been $180,000. Take the four or five years of the existence of the Mackenzie Government, and you will find that for advertising and all kinds and descriptions of printing, for subscriptions to the newspapers and everything of that kind, that amount is not exceeded; and I am not afraid to say that, if Mr. Mackenzie had been continued in office, that Government would have been carried on with every attention to economy and efficiency. Every year since, the expenditure has increased. The fact that there has been an increase of at least $1,000,000 a year is ample proof that their conduct has been marked by gross extravagance, and by gross disregard of the needs of this country. While the American people have been reducing their debt to a mere bagatelle in comparison with their population, we find that, while these hon. gentlemen entered into office with a debt one-third in proportion of what the United States debt was, they have now a debt three times that of the United States in proportion to the population. If they compare their Administration with that of Mr. Mackenzie's they will find that from 1867 to 1873, when they were ignominiously and properly dismissed from office for conduct not dissimilar from that which is now charged against some of them, they added about $11,000,000 to the debt of Canada, while Mr. Mackenzie did not add more than $200,000 to the debt during the time he was in office from 1873 to 1878. And after they returned again, not having improved in the slightest degree by their absence, they proceed to add a dozen million dollars or more to the annual expenditure of this country. It may be that in one or two individual instances they have not very much exceeded the sum that was charged before, but as a whole these figures in my hand show that in these items for Civil Government, which we are now discussing, they have very nearly doubled the total expenditure which was found necessary in our time, and which proper and judicious management would hardly require to be exceeded at all.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I notice an item here which hardly bears out the idea in reference to the economical habits of the Minister of Customs. I know the Minister of Customs believes that the Minister of Customs is a very economical manager and a very prudent one, but I see that in his department they appear to have $6 worth of towels, and that it costs $48 for washing. How can the Minister of Customs reconcile that with his ideas of economy?

Mr. BOWELL. I am afraid the Minister of Customs would require a much larger expenditure for washing if the hon. gentleman had any connection with the department.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That is a very brilliant thing; it appears they need more towels than washing.

Administration of Justice—Miscellaneous expenditure, including N. W. Territories..... $25,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why does the Minister of Justice ask for this increase of $3,500 in this item?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Because the expenses for miscellaneous justice, especially in the North-West Territories, are continually increasing. If the hon. gentleman will refer to the Auditor General's account in which these expenses are catalogued he will find that they consist principally of expenses in connection with the maintenance of prisoners there, conveyance for prisoners to trial, summoning of juries, and other fees in connection with the administration of justice. According as the population of the Territories increases these expenses are continually growing, and the estimate up to the present time is based on the actual expenditure of the current year.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What does the hon. gentleman call "miscellaneous justice"?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The miscellaneous items which appear in the Auditor General's Report under that head.

Mr. MULOCK. Would the Minister of Justice please explain the item of $4,000 for official arbitrators?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The four official arbitrators held office before the establishment of the court. They constituted a board of arbitration to which all claims against the Crown were referred. By the Exchequer Court Act they were entitled to be paid the same salary previously paid them while they continued in office, and according as their offices lapse they are not to be replaced; but the duties can be discharged by the referees of the Exchequer Court, who will be paid by fees according to the services rendered.

Mr. MULOCK. Were these permanent officers before the establishment of the Exchequer Court?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes; and they are now used as referees for the Exchequer Court and for the Government Departments to refer claims to from time to time, without going into the Exchequer Court. The names of the four arbitrators are Mr. Cowan, Mr. Simard, Mr. Muma and Mr. Compton.

Mr. MULOCK. It occurs to me that when we largely relieve them of their duties, we are treating them very liberally in continuing them on full pay. Are they to be considered as superannuated, or have they any real duties to perform, and to what extent are references made to them in the course of a year?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They are to remain in office precisely as they were and for the same purpose, but instead of adjudicating upon claims subject, as the law then was, to an appeal to the Exchequer Court, they report on claims. Some of them are used almost as much as before, but one or two of them have lapsed into such age and ill-health that they are not actively employed. They are subject to superannuation, but at present they continue to hold office, in view of the fact that the offices will not be filled when they become vacant.

Mr. MULOCK. It would perhaps be better if they were put upon the superannuation list. Could

the Minister tell us at some later stage what is the extent of the duties they perform in the course of a year?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I can state almost correctly now from recollection that Mr. Compton's services are very freely used in reference to claims against the Intercolonial Railway and its branches. Mr. Muma frequently assists in the same way, principally in Ontario and Quebec in relation to canal works. Mr. Cowan is very advanced in age as the hon. gentleman perhaps knows, and Mr. Simard is in a state of health that renders it almost impossible for him to be engaged.

Mr. MULOCK. I suppose the reports have a great deal to do with the findings of the Exchequer Court. I suppose that in some cases they have practically the rendering of the judgment of the court.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I cannot say that quite. The hon. gentleman will remember that under the Exchequer Court Act references may be made to those gentlemen for report. For instance, claims are made in connection with the operation of the Intercolonial Railway for damages arising from the destruction of cattle, from fires, from accidents of various kinds; and a short time ago a number of these claims, amounting I think to 30 or 40, had all to be reported upon by Mr. Compton.

Exchequer Court of Canada..... $7,950

Mr. MULOCK. I wish to mention to the hon. Minister of Justice that I frequently hear references made to the working of the Exchequer Court. As we know, there is but one judge, who is clothed with very extensive powers; and while I do not say for one moment that he does not discharge the duties of his office efficiently, we cannot ignore this circumstance, that there is a widespread feeling throughout the country that the Exchequer Court awards very liberal verdicts against the Crown. I believe that court was established to protect the Crown against claims, and in place of the old method which I suppose depended to some extent on the will or judgment of an officer of the Government. The present incumbent of this court is a comparatively young man, which is of course no crime, nor does it necessarily follow that he is not as capable as anyone else would be for discharging the duties of his position. I do not know that he has had a very extensive judicial duty to perform. He was in the Department of Justice, and no doubt the manner in which he discharged his duties there justified the Minister in promoting him to this high position. But there is dissatisfaction in some quarters at the amounts of the verdicts rendered against the Crown, and we know that the amounts involved in the references are extremely large and are growing in size.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. To understand the working of the Exchequer Court satisfactorily, one has to compare it with the system which preceded it. I suppose every member of the House will recall, when I mention it, the unsatisfactory state of affairs which existed before the Exchequer Court was established. We had, as a first atttempt to adjudicate on claims against the Crown, a "Petition of Right Act," under which the subject applied to a suit in the Supreme Court sitting as an Exchequer Court of original jurisdiction. We had, also, for the purpose of adjudicating on claims which did not come directly before the court, the four arbitrators whose salaries we have just voted. Conceding to those gentlemen all the skill and experience which men can obtain in the ordinary course of life, and aided as they were by sound common sense and good judgment, they were not a satisfactory tribunal when the claims referred to them reached such large amounts as they did in the expansion of the public works of the country. It was found that while those gentlemen proceeded on sound principles according to the judgment they could exercise, their awards against the Crown were continually increased on appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada; and if the hon. gentleman complains that awards to a considerable amount are now made against the Crown, that cause of complaint is far less than it was when the adjudication was in the hands of the unskilled arbitrators. Very often we found that those arbitrators—and I wish everything I say shall be taken without the slightest disparagement of them, because I believe they were painstaking and conscientious public officers—based their awards not solely on the evidence placed before them, but on their own observation and knowledge and their own criticism of the evidence submitted to them; and when the appeals were taken to the Supreme Court, because the Appellate Court felt bound to adjudicate on the evidence, we very often found the awards increased on appeal under circumstances which were certainly unsatisfactory to those who represented the interests of the Crown. We have now in place of that state of things a skilled judge of whom I cannot speak too highly, whether as regards his capacity as a judge, or as regards the other office of Deputy Minister of Justice, in connection with which office I must say that every transaction that I had with him developed my opinion not only of his high integrity, but of his skill and fitness for a high judicial position; and when the position became available, I thought I could do no better to serve the Dominion of Canada than to put him in a position in which he could adjudicate over claims against the Crown. I cannot find fault with the hon. gentleman's statement that there is a feeling abroad that awards are made too frequently against the Crown, because—and that is one reason why I can agree with the hon. gentleman, accustomed and trained as I am to resist claims against the Crown—I am inclined to regard the claims as often exorbitant; but laying aside that prejudice and examining the cases in which I have found large adjudications against the Crown, I must say I have generally been convinced that the judge is right, and have inserted an appeal in cases in which I could not take that view, without the slightest want of confidence in the tribunal itself. Very often when one finds that large amounts are given against the Crown, there is a natural feeling of surprise, because we hear but one side of the case; but a little investigation in some of these cases proves that feeling to be unwarranted. I really think there is no occasion for Parliament to feel anything but satisfaction with the experiment begun a few years ago of removing all these cases to a special tribunal, subject to an appeal to the highest court.

Mr. FRASER. I think, perhaps, the hon. the Minister of Justice has not gone far enough. I think

the Act might be very materially changed for the better as it is cumbersome, but so far as the judge is concerned, I must agree with him fully in his statements concerning not only his ability but his integrity and fairness. I think, however, the judge has too much to do, and it would be much better if those parties kept in office doing nothing were dismissed and another judge or two appointed. We would then have a better Exchequer Court, and business better done. These men, while they may act as assessors, I am satisfied do not do the work as well as the present judge, and when we consider the amount of business that comes before him no fault can be found. If, in place of these assessors, one or more judges were added, and perhaps the business of the Admiralty Court transferred to the Exchequer Court, an improvement would result. I only rise to say that, as an appeal always lies, I take the ground that the Crown will see that the country does not pay one dollar on any award by the Exchequer Court which it ought not. There is no doubt an impression to a considerable extent that the awards against the Crown are too large. I know, for example, during the time the Cape Breton Railway was being built, a large number of appeals were made to the Exchequer Court. The amounts offered in the first instance were so trifling that a large number went before the Exchequer Court, and the plaintiffs received sometimes twenty, thirty and sometimes forty times as much as offered, but I am satisfied the awards were all correct. We may go to the other extreme, but I believe the judge will not give one dollar more than the claimants are entitled to. I do not think the Crown should be as exacting as a private party, because when they take lands from people they should deal liberally with them. I believe the judge acts fairly and liberally towards those who seek justice from him, and I wish to add my testimony to his ability and fairness. And I think it would be an improvement if no more than one assessor were employed in that court and an extra judge or two appointed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In connection with this, there is another matter. I think the Supreme Court upheld that where the Crown undertook the work of a common carrier, it does not incur a common carrier's liability. That would regulate the carriage of freights over railways in the control of the Administration. I do not think that is a desirable position. I think that the Government when it undertakes the work of a mercantile company, it should be subject to the same liabilities.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is an outstanding decision of the Supreme Court to the effect that a suit will not lie against the Crown in such matters. I may say, however, that in advising the various departments on that question my department invariably advises that, in the case of the Intercolonial Railway, the liabilities of the department would be that of a common carrier, and the Department of Railways always acts on that advice. I am inclined to think, but I do so with great deference to the Supreme Court, that the decision in question would not be upheld now, in view of recent decisions elsewhere, and we also endeavour to be guided by the principles which govern common carriers, irrespective of the exemption of the Crown.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It seems to me that matter ought to be placed beyond doubt by actual legislation. There is another feature I may observe in this connection, and that is that, according to the more recent decisions in England, they distinguish between the liabilities of a department and the liabilities of the Crown. No such distinction is made in the cases to which I referred.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think anything I said would reflect on the judge. I did not so intend it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Oh, no.

Mr. MULOCK. I merely referred to the situation in hope that the Minister of Justice would see that every possible precaution was taken to aid in the administration of justice, for, however able the individual may be, we know that the decisions of the very wisest of individual judges are frequently reversed on appeal. In our province, where there are men on the bench who have served long years at the bar, we regard them as so mortal and fallible that it is common to appeal from individual judges to the court of appeals and still further. In the Exchequer Court, the amounts involved are so great that I think there is a special onus cast upon the Minister of Justice to see that cases are presented before the courts fully and that the litigation on behalf of the Crown is conducted as a citizen would in his own case. I cannot quite agree with my hon. friend that the Crown is called upon to receive a less measure of justice than a private citizen. If a railway company expropriates, there should be a leaning to liberality towards the citizen where any violation of his right has taken place for the public good, and the same principle would apply to the Crown in like circumstances; but, subject to such special reasons, the Crown has its rights, and the court which stands between the Crown and wrong is the Exchequer Court.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. So far from finding fault with the criticism of the hon. gentleman, I am very glad to have heard it. Assistance and sympathy in the way of reducing claims against the Crown are not very commonly met with.

Mr. FRASER. In saying that the Crown should deal liberally with the subject, I applied my remarks to those cases which the hon. gentleman mentioned. I see no difference between the Crown and a railway company with respect to lands taken by either from the citizen for the public good, and in each case the citizen should be dealt with on the side of liberality.

To pay for salaries or commutations of the Judges, Registrars and Marshals of the Vice-Admiralty and Maritime Courts..... $5,500

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The vote appears to be larger than last year, for the reason that we are voting a part of the amount which was formerly authorized by statute. My reason for asking this is that the Bill relating to the Admiralty Courts, which is now before the House, will make provision for all of these courts, and will place the allowance of the judges at the discretion of the House—their salaries to be voted from the consolidated revenue. I might say a word or two about the Bill in advance, with a view of explaining this item. It makes permanent provisions for the exercise of maritime jurisdiction. Certain other sections make provision as to what shall be done temporarily with the existing maritime courts, and it is to meet these provisions that this item is in-

serted here. We propose that the officers appointed under the Imperial Act shall be continued in their present positions. I know that complaints have been made that the remuneration of these officers is unequal. We do not propose now to redress this grievance, but we propose that the salaries shall be voted this year at the same amounts that existed under the Imperial Act. It has been proposed by this Bill that we shall continue the existing officers and not commute their salaries. We do not propose to commute with any of them, but we do propose to offer them the offices at the salaries they are now receiving. That is the reason why we take this vote. When we have these officers under our own jurisdiction we may make different terms, and the officers shall have nothing to complain of.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the annual amount?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. $5,500.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This is the present salary paid?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. There is one of these judges in Toronto?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to say that the judge we have has nothing to do. I am convinced it is almost a sinecure. The Minister can correct me if I am wrong.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is true that there is not much business there, but it is absolutely necessary to have a maritime judge in the Province of Ontario. We only propose to have one at present, but we take power to increase the number of districts as may be necessary, but the deputy judges hold offices in other districts where there is a considerable amount of business done, and they are paid by fees.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to have a return of the amount paid during the last five years

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will have the return brought down when the Bill is before the House.

Mr. MULOCK. Has not some question been raised in Toronto as to the rights of the province in regard to the establishment of maritime courts?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The question as to our right to legislate was raised, and it was decided in our favour by the Supreme Court.

Dominion Police.....$21,500

Mr. FOSTER. There is only the increase of one policeman.

Mr. MULOCK. Before passing from the other item, I would call the attention of the Minister of Justice to a question which has been before the House for some time—I mean the proposition to increase the salaries of the Superior Court judges, and I would also refer to the status of the County Court judges. I do not think the latter are sufficiently remunerated, and, in consequence of that, some of them are obliged to engage in extra work, frequently taking references and things of that kind, no doubt having regard to the emoluments. To that extent they are rendered unable to discharge the duties of their office. Take the case of the junior judge of the County of York. He is on the same footing with a judge in the rural districts. The junior judge of the County of York receives $2,000, with $200 allowance when he goes away from the city. I say it is impossible for a junior judge who lives in Toronto to live on such a small salary. While I do not desire to discriminate against a rural judge, I say that $2,000 is too small a sum for the junior judge of the County of York, who has to live in Toronto. If the junior judge were properly remunerated he might be able to discharge his duties without the number of judges being increased, but the Ontario Legislature has provided for an additional judge there. Of course, the city of Toronto is growing, and there is a great deal of commercial business done there, and the judge has jurisdiction not only in the city but also in the county, which is united with the city for judicial purposes. The person who occupies the position of junior judge for the County of York is a very able man, and I think that the fact that he receives the salary he does is not only unsatisfactory and unfair to him, but it is a degradation to the administration of justice itself. As to the remuneration of the Superior Court judges, I think that should be settled. For some years past I have heard propositions made for an increase in the salary of those judges. I do not think it is proper that this question should be constantly brought before the public. It is not fair to the judiciary. They are not able to speak for themselves or to reply to criticisms, and I think the position of a judge should remove him from outside criticism. A question like this is a delicate question, bringing the judiciary, as it were, in opposition to the public, who consider themselves, as they properly are, the paymasters. It is a question which should not be kept open; it ought to be dealt with, and dealt with properly. The salaries now paid are the salaries paid, I think, ever since the Superior Court was established, and a dollar to-day is not worth anything like what a dollar was when the courts were established. The remuneration of the Superior Court judges in the Province of Ontario needs, in my judgment, immediate attention. The salaries are not adequate, and I believe that a good, sound public opinion will sustain the Administration in dealing properly and at once with this matter. It is not popular, I presume, to increase salaries. I dare say there are a good many people who think the judges are overpaid. At all events, I am prepared to take my share of the responsibility in advocating that they be put on a proper footing. I say there is nothing between the people and anarchy except the judges, and if we are interested in any one thing we are interested in selecting to the bench—I am assuming we have always done so—the very fittest men. Whilst no salary that we can assign will, in itself, induce men in great practice to withdraw from practice to the bench, as there ought to be a fitness in all things, so I say a salary ought not to be assigned insufficient to enable a judge to maintain his family. The Minister of Justice, I see, does not approve of my remarks. He smiles upon them as if he thought there was nothing in them. I am sorry I have not awakened his sympathy.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. On the contrary, I was smiling with satisfaction to see how much information my hon. friend the Minister of Finance was getting on this question. I hope he will pay

the fullest attention to the remarks of the hon. gentleman. I sympathize entirely with what he has said, and as soon as I can convince my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, right and justice shall be done.

Mr. FRASER. No such small matter should stand in the way of justice. I know the Minister of Finance will not take that for a personal allusion.

Mr. FOSTER. The contrast is very remarkable.

Mr. FRASER. I mean that no opposition from any single member of this House should stand in the way, and I must say I think that if the Minister of Justice had thoroughly made up his mind so small a matter would not be allowed to stand in his way. I agree fully with what the hon. member has said. I do think that the question of the salaries of our judges should not be allowed to be discussed in papers from time to time, but they should be put in an independent position. In England there is no question about it, and we very seldom hear any complaint about the large salaries paid to judges in England. Of course, we cannot afford to pay them as large salaries in this country; neither do the judges expect it. But I know there is an inequality, and know the judges in some other provinces get more than they do in others. While, of course, certain litigants are always saying that justice is not meted out to them, I am sure that not only this House but the country would sustain any Government that would set this question at rest. I do believe that our judges are not so well paid as they should be, and that the conditions of life have so changed within the last ten years as to make it impossible—I know this to be the case in Nova Scotia—for the judges to live on the same salaries now that they could live on ten years ago.

Mr. TROW. I agree with the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) that we ought to place the judges on an equality. In counties with a population of 40,000, 5 cents a head would about make up their present salary of $2,200, and where there are 60,000 inhabitants the judge should be paid a higher salary in accordance with the increased work of the administration of justice. The County of York and a few other counties in Canada are placed on a par with a county that has about 20,000 inhabitants.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not surprised at seeing so many hon. gentlemen of this House, who are members of the bar themselves, advocating a raising of the salary of the judges, because, I presume, they are prospective judges themselves. But outside of that it seems to me they are so accustomed to making very heavy charges for services that anything like a moderate salary, or what would be a competent salary for men in other lines of life would not be considered by them a competent salary at all. I do not think the proposition to raise the salary would be popular with the people of the country. We know for a fact that if a judge happens to die, almost every lawyer in the county is willing to take the position, whatever the salary may be. As long as we find that to be the case I do not see any difficulty in getting even the best men to take the position of judges. Now, I am not saying that their salaries are too high or too low; I only say that the feeling in the country is that their salary is about in proportion with the salary of men of equal ability in other lines of life.

Mr. DAVIN. The inadequacy of judicial remuneration is still more striking in the North-West Territories and Manitoba. My hon. friend behind me (Mr. Fraser) speaks about the expense of living in Nova Scotia. Now, it is well known that in Manitoba and the North-West Territories the expense of living at this moment is far greater than in any other part of the Dominion of Canada, and yet our judges are paid less than in Ontario. In a previous session I spoke on this matter, and I spoke with some feeling, but without the least personal interest, as although I happen to be a barrister I do not practice, and I have no ambition to be a judge. I spoke with some feeling because I knew the *angusta res* of those gentlemen who had to maintain a high position on a very small salary. I am persuaded that if the hon. and learned gentleman would bring in a Bill dealing with this question, and if the Government, and especially the Finance Minister, who is nothing if not economical—and that is a virtue in a Finance Minister—if the Finance Minister will second the action of the hon. and learned gentleman, and if those gentlemen who belong to the same party as myself, but who take a very strong adverse view on this question, will support the Government, it will be found that, as the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) has stated, the Government, in doing justice to the judiciary, will be supported by a strong and healthy public opinion. It is not possible to exaggerate the importance of having the status of the judge, financially and socially, such that it will attract to the bench the very best talent in the country, and that you have a bar that will devote their whole time to law, and will fix their ambition on the bench, instead of having a bar, as we have in this country, that divides its attention between law and speculations of all sorts. In England, where the judges are properly remunerated, you have men of the highest talent, who devote their whole time, and all their energies—their days and nights—to law, and consequently you have judges on the bench who, when an important case is brought before them in Westminster Hall, do not need to stop and consider the judgment they will give, but are able to pronounce a judgment right off, for they have the cases at their finger ends. There you have the best legal talent of the country on the bench. And what does that mean? What it means is this: You have men of the highest character, of the highest ability, of the highest learning, of the most profound integrity, dealing with the important questions of property and the liberty of the subject brought before them. If the hon. Minister of Justice intends to take a step in this direction this session, and I hope he does, I will strongly, at least as strongly as my poor abilities will enable me to do so, support him; and I venture to say this, that he will be supported by the people of the country.

Mr. DEVLIN. I desire to ask the Minister of Justice if he is aware of the pressure of business in the Ottawa district. In fact, the business is so great that it is contemplated to divide this district, making one Pontiac and the other Ottawa division. I know not whether the Minister of Justice has advised the appointment of an additional judge. However, it is well known that the business is so considerable as to require this division to be made,

and the judge at present holding the position has a very great amount of work to do. In fact, I may call the Minister's attention to this, that so great is the amount of work that on several occasions an assistant judge has been invited to attend, and frequently the term of Queen's Bench, which is held twice a year, has been presided over by a judge specially invited for the purpose from Montreal, because the district judge residing at Aylmer had so much to do that he could not attend. Such was the case in June last, and I believe it was so on a late occasion. I cannot exactly understand why judges in the rural districts are paid only $4,000 a year, while judges presiding over courts in the cities are paid $5,000. It is well known that judges in the rural districts have to preside over the Court of Queen's Bench as well as the Superior Court, whereas in the city it is not so. Their responsibility is as great, if not greater; their living expense is equally costly, their position is equally as high, and it seems to me they should, at all events, receive the same amount of remuneration as judges of the Superior Courts residing in cities.

Mr. GIROUARD. I do not rise for the purpose of making a speech, but as a member of the legal profession I cannot allow the statement made by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) to pass without contradiction. I take the liberty of correcting the statement of the hon. member when he says the judges are paid as highly as other men in the same station in life and requiring the same education. I call the attention of the hon. gentleman and the House to the fact that the heads of great corporations are paid something like $20,000 or $25,000 a year, although the duties they perform are not more important than the duties performed by the judges of this country. It is not necessary to call attention to these large salaries paid to the heads of great corporations; let us consider the salaries paid the clerks of those corporations, not only of one or two of the great corporations, but even the clerks of banks and insurance companies. Several bank clerks in this country receive more than the $5,000 which is the salary paid to the judges of the highest court of the land, with the exception of the Supreme Court. Take even the cases of secretaries of those banks and corporations, and they receive $5,000, and more. Take the lawyers of some of the great institutions, and they receive more than $10,000 a year for performing duties less important than those performed by the judges. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) does not belong to the legal profession, but he belongs to a profession which does not require to make an appeal to Parliament to effect an increase in their fees; they do it in their offices, and unknown to their patients. I do not rise to make a speech respecting the salaries of the judges, but I call the attention of the House to this fact, and I know it to be a fact, that to-day judges in the great cities of the Dominion, and the judges belonging to the Superior Courts, are obliged to devote a portion of their time to other matters in order to provide the necessaries of life. I think this is a state of things that should be remedied.

Mr. SPROULE. The comparison I made was a fair one. I said the judges were equally as well paid as were men in other lines of life possessing equal ability. I might very fairly draw a comparison between the two professions, medical and legal. Take two men when they commence to study. The medical man when prosecuting his studies is obliged to devote four years of his life to his profession, during which he receives no remuneration, and is under very heavy expenses all the time. The lawyer is placed under another lawyer, and usually commences to earn money from the time he begins his studies. After the conclusion of studies both commence to practice. Taking an average, one is quite as able and intelligent and as well educated as the other. Their earnings are not, however, equal. A very fair amount of earnings of a doctor is $2,000 a year, with much much heavier outlays than a lawyer is required to make. A lawyer earning that sum would be considered as having a very small practice. Again, consider their position after five, ten or twenty years. Let the medical man be placed at the head of an asylum, where he would have as important duties to perform as a judge of the bench, and yet if he received a salary of $2,000 it was considered a very large one, while $1,000 is often considered a very fair amount. Let him be placed at the head of the largest hospital in the country, and he will consider himself very well paid if his salary be $2,000 a year. Let him be appointed health officer. The health officer of Toronto receives about $2,000 a year for giving his whole time and attention to the work. Lawyers, as a general thing, become so accustomed to making very heavy charges in their profession that they look upon it as a small salary when they do not receive $2,000. It is said I should look at the salaries of lawyers who are employed in connection with great corporations. It is understood that some of the lawyers of the Canadian Pacific Railway receive from $20,000 to $25,000 a year. But those salaries do not afford a fair comparison. I hold, notwithstanding the contention of every lawyer in the House, that the opinion prevails in the country that lawyers are paid equally as well as are other men of ability and education. A few instances may be given of large salaries paid to men controlling insurance companies and other corporations, but they have generally the control of the salaries in their own hands; and these few eminent men, either lawyers or financiers, advance their own salaries to a point which may fairly be called extravagant. We should not be guided by that rule. A fair comparison can only be made by taking the incomes of professional men in other lines, of men who are equally clever, who have spent an equal sum of money in acquiring an education, and who are quite as valuable in the line of life to which they belong.

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), in drawing his comparison between the legal and medical professions, has hardly carried that comparison far enough. He must know that it is human to err, and that when a judge errs his error is liable to face him at any time in future life, but when a member of the profession to which the hon. gentleman from East Grey belongs commits an error, that error is generally buried six or seven feet deep.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman forgets that when a doctor makes an error he is amenable to the law, and a judge is not.

Mr. HYMAN. The idea seems to prevail in this House that only professional men believe that the judges are inadequately paid. I do not agree with the hon. member for East Grey when he says that the opinion prevails amongst laymen that the judges are paid as much in proportion as other professional gentlemen. I do not think they are. I believe that a large majority of the laymen in this House and in the country at large feel that judges are inadequately paid, not only for the work they do but for the responsibility which they hold. I notice—and in making the comparison I do not desire to leave the impression that it is because I think the salaries of the judges in the Province of Quebec are anything too large, but simply because I think the salaries of the judges in Ontario are altogether too small—I notice there are four judges in Ontario paid $6,000 a year each, while there are three in Quebec paid that salary. There are seventeen judges in Quebec paid $5,000 a year each, and only ten in Ontario. The lowest payment to a judge in Quebec is $3,500 a year, while in Ontario we have the junior judges of County Courts who are only paid what might be comparatively called the mere pittance of $2,000 a year. I submit that these salaries are entirely too small for the responsibility of the office, and I address these remarks from the standpoint of a layman. I know and I feel that the laymen of this House, and the laymen of the country, will support the Parliament and will support the Government if they make a proposal to increase—I might say to largely increase—the salaries of the judges.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In reply to the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Devlin) I would say that I have not been made aware that the duties in the County of Ottawa, or in that district, have been too great for the present judge. I should hope that such was not the case. The judge in that district is a very able and efficient judge, and I was under the impression that he was not overworked. In reply to the hon. member for London (Mr. Hyman) I may say that while the Public Accounts do appear to show the result he has intimated, yet the *per capita* charge for the Administration of Justice in the Province of Quebec is considerably less than in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I agree with the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) that this question of the judges' salaries should not be continually brought before the House. For years and years we have had this question under discussion, and I would like to ask is it not the legal members of the House who are responsible for this and who are continually bringing up this question, whether for the purpose of getting favour from the judges or of getting on the right side of them I do not know. At all events it is the legal gentlemen who are constantly bringing up this question, and with the exception of the hon. member for London (Mr. Hyman) I have not heard a single layman in the House, since I have had the honour of a seat here, say one word in favour of the proposal.

Mr. LARIVIERE. I hope the hon. gentleman will except me, because last year I spoke in favour of increasing the judges' salaries and I am not a barrister.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I thought he was a lawyer, for he looks like a member of the legal profession. With the exception of the two gentlemen I have named, I have not heard a layman in this House ask for an increase in the salary of the judges; but the lawyers are everlastingly preaching that the judges' salaries are too low. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) complains that the salary of the junior judge in his county is too low. Is there anything to compel that gentleman to hold the position if he can do any better elsewhere? Why in the name of common sense does he not resign the position and take something else? The judge in the county which I have the honour to represent is one of the ablest men on the bench to-day. We have a junior judge there, too, for we are blessed with two judges; and these two judges have not got as much work to do in one month as an ordinary man does in one week. They have scarcely anything to do, and yet they are drawing big salaries. While there may be some counties throughout the province in which the county court judges have too much to do, yet I do not believe that, on the whole, the judges are overworked. I also contend that the salaries we pay to our Superior Court judges are quite sufficient. I venture to say that there are very few men on the bench who could earn as much at the bar as they are receiving in salaries, and if they can earn more why do they not resign and practice at the bar? There is nothing to compel them to retain their positions. More than that, whenever there is a vacancy to fill on the bench there are twenty-five or thirty applicants, and the Minister of Justice is beseeched from all quarters.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No, no.

Mr. AMYOT. No, Sir.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I know that a great many legal men in my own town have been trying for years to get a position on the bench, and I am told that it is the same in other counties. We must also bear in mind that there are many men who will shine at the bar and yet be a failure on the bench.

Mr. WATSON. What bar?

Mr. CAMPBELL. It is not the men who will command the highest salaries at the bar who make the best judges. Although I am not a lawyer, yet those who know have told me that some of the brightest men who have filled positions on the bench have been comparative failures while practising at the bar. I believe there are hundreds of men to-day practising their profession who have been almost a failure, so far as receiving large fees and getting large salaries are concerned, who, if they were appointed to a position on the bench, would fill it with a great deal of honour to themselves and credit to the profession and the country. My position is simply this: I know that the country, as a whole, is of opinion that the judges are receiving quite sufficient remuneration, and I sincerely trust that the hon. Minister of Justice will not give way to the flowery arguments which have been advanced by a few members of the profession who are in favour of raising the judges' salaries.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am a layman—neither a doctor nor lawyer—but I believe we should have on the bench the best ability to be found in this country. I do not think the County Court judges in Ontario are paid as much as they are entitled to receive. Any ordinary lawyer in practice will

earn more than we pay to one of our County Court judges. I am willing that both our County Court judges and our Superior Court judges should be paid a fair and reasonable salary, and I believe that if it is necessary to increase their salaries in order to secure the best possible ability on the bench, the country would assent to it. The junior judges especially, who get $2,000 a year and $200 for travelling expenses, are certainly underpaid. We know perfectly well that many lawyers doing a special business make more than $5,000 a year, and I have no doubt there are lawyers sitting in this House who in their practice earn as much as $10,000 or perhaps $20,000 a year. Unless you increase the salaries of the judges you cannot expect to secure the highest ability.

Mr. MULOCK. I did not think it was necessary, until it was referred to, to pay attention to the observation of the hon. member of East Grey (Mr. Sproule), when he suggested that if any member of the legal profession who advocated an increase of the salaries of the judges did so from some questionable interest or motive. I need not say that I have not such aim. My profession is that of a farmer, and I am not making much money at either. But if the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) or the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell), would like to know why the members of the legal profession bring this matter to the attention of the House, it is because they have actual knowledge of the necessity ; they know the inadequacy of the remuneration, and we only have to look across the line to see how a judiciary——

Mr. TYRWHITT. We do not want inspiration from across the line.

Mr. MULOCK. That is just what I was going to say. We do not want our judiciary to be degraded in public estimation. We want our judiciary to enjoy the fullest confidence of the people. They do enjoy that confidence, I believe ; but if the present condition of affairs is allowed to continue, we are more likely to have brought about the state of things indicated by the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) when we may see positions put up for tender, and a general competition for them, and then we may perhaps have the son of the hon. member for East Grey appointed to the bench just after he has been called to the bar and become qualified. We may have inferior men put in these positions, and it is necessary to guard against such a state of affairs. It is, therefore, our bounden duty—though it may not be popular, and though it may be the *role* of demagogues to denounce it—to place our judiciary in a position to command the confidence of the country. It is no argument to say that a dozen men could be got to fill the position of a judge. As I pointed out to the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) there are many persons in his riding who would be glad to take his position and perhaps discharge the duties quite as well as he does, or possibly better, for less than he receives. But that is not a fair test ; and I think it is unworthy of any member of this House either to impugn the motives of those who advocate this proposition, or to appeal to demagogic arguments, if possible to intimidate the Administration from dealing properly with the question. Do I understand the hon. Minister of Justice to say that he is in favour of immediately dealing with the case, provided the hon. Minister of Finance can see his way to provide the necessary funds ?

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) may think that his standing at the bar places him so high that he is above noticing what comes from any ordinary member of this House, even though impelled by a praiseworthy desire for economy. To say that many persons in my county could be got to take my position, and do it quite as well for a less salary, I do not think is very apt. I might say the same thing with regard to him ; nor do I think that any member of this House should be looked on as demagogue because he speaks in favour of economy. The hon. member might, with equal propriety, have directed his attention to his friend from Kent (Mr. Campbell), who I think spoke very reasonably and logically on the subject. Nor do I think the comparisons made by the hon. member for London (Mr. Hyman) were any fairer. He says that if a medical man makes a mistake, he buries it under the ground, and there is an end of it, while if a lawyer on the bench makes a mistake it lives to confront him. Now, you cannot criticize him, because he is on the bench, and, therefore, above criticism. If he is above criticism and above law, I do not think that should be a reason for raising his salary. If a doctor is guilty of malpractice, he is prosecuted for it. I believe there is at present a case in the hon. gentleman's own city in which a suit has been instituted against a medical man for $6,000 for the death of a patient, though no doubt he was faithfully and intelligently attending to his professional duties when the accident occurred, and it was in no way due to unskilful or unprofessional conduct. If the hon. gentleman's argument is a good one for increasing the salaries of the judges, it applies with ten times greater force to doctors. I do not wish the inference to be drawn which was drawn from my remarks by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), that it was a selfish aim the lawyers of this House had in view. I said, in a facetious way, that they were all prospective judges ; but the agitation is nearly always started by members of the legal profession in this House and carried on by them, and, notwithstanding their great ability, I hold it is not the impression of the country generally that the ordinary judges—I do not know anything of the Superior Court judges—are not paid a fair remuneration for their labour. I know that if there be a vacancy you can have almost any lawyer in the country, no matter what his standing, ready to fill the position of judge and glad to take it.

Mr. DENISON. As a Toronto man, I must say that the salaries of the judges are not sufficient. The salaries drawn by Superior Court judges is about what was paid them forty or fifty years ago, and times have greatly changed since then. In those days a judge of the Superior Court was a comparatively rich man, whereas to-day he is not, and his salary does not at all enable him to do credit to the position he is entitled to occupy. Whether it be unpopular or popular, I am decidedly of opinion that the Superior Court judges in Canada are not sufficiently paid. It is a well known fact that the leaders of the bar in Toronto are earning from $10,000 to $30,000 a year, and we cannot expect our best men to give up their practice and accept a judgeship at a salary of

$5,000 or $6,000 a year. If something be not done we will find a great difficulty in getting the best men on the bench, and if we do get a good man occasionally to go on the bench we will probably find that he will resign to renew his practice at the bar. We have had cases already of men not satisfied with their position on the bench going back to the bar, making four or five times their salaries as judges.

Mr. WALLACE. Name.

Mr. DENISON. There is no necessity to name. It is well known that such cases have occurred, and it is desirable that they should not occur. We want the best men on the bench, and not second class men. Canada can afford to pay her judges a proper salary. In every country in the world the judges are the best men, and are well paid, with the exception of this country.

An hon. MEMBER. What about the United States?

Mr. DENISON. I do not care what they pay on the other side of the line, or what they do, but in England, France and on the continent everywhere, they pay their judges properly, and I do not see why we should not do so here. As to the County Court judges, I am of opinion they do not receive what they ought to get. I do not know how it is in the County of Grey, but in the County of York they do not receive what they are entitled to.

Mr. WALLACE. I think it is rather an extraordinary coincidence that the hon. gentlemen outside of the legal profession who have advocated an increase in the salaries of the judges are themselves likely to appear in a short time before those judges to answer for their conduct at the last election. Of course we do not impute their motion to any idea that when their cases come before those judges they may be better considered on that ground, but the public outside may view it in that light. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison) has stated that judges have resigned their positions on the bench to resume the practice of their profession. He has not mentioned any names, and in Ontario I think the cases are very few, if any.

Mr. DAVIN. Sam. Blake.

Mr. WALLACE. He did that because he was not promoted to the Chancellorship.

An hon. MEMBER. Oliver Mowat.

Mr. WALLACE. He resigned to take the premiership of Ontario.

Mr. MULOCK. What about the Minister of Justice?

Mr. WALLACE. I am speaking of the Province of Ontario. He resigned to accept the position of Minister of Justice, which, I imagine, occupies the whole of his time, and leaves him no leisure to practice in the courts. I do not think the people are prepared to endorse any increase in the salaries of the judges. Men trained all their lives, whose training is as severe as that of the judges and who fill responsible positions where life and property are at stake, are getting only $1,000, $2,000, $3,000 or $4,000 a year. The further consideration must also be borne in mind that the judges receive a superannuation allowance when unfit for work, which is a very important consideration, and their labours are not very onerous. It is true that at certain periods of the year they are pretty busily employed, but I do not think as a rule they are overworked, and they have a good deal of spare time.

Mr. DEVLIN. The point I wish to make is not exactly that the judges are overworked, but that the Superior Court judges in the rural districts, whose work is as heavy as that of the judge in the cities, receive only $4,000 a year, whereas the latter receive $5,000 a year. In advocating the increase, I was not actuated by any motive such as that suggested by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), for I am one of those who have the good fortune not to have their elections contested, nor have I any selfish interest, since not being a lawyer I stand a very poor chance of being promoted to the bench; but I find it strange that already two judges have left the district of which I spoke. For instance we had a very eminent judge there in the person of Judge Wurtele, who left the district to take a position on the bench in the city of Montreal, where no doubt it is more pleasant to reside, beside the additional incentive of enjoying a well deserved promotion. Again Judge Bourgeois has removed to the town of Three Rivers, where, though his salary is not increased, the work is lighter. I would also call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the fact that, no doubt, very shortly the district will be divided into two. There will be the district of Ottawa and the district of Pontiac. The contract for the erection of the court house in Hull has been given out, and considerable money has been paid in connection with it. The difficulty in the new district of Pontiac is overcome, in connection with the site, and the work will shortly proceed. I should like to know if the same judge will have to preside over the two districts as he does to-day. We see now that the same judge has more to do than he would have to do over a smaller district or in a smaller circuit.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The reasons that have been given for the discrimination between city and rural judges are sound, and will appear to be sound to hon. members on reflection. It is true that they are the same in rank and that the judge in the district of Ottawa is the peer of the judge in the district of Montreal, but the difference arises from the difference in the cost of living, from the amount of work performed, from the amounts which are in litigation, and with regard also to the emoluments which are received by the profession in the two places. The hon. gentleman has referred to Mr. Justice Wurtele. Judge Wurtele was promoted from Ottawa to Montreal, but I am sure he is worse off in a financial point of view than he was before. The member for North York (Mr. Mulock) has put a question to me as to whether I am in favour of increasing the salaries of the judges now. If I am to answer the question in view of the inadequacy of judicial salaries I would say yes, because I have been for many years, seeing the amount of duties which the judges perform, seeing the amount earned by the profession as compared with former years, of the opinion that the salaries of the judges should be increased. It is a great mistake to imagine that, when vacancies occur on the bench, we are overwhelmed with applications from persons who are desirous to fill those vacancies. I would repudiate such an insinuation for the sake of the profession itself, even

if I had no other reasons. But the applications made to us are not numerous, and they are more rare with every vacancy that occurs: and that is especially true in the large centres of population. In fact, we find it more difficult to fill the offices as each vacancy occurs. There can be no greater mistake than to imagine that we ought to recruit our judges from failures at the bar. No doubt there have been excellent judges who had not succeeded at the bar, but these cases are very few indeed. More than that, while there is a great deal of truth in what some hon. gentlemen have said that the salaries seem to some to be liberal, I believe it is to the interest of every person in this country not only to see that the judges are a highly qualified body but to see that they are sufficiently paid, and enabled to keep up a position in which they may receive respect and deference from their fellow men. It would be unfortunate if our judicial officers should sink below the best rank in society. Many other questions arise in regard to this matter, as to whether the finances of the country would warrant a change being made, whether the proposition I previously made should be adopted, that we should commence with the Superior Court judges, leaving the County Court judges to a future time. I could not answer the hon. gentleman's question to-night, but I may do so later in the session.

Mr. McMULLEN. I find that the chief justice of the States receives $10,500 a year, the assistant judges $10,000 each, and the associate judges $6,000. In the State of Michigan the judges receive $2,500 and travelling expenses, while our judges only receive $2,000. I think we can fairly pay as much as they pay in the State of Michigan. In one county in the States a man ran for county judge. He had run for years around the country as a peddler. He was asked what his qualifications were for the position of county judge, and he was obliged not to go to the vote. I agree with the Minister of Justice that we want the best talent and the best ability on the bench, because we are all interested in having our cases decided according to the best judgment that can be given.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There will be an important committee sitting to-morrow, and I would therefore suggest that we should stop here.

Mr. FOSTER. I regret exceedingly to move that the committee rise when so little has been done. We have been sitting for eight hours, and only three items have been passed. At this rate, we have to fear that we shall be here until September or October. However, I move that the committee rise and report the resolutions.

Motion agreed to, and Committee rose and reported the resolutions.

CORPUS CHRISTI—ADJOURNMENT.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that when this House adjourns at its next sitting, it shall stand adjourned until Friday next at three o'clock in the afternoon.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that the House do now adjourn.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.30 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 27th May, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 79) respecting the Canadian Land and Investment Company, Limited.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 80) respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 81) to incorporate the Canadian Order of Home Circles.—(Mr. Coatsworth.)

Bill (No. 82) respecting the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company.—(Mr. Curran.)

Bill (No. 83) to incorporate the Septennial Benevolent Society.—(Mr. Coatsworth.)

Bill (No. 84) respecting the Saskatchewan Railway and Mining Company.—(Mr. Wallace.)

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION.

Mr. TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 85) further to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act. He said: The chief object of the Bill is to provide power for the exemption of steamboats when registered in the United Kingdom or elsewhere out of Canada, under those circumstances under which we have practically exempted that class of steamboats in the past. I refer particularly to those steamers chartered in Canada every summer season, and plying chiefly on the River and Gulf of St. Lawrence, which are registered in Great Britain and which possess the Imperial Board of Trade certificates. Under the operation of the Steamboat Inspection Act as it stands, it appears, according to a recent decision given by the Minister of Justice, that the Marine Department will be obliged to insist on those vessels going through a double inspection and paying double inspection fees, although possessing a certificate, not expired, from the Imperial Board of Trade. That is the main object of the first part of the Bill. There are several other sections of less importance; one, for instance, to perfect the existing law in regard to limited certificates. Certificates are granted to vessels plying on certain waters only and limited to those waters; but, under the law as it stands, a vessel having obtained this limited certificate and violating its terms by plying outside of the waters for which it holds a certificate, cannot be punished, as it appears impossible to enforce the penalties for that violation. So the next section supplements the provisions of the existing law. Then there is also a provision inserted at the suggestion of the chairman of the Board of Steamboat Inspectors, and in consequence of the great inconvenience the shipping interest often feel from the fact that unless the Board of Steamboat Inspectors is sitting a man who has passed his examination and whose examination papers have been certified, except the formality of submitting them to a meeting of a quorum of the board, is compelled to wait and

is unable to pursue his occupation until after the next meeting of the board. There is a carefully guarded clause in that connection, providing that under the circumstances, if the report of his examination is satisfactory, and is certified by the chairman of the board, the certificate may issue notwithstanding the fact that the whole board has not passed on it. The last clause of the Bill is inserted in consequence of our experience under the present Act, where reference is made to an officer of Customs being employed for the purpose of enforcing the Steamboat Inspection Act; for it has occurred in certain instances and in certain places that there was no Customs officer available and none could be spared at the time from the nearest point where there was a Customs station, and so no action could be taken although a vessel was running against the law. The object of the section is to give the Inspector of Steamboats the same authority as is now possessed by an officer in the Customs service.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PROPOSED QUEBEC BRIDGE—NORTH SHORE RAILWAY DEBENTURES.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) (for Mr. LANGELIER) asked, 1. Whether, on or about the 26th day of February last, Collingwood Schreiber, Esq., Chief Engineer of Government Railways, made a survey of the River St. Lawrence, immediately opposite and in the vicinity of the city of Quebec, for the purpose of ascertaining whether it was possible to build a railway bridge there? 2. Whether the said Collingwood Schreiber was commissioned by the Government to make this survey? 3. Whether this engineer has made a report respecting this survey to the Government? 4. Whether this report is favourable to the construction of such a bridge? 5. What is the estimate of the said Collingwood Schreiber as to the cost of such a bridge? 6. Whether it is the intention of the Government to lay this report before the House?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In the absence of the Minister of Railways, I beg to state that Mr. Collingwood Schreiber was sent to make an examination or survey as stated in the question. I am not in a position to say when that report will be brought down.

Mr. LAURIER. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to state that he does not know when the report will be brought down?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I could not communicate with the First Minister to-day about that, and I gave the answer as far as I could.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) (for Mr. LANGELIER) asked, 1. Whether it is within the knowledge of the Government, that, at a meeting held in Tara Hall, at Quebec, on the 26th of February last, Sir Charles Tupper, the High Commissioner for Canada to London, declared, that having telegraphed to the Right Honourable Sir John A. Macdonald, First Minister of Canada, in order to know from him what he ought to say on the question of a bridge at Quebec, and on that of the North Shore Railway debentures, he had received the following telegram:—

"KINGSTON, 26th February, 1891.

"Parliament will be asked to transfer bonds to Canadian Pacific Railway, on conditions proposed by the city of Quebec.

(Signed) "JOHN A. MACDONALD."

2. Whether the said telegram was sent by the Right Honourable Sir John A. Macdonald, to the said Sir Charles Tupper? 3. What are the conditions imposed by the city of Quebec, referred to in the said telegram? 4. Whether the Government intends to keep the promise thus made in its name by Sir Charles Tupper? 5. When does the Government intend to introduce the measure promised by the said telegram? 6. Whether the Government is aware, that, at the said meeting, Sir Charles Tupper declared that the citizens of Quebec might regard the building of the said bridge as an accomplished fact? 7. Whether the Government authorized the said Sir Charles Tupper to give the said promise? 8. Whether the Government intends to carry out this promise? 9. When does it propose to introduce a measure to give it effect?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The telegram mentioned in this question is not complete; it is only a portion of the telegram, and that is the only answer I can give to that part of the question. There will be a measure brought down during the present session in reference to the bonds of the North Shore Railway.

Mr. DAVIES (for Mr. LANGELIER) asked, Whether the Government are aware that during the period of the last election Victor Chateauvert, Esq., ministerial candidate in Quebec Centre, published in *Le Courrier du Canada* the following notice:—

"QUEBEC, 21st February, 1891.

"As member for Quebec Centre, in return for the confidence of my electors, I promise to give them a settlement of the Pacific million, and help for the bridge."

And that in a speech made by the said Victor Chateauvert, Esq., about the same date, to the electors of Quebec Centre, he made the following statement:—

"I can say, without boasting, that I have succeeded, with Colonel Forsyth, in inducing the Government to give up the million dollars of debentures (the million dollars of debentures which the Government retains on the Canadian Pacific Railway, between Quebec and Montreal) on condition that the Canadian Pacific Company shall make the necessary improvements on the Louise Embankment, construct elevators, and carry out the other works which will serve to make Quebec a distributing centre like Montreal and Toronto, and one of the finest ports in the world.

"After having secured from the Ottawa Government, through the influence of our Ministers, Sir Hector and Sir Adolphe, the return of the million of debentures, and a promise of aid for the bridge between Quebec and Lévis, I should consider myself a bad citizen if I did not consent to come forward under circumstances so favourable for the city."

2. Whether it is true, as so stated by Mr. Chateauvert, that he had secured from the Government the remission of the said million of debentures and a promise of aid for the said bridge? 3. What is the nature of the aid so promised? 4. When do the Government intend to introduce measures to carry out the remission of the said million of debentures, and to assist in the construction of the said bridge?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government are not aware that the article in question was published in that paper, but they do know that Mr. Chateauvert exerted himself very much about this remission of the million dollars, and also about

the bridge in question. The Government will introduce a measure about the million dollars debentures. The remainder of the question I cannot answer now.

Mr. FREMONT asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to carry out, during the present session of Parliament, the promise contained in the following telegram of the Honourable the Prime Minister:—

"KINGSTON, 26th February, 1891.

"Parliament will be asked to transfer bonds to Canadian Pacific Railway, on conditions imposed by the city of Quebec.

(Signed) "JOHN A. MACDONALD."

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) In reply to the hon. gentleman, I must tell him that the answer I gave just now to the question put by the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) applies to this case; that is to say, that the telegram referred to is incomplete.

ENGINEER OF QUEBEC HARBOUR BOARD.

Mr. TARTE asked, On what date did H. F. Perley cease to be Chief Engineer of the Quebec Harbour Commission? What was his salary when acting in that capacity? How long had he held the position? Who has been appointed to succeed him?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am informed by Mr. Perley that his resignation as Chief Engineer of Quebec Harbour Commissioners is dated 15th January, 1891. There was no salary attached to the position. He held the position from May, 1884, to January, 1891. I understand that Mr. Boswell has been appointed to fill the office.

PROTECTION OF FISHERIES.

Mr. GILLIES asked, Is it the intention of the Government to place a cruiser upon the southern coast of Cape Breton early in the present season, for the protection of the fisheries and the property of fishermen from destruction by foreigners?

Mr. TUPPER. There is already a cruiser on the southern coast of Cape Breton for the purpose of enforcing the Fisheries Act.

MEDICAL OFFICER AT ST. JOHN'S, P.Q.

Mr. BECHARD asked, Whether Doctor E. N. Chevalier, of Iberville, has been discharged from his position as medical officer of the Port of St. John's, Province of Quebec; and if so, for what reason, and who has been appointed his successor?

Mr. TUPPER. The port of St. John's, P.Q., is not a port where a medical officer is employed by the Dominion Government, but the collector, under the Act, has authority to engage a doctor from time to time when his services are required.

QUEBEC GARRISON CLUB.

Mr. LAURIER (for Mr. LAVERGNE) asked, 1. Does the property situated on St. Louis street, Quebec, known as the "Quebec Garrison Club," belong to the Federal Government? 2. What area of ground does this property cover? 3. For what purposes was the property leased to the Committee of Management of the Club? 4. What assessment value does the Municipal Council of Quebec place upon this property? 5. (*a*) For what period is this property leased to the Garrison Club? (*b*) What rent does the Garrison Club pay to the Federal authorities? (*c*) Date of the granting of the lease? (*d*) Date of expiration of the lease? 6. Is it the intention of the Department of Militia and Defence to renew the lease for this property on the same terms (viz., $1 rent per annum) as the present lease? 7. Has the Quebec Garrison Club, in accordance with the terms of the first lease, expended $10,000 on the property? 8. Is it the intention of the Department of Militia and Defence to endeavour to procure a higher rental for the property? 9. (*a*) Does the Department of Militia and Defence know that the institution is not purely a military organization, but that it is a social place of amusement having a regular bar, billiard room and card rooms, restaurant and kitchen; and that according to the last returns the membership is as follows:—About sixty militia (active), and about one hundred and eighty civilians? (*b*) That it pays bar and club licenses for the sale of liquors, and for the use of billiard tables, to the local authorities?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I desire to state: 1. The property situated on St. Louis street, Quebec, known as the Quebec Garrison Club, belongs to the Federal Government. 2. It contains 2 roods 12 perches. 3. It was leased for the purpose of being used by the Quebec Garrison Club as a military club and also as a library and reading room. 4. The municipal assessment value of the property is not known in the Department. 5. The property is leased for ten years from the 1st October, 1881, at a nominal rental of $1 per annum, but the understanding is that all repairs and keeping in order of the grounds and buildings would be at the cost of the club, and so it has been. The first lease given was for one year from the 1st of October, 1879; this was for four rooms. On the 15th of January, 1880, this lease was extended, giving the whole of the building known as the Royal Engineer Office, then unoccupied and in very bad repair, with a portion of the Engineer yard. A subsequent one was granted for ten years from the 1st of October, 1881, as I have stated. The lease expires on the 1st of October, 1891. 6. There has been no decision as yet on the part of the Government as to the renewal of the lease. 7. There are no conditions in any of the leases enforcing an actual expenditure of $10,000 on the property, but there was a very large expenditure, amounting to $11,359.91, and the whole of that was borne by the lessees, the additions and repairs becoming the property of the Government. 8. The question of raising the rent, if a new lease is entered into, is under consideration; the rental of the property is quite certain to be increased. The property is insured by the club to the extent of $4,000, payable to the Government of Canada. 9. We have no official knowledge in the Department of the organization or interior economy of the institution called the Quebec Garrison Club. No complaint has ever been received. The club pays all the taxes of the local municipal authorities, and keeps the street clear of snow in winter.

CONTRACTS FOR PRINTING PAPER.

Mr. DELISLE asked, Whether the Government have made a contract with any person or persons, company or companies, for furnishing the printing paper or other paper purchased by the Government?

If so, when was the contract made? To whom was it awarded? When does it expire, and what are its terms and conditions?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Tenders are always asked for printing paper by circular, stating the quality, conditions of delivery and quantity, sent to those firms which are in the habit of making printing book papers as distinguished from those making the cheaper kinds, namely, Buntin & Co., Barber & Co., the Toronto Paper Co., and the Rolland Paper Co. Others have been invited from time to time to tender, but with no satisfactory result. The contract is limited to a supply for one year for the necessary printing services, short contracts having been found the most desirable, in view of the constantly varying prices of those papers. A contract for certain lines of writing paper was entered into three years ago with the Rolland Co. So far as can be ascertained, theirs is the only establishment in Canada prepared to turn out the particular class of goods required. The contract has recently expired, and a new one will require to be made at an early day.

POUND-NET LICENSES—LAKE HURON.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. LISTER) asked, Whether pound-net licenses have been issued for the year 1891, for fishing between Blue Point and Goderich, Lake Huron? If so, how many have been issued? Are any of them double-headers? If so, how many? When was pound-net fishing first authorized between the above points?

Mr. TUPPER. Pound-net licenses have been issued for the year 1891, for fishing between Blue Point and Goderich, Lake Huron. Twenty-nine licenses have been issued, of which eighteen are double-headers, and one has four heads. Pound-net fishing was first authorized between those points in 1882.

ANNAPOLIS PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. LISTER) asked, Whether the Annapolis public buildings have been completely finished? If not, what sum will be required to finish them? Were tenders asked for? Who tendered? To whom was the contract awarded? What was the contract price? What amounts have been paid on account of the work to date? Is any further sum to be paid; if so, how much?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The buildings are not completely finished. About $2,000 required to finish them. Tenders were asked for. The tenderers were F. Toms, Ottawa; J. Burns, Ottawa; McDonald, Aylmer; Rhodes & Curry, Amherst, N.S.; T. O'Connor & R. McDonald, Moncton; C. B. Burton, Annapolis; J. McIntosh, Stellarton. The contract was awarded to Rhodes, Curry & Co. The contract price, $12,497, being lowest tender. $22,739 has been paid on account. This sum includes site, $4,096; heating apparatus, $1,226; fittings, $1,290. About $2,000 remains to be paid.

MR. HILAIRE HURTEAU.

Mr. GAUTHIER asked, Whether Mr. Hilaire Hurteau, formerly member of the House of Commons for the County of L'Assomption, is now in the employment of the Government? If so, how long has he been employed, what are his duties and what salary does he receive?

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Hurteau is now in the employ of the Government. He has been so since 1st June, 1887. He is employed in promoting immigration. He is paid $100 per month.

INDIAN AGENTS IN BRUCE.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Have any of the Indian Agents in Bruce acted as informers against persons selling liquor to Indians in that county? If so, what are their names? How often have they so acted, and what share of fines have they received in consideration of such service since the year 1886?

Mr. DEWDNEY. 1. J. W. Jermyn, Indian agent, Cape Croker, informed the Department by letter of 19th September, 1889, that he had laid information against John Colclough for selling liquor to Indians. This suit being successful, a fine of $100 was imposed upon Colclough, one moity of which was retained by the agent, as informer in the case. 2. James Allen, Indian agent, Saugeen, informed the Department in 1888, that he had laid information against the following persons for having supplied liquor to Indians, viz.: S. Laird, T. McVittie and James White, from none of whom was there a fine collected; and the same agent reported in 1890 that he had laid information against Simon Wahbeze, who was fined $50, but from whom the fine was not collected, and one Shomacher, who was fined $50. The agent's moiety of this fine being applied towards expenses in case of Wahbeze. This is all the information the Department has on the subject.

ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK.

Mr. EDGAR asked, Was a report made by any officer or member of the Canadian Government, on the subject of an increase in the length of the graving dock at Esquimalt, subsequent to the Order in Council dated 3rd February, 1885? If so, what was the date or dates of such report or reports?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Upon an application for extension of dock made by Messrs. Baker and Shakespeare, M.P.'s, the Chief Engineer reported on 25th January, 1886, that dock should not be extended, and Mr. Baker, M.P., was informed accordingly on the 2nd February following. On the 7th November, 1889, the Canadian Pacific Railway asked that the question of dock enlargement be considered, as they had determined to proceed at once with the construction of steamships to run between Vancouver, China and Japan. On the report of the Minister of Public Works made the 12th November, 1889, an Order in Council was passed on the 21st November, 1889, authorizing to communicate on this matter with the Imperial Government with the view of obtaining a further subsidy of £10,000. On the 10th May, 1890, a despatch was received stating that the Lords of the Admiralty were unable to incur any expenditure for exteinding the dock, as they considered it large enough.

METEGHAN WHARF, DIGBY COUNTY.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. BOWERS) asked, 1. Has the Government received any report from the Deputy

Inspector of Public Works of Nova Scotia concerning the Meteghan wharf, County of Digby? 2. Or any report from the wharfinger on the same subject? 3. If so, and the reports or either of them indicate that the wharf requires repairing, is it the intention of the Government to place an appropriation in the Supplementary Estimates for that purpose?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government have received no report in the office of the Department from an officer of the Department. Mr. Deveau, wharfinger, was asked from this office to report what was required, and he stated in reply that the sea had washed out the north-west part and the top is rotten and in poor condition, and finds that it will cost to repair, $3,000.

THE LANGEVIN BLOCK—CONSTRUCTION.

Mr. MULOCK moved for:

(*a*) Copies of all advertisements for tenders for the performance of any of the works in connection with the construction of the Langevin Block in Ottawa; (*b*) of all specifications, terms and conditions referred to in such advertisements; (*c*) of all tenders for such constructions; (*d*) of all contracts entered into for performance of any of such works, including copies of all specifications, terms and conditions referred to in said respective contracts; (*e*) also a statement showing: (1) all changes made in any of said contracts, specifications, terms or conditions, with dates of such changes; (2) the authority on which such changes were made; (3) the reasons for such changes; (4) all changes in the contract prices; (5) the reasons for such changes last named; (6) all changes in any such specifications, terms or conditions not accompanied by any change in the contract price; (7) the reasons why no such change was made; (8) all payments made under each of said contracts, and to whom, with dates of payment; (*f*) also a statement showing all cases in which any higher tender for any of said work was accepted in preference to a lower tender, and the reason thereof; (*g*) statement showing all withdrawals of tenders; (*h*) copies of all correspondence, letters, telegrams and memoranda touching any such tender last named, or its withdrawal; (*i*) statement showing all orders or authorizations for the supply of any materials, or performance of any of such works in connection with the erection of said block, and not included in any of said written contracts; (*j*) all claims for extras in connection with the construction of said block or any part thereof; (*k*) all payments made on account of such extras, with dates; (*l*) all claims for such extras that have been finally disallowed by, or on behalf of the Government; (*m*) all unsettled claims in connection with any of said works, whether for work, material or otherwise; (*n*) all claims for damages arising out of any of said contracts, orders, authorizations or works; (*o*) all changes or alterations in any portions of said works after the execution thereof; (*p*) the reasons for such changes or alterations, and why such changes or alterations became necessary; (*q*) the cost occasioned by each of the last-mentioned changes; (*r*) the total amount paid out to date on account of the construction of said block; (*s*) the total amount of unsettled claims in respect thereof; (*t*) the total amount claimed for damages above referred to; (*u*) the total amount paid for furnishings for said block; (*v*) the total amount of claims for such furnishings not yet paid.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MULOCK. I would call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact, that there has been an order made by the Public Accounts Committee for the production of the original documents referred to here, and, therefore, I would ask if it would be possible to have the copying done here, so that the production of the papers before the Committee may not be interfered with?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Does the order of the Committee include all these?

Mr. MULOCK. I think so.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The copying of this will take some time.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not wish the copying of this to delay compliance with the order of the Committee, but there are a number of these returns which consist of statements from the books, and they might be brought down first.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will make a note of that.

SOULANGES CANAL.

Mr. MOUSSEAU (Translation) moved for:

Statement showing all expenditure, and a Return of all reports and plans of Government engineers, if any, in connection with the Soulanges Canal, from 1873 to 1889, exclusively, and from 1889, inclusively, to June, 1890; also a Return of all plans and specifications made by engineers and completed by them, at the said date, June, 1890, in relation to the said Soulanges Canal.

He said: Before offering this motion in connection with the Soulanges Canal, I may be allowed, Mr. Speaker, a few remarks with regard to this work. The first part of my motion asks for the plans and reports of Government engineers in connection with the first surveys made preliminary to the construction of a new canal on the north shore of the St. Lawrence, in the County of Soulanges. These surveys were made during the period from 1873 to 1876. In the course of these two or three years, several elections were made with the help of this question of a canal; numerous promises were made in order to secure these elections. The surveys took place, but no reports were drawn; after the elections nothing more was heard of the matter. This is the reason why I ask to-day that the plans and reports in connection with this work and its cost be brought before the House, so that we may know how the matter stands. The second part of the motion asks for all plans and specifications made by engineers since 1889, and completed by them, up to the date of 30th June, 1890. I remember that during the election of 1889, solemn promises were made in the name of the Government in the county which I have the honour to represent. It was said that the surveys had been made, plans of the canal were even exhibited, and it was promised that the work would be commenced without delay. Well, the election ended, and immediately, or almost immediately, the surveys came to an end also. Now we are in 1891, and the canal has not been built, not even begun. In view of the expenditure made in connection with this work, if not altogether with the object of deceiving the electors, at least with the purpose of fooling them a little, I have thought it my duty to offer this motion, in order to ascertain the truth in this matter, for when I was elected the County of Soulanges requested from me a solemn promise that I would require and obtain information in regard to this question. Mr. Speaker, I hope the Government will remember the promises they have made, and that they will keep them; I hope that they will persevere in the favourable disposition which they have shown since the elections. Mr. Speaker, I must say that the system of canals built in this country has certainly contributed to our national prosperity and wealth. All the governments have striven to extend this system, and at the same time to favour inland and interprovincial trade. If I appear to be criticizing

the Government to-day, it is not because I condemn the past policy of the Government of building and enlarging our canals, but it is because I would like to see the Government still follow the same course and extend still further this development of our canal system. It is true, and it has been recently established, that canals are not a very paying branch of the public service. It is admitted that the canals do not pay the interest on the money they cost, but the money abundantly spent in the construction of canals is a great help to the people; commerce profits by it, and the country is indirectly benefited thereby, inasmuch as these works contribute to increase the national wealth and prosperity. The question, which is intended to be determined by the surveys, is whether it would be better for the country to deepen and enlarge the Beauharnois Canal, or to build a new canal on the north shore of the St. Lawrence, in the County of Soulanges. From information obtained, if not from official, at least from reliable, source, I am about certain that the reports of the engineers, if they are brought before the House, will show that they favour the building of a canal on the north shore. There are obvious advantages in the construction of a canal on the north shore. It would be cheaper than the deepening and enlargement of the Beauharnois Canal. The first portion of the latter, which would have to be deepened and enlarged, is through boulders, and would offer the engineers and contractors endless difficulties and obstacles; moreover, those who know the place are of the opinion that the cost of such a work would be very heavy. On the other hand, if we examine the ground surveyed on the north shore, we find extremely beautiful lands, a kind of plain, free of boulders, and a canal could be built there for much less than the deepening of that of Beauharnois would cost. Thus, Mr. Speaker, everything should induce the Government to decide in favour of the building of a new canal on the north shore of the St. Lawrence, in the County of Soulanges. Another advantage offered by a north shore canal, is that the Baie des Cascades offers a safe and spacious harbour, where vessels could find protection during storms. If you now turn to the north entrance of the canal, off the town of Coteau Landing, you again find a magnificent bay, larger than that of the Cascades, and which offers important advantages to navigation. This bay extends eight or ten acres off Lake St. Francis. It is a splendid bay, the bottom of which has no rock nor boulders, but is altogether firm enough. This bay has also the advantage of never being exposed to storms, as is the entrance of the Beauharnois Canal, especially at the upper end. Now, Mr. Speaker, if I dwell on these advantages it is because they are substantial ones, and because it would cost less to build a new canal in the County of Soulanges than to deepen and enlarge that of Beauharnois. Mr. Speaker, if you now consider the past history of the policy followed by Governments which preceded the present one, you will find that grave mistakes have attended the building of the Beauharnois Canal—I mean from a strategic point of view. It is known that all our canals are built on the north shore of the St. Lawrence, with the exception of that of Beauharnois. I do not have the pretension of saying to the House that it should follow my opinion, but I believe that here is a fine opportunity of correcting the mistakes of our predecessors. Should the present Government decide to build a canal on the north shore of the St. Lawrence, I can vouchsafe that all the country will be grateful to them, and that the people of the County of Soulanges, together with their humble representative, will be satisfied.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I have to congratulate the hon. member, at his outset in this House, on the moderation with which he has presented his request. It forms a happy contrast with the speeches which have been heard in the County of Soulanges on this burning question of a canal during the last elections. At that time, my hon. friend, as well as the friends of my hon. friend, were calling into question, not only the good faith of the Government, but the vote in the Estimates of last year; they were calling into question the very signature of the Governor General. To give an example of this, I will only mention the following: The Order in Council for these works, as for all the others, recited that engineers, after long and costly surveys, had come to the conclusion that, from many points of view, and one, among others, which was not mentioned by my hon. friend, that of military strategics—should Canada ever unfortunately have to be concerned in such a point of view—had come to the conclusion, I say, that the construction of the canal would be more advantageous and no more expensive on the north than on the south shore of the St. Lawrence. That is to say, instead of having the Beauharnois Canal deepened and enlarged, the engineers had concluded that it would be better to build a new canal within the limits of the County of Soulanges, to take the place of that of Beauharnois, which is on the south shore. This Order in Council stated that the Minister, having considered the report of his engineer, concurred in this report and recommended the same to the favourable consideration and approval of His Excellency the Governor General in Council. The hon. member held before his electors that this report adopted and afterwards approved of by the Governor General, was only a recommendation to have the work done, but not a decision of the Government. The hon. member will yet learn, I hope, that a recommendation from the Council, when approved by His Excellency, is an order that the thing so recommended be done, an order the good faith of which no one is at liberty to call into question. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has no objection—I state it in his stead—to put before the House the papers asked for by the hon. member for Soulanges (Mr. Mousseau). The surveys for this work were begun seventeen or eighteen years ago. I remember the efforts made in the interest of this work, and the very valuable information furnished the House by the eminent man who then represented the County of Soulanges (Mr. Lanthier). The hon. members of this House will remember, as well as I do, the efforts which have been made and the pressure which has also been exercised by the gentleman who succeeded Mr. Lanthier as the representative of the county, I mean Mr. Bain, in favour of the work which the present member for Soulanges has just advocated before this House. What the hon. member has just said in favour of the location and construction of the canal on the north shore, has already, very often and very eloquently, been said in this House

by his predecessors. The engineers began by making very costly surveys. Contradictory opinions were first arrived at. These opinions were discussed and represented contradictorily to the Government. On another hand, the important interests which had gathered around the Beauharnois Canal, were also considerations which the Government had to weigh before accepting the report of the engineers favourable to the construction of a new canal on the north shore. That took time. It was not simply a matter of election promises as it was held. It was the result of long consideration, which was brought to a conclusion by the active help afforded by Mr. Monroe, one of the most distinguished engineers of the country. This conclusion was arrived at last year, and my hon. friend could have seen that last session a sum of one million dollars was voted for canal works between Lake St. Louis and Lake St. Francis. He can ascertain it by looking at page 47 of the Estimates. This year, of this million dollar vote of last year, there is a re-vote of a sum of $300,000, which will be available for expenditure in the course of the next fiscal year. The hon. member said that if one would consider the past history of the Governments—I am not used to considering the future history, for history is generally written of the past—one would notice the mistakes which attended the construction of certain works on the south shore of the St. Lawrence, while so many reasons existed for locating them on the north shore. My hon. friend is in accord with the engineers, which is fortunate for them; he is in accord with the interests already known of his county, which is fortunate for his constituents; and he is in accord with the Government; we only ask one thing, that is, that he may continue being so. My hon. friend said he hoped the House would adopt his opinion, and give its approval to the construction of a canal on the north shore. The House may discuss the different schemes; Parliament has always the right to decide on the opportuneness of suggested works, especially when they involve considerable expenditure. When the House is called upon to vote the sum required for the work in question, it shall give by its vote its opinion on the decision of the engineers and of the Government, reached a year ago, in relation to the construction of this work. In conclusion, I will say that the Government has no objection to put before the House all the papers asked for by the hon. member (Mr. Mousseau). Had my hon. friend called upon the Minister in charge of the Department of Railways and Canals, he might have seen for himself that the plans are ready; that the Orders in Council are passed; and that only the necessary vote is now being waited for in order that the work may commence.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) Am I to understand from what the hon. Secretary of State has said, that there was in last year's Estimates an appropriation for the construction of a canal in the County of Soulanges?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. (Translation.) It is mentioned in general terms for canals from one point to another on the St. Lawrence, which included the north shore canal.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) The Soulanges Canal was not then to be seen with the naked eye. I perceive quite a difference between the Estimates of this year and those of last year.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. (Translation.) The conclusion of the engineers was not reached before last session, but a vote was asked from the House to provide for the work in accordance with the conclusion which was only to be finally reached by the engineers after the session.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) I find the following in the Estimates of last year: "St. Lawrence River and Canals, Lake St. Louis, and canals between Lakes St. Louis and St. Francis, $1,000,000." So that in last year's Estimates this vote was contingent. The appropriation could be used for the work or any other purpose as well. Nothing was voted for a canal in the County of Soulanges; there was simply a demand of a million dollars for improvements of canal works in general.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. (Translation.) On one shore or the other, but within the region in question.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) This year the word "Soulanges" was added in the Estimates, but it was not to be found in the appropriation of last year; so that my hon. friend was quite right when he was calling into question the promises of the Government. The promises of the Government, that is something we are used to in election times. The Ministers are lavish not only of religion, of loyalty, but of promises of money as well, in election time. They resemble certain debtors of whom it is said that they ruin themselves in promises and grow rich by not paying anything.

Mr. MOUSSEAU. (Translation.) One thing is certain. There was no canal for the County of Soulanges in the Estimates of last year. It is true that the million dollars voted were for Lakes St. Francis and St. Louis Canals, but the Soulanges Canal was not mentioned. This canal figured on the hustings, but never in the Estimates. Now, what are the surveys that were made? After having so often duped the electors with this canal question, the Government sent, in 1889 and for a little while in 1890, engineers, who, during the winter, bored little holes here and there, such as are made for the use of fishermen. Let one go and see what has been done in the County of Soulanges. Since 1873 all that the engineers have done is the boring of holes which could only be used as starts for little artesian wells. The electors were quite right in doubting, if not the genuineness, at least the validity, of the promises made by the Government in election times. One thing is sure, there has never been a cent voted especially for a canal in the County of Soulanges, and this is the first year that the Estimates have an item for this work.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. (Translation.) I will put this question to my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Laurier): Had the engineers decided, as they did after the session, that the canal could and should be built through Soulanges, does the hon. member contend that the vote granted by Parliament last year was not sufficient for the work, if the work was possible?

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) The answer is very easy: A vote is to be applied according to the explanation given in Parliament when the sum is voted; and I have never heard of the building of a canal through Soulanges.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. (Translation). Well, my hon. friend must have been absent from the House, evidently.

Motion agreed to.

FISHING BOUNTIES.

Mr. FLINT moved for:

Comparative statement for the years 1882 to 1891, inclusive (by Provinces) of: (*a*) Total number of bounty claims received by Department: (*b*) Total number paid; (*c*) Number of vessels, tonnage, and number of men entitled to bounty in each year: (*d*) Number of boats among which bounty was distributed, and number of men engaged in boat-fishing receiving bounty: (*e*) Total number of men receiving bounty; (*f*) Total annual payments of fishing bounty.

He said: In making this motion I desire to give somewhat more fully than I had any intention of doing at the time, not only the reasons for which I ask for this return, but also briefly to call attention to the false position in which not only myself and this House, but, I believe, the Minister of Marine himself was placed by the tenor of the reply to a similar motion submitted by me on a previous occasion. The motion I will not read, because it is on the Notice paper before the hon. gentleman, but I may say it asks for a detailed statement of nine items in connection with the fishing bounties. I made the motion after careful consideration and study of the statistics furnished me by this House and placed in our hands, and also those that were accessible to me in the library connected with Parliament. I was surprised and amazed when the Minister of Marine stated that I would find those details in the last volume of his report; but as the Minister, with that emphatic and imperious manner which he assumes as a Minister of the Crown, insisted that all the details would be found in the Fisheries Report, which he held in his hand, I cordially and cheerfully withdrew my motion. I discovered, however, within a few minutes, that the hon. Minister was mistaken. I discovered that the hon. Minister had not carefully read the motion, or that he had not carefully read his report, or a still worse alternative, of which I might accuse him if the matter were of sufficient importance, that he desired to mislead the House. I believe, under the circumstances, it would not be at all reasonable to presume that the hon. Minister had any intention of that kind. With respect to the return asked for the year 1891, I assume that he includes the distribution of the fishing bounties made during the recent spring; and while I am perfectly willing to accept the statement that it is impossible to give those returns, the Minister knowing fully the capacity and routine of the department of which he is so efficient a head, yet at the present moment I do not see why that return should not be included. I await enlightenment on that subject. As the cheques must have been prepared and sent out at a period anterior to 5th March, and as the fiscal year is nearly ended, I hold they could easily be included in the return I ask for in regard to 1891. But the Minister was incorrect when he said that all the items were to be found in the last volume of the Fisheries Report. I was aware before I made the motion that they were not to be found in the latest volume of the Fisheries Report, but I assumed that one or two pages must have escaped my attention in my haste, and possibly the hon. Minister was correct. However, I find on investigation that on the page to which the hon. Minister drew my attention there are none of the comparative returns for which I ask. There are statements of the number of fishing boats of the Dominion for the whole year, and of the number of men. But I call the attention of the Minister to the fact that that is not what I ask for: I ask for a comparative return by Provinces of the total number of claims received by the department. I also asked for the return by Provinces of the number of vessels, the tonnage of the vessels, the number of boats among which the bounty was distributed, and the number of men in boats receiving the bounty. The return presented in the report does not give the total returns by Provinces, although I admit it gives the total returns of some items for the Dominion. Therefore, out of the nine questions I have asked for in this motion, not one is answered by the returns on page 18 in the form in which I required the answer. I call the attention of the Minister to the fact that this return does not contain the items I moved for; it contains the comparative statements by Provinces and counties, which my hon. friend, the member for Queen's (Mr. Forbes), desired to have added, and I would suggest to the hon. Minister of Marine, if it is convenient, that he cause the necessary additional information to be published when this motion is adopted. Page 46 of the return contains a comparative statement of the total amounts paid to vessels and boats, but that includes only two of the items I have asked for in the return. The object of the returns I have asked for is that these may be placed upon some of the official documents, either of the department or of the House, thus presenting a complete picture of the growth and development of the fishery bounty system, and its effect upon the fisheries and upon the fishermen themselves. The hon. Minister, I think, will agree with me that there is no return at present which gives that picture. If an officer of the department takes the time, as I did previous to making this motion, to go through all the volumes of the Fishery Reports in the Parliamentary Library, this information which I have asked for can be procured. I have procured the information for myself, but if it were presented by a private member of the House and published either in *Hansard* or in any other printed form, it would not carry with it the same weight as an official document submitted by the Government. This information, when it comes from the Government, is authoritative, and it is more likely to be correct than if it were prepared by a person unaccustomed to arrange such statistics. At all events, the official document will be received with interest throughout the Dominion and will be studied with care. When I took up this matter of the fishing bounties I had no idea of raising a political question, nor do I wish to do so now. The only complaint I have made in this House in reference to the question is that there is a tendency—a tendency which I think has not been combatted by sufficient force to suppress—by gentlemen in high position in the Government of this country, to make this a political question. I wish to urge in the strongest manner upon Parliament and upon the Government the necessity for keeping this matter entirely out of the range of political partisanship. The resolu-

tion under which this bounty was placed at the disposal of the Government of this country stated that its purpose was "to aid and develop the sea fisheries, the encouragement of the building and fitting out of improved fishing vessels, and the improvement of the condition of the fishermen." If these very worthy objects are carried out, and if the Government will present to us from time to time carefully prepared statistical facts which will show in the blue-books or in other official documents the progress of the fishing industry, they will do a great service to the people of this country and to the members of this House, who are responsible for voting the money. I regret very much that this trifling matter should have been treated so seriously in the press, and that a representative of the people in this House, rising in his place to ask questions on a grave subject, should be made a subject of ridicule. I do not blame the gentlemen of the press, but I think the Minister of Marine will admit that it has placed me in an undeserved position. The importance of this question may not, perhaps, be fully appreciated by gentlemen who do not come from the Maritime Provinces. We have a splendid fund of four and a half million dollars which has been received by the Dominion through the energy of one political party, and which the exertions of the former Minister of Marine, the late Sir Albert Smith, placed at the disposal of the Government. This large sum of money was placed in the hands of the present Administration, and I presume they were carefully considering for a period of time the best use to make of it, but upon the eve of a general election they decided to bestow this fund in the form of a bounty; a decision which caused a certain amount of suspicion and comment throughout the country. I think it is a misnomer to call this a "bounty" to the fishermen. The fishermen of this country do not consider it a bounty, and in my opinion it would be far preferable and far more in accordance with the dignity and character of the men who receive it, if it were called by some other name. I would suggest that it might be called the "Fisheries Development Fund" or some other name which would indicate the purposes to which the money should be applied. From time to time complaints have been made in Parliament, generally by members from the Maritime Provinces, that the whole amount of this fund has not been devoted to the purposes for which it was intended. If we calculate the money at the disposal of the Government at 4 per cent., and deduct from the interest the total amount of fishing bounties paid out, we would find that if this is treated as a trust fund, and the interest on it treated as a trust, there would remain a large sum of money to the credit of the fund which ought to be distributed amongst the fishermen. I should like to see before the close of this session of Parliament, or at all events during next session, some decision arrived at as to the manner in which this money at the disposal of the Government shall be still more fully applied to the improvement and encouragement of fishing industries and to the fitting up of improved fishing vessels. The reports which have been laid upon the Table of the House from time to time contain very valuable information, and if I would not be misunderstood or misrepresented, I would pay the Minister of Marine the compliment of saying, that, so far as I am aware, he has proved himself a very energetic Minister in the discharge of the important functions of his office. I must, however, say that the statistical information supplied to this House, relative to the effect of this fund upon the development and growth of the fishing industry, and upon the improved methods of fitting up fishing vessels, have not been remarkable for that fullness of detail which characterize other official documents submitted to the people of the country. The statistical information I have asked for would, to a certain extent, give a pen picture of the growth and development of the fishing industry which is not given by any other published statistics which I have had the opportunity of seeing. This question must be treated with a great deal of care, and it must be entirely separated from any party bias. It is my sincere desire, as long as I have the honour to represent a maritime constituency, and one largely interested in the fishing business, to place my humble services, so far as I have any knowledge of this matter, completely at the disposal of the Minister, and to assist him by any advice I may be able to give, or any information that I may receive from any of my constituents, in order to aid him in carrying out the distribution of the bounty in such a manner as will promote the development of the fishing industry. While on my feet, I would ask the hon. Minister if it would be consistent with economy and with the view he holds, to publish some of the correspondence which he has had with many gentlemen who are thoroughly posted as to the requirements of the fishing industry? I am aware, from reports made by the department from time to time, that a large mass of correspondence has accumulated there, some of which contains suggestions of great value from practical men, and calculated, if carried out, to improve not only the condition of fishermen, but the character of the vessels. A great deal of discussion has taken place with regard to the decrease or increase of payments from this fund, as applied to the fishermen and the boats. The figures I ask for would show what the increase or the decrease is, and the relation of such changes to the progress of the industries in question. I would also invite the attention of the department to the reasonableness of devoting some portion of the fund still at their disposal to the procuring of information as to whether fishing vessels and other appurtenances of the fishing industry could not be improved. From time to time we hear of terrible disasters on the banks and elsewhere, with great losses of life, in consequence of defective arrangements for dory fishing. There may probably have been representations made to the Government on this subject, and I think a portion of this fund might be used in some way for decreasing the dangers of navigation and the risks of loss of life in connection with fishing on the banks. At any rate, I have found no statistics giving the relation between the amount of the bounty paid, the number of vessels and boats, and the number of men receiving the bounty, which would show the development of the fishing industry in these respects. For this reason I make this motion; and in consequence of the false position I was placed in when I made the former motion, I make these explanations to show that my motion was the result of considerable enquiry and deep interest in the matter. If I am still mistaken, and there is

in the pages of the report of the department the information I ask for, I would cheerfully apologize to the Minister for any misunderstanding that may have resulted from the debate of the 15th instant.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am exceedingly sorry the hon. member for Yarmouth has made his motion and his remarks in support of it largely on the ground that I had been apparently guilty of an attempt to conceal information from him, and was even so far forgetful of the position I hold in this House as to intend to be discourteous to him when he first moved for the information which he seeks to obtain by the present motion. I think it is only necessary for me, in my defence, to refer back to the *Hansard* of that date to show that I stated that if there had been anything omitted from the report, a renewal of the request would speedily bring it. But the hon. gentleman has forgotten what I wish to remind him of, that after the matter had passed from the Order paper I took the trouble to go personally to the hon. gentleman in his seat in this House, and there with him and the hon. member for Queen's, N.S. (Mr. Forbes), who is also interested in the question, I pointed out the information contained in the Annual Report of the Fisheries Department, with the pages where I conceived all the information he desired was to be found; and after a few questions as to whether the information was there, which I had looked up for the hon. gentleman, I left him with the remark that if there was anything further that was not in the report, and I could give it, he was, of course, entitled to it. I do not intend to pursue that phase of the question any further. Of course there is no objection to bringing down this information, but I wish to tell the hon. gentleman that the information for 1890, the year for which the last distribution has taken place, will not be ready in the ordinary course for some time yet, and of course that for 1891 will not be ready until later still. Notwithstanding that, if the hon. gentleman wishes a comparative statement of those years, the return will be prepared when we have the information ready. Now, on page 19 of my report, to which I called the hon. gentleman's attention, believing that everything he required was there, will be found a statement made up to the end of 1889, showing the year when the bounty was established, the number of claims paid each year, the amount of bounty paid each year, the proportion of bounty per head, the highest and lowest paid per head to vessel and boat fishermen, and the total cost of distribution since the bounty was established; and in the appendix to the report there are statements in detail for the year 1889 of the fishing bounty claims received for the year, the payments made to boats and vessels, giving the provinces, the number of claims received, rejected, held in abeyance, and paid. On page 46 of the appendix there is a comparative statement of fishing bounties paid from 1882 to 1889 inclusive, giving provinces, counties, vessels, boats and the totals; and it seemed to me that the information the hon. gentleman was seeking was there. But I did not pretend to be infallible and to understand exactly what the hon. gentleman desired; and it was for that reason I went personally to the hon. gentleman subsequently and was delighted to give him the fullest information possible in reference to the distribution of the bounty. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman, that, in the distribution of a fund such as that, considering its purpose and amount, it is necessary that the fullest facts should be annually laid before the people and Parliament, and it was in that view I caused to be prepared the very elaborate statement referred to. I do not like to draw into a discussion in which my own conduct is criticized any reference to an officer of my department, but I may tell the hon. gentleman, with reference to the alleged discourtesy, that my Deputy was under the same impression as myself, both on a previous occasion and subsequently, namely, that all the information which could be given was in the report. The hon. gentleman said there was not a comparative statement for the provinces. That is a matter of calculation, which will take a little time, but it will be prepared and laid before the House. In reference to the hon. gentleman's remarks concerning the administration of the fund, that was an idea of my own, and a year or so ago I sent to every hon. gentleman representing a fishing district a circular, and it is no doubt to that the hon. gentleman referred. In the report of 1889, if my memory serves me right—and I must speak very accurately to the hon. gentleman—the Deputy summed up the result of the enquiries and expressed his gratification that in all the reports received from the various districts there were no suggestions of material change in the system which had prevailed from 1882 which could be well adopted in connection with the administration of the fund. If the hon. gentleman, after looking into the report of 1889, desires full information as to what the different opinions were on that question, I will be very glad to bring all those papers down, should the hon. gentleman move for them. In connection with the other question, as to protection of fishermen on the banks, and the enquiry into the casualties that occur, fortunately, in connection with those fishing ventures, it will not be necessary to distribute any portion of the fund to obtain such information, as we can, with our regular staff, obtain the information required. Some of it we have obtained, and it was used, I think, by Mr. Colby, when acting for me last session, in the consideration of the Bill concerning further equipment for vessels going on the banks. However, if any further information can be elicited, I shall be most happy to endeavour to obtain it, and also to receive any suggestion from the hon. gentleman as to the form of enquiry which should be adopted.

Mr. FLINT. The hon. gentleman ought not to construe my remarks as imputing discourtesy. The imputation of discourtesy came indirectly from other quarters. I was gratified at the private explanation the Minister gave me, but I felt that the explanation should be made as public as was the original cause of the misunderstanding, since a most improper use has been made in other quarters of this incident.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is quite clear my hon. friend has some ground for complaining. I recollect he was taken to task in a very snappish and flippant manner for the notice of motion he gave. Now it appears my hon. friend was quite right, and the information he asked for should have been granted at the time.

Mr. TUPPER. That is a most extraordinary intervention on the part of the hon. gentleman, but I am not surprised at it. If there is any hon. gen-

tleman here who understands what flippant and impertinent language is, that hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House is the best authority on the subject I know of.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. One excepted.

Mr. TUPPER. I am glad to see the contrast between the hon. member for South Oxford and the hon. member for Yarmouth. The hon. member for Yarmouth is perfectly satisfied with the answer I gave. If the hon. member for South Oxford had any spirit of fairness in him, or any recollection of the facts, he would be equally satisfied with the explanation I gave. If he will look up *Hansard*, he will fail to see any language from me which could be considered as flippant, even by an hon. gentleman who is so biassed in regard to his opponents as is the hon. member for South Oxford.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I was in the House when the hon. member for Yarmouth read his question, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries told him that the information he asked for was to be found in his report.

Mr. TUPPER. Exactly; so I believed at the time.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That it would be found at page 17 of the report, and the hon. gentleman expressed his surprise——

Mr. TUPPER. I did not.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).——that the hon. member for Yarmouth, before he put the question, had not made himself familiar with the report.

Mr. TUPPER. That statement is incorrect. I am sure the hon. gentleman will not persist in misrepresenting me on a subject which he insists on making a personal matter. The *Hansard* report is as follows:—

"Mr. TUPPER. The hon. member and the hon. mover of the motion will find that all the information in detail which the mover has asked for, and also the information as to the returns by counties which the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Forbes) desires, are to be found in the report now in their hands—on page 18 in Appendix 2. I had the statement carefully prepared.

"Mr. FLINT. Are the returns there for 1891?

"Mr. TUPPER. I forgot to add, that it is impossible to give the returns for the year 1891 until the end of the year.

"Mr. FLINT. Does the statement in the report include all the items I have asked for here?

"Mr. TUPPER. Yes; if there is any one item in the motion which is omitted, another motion will at once bring the information."

I never expressed my surprise that the hon. gentleman had not made himself familiar with the report.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman not only spoke in a very sneering tone to the hon. member for Yarmouth, but all his hon. friends about him laughed at the ridiculous figure which, in their opinion, the hon. member for Yarmouth cut in asking for information so plainly presented in the report. Why, the hon. gentleman's answer was a cue to his friends on the press, and the ministerial organs attacked the hon. member for Yarmouth for his ignorance of the contents of the report. The hon. Minister refers to his courtesy in going at once and offering to give the hon. member for Yarmouth the information. Of course, when he discovered that the information which he said was at a certain page of the report was not there, he would have been very glad that this matter should not be brought up in the House, because the *rôle* is now reversed, and it is the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and not my hon. friend from Yarmouth, who is cutting a ridiculous figure. I do not think that the treatment the hon. Minister extended to the member for Yarmouth, is such as he, occupying the position he does, should have extended towards a new member, even if the Minister had been correct instead of being, as he was, wholly in the wrong.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Return showing the amount expended in field work in connection with the Geological Survey of Canada in each province of the Dominion in each year from 1867 to 1890, inclusive.—(Mr. McLeod.)

Copies of the report of the enquiry held by J. B. Caouette, in 1890, respecting the abstraction from the post office at Isle Verte, of a newspaper addressed to a resident of that parish; of all letters from the Post Office Department to the said Caouette, and replies thereto, and of any report made by the said Caouette; also, of all official correspondence in relation to the said enquiry.—(Mr. Amyot.)

Return showing the number of bushels of potatoes exported from Canada, from 1st October, 1890, to 1st May, 1891, and the place to which exported.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Return showing the amount paid for the supplies required by the crews of the several Government vessels engaged in the Fishery Protection Service, in the Province of Ontario, for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1890; together with the names of parties from whom purchases were made, and the prices paid.—(Mr. Somerville.)

Statement showing the number of Sessional Clerks now employed by the House of Commons; the name of each of them, and date of appointment.—(Mr. Joncas.)

Copies of all tenders, both first and second calls, for sections one, two and three respectively, of the enlargement of the Rapide Plat or Morrisburg Canal, a division of the St. Lawrence Canals, the return to comprise the quantities of the several items in the schedule of prices on which the tenders were computed, and the aggregate of each tender. Also, copies of all correspondence, Orders in Council, reports of engineers relating to the tenders, or contracts, or works, or as to changes in location or of designs, and all estimates in detail of the cost of said works and the reason for rejecting the first batch of tenders.—(Mr. Murray.)

Copies of all correspondence and reports to Council on the subject of payment of subsidies to the Canadian, West Indian and South American Steamship Company, and to Messrs. Pickford and Black, or either of them, and for copies of all contracts between the Canadian, West Indian and South American Steamship Company (Limited), and Messrs. Pickford and Black, or either of them, and the Government, for the steam service between Canada and the West Indies, entered into during the year 1890. Also the names of persons or companies to whom the subsidies for the steam service between St. John, N. B., and the West Indies were paid, previously to the execution of the contract by the Canadian, West Indian and South American Steamship Company, and the amounts so paid, and dates. Also the amount paid, and dates when paid to such steamship company, after entering into the contract.—(Mr. Davies, P. E. I.)

Copies of all petitions, memorials, reports and Orders in Council in reference to the establishment of a post office at Campleton, in the County of Inverness, Nova Scotia.—(Mr. Laurier.)

Copies of all tenders for the construction of the Annapolis Public Buildings; a copy of the contract entered into with the Government for the construction of the same; a copy of the conveyance to the Queen of the land upon which the same are erected; a statement of all amounts paid to the contractor on account of the work, with dates of payment.—(Mr. Lister.)

Copies of all papers, correspondence and documents, together with the report of the Minister of Justice and Order in Council relative to the disallowing an Act passed by the Local Legislature of the Province of Manitoba on

the 31st day of March, 1890, intituled: "An Act to authorize companies, institutions or corporations incorporated out of this Province to transact business therein." —(Mr. Watson.)

Copies of all papers, correspondence and documents, together with reports of the Minister of Justice and Order in Council relating to the disallowance of an Act passed by the Local Legislature of the Province of Manitoba on the 31st day of March, 1890, intituled: "An Act respecting the Diseases of Animals."—(Mr. Watson.)

1. Copies of all reports and correspondence relating to the permit system, and the administration thereof: copies of all regulations under which liquor is brought into the North-West Territories and sold there: also, copies of all memorials addressed to the Government relating to the present system and the sale of liquors, and the replies to the same. 2. Copies of orders or regulations relating to the sale of liquor on passenger trains in the North-West Territories, and within the limits of Banff Park, and statement of kinds and quantities of liquor so sold.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Copies of all correspondence, memoranda, documents, letters, petitions and all papers whatsoever in relation to the encouragement of the cultivation of the sugar beet and the protection of the manufacture and refining of beet-root sugar in the Dominion of Canada.—(Mr. Beausoleil.)

ADJOURNMENT--PROHIBITION.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. With the view of adjourning, if possible, at six o'clock, I would ask the hon. member for Lanark if he would consent to postpone the Order of the Day which appears in his name?

Mr. JAMIESON. I have no objection, provided it is thoroughly understood ample opportunity will be given to close the debate and take a vote. If that is the understanding, I have no objection.

Some hon. MEMBERS. When?

Mr. FOSTER. I am sure the Government has no disposition to avoid the fullest discussion and the consummation of that discussion by a vote in the House, and, if my hon. friend sees fit to postpone this at the present time, he may rest assured that he will have an early opportunity for resuming the discussion and bringing the matter to a vote.

Mr. FRASER. As seconder of the resolution, I should like to know when it is to come up?

Mr. FOSTER. I said at an early date.

Mr. FRASER. If an early date means early next week, very well; but the people of the country will not be satisfied unless a proper opportunity is afforded for the sense of the House to be taken.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought the assurance I gave would be satisfactory to the House, but I am afraid my hon. friend (Mr. Fraser) has a lurking suspicion that the Government desire to burk this question. In that case I may relieve his mind. The Government has no such a desire, but wishes that every opportunity should be given for the discussion. I will say that on Wednesday evening next an opportunity will be given to the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) to bring forward his motion.

Mr. FRASER. I did not suspect the Government of any desire to burk this question, as I know the Government are only too anxious to deal with this matter in the interest of the country, but I simply wanted an explanation that would be definite as to what an early day meant.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand that the Government are willing to adjourn this evening. If the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) is not ready to go on with his motion, I will not object to the adjournment, because I believe every one expected this debate to go on this evening, and nearly all the other gentlemen who have orders on the paper are not ready to go on with the public Bills and Orders, so that we would, perhaps, sit for only half an hour. I understand, therefore, that the member for Lanark is willing to postpone his motion. He is better prepared to deal with this question than I am, but I may remind him that "to-morrow" is a very dangerous word in this House.

Mr. JAMIESON. The only object I have is to have this question thoroughly discussed by this House, and, so long as ample opportunity is given for this discussion, I cannot offer any opposition to a postponement. I desire that every opportunity should be given to hon. members on both sides of the House to give their views on this question, and I am quite satisfied to allow the matter to remain for a week from to-day when, I hope, it may be disposed of finally.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am unable to understand why the Government desire a postponement of this question, for it is evidently at the instance of the Government, that my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) has consented to a postponement. The temperance people of this country are anxious that this matter should be discussed, and it is somewhat suspicious that the Government have shown such a desire for postponing it. The other night the Government were defeated upon a motion for the adjournment of the debate, but afterwards they drummed up their forces.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think this is not the proper time to enter into a discussion of the motion itself.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am not discussing the question, but simply the motives of hon. gentlemen opposite in asking for an adjournment.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think my hon. friend will see the inconvenience of entering upon a discussion of the conduct of the Government at this stage. That can be done at the proper time, but the interruption of the order of business can only take place by consent.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I thought the understanding was that we would adjourn at six, and then on Wednesday next this measure will come up and be discussed as the hon. gentleman would discuss it to-day. If that is the understanding, I would suggest, in order to hasten the business of the House, we might, with the general consent, take up the private Bills.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 17) respecting the River St. Clair Railway Bridge and Tunnel Company.—(Mr. Montague.)

Bill (No. 19) respecting the Canada and Michigan Tunnel Company.—(Mr. Montague.)

Bill (No. 22) respecting the Lake Temiscamingue Colonization Railway Company.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 61) respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Carpenter.)

Bill (No. 62) to enable the Victoria and North American Railway Company to run a ferry between Becher Bay, in British Columbia, and a point in the Straits of Fuca, within the United States territory.—(Mr. Earle.)

Bill (No. 63) respecting the London and Port Stanley Railway Company.—(Mr. Hyman.)

Bill (No. 64) respecting the Berlin and Canadian Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Bowman.)

Bill (No. 65) respecting the Montreal and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

Bill (No. 66) to confirm a lease made between the Guelph Junction Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Henderson.)

Bill (No. 67) respecting the Victoria, Saanich and New Westminster Railway Company.—(Mr. Prior.)

Bill (No. 68) to amend the Act to incorporate the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Davis.)

Bill (No. 69) to confirm an indenture made between the New Brunswick Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 70) to incorporate the Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Company.—(Mr. German.)

Bill (No. 72) to incorporate the Peterborough, Sudbury and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company.—(Mr. Burnham.)

Bill (No. 73) respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Sutherland.)

Bill (No. 74) further to amend the Canadian Pacific Railway Act, 1889.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 75) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 77) respecting the Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company.—(Mr. LaRivière.)

Bill (No. 78) to confirm an agreement between the Shuswap and Okanagon Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and to confer further powers on the Shuswap and Okanagon Railway Company.—(Mr. Ross, Lisgar.)

THE PICTOU BANK.

Mr. McDOUGALD (Pictou) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 76) to amend an Act to authorize and provide for the winding-up of the Pictou Bank.

Mr. MULOCK. Is there a bank in Pictou being wound up?

Mr. McDOUGALD. This bank has been in course of liquidation for a good many years, and I have no doubt that if the hon. gentleman consulted some of his political friends in that county, they might give him more information than I can give. The bank is nearly wound up, and this is to continue the charter for the purpose of completing the winding up.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think there is some money due to the Government. I would like to know from the Minister of Finance what is the amount that was deposited there, what amount has been recovered, and what is the total indebtedness to us, if any?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not the information in my hands at this moment, but I will procure it for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. McDOUGALD. There is nothing due to the Government from the Pictou Bank.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has it all been paid?

Mr. McDOUGALD. There has nothing been due at any time, so far as I know.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think there was a deposit there.

Mr. FOSTER. There is nothing in the Public Accounts as an asset. I think, if there had been a claim, it would have been kept in the Public Accounts as an asset.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I rather think there is. Are you quite certain?

Mr. FOSTER. I looked through them the other night, when you spoke, but I did not find any. But I am told that my hon. friend, the mover of the Bill, is one of the liquidators of the bank, and I think he would know.

Mr. McDOUGALD. So far as I know, there has never been a deposit by the Government in the Pictou Bank.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What business does the Minister of Finance intend to take up on Friday?

Mr. FOSTER. There is a resolution I intend to introduce, and there may be a Bill or two, and immediately afterwards we will proceed with the Estimates.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 5.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 29th May, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. DESJARDINS (Hochelaga) presented the second report of the Committee appointed to supervise the official report of the Debates of the House of Commons.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 86) to incorporate the Brighton, Warkworth and Norwood Railway Company.—(Mr. Cochrane.)

Bill (No. 87) to revive and amend the charter of the Quebec Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Desjardins, L'Islet.)

Bill (No. 88) to incorporate the St. Catharines and Merritton Bridge Company.—(Mr. Gibson.)

Bill (No. 89) to incorporate the Kingston and Pontiac Railway Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Renfrew.)

Bill (No. 90) to amend the Act to incorporate the Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Cochrane.)

Bill (No. 91) to amend the Act authorizing the city of Winnipeg to utilize the Assiniboine River Water Power.—(Mr. Macdonald, Winnipeg.)

Bill (No. 92) to incorporate the Anglo-Canadian Electric Storage and Supply Company.—(Mr. Mackintosh.)

Bill (No. 93) to incorporate the Ontario and New York Bridge Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 94) respecting the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSION.

Mr. TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 95) further to amend the Act 36 Vic., chap. 61, respecting the Trinity House and Harbour Commission of Montreal. He said: This Bill is necessary in view of recent legislation which abolished harbour dues in the port of Montreal, to supply another constituency for the representative of the shipping interest on the harbour board. Instead of making the qualification consist of the amount of dues paid on shipping, the Bill provides that that shall be settled by the amount of tonnage represented by the shipping interest.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

HUDSON BAY RAILWAY.

Mr. DEWDNEY (for Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD) moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Tuesday next to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient, in order to enable the Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Railway Company to construct a railway from the city of Winnipeg to some point on the Saskatchewan River, to enter into a contract with such company for the transport of men, supplies, materials and mails for twenty years, and to pay for such services during the said term eighty thousand dollars per annum, such payment to be computed from the date of the completion of the said railway.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether, when he moves this resolution, he will be prepared to lay before the House anything in the nature of an estimate of the probable cost of the work to which he desires us to donate this grant, or whether any survey at all has been made of the route which it is proposed to traverse?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I shall be prepared to give all the information which the Government have in their possession, and I believe that in it will be found the information which the hon. gentleman asks for.

Motion agreed to.

DEVELOPMENT OF SEA FISHERIES.

Mr. TUPPER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Tuesday next to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient that an annual grant of $160,000 be made to aid in the development of the sea fisheries and the encouragement of the building and fitting out of improved fishing vessels, and the improvement of the condition of the fishermen.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this an additional grant to the sum of $150,000 or thereabouts now paid?

Mr. TUPPER. $10,000 in addition to the $150,000 now appropriated.

Motion agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

Mr. FOSTER presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, copies of papers relating to the sale of the Carleton Branch Railway to the city of St. John.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 26th May, 1891.

RECIPROCITY PAPERS.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It will be in the recollection of the House that about a week ago I stated, in answer to a question from the other side of the House, that the papers which were under our immediate disposal relating to the trade negotiations with the authorities at Washington, would be brought down in about a week, in advance of others in respect of which permission had to be obtained. It was fully the intention to have laid them on the Table to-day; but from something I have ascertained to-day, I have reason to believe that a delay of forty-eight hours may result in our being able to lay the correspondence on the Table complete. I thought it better to do that, with the permission of the House, in order that the papers may not be brought down in two batches; but if by Monday that expectation should not be realized, the papers which are in our hands will be then brought down. I may say that in order to hasten a definite answer on that subject a special messenger was despatched some time ago to Washington, and communication has been made by telegraph with the home authorities.

TRENT VALLEY CANAL.

Mr. BARRON. Before the Orders are proceeded with, I would like again to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works to the importance of laying on the Table the evidence upon which the Trent Valley Canal Commission based their report. I propose to discuss the question by way of resolution some time during the session, but it will be impossible to discuss it properly without having the evidence. If I moved for it in the ordinary way, the motion would probably not be reached this session; and, inasmuch as the Minister promised last session that the evidence, if not too voluminous, would be put into the hands of the members, I would ask now that it be placed on the Table without any motion being made therefor.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think the hon. gentleman should make a motion on Monday, and I will agree to it.

CHIGNECTO MARINE TRANSPORT RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to provide that the time for the completion of the works of the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company, Limited, shall, as respects their title to receive the subsidy heretofore authorized, be the 1st day of July, 1893, instead of the 1st July, 1890; also that all penalties, forfeitures and deductions incurred by the company under section 2 of chapter 4 of the Acts passed in 51st Victoria be remitted, and that said section 2 be repealed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before going into Committee, we ought to receive a distinct explanation from the hon. the Finance Minister of the state of the works, the amount expended on them to date, and all the reasons that lead him to ask for a further extension. The hon. gentleman is quite aware that there is a very great deal of doubt, I think on both sides of the House, as to the utility of this work at all; and we have extended the time, within my recollection, twice if not three times already. I doubt exceedingly whether this expenditure should be made; but, in any case, before being asked for an extension, we ought to have a statement from the Minister in charge of the reasons which lead him to propose a further delay.

Mr. FOSTER. It was my intention to give the House all the information my hon. friend has jus asked for. It is not necessary for me, of course, to go into the history of the undertaking, as of that hon. gentlemen on both sides are probably well aware. Suffice to say that the first legislation with reference to this scheme took place in 1882, when the company was incorporated by the Parliament of Canada. The Act of incorporation then made it necessary that the work should be commenced within three years, that is, within 1885, and should be finished within seven years, or 1889; and the amount of the subsidy to be given was $150,000 per year for twenty-five years. Nothing practical came as the result of that legislation, and in 1886 the subsidy was amended. Instead of $150,000 for twenty-five years, it was made $170,600 for twenty years, but along with that amendment there was a schedule containing an indenture between the company and the Crown, dated 4th March, 1886, binding the company to complete the work as before, on the 1st July, 1889. There was, therefore, no extension of time, but simply a rearrangement of the subsidy. In 1888, the Act was again amended, and the time for completion extended to the 1st July, 1890, with a further extension of two years until the 1st July, 1892, on condition that for every month of that further two years extension, required to complete the contract to the satisfaction of the Government, the company should pay a penalty of $5,000. The action which is contemplated at present, is to relieve the company of any penalties liable to be incurred under that clause, and to extend the time until the 1st July, 1893, but without the penalty stipulated in the preceding Act. As to what has been done, I may say, that I hold the progress estimates, which show the amount of work performed since late in 1888, when work was able to be commenced. In the Amherst dock and basin there have been, in round numbers, 285,386 cubic yards of clay excavated, leaving 116,404 cubic yards yet to be completed. On the Tidnish side, dock and basins, there have been 71,165 cubic yards of clay and 13,961 cubic yards of rock excavated, leaving to be done 76,608 cubic yards of clay and 7,044 cubic yards of rock. On the railway line itself the clay excavated amounts to 1,225,921 cubic yards, leaving only 33,650 to be done; and the rock to 149,524 cubic yards, leaving 45,127 to be done; so that the total, both of clay and rock excavation, amounts to 1,745,957, leaving 278,933 to be completed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does the department estimate the value of the work to be?

Mr. FOSTER. I will come to that later on. As to the progress of the work, apart from the excavations, it may be said that the steel rails and fastenings have all been delivered, and nearly all the hydraulic machinery necessary for the working is on the ground. Thirteen miles of track is already laid, and nine-tenths of the pine sleepers necessary for the road have been delivered. The costly and very elaborate shipping cradles are ready for shipment, the locomotives are being built at the Kingston works at present, and there remains to be done about one mile of grading. The dredging of the channel for the entry of vessels at Tidnish is well advanced, and the moles for the protection of vessels on the Tidnish side are finished. Altogether there have been expended, as is shown by the certified reports, without reading the different items, £580,175 sterling, or, in round numbers, about $3,000,000, leaving somewhere in the neighbourhood of $2,500,000 yet to be expended to complete the whole work and put it in running order with all the gear and equipment necessary. It may be said that, at present, although for the last few months not so much work has been done, there is a fairly large force of men on the work engaged in ballasting and at the stone and earth work. The reasons that have induced the Government to ask for a delay are, in brief, these: Of course, the work is one of very great magnitude, requiring a great deal of engineering skill. Although the contract was entered into in 1888, most of that year was consumed in preparations for the work. Advertisements had to be published, tenders called for, investigations made by the tenderers, and it was not until the latter part of the year that the work actually commenced. The next season a great deal of delay happened, on account of the extremely and unprecedented wet weather, the nature of the ground being such that continued wet weather overflows it and keeps it in an unworkable state. This very wet season during that year retarded the progress of the work to a very great extent. Then again, although at first it appeared that the number of feet in depth to which the excavations had to go, in order to reach solid bed rock, that is, in the basins and docks, would not exceed a certain amount, it afterwards was found that the excavations had to be made some 24 feet deeper, the other rock having proved to be loose rock or boulders. That, of course, added to the delay, the consequent amount of work being rendered thereby very much greater. Then, also, there was great difficulty found on the part of the contractors in procuring labour. Large railway works were being carried on in Cape Breton at that time, and the Digby and Annapolis Railway was being constructed, so that it was very difficult for the sub-contractors to procure men, although they offered a considerable bonus, and this scarcity of labour operated to delay the contractors. These are the chief reasons why the Government has been induced to ask that an extension of time shall be granted to the 1st

July, 1893. The company is as anxious to finish the work at as early a period as possible as the Government and the country are to have it completed. The company is under large penalties now in the way of the interest it is paying upon its capital and upon its stock, and these are a very large burden upon it and act as a considerable penalty, so the company is not anxious to delay the work beyond the time which is absolutely necessary for its completion. Then, again, financial troubles upon the London money market, with which hon. gentlemen are all acquainted and which had their effect upon very many companies and concerns, were a difficulty to be met by the promoters of this scheme. Taking all this into consideration, with the fact that the Government meets no money loss by the delay, as, by the terms of the contract, it does not pay any subsidy until the road is completed and running, the Government has been induced to ask for an extension of time to the 1st July, 1893. If the works are not then completed, of course the contract is off.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The scheme of this Chignecto Ship Railway has never met with very great acceptance from the Parliament of Canada, nor with much support from the public of the Maritime Provinces. In 1888, when the Government proposed to extend the time for the completion and to alter the subsidy, the scheme was discussed pretty thoroughly in Parliament, and, excepting from the gentleman who then occupied the position of Minister of Finance, there was very little defence of the scheme. The members from the Maritime Provinces appeared to agree that they did not think it was calculated to be of very great importance. In fact, I think they deprecated this work being built for, and as a concession to, the Maritime Provinces. I, for one, deprecate any such idea, and I hope it will not be spread abroad in the minds of hon. members. The members from the Maritime Provinces on either side of politics never asked for the construction of this road. I never knew of any petitions being presented from the Maritime Provinces asking for Government aid for the construction of the road. It was engineered and passed through Parliament almost entirely by Sir Charles Tupper, who was the Finance Minister in 1888. At that time, by the statute of 1882, the Government had bound itself to pay a subsidy of $150,000 for twenty-five years, and in 1888 that was changed to $170,600 for twenty years, which was equivalent to about $2,000,000. Then we granted an extension of time, and it was understood that, if the company did not complete the road within twenty-four months, or by 1890, it would be liable to a penalty of $5,000 a month. I understand that this measure is to relieve the company of the penalties they have now incurred and the further penalties they may incur. It would be of no use now to discuss the principle of the measure. The faith of Parliament has been pledged to the extent of $2,000,000, though as to the benefits which will accrue from that expenditure I have never heard any two members agree. I have heard men engaged in shipping and commercial men speak of this great experimental work—for it is only an experimental work—but I have never heard one who had complete confidence in it. I rise to protest against this being considered a work in the interest of the Maritime Provinces, and against the Maritime Provinces being charged with the money expended on the work, although it is being constructed in the Maritime Provinces. When we ask for expenditure on really useful works in the interest of the country, we are met on the threshold with the statement that so much has been already voted, and the first thing referred to is the $2,000,000 granted to the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway. I have not heard any representative express his opinion that this work will be of any use to the Maritime Provinces, and I protest against its being charged against those Provinces.

Mr. TUPPER. I quite repudiate the point the hon. gentleman has made, and I think it cannot fairly be borne out by investigation or by a reference to the past history of this extraordinary undertaking, for it is an extraordinary undertaking. The hon. gentleman has fairly stated to the House that, whatever the individual opinions may be as to the ultimate success or failure of the enterprise as an enterprise, Parliament is practically committed to the extension asked for, unless that extension were shown to be based on poor or meagre grounds. The hon. gentleman has not at any length combatted the reasons given by the Minister of Finance for the proposition before the House, and I would put it to the hon. gentleman's sense of fairness whether it is advisable, since there is a considerable amount of capital embarked in the undertaking in good faith, and since a considerable amount of work has been done in connection with it, that the statements he has made as to the merits of the scheme as a scheme should be forced upon the country, because the result, if it does not prevent the extension of time, will only be to put further obstacles in the way of the carrying out of the enterprise. I do not want to depart from the course taken by the hon. gentleman, who has not directly opposed the scheme, but I have the evidence under my hand to meet the view taken by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). That view is, that practically this scheme had no supporter in the House in 1888 except the then Minister of Finance, Sir Charles Tupper. Remembering that on many occasions there were no divisions taken in the House in opposition to it——

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman will excuse me. We divided the House in 1888. It was only carried on a party division.

Mr. TUPPER. On several occasions, if my recollection serves me aright, there was no division, though there was certainly one in 1888. But, considering that the measure was not always opposed, even when the proposition was for a ship railway instead of a ship canal, and considering the fact that that legislation succeeded a demand from the province which, the hon. gentleman says, is to reap no benefit therefrom, the Province of New Brunswick, I do not think the hon. member's position can be successfully sustained. He will recollect the late Mr. Elder, proprietor of the *Daily Telegraph*, in the city of St. John, who was a representative man in the very important district to be largely affected by the successful construction of this ship canal; that gentleman for years gave his attention and his very valuable time and consideration to the subject, first, as a canal proposition, and he appeared before the commission and gave his evidence as to the manner in which the

interests of the ports in the Bay of Fundy and the ports in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, would be benefited by the construction of a canal; and then, afterwards, I won't say he was animated with political hostility, but apparently, seeing that no action was to be taken, he did not throw up his hat as the hon. gentleman would have expected, and say: We were well rid of it, and the country would not suffer from any incubus of this kind. In his paper, the *Daily Telegraph*, the leading paper of that district, he began to upbraid the Government for its want of faith and its inaction in promoting this very ship railway scheme; and I will ask the House for permission to read an extract from the *Daily Telegraph* of 21st July, 1887:

"Some time since, in speaking of the Chignecto Marine Railway, we mentioned the fact that Sir Leonard Tilley, speaking in the House of Assembly in 1866, stated the construction of the Bay Verte Canal would, at an early date, be undertaken by the Government. We further observed that the canal, having been abandoned and the ship railway started in its stead, it is surely not too much to ask, after waiting twenty years, that the general Government shall assist the enterprising projector of the present scheme in such a manner as may secure its completion."

There is a demand for aid by the chief exponent of the Liberal press in the Province of New Brunswick at that time. The article concludes as follows:—

"We have had a marvellous patience in this matter, and have waited too long. When the Pacific Railway was completed we were told that now something would be done in the eastern provinces. * * * * Meanwhile New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, the two worst used provinces in the Dominion (because the National Policy injures both without compensating advantages)—

The hon. gentleman sees what a good Liberal he was——

—"are waiting for the ship railway."

Let me further support the position I take in answer to the hon. gentleman. The Hon. Peter Mitchell, in his recent utterances in Parliament, was not an advocate of this scheme, but we remember that Mr. Mitchell was an opponent of almost every scheme that the present Government introduced on the floor of this House. At any rate, I will call him as an impartial witness on the point raised by the hon. member for Queen's. The Montreal *Herald*, in its issue of 10th September, 1885, says:

"This railway will be of great use to those trading between the north shore of New Brunswick and the United States, as it gives them a short-cut to the seaports of the Republic. Prince Edward Island will be benefited in a similar manner, but in a less degree. Advantages from this connection by railway of the waters separated by the Isthmus of Chignecto, would no doubt arise, which have not been foreseen. This is always the result of increased facilities of communication. They create a trade for themselves."

Now, I trust the hon. gentleman from Queen's does not desire to raise greater objections to the future carrying out of this enterprise than the natural difficulties to which the hon. Minister of Finance has adverted. The only effect of going back from the merits of the scheme, beyond raising a long debate in this House, would be to prejudice, to some extent, the enterprise in the markets of the world. Now, with reference to the object of the railway, the hon. gentleman sees, from the references I have given, that the Province of New Brunswick, previous to Confederation, considered this work of sufficient importance to take hold of it; and a leading member, who served in the Legislature of that province, advocated it so warmly that he was charged afterwards with not having carried out the promises he made concerning it. During the Administration of the Mackenzie Government at Ottawa, the Legislature recognized the importance of that enterprise, and if my memory serves me right regarding the debate that occurred in 1888, it was shown then that the matter dropped from executive action owing to the report of Mr. Page, which showed that to carry it out as a Government work would require an expenditure of $8,000,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He is referring entirely to the project of constructing a canal.

Mr. TUPPER. Certainly, they are inseparably connected, because I submit that the canal scheme having dropped the railway scheme took its place, as it promised to give the same quick connection between the northern ports and the ports of the Bay of Fundy and on the American coast. Owing to the report of Mr. Page that the construction of a canal would probably cost the sum of $8,000,000 for a 14-foot navigation, and that the work could not then be proceeded with, this scheme then came forward as a private enterprise, for which they asked a subsidy in the nature of a guarantee for twenty years, which was the limit of the expenditure for which the Government would become responsible. Now, I do not wish to travel any further than the hon. gentleman, though there is much to be said in reference to the merit of the scheme. I did not profess to speak from any personal knowledge of the question of construction, but it is a subject commanding now the attention and the study of the ablest engineers in the world. There is an interesting article in the *Nineteenth Century* for March last, to which I would call the attention of the House, before the next stage of this measure is taken. It is written by a very eminent engineer, Sir Benjamin Baker, who, referring to the work now done, says:

"The state of the works of the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway at the present time, is as follows:—The hydraulic lifts and the machinery as previously described, together with the hydraulic traversers for shunting laterally sections of the cradle, with small coasting vessels on them, off the main line on to sidings, have been almost completed and shipped by the manufacturers, Messrs. Easten & Anderson; the cradles are well advanced at the works of Messrs. Handysides; the earthworks of the line and docks remaining to be done are only about one-eighth of the total quantity, and the whole of the permanent way has long since been on the ground. It will be seen, therefore, that, as little remains to be done but the completion of the masonry and the erection of the machinery, there is good reason to hope that the much-debated question of ship railways *versus* canals will soon receive a practical answer by the opening of the Nova Scotia undertaking."

Mr. WELSH. I would not have said anything in regard to this matter except that Prince Edward Island has been brought into the discussion. The Minister of Marine has given the House to understand that the Island will be benefited by this scheme. I have denounced it every time it has been brought before this House, and I denounce it now; and I say that when this company has had eight or nine years to carry out this work and has only made use of three years of that time, and now asks for an extension of time and to be relieved from the penalties involved from non-fulfilment of contract, the boot is on the other leg. If they had had a claim against the Government which had been put aside, they would have claimed damages to the extent of millions. I have read the article quoted by the Minister of Marine; and as regards

the engineers, I would not give two-pence for their opinions. They are full of theories; the engineering difficulties no doubt can be conquered and the railway completed, and Canada will have to pay $2,000,000, although the railway will not be worth one cent when completed. Talk about granting $125,000 a year as a subsidy, I say this is boodleism carried out to a great extent. Talk about wild-cat schemes, this is one of the most wild-cat schemes that ever entered into the imagination of anyone. As I was afraid the Minister of Marine might subsequently say that this resolution passed the House without opposition, I protest against it. I should like to give it the six months' hoist. How many men in Canada have a dollar or a cent invested in this scheme? The money is that of English capitalists, and the credit of Canada will be injured when this scheme is exposed and the railway proves to be a failure. I told the late House that if the Government brought a shipowner, or a man engaged in the shipping business who had invested a dollar in the scheme, I would hold my tongue, but I never heard such was the case. If there were any honourable way of getting out of the scheme I should like to see it adopted, because it is only going to be a swindle.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I should like to ask the Minister of Finance, who has charge of the resolution, what reasons there are for releasing the company from the penalties under which they at present labour; and, if he thinks it is a proper thing to do, why the penalties should have been inserted in the first instance?

Mr. FOSTER. All I have to say is this: that the reasons which I have assigned for the extension of the time, and I gave them in full, are reasons also, if they are good for an extension of the time, why the company should be left free from the disabilities which according to the Act they have incurred for non-fulfilment. They would not have had to ask for an extension of time if it had not been for the inevitable delay, and it is on that account we also base our action in proposing the relief of penalties, which would not have been incurred if those reasons for delay had not existed, because they themselves have endeavoured to have the project carried out at the earliest possible date. They are paying interest on capital at the rate of about 7 per cent., and a large penalty in interest is therefore involved. The Government, if it errs at all, generally errs on the side of generosity against private individuals or companies. There is one thing to be remembered, and it is this: The hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Welsh) no doubt honestly opposes the scheme, but if the scheme does not work and is a failure, and if the ship railway is not operated, there is no liability incurred by the Government, because the Dominion does not pay unless the railway is worked.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is true; but injury will be done to the Dominion if the statement proves—as my hon. friend's experience in this matter no one will dispute—correct. If the scheme proves a failure, I have no doubt the credit of the Dominion will be, *pro tanto*, injured, and very largely so from the fact that the Government have associated themselves with this railway. The fact of Parliament granting a subsidy of $170,000 a year for twenty years to this railway will imply in the minds of English capitalists, from whose pockets I take it this money is expected, that the Canadian Government has looked into the work, that they believe it to be a valuable work, and it may fairly be implied that the Government believe it to be reasonably profitable to those people whose money we are practically securing in consequence of our having granted a subsidy. We have found in time past that the granting of our credit, or the giving of a guarantee by the Dominion for a work of this character, which proves entirely unprofitable, injures the chance of Canadians obtaining money for really useful and sound projects. That is the point which the Government should consider, which is the duty of the Government to consider, and in regard to which they may rightly be called on to answer. Before granting this subsidy, on the strength of which large sums are to be extracted from the pockets of other people not resident in Canada, the Government should assure themselves that there is a reasonable prospect that fair interest will be paid on the investment.

Mr. FOSTER. We are in the situation we occupy, and I would ask which would be the worse position for the Canadian Government to occupy? We have endorsed the work by so much as it is endorsed by our granting a subsidy. That endorsement has already been given. In view of that, whatever it may imply, British capitalists having expended $3,000,000 on the work, would it not be a worse position to occupy if an extension of time for two years, which costs us nothing, should stand in the way of the completion of the work, and consequently the investors would lose everything placed in the undertaking? I believe a good deal in the judgment of the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Welsh), but when he snaps his fingers at all engineers, he is a little extravagant in his criticism. As the hon. member said, this is an experiment. It is impossible to say it will not succeed. From my own point of view, according to what little study I have given to it, I believe that, from an engineering standpoint, it will thoroughly succeed; and I am not prepared to say, in view of the development of the trade of this country and the seaboard towns to the south of us, that the Chignecto Ship Railway may not, within the course of not very many years, prove to be advantageous far beyond the anticipations of even its advocates in this House. I know that, at the present time, a steamship corporation is being organized to run vessels between different points north and south and use the railway, and it is not impossible, in view of the development that has taken place in this country, that this railway may prove a paying concern. At all events, I will not take the responsibility, either of damning it with faint praise or offering it open opposition.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the railway be such as the hon. gentleman describes, it will be the greatest kindness to English investors to stop investments now. They had better lose $3,000,000 than five, six, or seven millions. But that is not entirely the point. We have already granted two or three extensions to this company; we have done all we could reasonably be called on to do, and I

do not see that we can now be called on to do more either honestly or in good faith.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understand the effect of the resolution will be, in addition to extending the time, which, I must say, I cannot take very strong ground against, to remit the penalties already incurred and to provide that no penalties shall be incurred in the future, whether they build their railway in the time specified or not.

Mr. FOSTER. If the railway is not built by that time, the all-important penalty exists, that they get no subsidy.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We will have the same story over again.

Mr. FOSTER. It will be in our own hands then to decide.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The same argument which now induces Parliament to extend the time would impel it to continue extending it if the obstacles in the way show that it is reasonable the time should be extended. So far as the English investors are concerned they are not making such a very bad bargain of it. In the first place, the Act provides that so long as the railway is operated, after it is built, we are obliged to pay an annual subsidy of $170,000. If the railway is ready to carry a ship across, and even if a shipowner would not trust his ships across that railway, they can operate the road by carrying cars or scows or perhaps a schooner or two across, and there is no doubt that, under the wording of the Act, they will be able to operate the road sufficiently to obtain the subsidy. Whether this ship railway becomes a commercial benefit or not, or whether or not large numbers of ships take advantage of it, is a speculation for the future: but, as I have said, the road can be operated so as to earn the subsidy, and so far as the English investors are concerned they get from the people of Canada 3 per cent. interest for twenty years on the $6,000,000 which is the estimated cost of the road. The English investors are, therefore, not running a very great risk: the burden is going to fall upon the Canadian people, and the Canadian people are paying the money by the vote of this Parliament in support of, and to build up, a scheme in which I think my hon. friend was correct when he said he could not find a man in Canada who was prepared to take a dollar's worth of stock in it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the hon. the Minister of Finance able to state who are the shareholders, or whether there are any of the shareholders in the Dominion of Canada?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not the list of shareholders.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is a piece of information which the hon. gentleman should present to the House when asking that this resolution should pass. He ought likewise to have the estimate of the Public Works Department as to the probable cost of building this ship railway. He ought to be provided with some reasonable details showing us how this concern is likely to work out. The Minister of Finance may be correct or he may not; he appears to be unwilling to commit himself in the slightest degree to assert that this will be a commercial success, and I think he is wise in doing so, for I doubt extremely that there is any chance of its being a success. Upon this question the hon. gentleman was quite silent. I think, however, we should have the two items of information which I ask for. We ought to know all about these shareholders when they are applying to this Parliament to be relieved from certain penalties.

Mr. WELSH. Before I vote for this resolution, which, as my hon. colleague (Mr. Davies) said, we cannot very well refuse, I would move that before this extension of time goes into force the company should deposit with the Government a list of the shareholders in that undertaking, so that the people of Canada will be able to judge who are the investors. I am very anxious to get this information. This ship railway has been frequently discussed in this Parliament and all the benefits which it is said we are going to derive from it have been laid before the House in glowing colours. We have been told that ships will be enabled to sail on dry land across this railway with their sails set, and all this sort of high-falutin stuff. I want to know who are the men engaged in this enterprise, because I understand that there is not a practical shipping man connected with it, and that it is promoted entirely by engineers and men of theory. I have grave doubts in my mind about the success of this ship railway, but I have no doubt that it will be a failure as far as any practical benefit to this country is concerned. I certainly believe that the list of shareholders should be deposited with the Government before this resolution goes into effect.

Mr. FRASER. I take it for granted that the Government must have in their possession a list of the shareholders, for I cannot conceive that they would pay so much money to any company without knowing who the shareholders are.

Mr. FOSTER. We have not paid anything yet.

Mr. FRASER. But the Government propose to pay the money, and they should have the names of the shareholders of the company before they submit such a proposition as this to the House. I wish to emphasize what the hon. member for Queen's has said. I am glad to know that none of the extracts which have been read have crossed the border, for, if the people of New Brunswick want this ship railway, I am glad to see that no statement has been made that the people of Nova Scotia want anything of it. As one of the members from the Province of Nova Scotia I wish to state that no man in that province feels like acknowledging that one dollar of this money to be expended for the ship railway is to be paid in the interest of Nova Scotia. In corroboration of what has been said by the senior member for Queen's (Mr. Davies)—not senior in age, but in the date of his election—I wish to say that I have not found a shipbuilder or a shipowner in the Province of Nova Scotia, nor have I found any intelligent man there who is prepared to say that this ship railway is going to be a success. I do not think it is wrong to state this on the floor of Parliament. Surely a reference made here to the fact that there are men who do not believe that it is going to be a success ought not to prevent the men who are engaged in the enterprise from proceeding with it. If this statement did prevent them, then it would be proof positive at once that it never can be a success, and, consequently, we would be justified in saying now that we do not believe it will ever

be a success. I might give the name of one of the best informed shipowners in Nova Scotia who made the statement to me that if every ship passing along that coast which might cross over that ship railway, did go across the railway, even then it would not pay. Every one knows that the ships will not take the risk or incur the expense of crossing, and that they would rather spend a day, or two, or three, or four days, or not more than six days at most in sailing round rather than run all the risk incurred in crossing on the railway. While I state this I cannot in any way conceive that the statement will interfere with the success of the railway if it can be a success; but my object is to state upon the floor of Parliament, as one member from Nova Scotia, that the people of our province do not hold themselves responsible for the expenditure of this money, nor do they believe it is in any way a grant to them. It would be infinitely better for the people of Nova Scotia if $3,000, or $4,000, or $5,000 were spent in different places all around the coast constructing and repairing harbours and places of refuge for the safety of our hardy fishermen, and to enable them to carry on their calling. It would be a thousand times better, if the money were expended in this way, rather than by sinking it in this ship railway. I presented a petition here the other day asking to have a comparatively small sum of money expended in the County of Guysborough, in a place where the hardy fishermen have no accommodation for their boats, but nothing was done in the matter, while millions will be spent on a ship railway which, I believe, will never be successful, and which will be a standing monument to the folly of those who promoted it. It would be far better for the people of that province if the money voted by Parliament were applied to assisting the fishermen to profitably pursue their trade, for we would receive an extra amount of revenue from the greater quantity of fish which they would catch, thus enabling them to contribute more largely to the revenue, while by investing money in this ship railway we are paying out money all the time and get no revenue in return. It should be the policy of every good Government that no money should be spent without bringing in some adequate return to the treasury, or without conferring some benefits upon the people at large.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend is some days behind the fair. It does seem to me, that there is a marked distinction between the criticism offered by my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) and the criticism of my hon. friend who has just sat down. The hon. member for Queen's, while he criticized the object of this resolution, namely, the taking away of the penalty and the extension of time, yet knowing that the principle had been affirmed by Parliament, that a large sum of money had been invested in this venture, and that, as he said himself, it was at least entitled to be placed in the category of an experiment the outcome of which cannot be foretold—while he made this criticism, did not attempt to state to the House and to have his statement go abroad, to be taken up by any person who had an interest in it, the wide world over, that not a ship would sail over this railway, that it was bound to be a failure, and that it would be a monument of folly. My hon. friend who spoke last, to be consistent, should have moved, and moved at once, that Parliament do not keep faith with this company, that no extension of time be given, and that we shut down on the whole thing; but, if he does not intend to do that and be consistent, he has not taken the most desirable course in standing up and declaring that this undertaking can never be a success, that it must always be a monument of folly, and that not a ship will ever go over it.

Mr. FRASER. I did not say that. I said what was stated to me, that, if every passing ship took the risk of going over it, it would not pay. I did not say that no ship would go over it.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend would be quite consistent in taking the course he did, if he were prepared to say that we should break faith with the company; but as Parliament has pronounced on the policy and has made a promise to the company, and as the company has gone on relying upon that promise, what is the use, what is the practical benefit to Canada in hon. gentlemen saying that it will be an utter failure and a monument to the folly of Canada? It is impossible in these days of invention to say what may or what may not be a failure in the line of new carrying facilities. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down reminds me of a gentleman who lived in the province from which I come—he is not now living—and who predicted that the railway between St. John and Pointe du Chêne would be such a failure that it would not pay for the grease to oil the axles of the cars; and yet to-day there is no better paying piece of road in Canada. As I stated before, the ground of criticism taken by my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) was entirely right; but I cannot see that he gave reasons which should in any respect justify hon. gentlemen in standing up in their representative positions in Parliament and declaring, forsooth, that what they have said is an experiment is certain not to succeed, and attempting to throw obstacles in the way of an enterprise which has already encountered sufficient obstacles. The engineers in charge of that undertaking are engineers of eminence, and they have faith in the carrying capacity of that railway, to take up ships and move them from one side of that neck of land to the other side, without strain or damage, and at a very low rate of cost. There are, of course, obstacles and difficulties; but are we justified in saying, they cannot be overcome? They have been overcome in other cases than this, and why should we say it is not possible that they can be overcome in this case? Once let it be demonstrated that ships can be taken up at Tidnish without strain, be carried over dry land and deposited in the water on the other side, and at a low cost, and I see no reason why we should not come to the conclusion that for the developing trade of Canada this may not become a travelled highway for vessels making ports south and north, enabling them to avoid travelling around Cape Breton or going through the Gut of Canso.

Mr. WELSH. My hon. friend is not a ship builder, that is certain, and I do not think he knows much about it. The marine slips, which take ships out of the water, are only perhaps 200 yards long, and yet a considerable number of the ships taken up by them get strained and damaged. In building a ship, the foreman has to keep the ship in shape while it is standing on the blocks; he has to go around those blocks every day and

keep them shored up so that there will be as little strain on the ship as possible; and in launching there is not one ship in ten that is not strained before it reaches the water. And yet the hon. gentleman, a man of theory without any practical experience, tells me that this railway will take up these ships loaded, carry them over the land, and dump them into the water again without doing them any injury. When this Bill was first brought in, I proposed to put in a clause to make the company guarantee to pay any damages that might be done to ships carried by it; but Parliament refused to do so. The hon. Minister of Marine talked about the Baie Verte Canal. We know that this talk about that strip of land has been going on for twenty years. At the time that a commission was sent to enquire into the question of the Baie Verte Canal I was examined before that commission, as well as a number of masters of ships in the Imperial service; and that project was denounced, for this reason, that the navigation of the Bay of Fundy was not favourable to shipping. The hon. member for Guysborough is quite right in the view he takes, because if every ship which required to do so took a short cut by that railway, it would not pay expenses; but that is a matter we have nothing to do with. We are in this work, and we cannot honourably get out of it. If we could, I would move the six months' hoist, but we cannot, and it would be like taking an unfair advantage of this company if we threw out this Bill. The wrong has been done, if it is wrong, and we have to swallow it; but I know this, that if any company had the hold on us that we have on this company, we would have to pay for it pretty sweetly.

Mr. FOSTER. I forgot to state that there is no objection to bringing down the list of shareholders, and I will have that brought down.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And you might bring also a statement of what we have spent.

Mr. FOSTER. We have spent nothing. We have no liability but the subsidy.

Mr. DICKEY. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Welsh) I understand, does not object to an enlargement of the time, which he admits is almost inevitable; but in order to get rid of the weight of his judgment, which I know is considerable on naval matters, I would remind him that other people of very high reputation entertain a contrary opinion as to the safety with which vessels can be transported over land on railways of this kind; and I think the hon. gentleman should not be too set in his opinion, and should not hold the experience which he has gained in battling with the seas to entirely overweigh the experience of others who are equally sincere and who hold equally strong opinions on the other side. One of the most distinguished authorities on ship-building in the world is Sir E. J. Reed, the chief constructor of the British navy. He is a man on whose report the Parliament of Great Britain votes millions of dollars without a word, upon whose reports that Parliament alters its whole plan of naval construction. He is a gentleman whose opinion is accepted in the most unhesitating manner, and Sir Edmund J. Reed has given it as his opinion that ships, not only of one thousand tons but of five thousand tons, may be lifted out of the ocean, not 18 feet but 40 feet, and carried, not 17 miles, but across the Isthmus of Tehuantepec, which I believe is 117 miles. Therefore, the junior member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Welsh), when giving his opinion, should reflect that there are others equally sincere who hold equally strong opinions contrary to his.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not want to enter into any discussion of the technical question as to whether it is feasible to construct this railway in such fashion as to carry ships. That is entirely outside the question, but with all deference to the views expressed by the hon. gentleman opposite, I am not prepared, for my part, even indirectly to sanction the doctrine laid down by the Finance Minister, at least apparently laid down by him, that people who enter into a contract with this Government are to be relieved from the penalties we expressly declare should be inflicted upon them if they do not fulfil it within a given time, or that there is anything dishonourable in our refusing to implement a contract which these gentlemen are not prepared on their side to fulfil. If the case were reversed, I know well these people would exact the last farthing from us; and we have the right to exact, and it is not a breach of faith, in my judgment, to exact, when we see fit, the letter of the bargain in matters of this kind, more especially as we have already in this instance altered the terms and extended the time for the contractors' convenience. That is my opinion, and I do not want the impression to go abroad that the Commons of Canada are bound to allow people to alter the terms of their contracts at their own convenience.

Mr. WELSH. I compliment the hon. member for Cumberland on standing up in defence of this ship railway. It is a great benefit to his county, for I believe the whole three or four million dollars will be spent in that county. He has the right to stand up for it. It has brought in a good deal of capital to his county, and done it a good deal of good. But while my hon. friend brought forward the names of engineers high in authority in the Admiralty, while he mentioned as authority one of the head draughtsmen and surveyors of the Admiralty, Mr. Reed, who I have no doubt is quite competent, will he tell me why he could not name some competent man in the Dominion connected with shipping who would approve of it? He went to the British Navy and Admiralty to bring out an engineer and draughtsman and superintendent to prove that steel ships could be carried over this railway. Well, this is a Canadian undertaking. It is not proposed that we are going to carry steel ships over this railway, but the general run of vessels, small fishing vessels and wooden ships, and I would be glad to see some competent shipping man in the Dominion approving of this scheme.

Mr. HAZEN. I do not rise for the purpose of making any extended remarks concerning the merits or demerits of the ship railway across the Isthmus of Chignecto, but I cannot allow to go unchallenged the statement of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Welsh) concerning the navigation of the Bay of Fundy. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that when he gave evidence before the commission, which was considering the advisability of constructing the canal which has since had its place taken by the ship railway, one of the reasons which he urged strongly against the construction of the canal was the dangerous character of the navigation of the Bay of Fundy. That statement has done service

over and over again to the detriment of the trade of the port of St. John and the ports along the coast of the Bay of Fundy in every direction. So serious was the effect of such misrepresentation in different parts of the world that some few years ago the Board of Trade of St. John directed their attention to the matter, and published a pamphlet on the subject, which I fear the hon. gentleman has not had the pleasure of reading.

Mr. WELSH. Yes; I read it.

Mr. HAZEN. If he had, I feel satisfied he would not, from his place in this House, especially as he is a representative of one of the Maritime Provinces, make a statement so detrimental to the interests of another Maritime Province, in whose interests we, as members of the Maritime Provinces, ought to be bound together by one common feeling. That pamphlet clearly disproves the slanders circulated in the past about the Bay of Fundy. One might well say, on hearing the remarks of the hon. gentleman: "Save me from my friends," as the impression created by remarks such as he has made, scattered broadcast, not only throughout this country but all over the world where people are interested in shipping, has been to lead people to believe that the Bay of Fundy is almost impassable for navigation; that it is full of currents, against which no vessel can make headway, and that any vessel entering the bay is about to undertake a most perilous journey. Investigation has shown, however, that there are as few mishaps in the bay as in any other waters in any part of the world; that few wrecks occur there; that there are not a great many days of fog during the year, that it is eminently safe for navigation. Therefore, statements such as those made by the hon. gentleman, which have inured to the detriment of our shipping interests, are not warranted by the facts; and I am sure it will afford me great pleasure to send a copy of the pamphlet to the hon. gentleman, in order that he may no longer be under a misapprehension of the real facts of the case. With regard to the Chignecto Railway, I do not pretend to be a practical man in matters of that kind and to be able to give an opinion that would be of any value; but it must be borne in mind, as pointed out by the hon. Minister of Marine, that, a few years ago, a gentleman of great authority, one of the leaders of the Liberal party in New Brunswick, the Hon. Wm. Elder, a man who influenced more the public opinion of his province through his journal than any other man in it, was firmly convinced, not only of the practicability of the scheme, but also of the advantage which would accrue from the building of such railway, and he used his great ability to urge upon the Government and to arouse a sentiment in the country which would influence the Government to grant sufficient aid to enable the work to be carried to completion. Concerning the feasibility of the work, I am not a judge, but we have the opinion of the most eminent engineers that it is feasible; and if it be not then we can place no reliance upon the opinion of men eminent in their profession, and whose reputation is not limited by the boundaries of the country in which they live. Statements have been made in this House to the effect that the road cannot pay. Whether it can or not, only time will decide after the road is completed; but it must be remembered that never has a great enterprise been undertaken in this country, no matter what, against which similar prophecies have not been made. It must be borne in mind, as stated by the hon. Minister of Finance, that the leading Liberal politician of his time in New Brunswick, who occupied a portfolio in the Government of Mr. Mackenzie, said at the time of the construction of the road from St. John to Shediac, that it would never pay for the grease on the wheels, and he furthermore said it would pay the province better to hire two four-horse coaches and keep them constantly on the road for the carriage of passengers than to build that railway. Every man in the House knows that there is no line of railway in Canada over which there is a greater amount of traffic, or which pays better, than that portion of the Intercolonial Railway from St. John to Shediac. Then, when the enterprise of the Canadian Pacific Railway was before the country, we had the statement made by a practical man that the whole wealth of the British Empire could not complete that railway within the time specified, and yet it was completed five years before that time. Consequently, in view of the present development of science and engineering skill, it is scarcely safe to make prophecies of this sort, such as the member for Guysborough has made, as the past has shown that they are, in many cases, all falsified by the facts.

Mr. WELSH. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) has referred to a pamphlet which was brought up by the people of that city to show that their harbour was fitted for a winter port.

Mr. HAZEN. It was as to the general character of the port of St. John.

Mr. WELSH. If the hon. gentleman has read that pamphlet, he will find that there is considerable fog there. I was one of a commission sent down to report on the feasibility of the Baie Verte Canal. While I was there, I saw an old gentleman who had been in the Imperial Navy. I asked him what he thought of the Bay of Fundy. He had been sailing as master of a ship for forty or fifty years, and he said the navigation of the Bay of Fundy was the most difficult he had ever encountered in his life. I asked him if there was much fog there, and he said it was the worst fog he ever got in the world, and I think the fog must have got over my hon. friend from St. John. I think he is befogged. I do not blame my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Dickey), because the money is going into his pocket or the pocket of his people, but I am sure that my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Hazen) is befogged. They asked this old shipmaster——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the name of the Ancient Mariner?

Mr. WELSH. I have no objection to give his name. He was a strong man, but his name was not Samson. His name was Salmon—a fishy name, but a good name. He said: "I have been all over the world, and I never saw the fog so thick as in the Bay of Fundy; it was so thick that I could make a looking-glass of my hand by holding it up and looking at it." I hope my hon. friend from St. John will bring this pamphlet here, and then, if my statement is not correct, I will apologize.

Mr. GILLMOR. I do not think the character of the Bay of Fundy comes into this discussion, and,

if it does, I do not think it is becoming on the part of members from the Maritime Provinces to decry it. Ships have been coming into the Bay of Fundy during all the past, and they will come in in the future. I have never heard that the freights to the Bay of Fundy were higher than those going to the north shore. As to this ship railway I have no experience, but for many years the project of the Baie Verte Canal was a popular project in New Brunswick, and I believe that, when we went into Confederation, it was understood that we should have that canal as an offset to the large expenditures which had been made on canals in other parts of Canada. Of course, the Intercolonial Railway had not been built at that time, and therefore much of that traffic came down the north shore, and it was understood that the Baie Verte Canal would facilitate trade between the St. Lawrence and the Bay of Fundy. Under the Government of Mr. Mackenzie, a commission was appointed to investigate that matter, and one of the commissioners was Mr. Lawrence of St. John, who did not agree with the majority and produced a minority report which differed very much from that of the majority as to the cost of the canal. Now, the Intercolonial Railway has made that of much less importance than it was, and I hope that the number of ships coming into the Bay of Fundy will increase; and, when we open our ports to the world, as a free trade country, there will be no talk about fogs. The trade will increase, and then it may be that this enterprise will pay. However, I have very little faith in this enterprise. I do not load any ships and I never expect to, but I would be very much afraid to send any ships across that railway. We are appropriating something like $3,500,000 for that purpose, and that is a large subsidy to give to an enterprise like this, and at present, at least, it appears to be very extravagant when there are other undertakings which would be of so much more benefit. But what I want to know is why we should relieve the company from the penalties? If it was necessary at the inception of this enterprise to put the penalties in, why should we remove them now? That is what I cannot understand.

Mr. DICKEY. I want to lift that fog, if possible. I would remind the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Welsh), that the people who have the most interest in the question of fog, in regard to navigation, are the insurance companies, and I should like to know why the insurance from the Bay of Fundy to Great Britain is one-quarter per cent. less than the insurance from ports south of Cape Tormentine to Great Britain?

Mr. WELSH. Will the hon. gentleman tell me what rate they charge from the Bay of Fundy to Great Britain, and I will tell him what rate they charge from the St. Lawrence to Great Britain.

Mr. DICKEY. At what season?

Mr. WELSH. Can you tell me?

Mr. DICKEY. At what season?

Mr. WELSH. Say now.

Mr. DICKEY. 2 per cent.

Mr. WELSH. What do they charge on a cargo of lumber or grain?

Mr. DICKEY. Less than 1 per cent, as I am informed.

Mr. WELSH. Then you do not know. I can give you the information. You have come to the right shop. You are wrong altogether.

Mr. BOWERS. As to the fog in the Bay of Fundy; as one who has traded between St. John and Westport for 15 years, I say there cannot be any place in the world with more fog than the Bay of Fundy. I have known the time when for two or three weeks you could scarce see the light of the sun. Any person living in St. John must know that there is no place with more fog than that city and harbour, and I cannot understand how anyone can say that there is no more fog there than elsewhere. If I ask for $1,000, or $3,000, or $5,000 for repairing breakwaters in Digby county, I am told there is no money, while here we find that $3,500,000 is to be expended in the next 20 years as a subsidy to the Chignecto Marine Railway. Mr. Speaker, $170,000 each year for 20 years would build up all the breakwaters required in Nova Scotia, as well as all other parts of the Dominion, and would be productive of more good. I think if this money is to be spent, and I suppose it will have to be, I protest against Nova Scotia being charged for any part of it, and I hope the Government will take steps to see that the work is efficiently done as well as worked afterwards so that we shall not suffer for it.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I was very much surprised at the remark of the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Welsh), with regard to the statement which had just been made by my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Dickey). I have had some experience in shipping myself, although, perhaps, not as much as my hon. friend opposite, but I am sure, and I think he must know, that the rates of freight from ports on the Bay of Fundy, and the rates of insurance, are quite as low as they are from ports on the north shore. He asked for rates at the present time. I have a statement from my hon. friend from Gloucester (Mr. Burns), and it quite agrees with my own views on the subject, that the present rates of insurance from ports on the Bay of Fundy are about 10s. on steamers and about 17s. 6d. on sailing vessels; while from Miramichi and places on the north shore, they are about 2s. 6d. higher. I do not intend to discuss the merits of this ship railway scheme; I do not think it is the proper time to do so. I think what we have now to consider is the question of good faith between the Government and the company which has entered upon the construction of this work. I quite agree with the senior member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) that it would be a bad thing for this country not to give this extension of time. I cannot fully endorse what he stated with regard to the paying of this subsidy. If I read aright the Act granting the subsidy, the Government has taken special precautions with regard to the payment of this subsidy; it is only payable after the completion of the work; it is only payable annually after the work is in successful operation. This, as I understand it, throws the whole responsibility of the completion and successful operation of this great enterprise upon the company who are constructing the work. I think that is a strong reason why the request which is made by the company should be granted, and why the resolution which is moved by the Minister of Finance should be accepted by this House.

Mr. WELSH. I am not going to take a back seat, even if my hon. friend the Minister of Marine desires it. The hon. gentleman from Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) is in the same position as my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Dickey); they are neighbours alongside of the railway, it is going through their counties, and I have no doubt the hon. gentleman makes a very nice pile out of this railway. So far as his rates of insurance are concerned, I will say this: that I do not agree with him. I did not hear all his remarks, but I can guess a large part of them, at any rate. He tells us that the rates of freight and insurance from ports in the Bay of Fundy are less than from places on the north shore. There are different ports in the Bay of Fundy, and he knows that the rates of freight at the head of the bay, where this railway dumps the vessels, are much higher than they are from the Baie Verte, from the other side, during the summer months. He knows very well that the rate of insurance is high enough, and the rates of freight are high enough. But I know that the rates of freight from St. John and the entrance of the Bay of Fundy are less. It is no use for the hon. gentleman to try to mislead the House by talking of the Bay of Fundy as one port. Let him name a port in the Bay of Fundy.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I will name West Bay, or Parrsborough at the head of the Bay of Fundy.

Mr. WELSH. I know where Parrsborough is, but how far is Parrsborough from the point where this railway is going to dump ships into the water? Let him answer that. I know the Bay of Fundy, and I know the port of Tidnish as well as the hon. gentleman does, and I have sailed 150 sailing vessels there myself. I know what I am talking about, and I can get cargoes insured now for 12s. 6d. from Charlottetown to London. Can you quote a lower rate than that?

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I can get them insured for 10s.

Mr. WELSH. You can put the half-a-crown into your pocket.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance why this company is relieved of penalties? The Act, chapter 4, 51 Vic., section 2, provides for the payment by the company of certain penalties. I would ask the Minister why he amended the Act of 1888 in this regard?

Mr. FOSTER. I explained that, but my hon. friend did not, perhaps, hear it. The reasons I gave on the introduction of the resolution were reasons for the extension of the time and the taking away of the penalties, those that may have been incurred, and those which were to be incurred, by the clause of that Act. I gave the reasons in full to the House, and I will repeat them briefly. The first was the delay which was necessarily experienced in the beginning of the work, so that although their contract was dated in 1888, when the last Act was passed, they did not go to work until the latter part of that year, a certain period of time having necessarily to be expended in getting out advertisements and having the investigations made by the different persons who were tendering, and having the tenders accepted, so that nothing was done until the latter part of that year. Then came an unprecedentedly wet season which, in that part of the country, where the land is flat and swampy, militated very strongly against the prosecution of the work. Then it turned out that they had to dig some 24 feet deeper in laying the foundations of the dock in order to reach the solid rock, than they first estimated for. Then there was the extreme difficulty of getting labour, the Cape Breton and the Annapolis Railway works going on at the same time called labour off in those two directions, and even though they gave a bonus for labourers, they found it very difficult to obtain them. All these difficulties were in addition to those which have taken place in the great money markets of the world, and which have rendered it difficult for this corporation, as for a great many others, to raise the money necessary for the prosecution of their work.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—THE HIGH COMMISSIONER.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I beg to move in amendment: That all the words after the word "That" be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof:—

> The conduct and language of Sir Charles Tupper, High Commissioner of Canada in England, in interfering in the recent elections and in imputing treasonable and disloyal motives to a large proportion of the people of this Dominion, and also in assailing and vilifying the managers of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and in reflecting upon the position of the said company, is a breach of the duties of the office which he fills, and is calculated to destroy the efficiency of the said office, and to injure the credit of the Dominion, besides damaging a very important corporation whose shareholders have invested large sums of money in the work of extending and promoting the railway system of Canada.

This is a new Parliament and this is the first session, and though I expect party lines to be drawn, even sharply drawn, and I do not at all object to that, still I submit to the judgment of the majority that there are questions upon which all minds, if they listen only to the voice of reason and set aside party prejudices, must of necessity come to the same conclusion. I submit that the question which I now propose to the House is one of these questions. The office of High Commissioner is one of very great importance. It is not new in the history of politics. Before the American Republic, all the provinces, not all perhaps, but the most important provinces among the American colonies, were represented by commissioners at the Court of St. James; and it is within recollection that one of the leading men of his day in England, Mr. Burke, long represented the Province of New York. The services which he rendered were of great importance. The office of High Commissioner is practically one which is in the full sense of the word a diplomatic office. The High Commissioner is the ambassador at the Court of St. James. He has to discharge all those functions which would be discharged by an ambassador were we an independent nation instead of a colony. In fact, the only difference which I see in the office of High Commissioner and the office of ambassador is simply this: that, whereas the ambassador of a nation is the channel of communication between his country and the Government to which he is accredited, in all our official relations, His Excellency the Governor General is the channel of com-

munication ; but, apart from that, all the duties, all the responsibilities which are discharged by and which appertain to the office of ambassador are also discharged by and appertain to the office of High Commissioner. Now, I submit this proposition to the judgment of every member of this House, whether sitting on this side or on the other side, and it is a proposition, I venture to say, which will not be denied by any, not even challenged by any member of this House : that such an office is eminently non political, and the incumbent of the office should be as much removed from the arena of party politics as you are, Mr. Speaker, when you occupy the Chair. Of course, we know very well, that if a man accepts an office, whether the office of Speaker of this House, or that of High Commissioner, or any other office, it is not expected that he will at once divest himself of his own opinions, of his feelings, of his convictions, nor even of his prejudices ; but it is expected of him that so long as he discharges the duties of the office, so long as he receives a salary from the Canadian people, he will be removed from the arena of practical politics, and that if he steps down from the high altitude of his office to come down into the arena of practical politics, I submit to the judgment of this House, and above all to the majority in this House, that that functionary is committing a breach of the duties attaching to his office. I am sorry to have to make the reproach that Sir Charles Tupper, in my opinion, and I submit it to the judgment of the House, has been recreant to the duties of his office. He has not shown himself to be above party politics ; on the contrary, he has shown himself—I am justified in using the expression—a shameless partisan of the present Government. One of the duties of Sir Charles Tupper as High Commissioner is not only to be the channel of communication for the Government of Canada, but it is also his duty to look after the interests of all Her Majesty's subjects who reside in Canada and who have a temporary habitation in England. If a poor sailor, for instance, were to be charged in England with an offence which brought him before a court of justice, if he happened to be penniless, which is often the case, it would be the duty of the High Commissioner to come to his assistance and secure him a fair trial ; and we know very well the High Commissioner has so acted, and we know from the High Commissioner's report that he has felt bound to assist Canadians who required assistance in London. But while Sir Charles Tupper expended the great sum of $25 in assisting poor Canadians in London, he at the same time was doing his very best with persistent malice—I use the word malice advisedly—to do the utmost injury in his power to a great corporation, and to thousands of Her Majesty's subjects. At this moment Sir Charles Tupper is doing his best in London, and is never losing an occasion, to do injury to the shareholders of the Grand Trunk Railway, because, forsooth, the shareholders of the Grand Trunk Railway chose not to be the humble servants of the Government during the last election. If the Grand Trunk Railway Company had assumed the attitude maintained by the Canadian Pacific Railway, not a word of condemnation would have been said ; but because the Grand Trunk, for reasons of their own, whether wise or unwise, chose to adopt an attitude different to that adopted by the Canadian Pacific Railway, they are assailed in every possible way by the High Commissioner of Canada with all the authority attaching to his name and his position, and every effort is made on his part to do them as much harm as possible. It is useless for me to say that the Grand Trunk Railway Company were quite within their rights when they took the stand they adopted, and even if they had been wrong, even if the course they took did not serve the best interests of the company, it does not lie in the mouth of the High Commissioner of Canada to cast blame on them, but it is a question which can be treated on the floor of Parliament by members of Parliament. Again, I maintain it is a question that is not in any way connected with the position or duties of the High Commissioner, so long as he occupies the present position towards the people of Canada. He is not only agent of the Government of Canada, but he is the agent of the people of Canada, and he is bound by his office to do anything he can to help the people of Canada and Her Majesty's Canadian subjects. But I submit it is a breach of duty on his part when he uses the slightest particle of his influence in order to injure his fellow-subjects, however they may happen to come under his displeasure. What is most remarkable is, that Sir Charles Tupper is displaying malice—I use the word again—towards that railway company, not once or twice, but persistently, that he is attacking the company again and again. He has attacked them in speeches in this country and in England, in the daily press and even in reviews ; and I notice that the day before yesterday, at a banquet tendered to him, he displayed, in my opinion at least, singular want of tact, discretion and judgment, by taking occasion to repeat the remarks with which he had previously attacked the Grand Trunk Railway Company. That is not all. On these facts alone I submit Sir Charles Tupper cannot receive the approbation of the people of Canada. If hon. gentlemen opposite are ready to admit that it is within the power and the duty of the High Commissioner of Canada to step down from his office and attack his fellow-subjects, well, let us hear it so stated on the floor of this House. Is the Government of Canada prepared to say that they endorse the conduct of Sir Charles Tupper, and do they proclaim him right in acting as he did ? Perhaps they will say that the Grand Trunk Railway Company is wrong. I am not discussing that question : all I assert is, that the Grand Trunk Railway Company have a right to their opinion, and I further assert that it is a breach of duty on the part of the High Commissioner to attack his fellow-subjects simply because they differ from him in politics. But there is more than this. Sir Charles Tupper stooped from his position to come down and take part in the late election, and I say this was also another breach of the duties with which he is entrusted. Having referred to Sir Charles Tupper descending from his position to take part in the elections, I would be warranted in calling the attention of the House to the language which he used towards the leader of the Liberal party when he charged him with treason. I make no charge upon this ground whatever. For my part, when charged with treason, either by the Prime Minister or by the High Commissioner, or by anybody else, I never was troubled by any such charge, because I claim that my loyalty is above any such reproach. I claim that I am

as faithful a subject of the British Crown as the First Minister or the High Commissioner or any member of the Conservative party. It is not for that reason that I attack the High Commissioner upon the present occasion, but I say that the mere fact, the fact alone, that he came down from his position to take part in the election is a conduct which deserves the highest censure of this House. You, gentlemen, talk of loyalty every day, but I appeal to you on the score of British institutions and British precedents: do you believe, or does anyone believe that if any one of the ambassadors of England at foreign courts —Lord Lytton or Lord Dufferin for instance—were to come down from their mission to take part in an election in Great Britain; do you suppose that the people of Great Britain would for one instant tolerate such conduct? The ambassador who would do that would be compelled on the following day to step down and out from his office, and then he would be at liberty to take any part he chose in an election. But, Sir, it would be a disgrace to the diplomatic service of Great Britain if one of the ambassadors of Great Britain were to do the thing which has been done by Sir Charles Tupper in the late election. I appeal, therefore, to the majority; that they will not sanction such a course as that; I appeal to them, if they are loyal to the British Crown, to be loyal also to British institutions, to British precedents and to British practice. It is not enough to proclaim one's loyalty; it ought to be shown in one's conduct; and I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that each one of the members of this House, whatever vote he may give upon this motion here, would, if he were a member of the British Parliament, vote to condemn such conduct as that which Sir Charles Tupper has been guilty of. That measure of justice which would be given on such an occasion I now ask to be given on this occasion.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. the leader of the Opposition, in making this proposition to us has declared in terms of great solemnity that he has a profound reverence for British precedents. He has taken occasion to couple that protestation, in the most solemn form, with a declaration of his personal loyalty which he occasionally makes in very earnest tones to this House, but which I shall by no means accuse him of displaying at times for political purposes and then hiding under a bushel, as he imputed not very long ago to members on this side of the House. I shall take the liberty of assuming that the hon. gentleman is not only sincere in his declaration of his personal loyalty, but that he likewise has a reverence for British precedents, and I will ask him before the vote is taken upon this question to point out a precedent in British legislation or in Colonial legislation in which a member of the House rose and moved that a public servant be censured for language which has not been proved against him, and the utterance of which is most distinctly denied upon the other side of the House. The hon. gentleman invites this House to come to the conclusion that the conduct of Sir Charles Tupper is discreditable in imputing treasonable conduct and treasonable designs to a large portion of the people of this country. I assert here that Sir Charles Tupper has not done anything of the kind, either in connection with the recent election or upon any other occasion. I have stood upon the platform with Sir Charles Tupper during the recent election contests. I have read most of the speeches which he delivered in this country during that period, and, so far from imputing treasonable motives to the people of this country or to the Liberal party of this country, Sir Charles Tupper's declaration everywhere, with regard to that question, was that the whole sentiment of this country is loyal to the core; and one proof that he has cited of this is the large number of Liberals who have been returned to this House at the recent general elections, not one of whom could have come here if he had not distinctly avowed his loyalty to British institutions, his desire to uphold these institutions, and his disavowal of the disloyal designs which some of the followers of the Liberal party had attributed to them. Sir Charles Tupper, in one place after another, has shown, that, while certain persons had put themselves forward to promote the welfare and the designs of the Liberal party in this country, but really to subvert the institutions of this country—he has declared over and over again, that, before the Liberal party could venture to go to the polls, they were compelled to disavow all connection and all sympathy with any such designs or with individuals who were promoting these designs. Therefore, far from attributing disloyal sentiments to the great body of the people of this country or to the great minority who follow the fortunes of the Liberal party, he has proudly declared that that disavowal took place in every province of the country, and that if it had not been for that the Liberal party would have been annihilated in the recent elections. In the face of that statement made by himself again and again, this House is asked to come to the conclusion that Sir Charles Tupper has declared that a great body of the people are disloyal to British institutions. Although the hon. leader of the Opposition has not thought proper to give us any notice of the motion which he has made to-day, I am in a position, from my knowledge of Sir Charles Tupper's language, both before and after the elections, to deny most positively that he has attributed treasonable sentiments or treasonable designs to any great body of the people of this country. If the hon. leader of the Opposition had consulted the British precedents which he so much reveres, it would not have been necessary that I should put any denial of this kind on record. If he had followed those precedents or had shown the slightest regard for fair-play he would at least have laid on the Table of this House the evidence of the language he proposes to condemn. Now, Sir, it is perfectly true that the High Commissioner holds a very high and important position in respect to this country; he is one of our great public functionaries; but conceding all that, I deny the hon. gentleman's proposition that he holds any such a position as a foreign ambassador occupies. A foreign ambassador must necessarily keep himself, to a great extent, free from party politics; he must avoid anything that would impair the relations between himself and the court to which he is sent; because he is the medium of communication between the Government which sends him and the Government to which he is sent. The High Commissioner in our service occupies no such position. He is nothing but the agent of this Government living in London. His Ex-

cellency the Governor General is the medium of communication between this Government and Her Majesty's Government, and no other can be had; but when representations from this Government are to be pressed on the members of the Imperial Cabinet, it is desirable that we should avail ourselves of the services of an agent, living there, acquainted with the affairs of this country, and competent, as a man of Sir Charles Tupper's experience and abilities is, to aid in carrying forward the public business of this country. He does not occupy, either at home or abroad, such a position as an ambassador in the diplomatic service of the British Government holds. But if he did, while it might be in bad taste for him to engage in a political struggle in his own country, the hon. gentleman knows as well as I know that a British ambassador does not leave his political preferences behind him when he goes into the diplomatic service. It is necessary that our High Commissioner, like an ambassador—and in this the parallel holds—should be the confidential agent of the Government he serves, should be in sympathy with its policy, should strive to carry out that policy, should be the depository of its secrets: and for this very reason the officer, to be competent and efficient, must necessarily have his political sympathies and be in very close alliance with the Government he serves. Sir Charles Tupper, occupying as I have said the position of a public officer not in the diplomatic service, not only is the agent of the Government in the city of London, but has been for many years a statesman of great eminence and great influence in this country. Sir Charles Tupper, when, rightly or wrongly, the invitation was extended to him by the Premier to come to Canada and take part in the recent elections, felt that the interests of this country were at stake in those elections. He has not hesitated to say that himself; and I think the hon. leader of the Opposition is somewhat mistaken in the choice of his expression when he declares that Sir Charles Tupper "stooped" to take part in those elections. Considering that the fate of this country was at stake, considering that the trade relations of this country were being discussed and fought over, and that the issues with regard to those trade relations were perhaps the most important ever submitted to any of the British North American Provinces, I do not think that anybody who had regard for this country and a hope for its welfare, could fairly be said to have stooped in order to take part in that contest. I do not think the hon. gentleman himself stooped very low when he took part in those elections, convinced as he was that the trade policy he advocated was the best for his country. I do not think that Sir Charles Tupper is so high in the position he occupies as the agent of this Government in London that he stooped when, feeling that the welfare of his country was at stake, he came before the people he had served for nearly a quarter of a century as a Minister of the Crown, sharing in its most important struggles, and connected with every phase of its interests in the past. If Sir Charles Tupper mistook his position in that regard, the hon. leader of the Opposition has the distinct avowal of the First Minister that Sir Charles came by his invitation, and in making that announcement the other night, Sir John Macdonald took the responsibility of his action in that respect. Therefore, if anybody is censurable for that action, the censure should be moved against us and not against the High Commissioner. The hon. gentleman must know, when he speaks of the charge of disloyalty, that it was no unfair comment on the trade policy which hon. gentlemen opposite put forward, to say that the success of that policy would undermine the relations between this country and Great Britain: but if the hon. gentleman differs from me in that particular, if he thinks such an allusion to the disloyalty of some engaged in the campaign of unrestricted reciprocity, and the disloyal tendency of that policy, I have to remind him that the leader under whom he served with so much distinction for many years, declared his belief, before polling day was over, that that policy would totally undermine the relations between this country and Great Britain. Now, Sir, returning for a moment and referring to the hon. gentleman's extraordinary course in asking us to pronounce a censure upon an officer for language which has not been proved before this House and which is incapable of proof, what language of Sir Charles Tupper has the hon. gentleman in his mind? Why, he has not even stated what the language of Sir Charles Tupper which he objects to was? Has he quoted a line or a sentence from any report of Sir Charles Tupper's known speeches to indicate that there is a particle of foundation for that resolution? No, Sir: but without doing so, the hon. gentleman not only asks us to vote for a resolution censuring Sir Charles Tupper, but imputes again and again to that gentleman, not only wrong and injurious language, but malice as the motive on which it is founded. Are we, in the absence of a single declaration of the language the hon. gentleman objects to, to take expressions which have been made use of in the proceedings of this House as being the foundation of this motion? I am not at liberty, by the rules of the House, to refer to a past debate: but are we to consider the misrepresentations that have been made by some members of the Liberal party, that Sir Charles Tupper, at a banquet two nights ago in the city of London, used injurious language against the Grand Trunk Railway Company? Is that the foundation of this resolution? Where is the report of it? Where has the hon. gentleman seen such a statement? I ask him to answer me now. No telegraphic report on which the slightest reliance can be placed has yet reached this country, to show that Sir Charles Tupper has made use of such language. Yet, in the opinion of the leader of the Opposition, this House should be ready to come to a resolution that Sir Charles Tupper should be censured for something he said at the banquet two nights ago in the city of London, and which the hon. mover of the resolution is not able to quote. Are we to found this resolution upon an impression which prevails in the minds of some hon. gentlemen opposite that Sir Charles Tupper called them "ruined gamesters?" I am aware that some members of the Opposition have a feeling of resentment against him, through the impression that he had used some such observation with regard to them, and I suppose this resolution is to be founded upon that; but the House will not be surprised when I say that he made use of no such language with regard to them. If I am wrong, by all means let the hon. gentlemen in the front row opposite, who, I suppose, entertain

that suspicion, quote his language, unless we are to depend indeed upon any loose telegraphic report, sent perhaps by a partisan or published in a partisan newspaper. The report of the speech or letter, or whatever it was, has, by this time, reached this Dominion, and let us have the words. Instead of Sir Charles Tupper using such language with reference to the hon. gentlemen who sit opposite, and who, it was said, had sat opposite to him in political life for many years, they will find he applied no such observation to them, but to some whose methods and whose conduct in public affairs —outside of this House altogether these men are— these hon. gentlemen, if they expressed their own honest sentiments, would not hesitate to characterize by language no less strong. Are we to found a vote of censure on the statement that Sir Charles Tupper tried to bribe, and bully, and coerce the Grand Trunk Railway Company into supporting the Government during the recent elections, and then denounced them and endeavoured to injure their stock and enterprise because they refused to comply? I can tell this House that not only is there no record to prove this, but that there is no foundation for such statement of suspicion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. member for South Oxford who has just said "hear, hear," knows perfectly well that Sir Charles Tupper's statement as to the actual interview has been put before the public, and surely that ought to be here, surely it ought to be quoted and refuted, surely the evidence by which it is to be refuted should be weighed in this House before this House is asked to pass judgment. The hon. gentleman knows, as a good many behind him know, that what Sir Charles Tupper did ask the Grand Trunk management was simply this: that in the election contest which was going on, however their interests might lie, they might leave their employés—the men who were earning their bread in Canada, and who were as capable at least of forming a judgment on public questions as Sir Henry Tyler was—to vote as they pleased in the interests of their country and according to their consciences. He asked further that the Grand Trunk should come out in a public declaration and say their men were free to vote as they pleased. That was the only request he made, but it is the one which is sometimes characterized as an attempt to bribe and bully the Grand Trunk Railway. I shall not undertake to show what the conduct of the Grand Trunk Railway in the election campaign was. It is not necessary I should do so. The hon. gentleman has not invited the judgment of this House upon that conduct, he says, but there are impressions abroad that the Grand Trunk Railway not only refused to give the announcement that its men were free to vote as they pleased but adopted a line of conduct in a very different direction indeed. The hon. gentleman has said that if the Grand Trunk Railway had pursued a different course it would have been open to very grave censure. He has said that if it had pursued the course which the Canadian Pacific pursued, Sir Charles Tupper would have fondled them with a very kind caress; but if the Grand Trunk Company had pursued the course which it was asked to pursue by Sir Charles Tupper, let me ask: Would the Opposition have espoused its cause as it has in this resolution in response to any attack which might have been made? What objection can the hon. gentleman have had to a great corporation like that declaring that its public servants were perfectly free to do as they pleased? There was no request even that the facts should be, if they were facts, concealed from the employés; there was no request that the prejudices or sympathies or judgments of their masters, in favour of one party or the other, should be concealed; there was but the simple request: Leave your men free; let them act as Canadians and not as slaves. Is what we are asked to declare by this resolution, that Sir Charles Tupper has attacked the Grand Trunk Railway Company, that he has sought with malice, as the hon. gentleman has said, to injure that company and its shareholders, to injure those people in this country who are interested in that enterprise, true? I ask again, Sir, where the evidence is, that he did anything of the kind? I deny the charge most positively. What Sir Charles Tupper has done has not been against the interests of the shareholders of the Grand Trunk Railway or the people in this country who are interested in that enterprise; what he has done has been to criticize in strong terms the management of the Grand Trunk Railway in dragging the interests of thousands and tens of thousands of shareholders in the old country and here into a political campaign, and risking their fortunes in the result. The probability is that the leader of the Opposition will, before very long, find that he has not the thanks of the people whom he professes to be so desirous to save from the criticisms of Sir Charles Tupper. The shareholders who are well able to look after their own interests, the people who realize to-day that those interests were very seriously jeopardized by the energies of a great corporation in this country being thrown into a political compaign, and its fortunes made to turn on the result, will not feel indebted to the hon. gentleman for the course he has taken. Just a word or two more as to the position which Sir Charles Tupper occupied during the elections. There is no doubt that any public functionary, be he as high a functionary as Sir Charles Tupper is, or much inferior in rank, takes, when he goes into a political contest, his fortune and his political life in his hand. When he enters the political field, his fortunes must depend on those of the party with whom he connects himself, and their fate he must share. Sir Charles Tupper was perfectly conscious of that when he accepted the invitation of the First Minister to come to this country, during the elections; and if the decision of the people had been other than it was, he would have accepted his fate, and hon. gentlemen opposite, if they had assumed office, would have found his resignation awaiting them. He understood that risk perfectly, and he took it; but the decision of the people on the question of the propriety of Sir Charles Tupper's action, and on every other question which was put before them on the 5th March last, was distinctly in favour of the course the Government had pursued, and Sir Charles Tupper had pursued. While that is so, this House, which directly represents the people, which has come from the people within a few months, is asked to censure Sir Charles and to reverse the popular decision. I do not intend to detain the House any longer, but I invite its attention again to the fact that, appealing as

the hon. gentleman has done, to British precedents, to British justice and to British fair-play, he thinks it consistent to condemn Sir Charles Tupper upon statements which are not proved, and upon statements which, as many members of this House know, are absolutely untrue. The statements I have quoted, and which, perhaps, the hon. gentleman had in his mind when he spoke, though he did not put them forward, show that the language which Sir Charles Tupper used as to treasonable inclinations, treasonable motives or treasonable designs, were not used with reference to the whole Liberal party or to any considerable portion of our people; and gentlemen who have looked at the record of these statements must come to the conclusion that the assertions which were put forward in the press and elsewhere with regard to Sir Charles Tupper having made use of statements of that kind were calumnious to him, and unjust to the Government he served. I am sure that the House will not adopt any such resolution as this, unless the hon. gentleman can give some evidence of the statements on which he asks us decide.

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

After Recess.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 60) respecting the Lake Erie, Essex and Detroit River Railway Company, and to change the name thereof to the Lake Erie and Detroit Railway Company.—(Mr. Denison.)

Bill (No. 79) respecting the Canadian Land and Investment Company, Limited.—(Mr. Ross, Lisgar.)

Bill (No. 80) respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. Ryckman.)

Bill (No. 81) to incorporate the Order of Canadian Home Circles.—(Mr. Coatsworth.)

Bill (No. 82) respecting the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company.—(Mr. Curran.)

Bill (No. 83) respecting the Septennial Benevolent Society.—(Mr. Coatsworth.)

Bill (No. 84) respecting the Saskatchewan Railway and Mining Company.—(Mr. Wallace.)

SUPPLY—THE HIGH COMMISSIONER

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I have much doubt whether, if the hon. the High Commissioner had been present in the flesh to-night, he would have felt any exuberant delight or any special gratitude to his hon. friend the Minister of Justice for the peculiar line of defence that hon. gentleman saw fit to adopt on his behalf. I am far from saying that, under all the circumstances, the Minister of Justice, whom I freely admit to be an able lawyer, did not take the best course for his client, but at the same time I must say that the line of defence in itself was a rather curious one. The hon. the Minister of Justice adopted in the first place the plea of *non mi ricordo*, of which we have heard a good deal in other quarters lately. The hon. gentleman tells us he was not aware that his discreet friend, the High Commissioner, had used any language which would justify the comments of my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Laurier). I think, if the Minister of Justice had read, as he said he had, most of the speeches delivered by the High Commissioner during his recent extended tour in Canada, the hon. gentleman would have recognized the fact that, having recourse to a very old and well-worn style of argument, having no case himself, he saw fit to indulge in very nearly unlimited abuse of his opponents. Why, Sir, his whole plan of campaign, and that of a good many of his friends, was nothing else but one continuous screech of treason, supported by a most contemptible theft of a letter from a printing office, obtained by a man whom I have reason to believe had been previously acting as a spy in the *Mail* office, who, being discovered and turned out of that office, then occupied the honourable position of a thief in the establishment of Messrs. Hunter & Rose; and I have been told—and if that is incorrect let the hon. gentlemen repudiate it here—that, as a reward of merit, that man was subsequently employed by the Government of Canada in some office. The hon. gentleman has nothing to say on that point. Well, Sir, I call the attention of the House to this fact: My hon. friend's indictment of the High Commissioner had three counts. First of all, he accused him of interference in our elections while a paid servant of the people of Canada, occupying a very high position in the Civil Service, being in fact a sort of diplomatist or ambassador. In the next place he accused him of using unjustifiable language to a very large portion of the people of Canada, and of using unjustifiable language and indulging in threats toward the Grand Trunk Railway Company. Now, Sir, the hon. Minister of Justice wanted proof, legal proof, of all these things, and looking at the line he adopted it seemed that he would have required legal proof of Sir Charles Tupper's having come over to Canada and interfered in our elections, if it had not been for the circumstance that the First Minister admitted on the floor of the House a few nights ago that Sir Charles Tupper came at his instance. Well, Sir, I dare say the hon. gentleman is right in demanding that there should be full proof, and I shall presently call the attention of the House to certain statements which appear to me to go as far as can be reasonably desired in supplying exact and literal proof of every statement contained in the resolution in your hands, and of every statement made in the speech addressed to the House by my hon. friend. But I wish to call the attention of the House to this fact: By taking the line that the hon. gentleman did, by declaring that he required proof, legal proof, of these accusations, the hon. gentleman impliedly admitted that if that legal proof were forthcoming, he for one was not disposed to defend the conduct of the High Commissioner. Sir, if that be his meaning, and that is the obvious inference to be drawn from his words, I say it does the Minister of Justice great credit; and I for my part fully believe that at any rate that in their heart of hearts, whatever political exigencies may compel them to say, or however political exigencies may compel them to vote to-night, not only the Minister of Justice but many of his colleagues, not only many of his colleagues but many of his supporters, utterly and entirely disapprove of and repudiate the excessively indiscreet conduct and action of the High Commissioner, at any rate as regards the language which he used to the whole Opposition in Canada, and more particularly the language he saw

fit to use to the Grand Trunk Railway. Sir, I say it is creditable to the hon. gentleman's common sense if this be so. For with what pretence of fairness or reason could those hon. gentlemen defend that language, many of whom owe their seats to the direct intervention of another very powerful railway corporation, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, which not only transferred a vast number of votes from one part of Canada to the other, but brought in whole hosts and armies, I might say, of men who had departed from this country, but who returned—I won't say for what consideration—to cast one last vote in behalf of their Conservative friends at the last election. Now, the hon. gentleman wants legal proof, he wants evidence that Sir Charles Tupper charged the party of which my hon. friend is the leader, with treasonable and disloyal motives during the last campaign; and he wants proof, also, that Sir Charles Tupper used indiscreet language, used improper language, used language which no man in his position should ever have permitted himself to use, toward the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada. By the kindness of a friend I have been favoured with a copy of the Amherst *Gazette*, which declares that on declaration day "Sir Charles Tupper was at his post," that "he made a ringing speech," that "he unmasked an ingrate railway company." Now, I will give the hon. gentleman, from an organ of his own, a few samples—I am not going to inflict the whole of this article upon him, although it would be worth while—I will give him a few samples which, I think, will show him that Sir Charles Tupper was guilty of what my hon. friend stated, and that he attributed disloyal and treasonable motives to the party of whom we are the representatives in Parliament to-day. Here is one sentence:

"There are two great parties in Canada, one loyal to its own, the mother country, the other ready to hand over our country to aliens, and to turn its back on Great Britain."

Mr. SPROULE. That is quite true.

Mr. BOWELL. Quite true.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So the hon. gentleman opposite, the man who of all others is the organ of a party most directly opposed to the whole policy of the Empire, who is the defender of a policy which discriminates against British goods, a policy which has reduced the import of goods from Great Britain into Canada by many millions, a policy under which to-day not one single article in general consumption by the people of Canada, produced in or manufactured by Great Britain, is admitted free, that is the gentleman who ventures to endorse the slanderous and calumnious statement made by Sir Charles Tupper.

Mr. BOWELL. True as Gospel.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT, Sir, if the hon. gentleman, or any other man, on the floor of this House dares to impugn the loyalty of any man on this side, I say that the statement is a slander and a calumny. More than that, if they dare to bring forward a charge, I, here to-night, give them the challenge—let them come forward, let them state their charge, let them ask for a committee of this House, if they dare, to prove their charges; and, Sir, if any man makes the charge and is afraid to ask for a committee, afraid to prove it, then, besides branding the charge as a slander and a calumny, I shall brand the man who makes it as a coward. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to the mild and delicate language in which the High Commissioner, after paying his attention to the Liberal party of Canada, thought fit to deal with the Grand Trunk Railway Company. He goes on to say:

"When the election came on, notwithstanding all we have done for this company."

What have they done for this company? Why, they have granted, on pretence that it was for the public good in the highest degree, certain sums of money, not belonging to them, but belonging to the whole people of Canada, Reformer and Conservative indiscriminately; they have granted this, as they allege, for the public good of the country. However, he says:

"The Company issued a circular commanding its thousands of employés to vote against the Government."

Which statement, Sir, was denied emphatically by Mr. Seargeant, General Manager of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and unless better evidence than that of Sir Charles Tupper is brought forward, I say that statement is wholly untrue.

"He never could have believed that a company of English shareholders could have been induced to use such great power and influence to strike down British institutions in this country. There are these differences between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway."

There is a difference he did not mention, but which influenced that great man's mind a good deal. The Grand Trunk Railway opposed and the Canadian Pacific Railway supported him and his friends. But he goes on to state:

"We lent the Grand Trunk Railway an enormous sum, and they never paid back a dollar. We lent the Canadian Pacific Railway thirty millions and every dollar was repaid before it was due."

How? We took of our own lands six million or seven million acres back and $10,000,000 out of the $30,000,000 subsidy were repaid in that way, and those six or seven million acres we subsequently re-granted to railways controlled by the Canadian Pacific Railway. That is not paying back every dollar before it was due, by taking back lands which are of no use, which we cannot sell, which, according to the Minister of Interior, are at the present moment a dead loss to us. Going on, he said:

"By the wasteful extravagance"——

Mark the courteous language of this eminent official towards a company which has expended $150,000,000 of English capital in this country, for which it receives an exceedingly ill reward—

—"jobbery and mismanagement of the Grand Trunk, millions upon millions have been lost. It was ruinous to its shareholders and many widows and others lost all they possessed. This was most damaging to Canada and led English people to pronounce it an awful country. On the other hand nothing had so raised Canada in the view of English capitalists as the Canadian Pacific Railway, for every man who invested gets a return. The Grand Trunk also since the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, has been ruining its own shareholders in its vain attempt to obstruct that line and going into wild purchases of lines to embarrass it. Now you find Laurier, Wiman, Farrer and the Grand Trunk Railway Company, these craven creatures who have been representing us as people whose life could be crushed out of us by the United States, leading and abetting a party which turns its back on England; and Sir Henry Tyler, a member of the British House of Commons, using the money of his shareholders, not in building up the country where its interests lie, but in bringing upon it dire calamities. Our Government was very forgiving and forbearing, but, in his opinion, it would carefully guard against giving increased power and influence to a corporation which shows such

base ingratitude and is ready to spring at our throats when it sees the opportunity."

I submit, with all respect to the Minister of Justice, that I have given them already in that speech most ample proof of the perfect correctness of the statements made by my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) and most ample warrant for the motion placed in your hands, Mr. Speaker. But the gentleman was not content with that. The gentleman must needs to do what Job desired his enemies to do, not exactly write a book, but write an article in a magazine. This article which appeared, I may tell the Minister of Justice, in the May number of the *North American Review*, is signed "Charles Tupper," and I presume the hon. Minister will accept that as sufficient legal evidence, or must I have witnesses to prove the Charles Tupper herein mentioned is the identical Sir Charles Tupper at present High Commissioner in London or plenipotentiary to Vienna, I do not know which. He goes on to make a statement which I will presently characterize somewhat as it deserves:

"The manner in which Mr. Wiman gloats over the McKinley Bill as a great object-lesson to aid in the 'capture of Canada' leaves no room to doubt that this measure, so far as it affects Canada, was prompted by Mr. Wiman and his associates, Sir Richard Cartwright and Mr. Farrer."

I must say in the mildest manner to every hon. gentleman opposite that that statement is a deliberate and unmitigated falsehood; I repeat, a deliberate and unmitigated falsehood. I never held any communication whatever with Mr. McKinley. I never suggested one line in his tariff. I knew nothing as to what Mr. McKinley was going to introduce, and if hon. members opposite dare to make a statement on the floor of this House that I had anything to do with the introduction of the McKinley Tariff Bill, I do not doubt that within the short time a letter can reach Mr. McKinley, wherever he may happen to be, that falsehood will be branded and gibbeted as it deserves. I notice that other parties followed his example, and the Minister of Justice himself was not ashamed to give utterance in a State document to the same statement. He did not accuse me personally, and I need not, therefore, reply to him on that score: but he makes the statement in a despatch sent to the Home Government, under date of Dec. 14th: "It is the avowed object of the McKinley Bill to teach Canadians that they cannot avail themselves of the markets of the United States while they continue their allegiance as British subjects," a statement of which I should thank him to give proof, if he possesses any.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is a quotation from James G. Blaine.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Let the hon. gentleman produce his quotation, if he has it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the hon. gentleman has greatly misrepresented, or greatly misunderstood Mr. Blaine, and until I see the statement over Mr. Blaine's handwriting I entirely decline to accept his assertion that Mr. Blaine was so indiscreet as to make any such statement.

Mr. TUPPER. Allow me to quote the statement.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where from?

Mr. TUPPER. From the New Brunswick press.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. TUPPER. I presume hon. gentlemen will not attack the veracity of the New Brunswick press. The hon. member for Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has stated that a letter to Mr. McKinley would reach him in a very short time. I challenge him to obtain a letter from Mr. Blaine, saying he did not so speak. Mr. Blaine, speaking in Calais, Maine, in 1888, said:

"Beyond the frontier, across the river, our neighbours chose another Government, another allegiance. They are subjects of Queen Victoria; they are loyal to Her Majesty. They live under a foreign flag. They do exactly as they have a right to do. I neither dispute their right nor envy their situation. It is their right to choose for themselves, as it is our right to choose for ourselves. But I am opposed, teetotally opposed, to giving the Canadians the sentimental satisfaction of waving the British flag, paying British taxes, and enjoying the actual cash remuneration of American markets. They cannot have both at the same time. If they come to us they can have what we have, but it is an absolute wrong against the rights of American citizens that millions of men who owe the United States no allegiance, who have no part or lot with us, who are not of us, but choose to be foreign to us; it is an absolute wrong for Congress to say that they shall have exactly the same share in our markets and the same privileges of trade under our flag that we have. So far as I can help it, I do not mean that they shall be Canadians and Americans at the same time."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is the kind of miserable quibble under which, mark you, Mr. Speaker, these men dare to put in a State paper—a statement that "the McKinley Act was avowed to be designed to teach Canadians that they could not avail themselves of the markets of the United States." I say, Sir, that Mr. Blaine is known to have been opposed to the McKinley Tariff Bill; he is known to have been opposed from the first to its introduction, and to have predicted the ruin of the Republican party from the time it was passed. These gentlemen opposite bring a letter or a speech made three or four years ago by Mr. Blaine to prove that Mr. Blaine avowed the object of the McKinley Tariff Bill, which was not so much as thought of for several years after, to be to teach Canadians that they could not avail themselves of the markets of the United States. Well, Sir, if that is what the Minister of Justice calls legal evidence, the less we have of it in this discussion the better. And mark you, Sir, that was not enough; these hon. gentlemen go on to say this:

"The subject is also to be viewed to some extent in connection with the question of the Confederation of the Provinces. The union which was effected, in accordance with the strong desire of Her Majesty's Government in 1867, has always been viewed with unfriendly feelings by a large portion of the people in the United States."

I would like to have proof of that. Is there any letter, or any speech of Mr. Blaine, or even the report of any interview with him to prove the truth of that most improper and unfortunate statement? or, is the Minister of Justice and his friends desirous of heaping up another car-load of dirt to be swallowed by them on the 12th October next, when they resume their interrupted interview at Washington? Now, Sir, the Minister of Justice went on—and I think the hon. gentleman's better sense will teach him that he was very indiscreet, at least, in doing so—he went on to justify the conduct of Sir Charles Tupper, the paid servant of Canada, the High Commissioner of Canada, in coming over here for the purpose of interfering in elections. I cannot

believe that, on mature reflection, the Minister of Justice will declare that it is expedient for one of the chief officers of the Civil Service to set an example to others of the Civil Service to interfere in elections. As for his plea that Sir Charles Tupper took his life in his hands, and that he interfered at his own risk, the same would be equally true, no doubt, of the whole mass of civil servants if they choose to do the same thing. Does the hon. gentleman who affects, or pretends to affect, a sincere admiration for British institutions, desire to pave the way for the introduction of the spoils system here? Does he desire that at every change of Government, every civil servant not in accord with the party in power should lose his office, because there is not the slightest doubt that such example as was set by Sir Charles Tupper and other instances of that kind would tend most powerfully to bring about that innovation, which he, I think, as well as myself, would sincerely deplore to see made the rule of Government in Canada. The hon. gentleman, like a good many other gentlemen on the opposite side, cannot forbear, when discussing the conduct of Sir Charles Tupper, to call attention to the fact that in a recent letter of Mr. Edward Blake that gentleman had used words which I believe he subsequently disavowed—used words which were construed into the meaning that he regarded annexation as the result of the policy of reciprocity. The hon. gentlemen are very fond of quoting Mr. Blake, but if they want to quote Mr. Blake's letter I will give them a passage or two which they would do well to mark, read, digest, and inwardly understand. Mr. Edward Blake says:

"The Canadian Conservative policy has failed to accomplish the predictions of its promoters.

"Its real tendency has been, as foretold twelve years ago, towards disintegration and annexation, instead of consolidation and the maintenance of that British connection of which they claim to be the special guardians. It has left us with a small population, a scanty immigration and a North-West empty still; with enormous additions to our public debt and yearly charge, an extravagant system of expenditure, and an unjust and expensive tariff: with restricted markets for our needs, whether to buy or to sell, and all the host of evils (greatly intensified by our special conditions) thence arising; with trade diverted from its natural into forced and therefore less profitable channels, and with unfriendly relations and frowning tariff walls, even more and more estranging us from the mighty English-speaking nation to the south, our neighbours and relations, with whom we ought to be, as it was promised we should be, living in generous amity and liberal intercourse. Worse, far worse. It has left us with lowered standards of public virtue and death-like apathy in public opinion; with racial, religious and provincial animosities rather inflamed than soothed; with a subservient Parliament, an autocratic executive, debauched constituencies and corrupted and corrupting classes; with lessened self-reliance and increased dependence on the public chest and on legislative aids, and possessed withal by a boastful jingo spirit far enough removed from true manliness, loudly proclaiming unreal conditions and exaggerated sentiments, while actual facts and genuine opinions are suppressed. It has left us with our hands tied, our future compromised, and in such a plight that, whether we stand or move, we must run some risks which else we might have either declined or encountered with greater promise of success."

Now, Sir, if the hon. gentlemen opposite want to quote Mr. Blake I advise them to quote the whole of his letter and they will see that Mr. Blake's statement is this and nothing else: that the conduct of the Conservative party has been so scandalously corrupt, so extravagant, so disintegrating and demoralizing, that he fears in sheer despair that they have brought the country to such a pass that there is nothing for it but annexation. That is what Mr. Blake said. I cannot say that I myself hold the same view, but I have not the slightest hesitation in endorsing him in the assertion that a very few years more of such scandalous corruption, of such scandalous misgovernment, and of such cases as those which a committee of this House is now investigating, would, in all probability, bring about the results he deplores. Now, Sir, for myself I may say frankly that I do not care one potato paring for any statement that Sir Charles Tupper may make about me here or elsewhere. It is a pretty considerable number of years since, standing in this place, I took occasion to state to that gentleman across the floor that whenever Sir Charles Tupper made any statement on his own authority, from that time out I desired that it should be understood that unless I expressly admitted it to be true I was to be taken as contradicting it. As to Sir Charles Tupper's whole conduct in this matter I say that from first to last it has been intolerable and indecent. He was the paid servant of the people of Canada, he was bound by his office not to make any interference in our campaigns or elections; but whether that be so or not it was his clear and bounden duty to abstain from calumniating the majority of at least several of the most important Provinces in Canada. It was Sir Charles Tupper's clear and plain duty to abstain from vilifying and attacking the Grand Trunk Railway Company, a corporation whose shareholders have invested so many hundreds of millions of dollars in promoting the best interests of Canada and who, as every man knows right well, have received a most meagre and imperfect return for all they have done for us. I do not want to go over all the early circumstances connected with the Grand Trunk Railway Company, but I can tell the House, that even up to a very recent date, the fact that a very large amount of English capital has been brought into this country on the faith of representations signed by three members of the then Canadian Cabinet and colleagues of our present First Minister, and that those representations have been utterly falsified by the event, has had an extremely mischievous influence, an extremely injurious effect on Canadian credit. And, Sir, I cannot forbear to express my individual opinion that if there were unhappily many widows and orphans reduced to penury by the Grand Trunk, it was very largely due to the unfortunate representations which were made by certain members of the old Government of Canada. Now, Sir, what was the crime of the Grand Trunk Railway Company? Why were they such monstrous craven creatures? Why was it stated that millions and millions of capital had been wasted in extravagance, jobbery and corruption? Why, Sir, their crime was this: that when Sir Charles Tupper went to Montreal and demanded of Mr. Seargeant that the Grand Trunk Company should assist the present Canadian Government, Mr. Seargeant told him frankly and fairly that he was not prepared to render him any assistance at all. That crime was treason; that crime, according to Sir Charles Tupper, involved the destruction of British institutions and turning your back on the mother country. Well, Sir, if the Grand Trunk Company committed this crime, I have to tell the Government that they held the same opinion as was held by at least a majority of the people of

Ontario, as the public records show; that they held the same opinion as was held by a decisive majority of the people of Quebec, as the public records likewise show, and by a decisive majority of the people of Prince Edward Island, as hon. gentlemen know right well, even though the tight and gallant little Island was tempted by the promise of the construction of a tunnel which the hon. gentleman's own colleague has declared in the other House would cost not less than $20,000,000. And, Sir, by whom were these gentlemen charged with treason? Why, they were charged by the identical gentleman who, as soon as he could possibly obtain an interview with the United States authorities, showed himself prepared to grovel at their feet, if only they would give him any sort of hope or encouragement that they would treat on any condition. Now, Sir, I am disposed to deal a little more leniently with Sir Charles Tupper than I otherwise would have done, in view of one consideration, which I mentioned some years ago. After sitting in Parliament for many years with that hon. gentleman, I came to the conclusion that, although a man of great energy and considerable capacity in certain directions, the hon. gentleman was one of those unhappily constituted persons who are mentally colour-blind, and who, if they were paid for it, could not distinguish right from wrong or truth from falsehood; and entertaining that opinion, I have not felt disposed since then to be quite so hard on his little eccentricities as I otherwise would have been. But while, as regards the man, he is more a subject of pity than of blame, viewing the matter in a philosophical light, we have to consider the effect which is likely to be produced in England and in other countries by reason of his language. Now, Sir, I am not going to take extracts, though there are many of them, from journals which might be supposed to be in any wise affected by the Grand Trunk Railway Company; but I would like to read to the House a couple of short extracts from one of the most eminent journals in England, one which more than any other sways the financial destinies of England, and which is likely to have very great weight, indeed, on the minds of English capitalists. I would call the attention of the House to the words in which the *Economist* of London sees fit to speak of Sir Charles Tupper's actions and language. In its issue of 14th March, it says:

"After accusing the Grand Trunk of attempting virtually to transfer Canada to the United States, Sir Charles Tupper then declared, according to Reuter, that 'the extravagance, corruption and jobbery of the Grand Trunk management, by which millions had been lost by British investors, was the worst blow Canada had ever received, while the investment of millions in the wild and reckless purchase of railways to obstruct and head off the Canadian Pacific had ruined the Grand Trunk shareholders.' He also added that: 'while the Government were of a forgiving disposition, they would fail in their duty to Canada if they gave increased power and importance to the corporation which had shown base ingratitude by springing at the throat of, and attempting to strangle, the young Dominion.' These utterances suffer from the defect of being a trifle eloquent; but, nevertheless, in this instance, their extraordinary character is scarcely diminished on that account."

Then it goes on to say that to the Canadian Pacific:

"The Grand Trunk has, in fact, shown great hostility and no doubt much destructive competition has thus arisen, which might have been avoided by a more conciliatory policy. So much of truth there is in Sir Charles Tupper's assertion; but this obviously does nothing to justify his charge of 'corruption and jobbery,' from which he says, British investors have lost millions. A grave charge of that kind ought not to be made unless it can be fully substantiated, and obviously the matter cannot be permitted to rest where Sir Charles Tupper has left it. If for political purposes he has recklessly made charges which he cannot support, he has acted most shamefully. On the other hand, if there has been such malversation and wholesale peculation as he alleges, why has he done nothing until now to warn or protect the investors for whom he professes so much concern? The Government which for years he has represented here have from the first been closely associated with the Grand Trunk Company. The railway is indeed in a sense a national undertaking, and if his colleagues in the Administration have knowingly permitted the shareholders to be defrauded to the extent of millions, they have been grossly neglectful of their duty. And still more blameworthy will they be if now, having broken silence, they take refuge in indefinite allegations instead of specifying and bringing home to the parties implicated the frauds they allege to have been perpetrated."

That was written, Sir, on the 14th of March. Sir Charles Tupper appears to have accepted the challenge. He appears to have inflicted column after column on the readers of the *Times*, if they had patience to look over his lucubrations, in the attempt, not to substantiate but to explain away a very considerable portion of the charges which he first brought; and I call the attention of those hon. gentlemen to the way in which six weeks later, after Sir Charles Tupper's charges and Sir Henry Tyler's reply had been fully before the English public, the *Economist* deals with him:

"We now have a long statement by Sir Charles Tupper in reply to Sir Henry Tyler's speech at the half yearly meeting of the Grand Trunk Company, and it would be difficult to conceive of anything more inconclusive and unsatisfactory."

That is the opinion of one of the highest financial authorities in England as to the figure the High Commissioner has made of himself in his recent duel with Sir Henry Tyler—

"The greater part of it is taken up with the question of how far the Grand Trunk influence was used against the Government in the recent elections. On this point we may be sure of one thing at least: that if it had been employed in the service of the present Government we should have heard nothing of the charges which Sir Charles Tupper has recently brought against the company."

Now, Sir, my point is this: You have heard from a high authority how our Commissioner's charges are regarded. And the hon. Minister of Finance will know that the Government of Canada does not escape quite scatheless in this direction. Now, it is quite possible—I dare say the hon. Minister, if he likes, could say more about it—within a very short time we may require to appear in the English money market as borrowers. It is quite possible that we will have to contract a new loan or two within a very short time, and I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether he thinks he will find his task made easier by the conduct of the High Commissioner? Does he believe that he is likely, by enlisting against him or by having his High Commissioner enlist against him, the opinion of the Grand Trunk Railway, which is a potent influence in Canadian affairs, which has many thousands of shareholders scattered all over England, to add materially to his prospects in floating a loan, if these gentlemen were to ask him (the Finance Minister of Canada): Are we to believe your High Commissioner, are we to believe that one great party in Canada which practically controls three important Provinces—the two most important Provinces in this Dominion; are we to believe that they are, as Sir Charles Tupper has represented them, disloyal to the core, annexationists in disguise, led by men,

as he said in Toronto, who were preaching unveiled treason? Are we to suppose he is right in saying that the Liberal party are, to all intents and purposes—because that and nothing else is the meaning to be drawn from Sir Charles Tupper's Amherst speech—practically advocating annexation? I say if there were no other reason, the fact that the High Commissioner was alleged to be sent to England for the purpose of promoting our financial interests, for the purpose of aiding us in contracting loans on good terms, that alone would be a sufficient justification for all my hon. friend has said in condemnation of his conduct in the motion before you now. I believe, and will still believe until I have evidence to the contrary, that there are men on the other side of the House to be found who will express their regret, before this debate closes, at the language Sir Charles Tupper has thought fit to use not merely to his political opponents but to a corporation, which has done so much and suffered so much for the purpose of promoting the interests of the people of Canada as the Grand Trunk Railway has done.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. If, as the hon. member for South Oxford says, Sir Charles Tupper has no reason to be thankful to the hon. the Minister of Justice for defending him, the Grand Trunk Railway has less reason to thank the hon. member for South Oxford for entering into its defence this evening. The hon. gentleman, in espousing the cause of that company, said it opposed the Government of the day because the Canadian Pacific Railway was supporting it. He then proceeded to refer to the fall in Canadian securities and to the possibility of our having to go on the money market to secure a loan. I ask the hon. gentleman if Sir Charles Tupper's correspondence has not been published in all the leading papers, and whether, despite that fact, there has been any greater fall in Canadian securities to-day than those of any other country? On the contrary, our securities stand higher than those of any sister colony. The hon. gentleman is not giving fair-play to his own country when he states that because Sir Charles Tupper defended himself against the grossest kind of attack, our securities are bound to fall when we endeavour to raise a loan. I will not refer to loans the hon. member for South Oxford made when he was Finance Minister or to the loans which this Government has made since he left office. He has stated that Sir Charles Tupper had no right to come to Canada. To be sure the leader of the Government asked him to come, and does not the hon. member for South Oxford remember that while Sir Charles Tupper was performing his duties as High Commissioner, the hon. gentleman made speeches attacking him in his absence, and that Sir Charles Tupper challenged the hon. gentleman to meet him but he did not accept the challenge? As the hon. gentleman has quoted from various documents, it is only due to the man who is three thousand miles away, to give his reasons why he came to Canada. He came to Canada, it is true, to fight the party battle, but in that battle were involved very great interests for our country. The hon. member for South Oxford never lets pass any opportunity of which he can avail himself, to attack the High Commissioner in his absence. If the hon. gentleman desires the High Commissioner to occupy a non-partisan position, he should exercise some kind of judicial fairness and not attack him behind his back, as he has done to-night and in a manner he would never do to his face. The hon. gentleman says Sir Charles Tupper came to Canada simply at the beck of his party. Sir, Sir Charles Tupper, at the time of Confederation, fought for the interests of Canada, which he believed to be then at stake, although he was the only man in his Province who was elected in favour of the Union. And from that day to this, Sir Charles Tupper has struggled to advance the interests of his country, and has been able to defeat his detractors, as the hon. gentleman knows well to his cost. The hon. gentleman has asked us to prove that he ever said a word against the interests of Canada. Why, we are in a position to prove it out of his own mouth. When the Government brought down a resolution to give one hundred millions of acres of land to the Canadian Pacific Railway, the hon. gentleman then decried his country and kept up his opposition to that great enterprise until the last spike in the road was driven. Lest the hon. gentleman's memory has become treacherous, I will call his attention to the remarks he made in this House as late as the 14th March, 1888:

"There is danger lest Canada, so far as regards our native born population, should sink into a mere residuum, a country from which the best and most intelligent of our people are fleeing, not by hundreds or by thousands but by millions. Then as to foreign immigrants, if these statistics can be relied upon, it is clear that we are at the same time becoming a mere dumping ground for the refuse of those whom we import into this country. It is quite clear that we are not growing up towards the light, and I hold it to be a very miserable symptom of our political growth, that there should exist here this craving to hang on to our mother's apron strings."

I can quote further.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. Sir, in May, 1884, at Toronto, when the Canadian Pacific was fighting for its life, he said:

"If you want to find a true parallel to our Government in Canada, you will not find it in a country having free institutions outside of Canada. You must search for it in some such state of things as existed in France in the days known as the Second Empire, which began with the massacre of December and wound up with the capitulation of Sedan."

And yet the hon. gentleman professes to believe thoroughly in the institutions of this country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Go on. That is a very good speech. You had better read it all.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I am not questioning the hon. gentleman's eloquence or the hon. gentleman's ability, but I would like to see his eloquence and his ability concentrated upon fighting the battles of his own country. We have heard Sir Charles Tupper denounced to-night, and it has been said that he has done nothing for Canada. I ask if he has not conferred a lasting benefit on Canada in one matter which has been referred to, by which he saved a million and-a-half of dollars a year to the farmers of Canada, representing now over $10,500,000, when preventing the scheduling of our cattle. The hon. member for South Oxford has referred to the Hoar Committee at Washington. I think he ought to have placed his party in a proper position in regard to that matter. He has said that Mr. Farrer was betrayed by a political spy,

but he has not denounced him for his actions in Washington. Spy or no spy, it is the exposed documents we have to deal with, and I will refer to the time when Mr. Farrer came first to the front in this question, and find an opinion of the Toronto *Globe* with regard to a man who is now the editor of that paper, and has been placed there by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and his friends.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Read what the *Mail* said about you.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I am discussing national affairs, no man or no newspaper ever charged me with betraying my country. The *Globe*, in an article of the 7th January, 1890, had the following with these headings :—

"STARTLING.

"THE HOAR COMMITTEE LOADED UP THE OTHER WAY—THE MAIL'S EDITOR AT WORK.

"*False Representations as to the Feeling in Canada.*

"Surely the Canadians who have conspired to prevent an early and honourable settlement between Canada and her principal neighbour are traitors to the Dominion. That they have slandered this people by representing them as craving annexation is a minor count in the indictment."

Again, on 9th January, 1890 :

"A Canadian paper capable of spreading in Washington (through its emissary Farrer) the lie that Canadians are on the point of seeking annexation, and of spreading this lie in order to defend a scheme that it publicly declares for the benefit of the country, such a paper is, we say, utterly given over to duplicity and wholly unworthy of credence. They are either afflicted with a monomania of treachery, or maintained by a ring of conspirators bent on bringing Canada to sore trouble, in order to effect her annexation to the Republic."

This gentleman is now at the head of a great Liberal newspaper, and since then it has been admitted that he endeavoured to cripple and hamper Canadians. What could do more damage than this advice to parties in the United States ? Let me quote one sentence :

"The imposition by the United States of a tonnage tax on all Nova Scotia vessels laden whole or in part with fish would speedily put an end to seizures, and indeed to the whole controversy. Another way of bringing the Government and all concerned to their senses would be to suspend the bonding privilege, or cut the connection of the Canadian Pacific with the United States territory at Sault Ste. Marie. Either of these methods would rouse the full force of western Canada influence against the Government. It would be better still to oblige Britain to withdraw her countenance and support from the Canadians as she did in 1871. That would secure the end desired without leaving the United States open to the charge of being animated by hatred of Canada, on which Sir John Macdonald trades. It is plain that Sir John Macdonald's disappearance from the stage is to be the signal for a move towards annexation."

Mr. Wiman has been referred to. Let us see what he has to say in connection with this matter. I wish to show the House that Sir Charles Tupper was thoroughly conversant with everything that went on, and particularly in reference to this Hoar Committee in Washington. On the 30th December, 1889, Mr. Wiman gave his evidence as follows :—

"The first step that Canada will take, or the first indication she will make, of a desire for closer relations with the United States will be at the general elections, within eighteen months. If the question is squarely put before the people at that time for trade relations, and they say 'yes,' as the majority probably will, that would be an indication to this country of a desire for closer relations. I do not know whether you are aware of it, but there is a tremendous religious feud going on in Canada between the French Roman Catholics and the Protestant Canadians. That has produced a growth of sentiment in Canada in favour of annexation ; but it has had the opposite effect in this country, because attention has been drawn to the growth of the French race, and their possible influence if they were admitted to the Union."

Questions were asked :

"Do you not think that with our influences and policies we would be more likely to absorb and master that element, to revolutionize that people, and make them a part of ourselves, than the contrary ?

"Mr. Wiman :—Yes, if we can make them our customers, and trade with them and all that—we can afford to let the question of annexation and of future alliance take care of itself."

And in reply to other questions Mr. Wiman summed up his opinions in these words :

"We want to do something in our life-time. You can do that by making some arrangement that will win them rather than force them. You can encourage the Liberal party who have made that a plank in their platform."

The chairman asked :

"Are you an American citizen? Answer: I am a Canadian subject of Her Majesty. I should say in explanation of that, as the question is so pointedly put, that I did not take upon me the privileges, advantages, responsibility and glories of American citizenship, because, by doing so, I should lessen my influence in my native country."

And yet, Sir, this was the gentleman who was eulogized, defended and caressed by the Liberals of Canada. I will now quote something from Mr. Wiman's own pen, written two weeks prior to the general election of 5th March, Mr. Erastus Wiman issued a manifesto to the New York *Sunday Herald*, in which the following occurs :—

"Unrestricted reciprocity is now regarded by the Liberal party in Canada as the only practical trade arrangement which can be made between the two countries. Under a policy of unrestricted reciprocity the custom houses would be continued along the border line, but there would be a free admission into both countries of the products and manufactured goods of each. This, of course, requires that the tariff of Canada must never be lower than the tariff of the United States, though it may be placed just as much higher as the Canadians find necessary.

"When it seeks to regulate the commerce of the continent and adversely affect the interests of vast classes of Canadians, then he who is truly loyal to his own country and his own people is at liberty to be disloyal to a nation three thousand miles away and who has no interest to serve except a material interest common to both.

"Unrestricted reciprocity requires also that foreign goods, including those from Great Britain, shall have a duty exacted upon them by Canada, while on goods exchanged between Canada and the United States there would be no duty whatever. This, of course, would imply that Canada should discriminate against imports from British ports."

I have pointed out the fact that these gentlemen were in active communication with Mr. Wiman, and that Sir Charles Tupper, who represented Canada in Great Britain in a semi-ambassadorial position came here to fight the battles of the country. The hon. gentleman mentioned the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and the name of Mr. Reeves. Mr. Reeves has said :

"'It is true that we carried between 150 and 200 Canucks to Canada a day or two before the election. We also carried several hundred from various points on the line in Indiana and Michigan. They went to Canada for the purpose of voting a Liberal ticket. I am not ashamed of it. I am an annexationist, and have been for 26 years. I wish we had been able to muster thousands more. As it was we could not muster enough, for the election went against us, and Mr. Reeves smiled sadly.

"Did you furnish the men with free transportation ?—No, we were paid for it. We are not running a gift enterprise.

"Did any one furnish them with free transportation ?—I could not say as to that. I know that I did not furnish them with transportation. Of course I tried to induce as many to go as possible. I see, now, however, that I made a mistake in not working harder. I ought to have organized bureaus and induced every Canuck in the West-

ern States to have gone home and voted against Macdonald and Van Horne."

There is the evidence of one of the Grand Trunk employés that they were quite active in trying to defeat this Government. I am no enemy of the Trunk, but I am a believer in fair-play. The hon. gentleman has charged Sir Charles Tupper with coming to Canada at the beck of his party. Has he read his speech at Windsor? If not, in all fairness to Sir Charles Tupper, some portion of that speech should be placed upon record. I quote the following:—

"Now, I understand that Sir Richard was addressing the electors of this fine city a few days ago and he expressed some surprise that I should come here. Well, I think that he ought to have expressed no surprise. When I was 3,000 or 4,000 miles away Sir Richard Cartwright had the good taste to make me and what I said and did the staple material of his address to the public all over the country. If there were no other reason why I should come here to-night than for the purpose of answering briefly two of the charges made by Sir Richard Cartwright against me, I would be justified in being here. Now, in the first place, he has attacked my veracity. He has said that I have made two very exaggerated statements. He has said: 'I was present when the same accurate and most veracious person (Sir Charles Tupper) declared that before 1888 we would be exporting 640,000,000 bushels of wheat from Manitoba, and was even good enough to cipher out how many cars it would require to carry it.' Now, I think you will agree with me that Sir Richard Cartwright, when he is dealing with an absent man, ought not to make a gross misstatement as to what he has said. I hold in my hand the speech in which I referred to that matter, and you will find that it is just as much unlike what Sir Richard Cartwright said as light is unlike darkness. (Laughter and applause.)

"I was endeavouring to draw the attention of the House of Commons on the 5th February, 1884, to the great capabilities—the great agricultural capabilities—of the North-West of Canada, and here is what I said:

"'But let me just ask the attention of the House for a single moment to a few figures, which will indicate what the capabilities of that country are in regard to the production of wheat. One hundred thousand farmers, each farmer cultivating 320 acres of wheat land—has any hon. member made the calculation of what they would produce?

"'Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes.

"'Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am glad the hon. gentleman has done so. I am glad his attention has been drawn to the fact that 100,000 farmers cultivating 320 acres each, or 200,000 farmers cultivating half that quantity each, and taking the product at only 20 bushels to the acre, instead of 27 or 30 bushels, which is the average in the North-West in favourable years, would give 640,000,000 bushels of wheat, or 50 per cent. more wheat than the whole United States produces to-day. You have only to look at those figures for a single moment to see what the future of Canada may be, to see what a magnificent granary for the world is placed in our Canadian North-West: and when you remember we have six belts running through that fertile country that would each give 320 acres to 100,000 farmers; you can understand to some little degree what a magnificent future awaits us in the development of that great country.'

"Now, I ask this intelligent audience to contrast the statement that I made on the floor of the House of Commons of Canada with the statement that Sir Richard Cartwright says I made, and which the *Globe* of Saturday last reiterates upon what I think you will say is a very unworthy foundation for the repetition of such a statement. (Applause.) But Sir Richard Cartwright brings a more grave charge against me than that, and he attached so much importance to that charge that he published it in pamphlet form, and I have it in my hand. In a speech delivered by Sir Richard Cartwright in Ingersoll on 14th November, 1889, when I was on the other side of the water, he said:

"'Two years or so ago Sir Charles Tupper, being desirous for certain personal and political reasons (partly connected with the wholesale scheme of bribery by which he secured certain constituencies in Nova Scotia in the very throes of the last general elections) of inducing the House to build a certain line of railway, deliberately assured the House with the utmost emphasis, and particularly that by building a bare 80 or 83 miles they would shorten the distance from a large part of Nova Scotia to the rest of Canada by from 40 to 45 miles for every pound of freight and every passenger going from one place to the other.

"I will hand this statement to the reporters who are present, in order to enable them to take down accurately this charge which Sir Richard Cartwright makes against me. One would say that it was plain enough and emphatic enough, but it goes on:

"'On this solemn and distinct assurance the road was undertaken. It is now nearly completed, and on the vote being brought up in Supply it was ascertained after a long and full discussion, and was admitted by Sir John A. Macdonald himself, that so far from the construction of this 83 miles having shortened the transit from 40 to 45 miles, the utmost that could be gained (and even that was stoutly disputed) was barely 7 miles. And that the country was to spend not less than $1,500,000, and probably fully $2,000,000 for a road, the construction of which had been secured by this gross and most deliberate misrepresentation on the part of Sir Charles Tupper.'

"'Now, Sir, if Sir Richard Cartwright is anxious to indict a man for those statements by which I was led to believe that a saving of from 39 to 40 miles would be made by the construction of the road from New Glasgow to Amherst, I can furnish him with the name. I was not interested in that road or in the promotion of it more than anyone in this audience before me, and if Sir Richard Cartwright wants to indict the man who was he will have to indict his friend, and that man and that friend was Mr. Erastus Wiman. (Loud applause.) If he wants to indict the man who was the author of the statement, I give him the name and the evidence. I hold in my hand the petition of Mr. Blackman, the president of the Great European Short Line Railway, who came to the Government of Canada with a petition asking for aid to construct the road, and the statement made in that petition was that the construction of a line of 77 miles would mean the saving which I have referred to. That paper is the original paper now on file in the Department of Railways and Canals in Canada. That was in 1882. I did not go into the question with as much care as I otherwise would have done, believing that Mr. Blackman and Dr. Green, the president of the Great Union Telegraph Company of the United States, who were promoting this company, and Mr. Wiman, before undertaking the building of a line of railway, would have ascertained what was to be accomplished by it. Their statements were accepted by me, but I put the paper in the hands of Mr. Collingwood Schreiber, Chief Engineer of Government railways in Canada, who reported that what Dr. Green and Mr. Blackman had set forth in regard to the distance to be saved would, he also thought, be saved. Here is what was said:

"'The scheme appears very attractive, and the road would undoubtedly draw a large ocean traffic.'

"It was to form a great line of communication to the heart of Canada; it would also secure to the Dominion the control of the highway between the two continents, contribute to the development of her resources and the promotion of her prosperity. It spoke of the distance to be built from New Glasgow to Amherst, and said it would be 77 miles. Now, these were the statements that Mr. Wiman and his friends made. I have given you the report of the Government engineer, bearing out what Mr. Wiman had said, and upon that Parliament was asked for a vote of money and gave a subsidy. I do not say that Mr. Wiman and his friends were not acting under the belief that the statements which they made were accurate, but if Sir Richard Cartwright wants to indict a man who had a personal interest in the road I tell him that Mr. Wiman was a large stockholder in that road. I give him the name, and I can produce the prospectus published by the company, of which Mr. Wiman was a member, which contains the statement as to the saving that would be made. I hope that Sir Richard Cartwright will feel that no personal considerations will prevent him from doing and going forward with the indictment against Mr. Erastus Wiman for having misled the Government of Canada. (Applause.) If any person here should have the slightest doubt of this I can only say that I hold in my hand a letter from Mr. Erastus Wiman, in which he states that he had a large interest in the company, and begs me to give the best assistance I could. (Applause.)

"Having discussed these two personal matters, I think you will agree with me that it would benefit the character, the standing and the ability of a man like Sir Richard Cartwright if he would not attack a man when 4,000 miles away from where he is speaking, if he would not attack a man who is not in political life, and who has to discharge the duties of an independent office in England; if he would not attack such a man with such gross and unfounded calumny and aspersion. (Loud applause.) If there were no other reason for my being here, it should

be sufficient that he had ventured to attack me in my absence, and having done so, his course has perfectly justified me in repudiating such slanderous and unfounded language. (Loud applause.) I do not charge Mr. Wiman with intentional misrepresentation. He, no doubt, had accepted somebody else's statement, and had been misled in that way; but I must say that Sir Richard Cartwright ought to be very careful how he assails the reputation of a public man because he made a mistake. You know that Mr. Wiman has taken the position of being the counsellor and guide of the great Liberal party in Canada. (Laughter.)"

Sir Charles Tupper was perfectly willing to discuss matters with the member for South Oxford, but, failing to do that, he put his views on record. He takes the speech of the hon. member for South Oxford, and, clause by clause, proves that the hon. gentleman misrepresented him. He proves that he was maligned by the hon. member for South Oxford, and he says that he came back to the country where for thirty-six years he had been a representative man, to reply to the ex-Minister of Finance and to refute the charges that he had made against him. Was there any wrong in that? Was there any crime in that? The hon. gentleman came here to fight his battles, just as the member for South Oxford fights his battles, and to-night he defames Sir Charles Tupper on the floor of the House, and reads parts of extracts, leaving out the context, for the purpose of endeavouring to convict him of wrong-doing. The hon. gentleman says that the Grand Trunk Railway was abused. I cannot see where the Grand Trunk Railway was abused. Sir Charles Tupper has given his reasons for what he stated in regard to the Grand Trunk Railway, and those very reasons are given in letters that appeared in the London *Times*. His fight was with Sir Henry Tyler for inspiring the action of the Grand Trunk. In the first place, what does Sir Charles Tupper say in regard to the attempt to bribe the Grand Trunk Railway, the attempt to force the Grand Trunk Railway to support the Government? Has that ever been denied? Sir Charles Tupper has publicly denied the allegation, and no one has proved it. He says:

"Sir Henry Tyler had agreed to take over that road from Rivière du Loup to Edmundston, provided the Canadian Government would give a subsidy of about $2,000,000 to carry the line to Salisbury, and running powers from there to Halifax, so as to enable the Grand Trunk Railway Company to reach that point. When I arrived in Montreal Mr. Cameron came to me and said Mr. Seargeant wished to discuss that matter with me, and it was arranged that I should go to his house for that purpose. This I did, as the following extract from Sir Henry Tyler's letter shows:

"'The question of a subsidy for lines to be constructed in New Brunswick in the Grand Trunk interest, with a view to a connection between Halifax and St. John was also referred to; Sir Charles Tupper stating that no personal pledge could be given on the subject further than that the matter would be brought before the Cabinet on the first occasion of their meeting, which would be after the elections.'"

Here Sir Henry Tyler admits himself that Sir Charles Tupper told him that until the election was over it was impossible to discuss that question; yet the member for South Oxford says that Sir Charles Tupper went to Montreal to bribe the Grand Trunk Railway. We have more evidence than that. Sir Charles Tupper says:

"Having received a letter from Sir John A. Macdonald, in which he said, speaking of Mr. Seargeant: 'I was much surprised at the instructions which he had given (of which I had indubitable evidence) to the employés of the railway, to vote against us or not to vote for us,' I pointed out to Mr. Seargeant the great injustice of such an order, and requested him to recall it, and inform the officials and employés that they would all be free to vote as they wished. I sent a copy of my letter to the *Times* to Mr. Cameron, who wrote to me on March 28 as follows:—

"'You certainly made no request to Mr. Seargeant to issue instructions to the officers and employés to vote for the Government, and you urged nothing more than that the Grand Trunk should remain neutral in the contest and allow the employés to vote as they wished, which Mr. Seargeant said was his own wish and intention, but that he was an officer of the Grand Trunk and must obey any instructions he received.'

"'So much for the question of fact. Sir Henry Tyler denies that Mr. Seargeant issued a 'manifesto,' but adds afterwards 'matters at Washington rendered it absolutely necessary for Mr. Seargeant to make and publish such a statement.'"

The member for South Oxford in all fairness should have read the entire letter referred to in the interview with Mr. Seargeant. But where is the abuse of the Grand Trunk Railway? We will take Sir Charles Tupper's letter; he says:

"I said in the same speech: 'Canada had loaned to the Grand Trunk enormous sums, not a dollar of which had been repaid.' Why, did not Sir Henry Tyler suppose that this implied that the loan was to him? But if there was any misunderstanding on this point, or any delay in correcting it, the fault does not lie with me. I spoke at Amherst on the 9th of March, and my speech was published on the 11th at Halifax, as the enclosed copy of the *Herald* will show. I said:

"'I will say further that the worst blow Canada ever received in England was that caused by the loss of millions of pounds to English investors because of the jobbery, extravagance and corruption of the Grand Trunk.'"

Well, if I mistake not, some of that very jobbery and extravagance charged now, were condoned and apologized for by the member for South Oxford by his vote in Parliament. Sir Charles further wrote to the *Times*:

"Sir Henry Tyler knows that I referred to the original construction of the Grand Trunk Railway, which was so marked by 'extragance, jobbery, and corruption' as to waste an enormous sum of money, and involve those who had furnished the capital in all but a total loss. The 188 miles of road from Quebec to Rivière du Loup, which the Government engineer estimated could be built equal to the rest of the Intercolonial Railway for about £372,000, cost the Grand Trunk shareholders no less than £944,000! If Sir Henry Tyler wishes evidence of corruption he has only to read his own letter of April 7, where he says: 'There have been Canadian politicians who in times past too frequently employed the Grand Trunk Railway as an instrument for party purposes, and fattened on the British capital invested in it.'"

He further wrote:

"While every man who had invested a dollar in the Canadian Pacific Railway is drawing interest on his money, thousands of people who invested in Grand Trunk stocks not only receive no interest but have sunk their capital. It was these investments which so damaged Canada in the eyes of the British public, and even to-day the Grand Trunk by its wild and reckless purchases of additional railways—purchased for the purpose of obstructing or heading off the Canadian Pacific—in which additional millions of money are being sunk, is involving the Grand Trunk shareholders in greater ruin."

I would now briefly refer the hon. gentleman to the last report of the Grand Trunk Railway. In that report it is stated:

"If any of the officers or other employés of the company thought proper, in the exercise of their individual rights, to vote against the Government, in regard to which the Board have no information, it may be supposed that they did so from the same feeling which has, from time to time, actuated the shareholders to give expression to their opinions at the half yearly meetings, and in the petition to the Canadian Government, which was signed by 11,000 shareholders in January, 1889, and duly forwarded to Canada and presented to the Government, and of which a copy is also, for facility of reference, herewith forwarded."

In that petition the shareholders state:

"When, however, the original policy was changed, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was empowered and assisted to acquire various lines in the older sections

of the country, and to make extensions in competition with and duplication of the Grand Trunk Railway and other railways, then it was realized that a great national undertaking, intended to connect together the various provinces of the Dominion, was being diverted from its original purpose, and transformed into a powerful engine, aided and supported by the financial influence of the Government, for local competitive warfare against the interests of your petitioners, and the properties in which their money had been invested."

Naturally, Sir Charles Tupper, as representative of Canada, says that is not true; he states distinctly that no such thing has taken place. Hon. gentlemen opposite know that in the building of these, some of which were afterwards secured to the Canadian Pacific Railway, aid was given by the Canadian Government, and like many lines they have merged in other systems. The Midland system is merged in the Grand Trunk Railway, and portions of Western Ontario lines have been merged into the Canadian Pacific Railway. Yet the hon. gentleman would ask Sir Charles Tupper to maintain silence while people are defaming the Government of Canada, and stating distinctly that they subsidized lines that the Government promised them not to subsidize. Now, hon. gentlemen have talked a great deal at various times in their press with regard to the abuse of Sir Charles Tupper in calling them "ruined gamesters." I do not believe that the hon. member for South Oxford will again attempt to make that charge. I do not believe that any hon. gentleman on the opposite side of the House will repeat the charges made in the Liberal press, that Sir Charles Tupper publicly denounced them as ruined gamesters. I ask them if they have taken the trouble to find out what he said? I have here a copy of the London *Times* in which that charge is made. Sir Charles Tupper writing to the London *Times* on the 18th May, says:

"I have shown that Sir Henry Tyler—like Artemus Ward, who was ready to sacrifice all his wife's relations to the war—having by his fatuous mismanagement reduced his company to the greatest straits, turned his back upon the Government, which according to his own letter had saved the Grand Trunk Company, and united with Messrs. Wiman and Farrer, who were suggesting to the United States the means of reducing the Grand Trunk Company to bankruptcy, in an attempt to subvert British institutions in Canada. Fortunately for Canada, and for the Empire to which it belongs, this last throw of these ruined gamesters has not been successful, and their designs now stand revealed."

The hon. member for South Oxford might have secured that paper and should apologize to some extent for the words used towards Sir Charles Tupper, but he maintained silence, although the paper was on file in which it is stated distinctly that Sir Charles Tupper refers to Messrs. Farrer and Wiman. More than that, the hon. gentleman asserts that Sir Charles Tupper maligned the Opposition, stating that their policy was inimical to the interests of Canada. The Minister of Justice referred to the fact that Mr. Blake put that on record, and also expressed his opinion on that declaration. Hon. gentlemen opposite quote from Mr. Blake's speech, but omit the most important portions. If Sir Charles Tupper used ungenerous words towards the Opposition, Mr. Blake used words quite as strong and quite as suggestive. In order to prove that I will read what Sir Charles Tupper said when he was charged with maligning hon. gentlemen opposite. Sir Charles at Amherst said:

"I will read extracts from Mr. Blake's open letter sufficient to sustain the position that the great Liberal Conservative party took throughout this campaign, that therein British institutions were at stake in Canada—not on account of free trade only, but the issue was: Whether we were to become a part of the United States or not. I think you will say that Mr. Blake gives evidence on this point that admits of no contradiction on the part of our opponents. Mr. Blake writes: The tendency of unrestricted free trade with the United States, high duties being maintained against the United Kingdom, would be towards political union, and the more successful the plan, the stronger the tendency, both by reason of the community of interests, the intermingling of populations, the more intimate business and social connections, and the trade and fiscal relations, amounting to dependency, which it would create with the States, and of the greater isolation and divergency from Great Britain which it would produce; and also and especially through inconveniences experienced in the maintenance and apprehensions entertained as to the termination of the treaty—our hopes and our fears alike would draw one way. We would then indeed be looking to Washington."

Again:

"Assuming that absolute free trade, best described as commercial union, may and ought to come, I believe it can only come as an incident, or at any rate as a well understood precursor of political union, for which indeed we should be able to get better terms before than after the surrender of our commercial independence."

What else can we offer as a reason for the action of Sir Charles Tupper and the words which he used? We can offer this, that leading Liberals, headed by Mr. Gordon Brown, Hon. Wm. McDougall and scores of others, espoused the cause of the Conservative party at the last election, for they realized the increased peril to the nation. I desire to refer to another matter. It is stated that Sir Charles Tupper called the Liberal Party in Quebec "ruined gamesters." Sir Charles said:

"Mercier, by his wild extravagance and determination to hold on to power, has spent the last dollar in the treasury. He is wandering about from bank to bank now, borrowing money at six per cent. interest to carry on his Government from day to day, and passed an act of repudiation, the most dishonourable and injurious ever passed in a British Province, and in fact the only instance of its kind in the British Empire. He has destroyed the credit of Quebec. His efforts on behalf of Mr. Laurier are well understood and are the last throw of a ruined gamester."

Those words were not applied to the Liberal party, but were levelled at some of the leaders of the party, like Mr. Mercier, who were not only misleading their supporters but ruining the country. We have had other Agents General, and perhaps it would be well for me to call attention to remarks made by a certain Agent General when the hon. member for South Oxford was Minister of Finance, and I will take occasion to compare the acts and statements of Mr. Jenkins with those of Sir Charler Tupper. Sir Charles has worked indefatigably in the interests of Canada. The first act performed by Mr. Jenkins was to deliver a speech against Canada and in favour of other countries. At a Union Labourers' League Demonstration Canada's Agent General advised the people to go to Queensland and New Zealand. I quote from the Labourers' Union *Chronicle*, June, 1874:

"When he saw men and such men as he did see living on the wretched wages now paid them; when he compared their condition with the condition of those now out in the colonies who went from this country with nothing save their skin, and were now in a position of comfort and influence, he felt that emigration was well worth their notice. If the farmers would not employ the men here let them go to Queensland and New Zealand where they were willing to employ them."

No word for Canada. Not a word was said condemnatory of the Agent General by the then Minister of Finance (Sir Richard Cartwright), yet

to-day the hon. gentleman denounces the man who has done more to make Canada great and to consolidate the interests of the Dominion than any public man, save and except the right hon. the leader of the present Government. There is another comparison I desire to institute. Charges of extravagance have been made against Sir Charles Tupper. On consulting the Public Accounts I find a record of the two Agents General, one appointed under the régime of the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright), and Sir Charles Tupper. An exhibition was held in Philadelphia some years ago, and a number of commissioners were selected to go there. The total cost of the Commission reached $30,000 a year, while only $250 or $300 were expended for medals for successful exhibitors. I will now submit a comparison of expenses, selected from the Public Accounts for 1876 and 1891, as follows:—

1891,

SIR CHARLES TUPPER.

1.	Carpentering	$ 67 20
2.	Directories	4 86
3.	Newspapers	196 00
4.	Parliamentary papers	18 29
5.	Repairs to house	62 79
6.	Repairing furniture and whiting walls	97 33
7.	Subs. to Col. Institute	9 73
8.	Fire insurance	48 65
9.	Gratuities to postmen	29 57
10.	Parochial rates	349 47
11.	Stock Exchange Year Book	7 30
12.	Aid to distressed Canadians	25 33
	Victoria Buildings, Dominion Offices, 1 year and heating	2,780 52

1876.

COMMISSIONER PERREAULT.

1.	Provisions and groceries (including some liquor bills)	$ 2,526 50
2.	Dinners, oysters and porter	332 12
3.	Gold watch presented (name unknown)	269 00
4.	216 bottles Bass Ale	40 50
5.	Roderer Champagne (12 bottles)	28 50
6.	Pleasant Valley Wine (36)	48 00
7.	Sparkling Wine (pints) (24)	18 00
8.	Hennessy Brandy (11)	22 00
9.	Superior Old Port Wine	15 00
10.	George House, 11 dinners	50 00
11.	Lafayette House—flowers, champagne, cigarettes and 32 dinners	220 00
12.	Annie (various times)	60 00
13.	13 gallons best sherry	52 02
	Rent of furnished house, 8 months	2,666 72
	Servants	445 00

If you compare the public life of Sir Charles Tupper with any hon. member on the opposite side of the House, or if you compare his actions with those of any official in the country, I think for patriotism, ability and public spirit, they will compare favourably with those of Canada's famous statesmen in either party. I think the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution has done an injustice to Sir Charles Tupper in every sense of the word. Charges have been made that cannot be established, allegations that in his absence his friends—and he has many—will not allow to pass unchallenged. I am ready and prepared to vote to support the action of the Government with reference to Sir Charles Tupper, and to vote against the resolution moved by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier).

ILLNESS OF SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, we have known that for the last few days the Premier has been lying ill at his residence. I have the painful duty to announce to the House that the news from Earnscliffe just received, is that the First Minister has had a relapse and that he is in a most critical condition. We have reports from the medical men in attendance on the right hon. gentleman and they do not seem to believe that he can live many hours longer. Under these circumstances I will move, seconded by Mr. Laurier, that the debate be now adjourned.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, under such sad circumstances it is also a painful duty for me to second the motion of the hon. gentleman. The country will of course be shocked to hear the sad news, and I am sure it will not be possible to proceed with business further. I second the motion.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 9.50, p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 1st June, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 96) to confirm a deed of amalgamation between the Ottawa and Parry Sound Railway Company and the Ottawa, Arnprior and Renfrew Railway Company, and for other purposes.—Mr. Jamieson.)

DREDGING—KAMINISTIQUIA HARBOUR.

Mr. LISTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would ask the Minister of Public Works when I may expect to have the return, ordered the 11th May, asking for particulars respecting the dredging of Kaministiquia Harbour?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will take a note of it.

RECIPROCITY PAPERS.

Mr. LAURIER. When will the hon. the Minister of Justice be prepared to bring down the papers with reference to the negotiations at Washington?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am expecting hourly to receive a definite answer, and may have it at any moment, when I will bring down all the papers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. gentleman has not received permission to lay on the Table all the papers, he will be able to bring down a certain portion?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 86) to incorporate the Brighton, Warkworth and Norwood Railway Company.—(Mr. Cochrane.)

Bill (No. 88) to incorporate the St. Catharines and Merritton Bridge Company.—(Mr. Gibson.)

Bill (No. 89) to incorporate the Kingston and Pontiac Railway Company. —(Mr. Ferguson, Renfrew.)

Bill (No. 90) to amend the Act to incorporate the Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Cochrane.)

Bill (No. 93) to incorporate the Ontario and New York Bridge Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 94) respecting the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

DYKE—LA RIVIÈRE DU SUD.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, Whether the Government intend to place in the Estimates the sum of $3,000, in order to defray the cost of a dyke, to be thrown up in order to protect the public highway running alongside La Rivière du Sud, in the parish of St. Thomas, in the County of Montmagny, in order to prevent damage to the highway by the water and ice, which accumulate there, on account of their being held back by the piers of the Intercolonial Railway bridge; the whole as recommended by Mr. Louis Coste, a civil engineer in the employ of the Department of Public Works?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot give an answer now. It is not customary to state what sums are to be placed in the Supplementary Estimates, and I think the hon. gentleman had better wait until the Supplementary Estimates are brought down.

LIVERPOOL AND ANNAPOLIS RAILWAY

Mr. FORBES asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government this session to place a sufficient sum in the Supplementary Estimates to finish and complete the subsidy to the Liverpool and Annapolis Railway from Liverpool to Annapolis?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I must give the hon. gentleman the same answer as I have given to the previous question.

ST. JOHN RAILWAY STATION.

Mr. DAVIES asked, 1. What is the "additional property accommodation" at St. John railway station, for which a vote of $80,000 is asked, wanted for? 2. Was the necessity of this "additional property accommodation" reported upon by any Intercolonial or other official; if so, by whom? 3. How much land is at present being taken for the $80,000? Is it proposed to take any more land adjoining? Has the land proposed to be taken been valued by the arbitrators? If not, is it to be so valued? 4. Does the land proposed to be taken belong to the Harris Estate, Harris & Co. (Ltd.) or Jas. C. Robertson, or any and which of them?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In the absence of the head of the Department I cannot answer now.

LISTOWEL POST OFFICE AND CUSTOM HOUSE.

Mr. GRIEVE asked, Is it the intention of the Government to place a sufficient sum in the Supplementary Estimates during the present Session, to erect a post office and custom house in the town of Listowel, County of Perth?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman will have to wait until the supplementaries are down.

PORT ARTHUR BREAKWATER.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Who received the contract for the Port Arthur breakwater? What was the amount of the contract, and where does the contractor reside? Is the breakwater completed? If so, has it exceeded the contract price, and how much? Has the contractor been paid for the works in full? If not, is any claim made for a balance? If so, how much, and by whom claimed?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The following answer has been sent to me by the department:—There have been three different contracts let for the construction of the breakwater at Port Arthur, namely, the first portion to Duncan Macdonald, of Montreal, for $146,000; the second to Archibald Stewart, of Ottawa, for contract amount, $98,000; sheathing northerly end of breakwater, $586.72; for construction of block southern end of work, $9,840; total, $120,910.72; and the third to John M. Kirby, of Chute à Blondeau, and Archibald Stewart, of Ottawa, contract amount, $124,000; for sheet piling the piers at entrance, $4,802.84; for stone placed in talus, $4,000; total, $132,802.84. Mr. Macdonald had no extra work. Mr. Stewart presented a claim in connection with the second contract for alleged subsidence of the work which was not allowed by the Department. No claim for extras has been made in connection with Messrs. Kirby & Stewart's contract. The breakwaters have been completed. No contract price was exceeded. The contractors have been paid in full.

CHIEF ENGINEER OF THE QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSION.

Mr. TARTE (translation) asked, Whether it is within the knowledge of the Government that Mr. Boswell was appointed Chief Engineer of the Corporation of the Quebec Harbour Commissioners during the month of September, 1890—that is to say, about four months previous to the alleged resignation of Mr. H. F. Perley, on the 15th of January, 1891?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) In answer to the hon. member, I have to say that the report which I have received from the department is as follows: There is no record of the department having been notified that a successor to Mr. Perley has been appointed in the person of Mr. Boswell.

RAW SUGAR IMPORTS.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, What quantity of raw sugar stands in the books of the Custom House, Montreal, as ex-warehoused by the two sugar refining companies or individuals, upon which duty has not been paid? How much duty is unpaid by each? How long are refiners permitted to ex-warehouse raw sugar without paying duty?

Mr. BOWELL. This question is somewhat involved, but I will answer it as fully as possible. No raw sugar that I am aware of stands upon the books of the Customs as ex-warehoused, nor has

the department any knowledge of raw sugar being ex-warehoused upon which duty has not been paid. Refiners are not given time during which to pay duties when they ex-warehouse raw sugars.

PROVINCIAL RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron) asked, Can the Government state what sums as subsidies to railways have been paid by the different Provinces of the Dominion since Confederation; and, if so, what are the respective subsidies?

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will refer to the yearly report from the Railway Department, he will find the information he asks for. There is a page in the report which gives the amount paid to each railway by the municipality, the Provincial Government and the Dominion Government. If that does not give him all the information he desires, he can put a question on the paper again.

INDIAN AGENT AT WIARTON.

Mr. SOMERVILLE asked, Did Wm. Simpson, Indian Agent at Wiarton, receive leave of absence for two weeks just previous to the recent Dominion elections? Was his office closed during this period.

Mr. DEWDNEY. To the first part of the question I may say, yes. To the second, I understand that arrangements were made for carrying on the duties of the office while the officer was absent.

GEORGIAN BAY ISLANDS TIMBER.

Mr. SOMERVILLE asked, What amount of dues have been collected on timber cut on White Cloud, Hay and Griffiths Islands, in Georgian Bay, during the years 1887, 1888, 1889 and 1890, respectively, by the Indian Land Office at Wiarton?

Mr. DEWDNEY. In the season of 1887-88 the amount collected was $1,292.79; in 1888-89, $976.34; in 1889-90, $148.32. Returns for 1890-91 have not yet been received by the department.

PIERRE ST. PIERRE.

Mr. PROULX (Translation) asked, Whether Mr. Pierre St. Pierre is still employed as Slide-master at the Carillon Dam? If not, why was he dismissed, and by whom has he been replaced; and what is the salary of the present incumbent?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) Mr. Pierre St. Pierre has ceased to be employed at the slide of the Carillon Dam. The letter which was sent to him said that one man was sufficient at this post, and consequently Mr. J. Middleton, who was the senior employé, was retained. He gets $1.40 per day.

CATTLE ON EUROPEAN STEAMERS.

Mr. FEATHERSTON asked, Whether the Government have made any Order in Council regulating the size of cattle space in steamers carrying cattle from Canadian ports to ports in Europe? If so, what is the length and breadth of each space? If such order has not been made, what orders, regulations or instructions have the Government inspectors at the ports of Montreal and Quebec received for their guidance in loading cattle and sheep at said ports, or have they any power to restrain steamers from going to sea with cattle in insufficient space for their comfort and lives?

Mr. HAGGART. No Order in Council has yet been made to fix the cattle spaces in steamers. The subject is under consideration. The inspections at present take place under the provisions of section 26, chapter 7, Consolidated Orders in Council of Canada. Under such Order the Government Veterinary Inspector has power to prevent any vessel getting a Customs clearance carrying cattle in insufficient space for the health of animals.

SEIGNIORY OF SILLERY.

Mr. GUAY (for Mr. FRÉMONT) asked, For what reason, and on what date did the Government discontinue proceedings in the case of Picard *vs.* Picard before the Superior Court, in the city of Quebec? Whether the Government intends to continue proceedings in this case, in order to decide the question whether the Seigniory of Sillery belongs or does not belong to the Huron Indians of Lorette?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The intervention of the Crown in these proceedings was discontinued for the reason that it was considered that neither the Crown nor the Indians referred to had any interest in these proceedings. In order to withdraw, the intervention of the Crown was made by the department on the 26th January, 1884, but for various reasons the record was not actually withdrawn until 1886.

STRATFORD BOYS' HOME.

Mr. DEVLIN asked, Whether the Boys' Home at Stratford is under the control of the Government? If so, who is the director of the institution, and who was acting in that capacity 7th August, 1889? What was the amount of money paid by the Government to the Boys' Home during the year 1889?

Mr. HAGGART. The Government has no control over the Boys' Home at Stratford, and is not informed who is the director of that institution. No money was paid by the Government to the Boys' Home during the year 1889 or since.

WHARF AT GATINEAU POINT.

Mr. DEVLIN asked, How much money has the Government expended in constructing, during the past year, a wharf at Gatineau Point? Who have filled during the past year the positions of Superintendent and of Inspector of Government works at Gatineau Point, in the County of Ottawa, and what sums of money have been paid to them?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The answer I have from the department shows that there is no wharf built at Gatineau Point during the past year, and therefore no expenditure was made, and no expenditure was made on the existing wharf, nor was any inspector employed.

FORT DU COTEAU DU LAC.

Mr. MOUSSEAU asked, 1. Has the Government leased the property known by the name of "Fort du Côteau du Lac"; if so, to whom, and for what rental? 2. Since the year 1872, what are the names of the parties who have been, successively,

the lessees of this fort; and what sum of money has the Government received from the said lessees? 3. If this fort is not now under lease, is it permissible to any person to enclose this property, and to make use of it by keeping it as a pasture ground?

Mr. DEWDNEY. This property was leased for two successive terms of five years, commencing the 1st of June, 1871, to Mr. G. A. Beaudet, the rental for the first term being $500 per annum, and for the second term, $150 per annum. In 1886, Mr. Beaudet was permitted to occupy a portion of the property for a period of two years at a rental of $30 per annum. The total amount received from Mr. Beaudet by way of rent was $3,260. The land is for the present withdrawn from sale and lease in the expectation that it will be required for public purposes, and Mr. Beaudet has been charged with the guardianship of it, in consideration of which he is permitted to occupy it temporarily, but upon condition that he will vacate it whenever he may be called upon by the department to do so, and that he shall have no claim to any compensation or consideration whatsoever for any improvement he may make upon it.

QUARANTINE FOR SHEEP.

Mr. SPROULE asked, Whether the attention of the Government has been drawn to the fact that the United States, authorities have ordered the establishment of a quarantine for sheep and lambs going from Canada to Buffalo and other points? If so, have any steps been taken to get the order rescinded, or to convince them of the fact that no contagious disease exists among sheep in Canada?

Mr. HAGGART. The Government has received no official information, neither has it any correspondence on this subject, consequently no action has been taken.

MAJOR'S HILL PARK.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Were tenders asked for for the care and improvements of Major's Hill Park for the current year? 2. Who was the lowest tenderer? Who received the contract? What is the contract sum? 3. What was the amount of the lowest tender?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. 1. Yes, by public advertisement on the 29th May, 1890. 2. Lowest, Charles Scrim, Ottawa, $3,700 per year. L. Garello received the contract for $3,700 per year. 3. $3,700 per year. Charles Scrim was the lowest tenderer. The last clause of the specifications on which the tenders were called and based, was as follows:

"The contractor must devote the whole of his time to the service, and will not be allowed to engage in any other work, and he will be required to remain on the premises during all working hours, both winter and summer."

On the 25th June, 1890, the chief architect reported that he had an interview with Mr. Scrim, the lowest tenderer, who declined to enter into a contract on those terms, and that Mr. Garello, the next lowest tenderer, agreed to do the work on the price of the lowest. The Minister was authorized by Order in Council of the 30th June, 1890, to enter into a contract with Mr. Garello on the price of the lowest tenderer, $3,700. Garello's tender price was $4,500 per year.

TEMPERANCE COLONIZATION SOCIETY.

Mr. WALLACE (for Mr. COATSWORTH) asked, Whether the Government have made a settlement with the Temperance Colonization Society? If so, has the settlement been consummated? If a settlement has been made, how many acres of land is the Society to receive? How much money has the Society paid to the Government? Is the Society now indebted to the Government? And if so, in what amount? Has the Government received communications from any persons, protesting against any settlement being made with the Society until the Society has recompensed equitably all parties who invested money in the Society? Have the Society disposed, or attempted to dispose, of lands to contemplating purchasers on terms and conditions which the Government refused to sanction?

Mr. DEWDNEY. 1. Yes; by authority of an Order in Council, dated the 21st April last. 2. Practically the settlement is consummated, although all the lands to be patented to the company have not yet been selected. Mr. Pierce, an officer of the department, is at the present time examining the land with a view to the selection of the balance. 3. 100,000 acres. 4. $100,000. 5. The Society is not now indebted to the Government. 6. Yes; several. A careful examination of the correspondence, however, shows that most of the complaints were embraced in the return already submitted to Parliament. 7. The department has no information on the subject of the terms on which the Society has disposed of its lands.

SECOND HOMESTEADS, N.W.T.

Mr. DAVIN moved:

That, whereas in 1883 an Act was passed granting second homesteads to those settlers who had completed the conditions of the first homestead entry; and whereas in 1886 an Act was passed abolishing the policy of second homesteads; and whereas in 1887 an Act was passed which acknowledged the principle and right of those second homesteads, it should now be enacted that all those settlers who came in between 1st June, 1883, and 2nd June, 1886, should, on completing their improvements, be granted a second homestead.

He said: There are two reasons why it is desirable to proceed with this motion at once. Last session I was reproved by the Government for not bringing on my motions earlier. My hon. friend the Minister of Interior said:

"The second grievance I have with the hon. gentleman is this: During the first portion of the session he placed on the Order paper a large number of very important motions, all referring to the North-West Territories. He really took advantage of his own colleagues, who, I know, felt very strongly on the subject; and yet, although the hon. gentleman had placed those motions on the Order paper, he was not in his seat when, day after day, they were called, and he was obliged to answer them or to take the action which it was his duty to take."

Well, I was very unparliamentary at the time, and I said, "That is not true," and as I was reproved for not bringing them on in time, why, of course, I ought now to bring them on as soon as possible. But, as a fact, five weeks of the session had passed before I placed these notices on the paper, so that I could not have placed them on the paper in the first part of the session. It so happens that I can prove a negative, because on every private day, as you may see from the *Hansard*, I was in my place, because on every private day I spoke, as is evidenced by the *Hansard*; therefore, the state-

ment that I was not in my place cannot be correct. But there is a double proof. I have the Order paper here, and I find that there were 47 motions before mine, and on examining the *Hansard* I find that these motions were called, one after another, and discussed on each private day, and the very first day that my motion was called, I went on with it. Although I was unparliamentary, I was correct, and if the statement is challenged I have all the figures here to prove it. Not only that, but it so happened that on every Government day I was in my place and spoke. The hon. gentleman stated that I placed these motions on the paper early in the session to take advantage of my colleagues. That statement is not correct, because, as I have said, five weeks had passed: therefore, the statement that I put them there to take advantage of my colleagues falls to the ground. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the reason I delayed putting them on the paper so long was this: I wanted to see what the Government was going to do in regard to the subjects dealt with in these important motions. Now, with regard to the motion I am about to bring before the House. We have some seventy new members in this House: something like one-third is new blood. Last session, my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, in dealing with this matter, said, after he had declared that he could not yield to my motion:

"I do not intend to retreat from the position I have taken on this subject. I will bring the matter before my colleagues again, and, if they feel inclined to change the policy and to extend the provisions of this amended Act for another year, I will not stand in the way; although, at the same time, I may express my opinion in a diametrically opposite sense."

I do not know whether my hon. friend brought this important question of second homesteading before his colleagues, but we shall be very glad indeed to hear of his having brought it before his colleagues and taken the side of justice and not the side of injustice. Mr. Blake spoke on this matter, but, I must say, not with his usual acumen; I suppose his mind had not been directed to the subject, and certainly he hardly understood it. He said:

"The principle of a second homestead having been very much pressed upon the House, it was conceded; but according to the views of those who have the best knowledge of the subject, it proved unsuccessful and was discontinued. I must say that I think the balance of the evidence indicated that it was discontinued too peremptorily."

That was the opinion of Mr. Blake, as a great lawyer, looking at this matter. He continued:

"That a longer day of grace ought to have been given than was given. Although the Minister of the Interior thinks it was a mistake to extend that day, my view was that it was a just and reasonable thing to make that extension—having regard to the position of the existing interests, undefined as they might be—of those who went in on the expectation raised by the adoption of that principle; but I must say, since the House, having decided that the experiment was a failure, and having determined to discontinue it, gave that extension out of regard to certain so-called vested interests, I think the extension was a liberal one and ought to be a final one. I was glad to hear the earlier part of the statement of the hon. Minister of the Interior when he announced such a firm conviction as to what the policy of the Government and the House ought to be, but I was sorry when he declared in the end that he would waive and relinquish his policy if the rest of his colleagues differed from him."

So that we hoped, because the Minister's mind was in a state of balance, that if on going back to his colleagues he found his colleagues took the view that the provisions of the Act of 1883 were embodied in pamphlets issued by the Department of Agriculture in 1885, pamphlets scattered broadcast throughout Europe, pamphlets read on the banks of the Rhine, on the banks of the Tweed, pamphlets read all over England and Ireland, on the faith of which men came out here—we hoped under these circumstances the men who signed the petition would be placed in the position that justice suggests they should occupy. When I was interrupted in reading that petition, those petitioners, poor farmers as they are, were going on to say that they had read that pamphlet, and that they had come out in consequence of the representations it contained. In what condition do they find themselves? They look around and see men who came into the country in 1882 getting second homesteads, men who came in during 1882, before the Act giving second homesteads came into existence, those men, such is the farce in consequence of that impulsive repeal of 1886, who came into the country without any motive as to securing a second homestead being before their minds, obtaining second homesteads, while men who came here with the lure and hope of obtaining a second homestead before them cannot get the second homestead. The plea in regard to this matter is, it is a bad policy. That is the first point taken. I told the hon. gentlemen opposite it was a bad policy in 1883. The moment the Act came into my hands—I was out in the North-West at the time, and I think Hon. Mr. Macpherson was either Minister or acting Minister of Interior—I at once sat down and denounced the principle. I said it was a bad principle, that it would give a perambulating settlement. In the name of all that is reasonable then, why did not the Deputy Minister, who is now so strong against second homesteading, go to the Minister and say: There are strong points made against the second homesteading system we are adopting, we must not go on with it, but had better have the measure repealed next year. If that had been done, the extension I obtained in 1887 would have covered all those who came in. But no, although I hammered away for three years, the Act was not repealed until Hon. Thos. White came into office in 1886, and then he repealed it. When he was with me in Regina, I said to him: It is a bad principle, it gives us unsettled settlers, so to speak, men who are looking for another homestead and who are not satisfied with one. But it never occurred to me that when he proceeded to repeal the clause in the Act of 1883 he would not only sweep away utterly the bad principle that had been hatched in the Department of the Interior, but also all the rights that had accrued under that principle. I may tell this House that it will do great harm, in my opinion, if the call of justice, for it is the call of justice, is regarded with deaf ears. And I will tell hon. members why. Some of those who signed that petition are men in whom a prominent member of Parliament in England takes great interest. They are, as I know, in communication with him, and as sure as this House refuses the prayer of their petition now upon the Table, which sets forth that they came out with the promises before them embodied in the pamphlet, pointing out the advantages of Canada as compared with the United States, and setting forth that in Canada they can have two homesteads, that after a man

had got his first homestead he could secure a second, an advantage which the United States did not offer; as surely as Parliament denies the justice I demand in the name of these poor men, so surely will the fact be brought before the Imperial Parliament, and so surely will the fact be advertised throughout England and the whole world, that in regard to her obligations to settlers Canada is capable of breaking faith. These are poor men, poor settlers, some of them living in shacks, some living in good cement houses they have raised themselves; but is it because they are poor men, forsooth, their claims of justice are not to be listened to? Are they to be put aside with a wave of the ministerial hand and with a wave of the hand of the Deputy Minister, telling us it is a bad principle, but saying not one word about justice? Not one word is said as to whether they have a just claim or not, only that it is a bad policy, and the department must have revenue. The department must, indeed, have revenue; but I will show before I conclude my motion how the revenue may be made more consonant with the expenditure, and how the expenditure may be cut down; and if we are going to save money, do not let us save it by trying to squeeze a few dollars out of the poor settlers, but by cutting down unnecessary expenses and bringing the department into a state of efficiency. Many men have made mistakes in taking up settlements. We have magnificent lands. We have hundreds of millions of the finest wheat-growing lands in the world. But we have some bad land, and some of those very men who came in after the Act of 1883 was passed made mistakes; and how must they feel when men who came in before the Act was passed, and before the right to a second homestead existed, have taken up second homesteads, which they themselves would have liked to take up, but their hands were tied, and *non possumus* is the heartless response of the Canadian Government to their demands. Now, these people feel very badly, because my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, as they state in their petition, when he was up there a year or so ago, had a meeting at which he met the people, and at which he stated he would do his best for them. He asked me, as they recite, whether it could be done by Order in Council, and I said: "I am afraid not;" however, the Minister said he would do his best, but, as the people now state in that petition, they fear he has done his very worst for them. In fact I must say that the present Minister of the Interior has shown no sympathy whatever with the settlers in the North-West since he became Minister. One of his great deeds in the management of the department is this: There used to be a means by which a man who left his homestead, either through it being cancelled or by reason of the strenuous pressure of *angusta res*, had to go to town to earn his livelihood, and by which, if this man left his house behind, the incoming settler would have to pay its value, and the Government would pursue a just and right policy in handing this value over to the outgoing settler. The Government would send an inspector to value the improvements and then they would pay to the outgoing settler, less the cost of inspection, the value of these improvements as received from the incoming settler. That was a just and fair policy. But now we have an heroic policy, we have a policy before which men will bend the knee and lift up eyes of admiration on the magnificent statesmanship that belongs to Canada. That policy now is, that the Government of Canada takes the value of the improvements made by the outgoing settler and puts it in its avaricious pocket. It is a great policy, indeed; but, Sir, the very last man who should be guilty of stooping to such a piece of petty—shall I call it "green-grocery" statesmanship—is the hon. Minister of Interior himself, and I will tell you why. There was a poor man named John Cowan, who was leaving his homestead, and who had erected thereon a fine house. The present Minister of Interior was then Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories, and as Lieutenant Governor he was bound, if he should have anything at all to do with them, to be the protector of these settlers. That was the bounden duty his office demanded from him. Cowan's house was worth about $1,200, and the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories bought it for $300. In 1887, J. J. Grant was coming into the Territories, and he fixed on Cowan's section and wanted to go right in there, but there was a block in the way. The Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories, a future Minister of the Interior, a wealthy man, would not give the house to Grant unless Grant planked down $600, or 100 per cent. on the purchase. It is not surprising, I think, that we are getting this kind of policy now from the department; and I should mention that I intend to move for the papers in the case of Grant, because I think that Grant is entitled to compensation. Grant came to me and I said to him: "Don't pay a cent more than $300." I at once communicated with Mr. White, and I told him how the matter was, and how the whole Department of the Interior had been made a donkey-engine to the avarice of the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories. I will read later on a letter written by Mr. Smith trying to wring the $600 out of Grant for the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories. I never could get the grasp of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior from the neck of Grant until he was on the eve of entering the Cabinet, and then Mr. Smith came to me flurried and anxious to at once have the thing settled for $300. I wrote to Grant and told him he could pay the $300 if he wanted the place, and he paid that sum. It is a fine house and is worth $1,200. When the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories took that sort of interest in the settlers, I am not at all surpised that he refuses justice in this matter of the second homestead, and that when he proceeds to make great reforms and to swell the income of the Department of the Interior, he swells it by saying: "I will take the value of the improvements of the settler—the poor wretched settler who has had to abandon his place and go to the town, I will confiscate the value of the improvements which was given to the settler in a generous and honest way under previous Administrations." Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want that spirit to prevail in dealing with the settlers of the North-West Territories, and I hope the House will not think me too arrogant when I say that I will not allow it to prevail. Hon. gentlemen sitting on the Treasury benches may laugh, but I say to them I will not allow it to prevail, and I will tell these gentlemen who laugh there that there is not power enough in them nor power enough behind them

to prevent my crushing down such a policy as that.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid the hon. gentleman is transgressing somewhat the Rules of Order. He is threatening hon. members of the House.

Mr. DAVIN. Oh well, Mr. Speaker, I did not know I was threatening anyone. I thought I was speaking with great suavity. Well, Sir, I entreat the attention of the Government, I entreat the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, and I entreat the attention especially of the Minister of Justice, who is a great lawyer, to the case I put. You passed an Act in 1883 in which you declare that any man coming into these territories and taking up a homestead and completing his duties and having obtained a patent, can acquire a second homestead at the end of three years, just the time it was absolutely necessary to spend in fulfilling the conditions to get the patent, and then you sweep the whole thing away. Do not you see that by doing that you made it utterly impossible for any man who came in within the time of the passing of the Act of 1883, and the passing of the Repeal Act of 1886, the only men that in justice appear to be entitled to it, could possibly get a second homestead, whereas men who came in 1881 get a second homestead, because they can fulfil their patent duties before the Repeal Act of 1886 was passed. Now, Sir, when that Act was passed a strict construction was put upon it by Mr. H. H. Smith and Mr. Burgess, and that construction was, that no man could get a second homestead unless he had actually got his patent before the 2nd June, 1886. I looked at the Act and I declared that my interpretation of the Act was that it meant that any man who had fulfilled the duties that entitled him to a second homestead, and had a certificate that he was entitled to a second homestead, could get it, even without a patent. After correspondence with Mr. Smith and Mr. Burgess, a month elapsed and I got a letter from Mr. Burgess saying that the department had come to the conclusion that my view of the Act was the correct one and that the department intended to adopt it. Now, if my view in that case was the correct one, may not my view be the correct one now, and I may say that Mr. Blake was under a mistake in supposing that the House had to do with the extension of time. What happened, as I explained before, and as I explain now for the sake of those hon. gentlemen who have since come into the House, was this: I spoke from my place before dinner, making an argument on the second homestead question. Mr. White got up, and said: "I do not agree with you." After dinner I went over to him, and asked him: "Have you considered my argument?" He answered: "I have, and I see the full force of it." I said: "Then you are going to act on it?" He replied: "How can I? All my colleagues have decided against you." I then said: "It is a curious thing if you cannot carry it out, and you the Minister of the Interior," and I added some humorous remark, and was probably a little harsh. I returned to my seat, where I sat somewhat moody for awhile, and then went over again to Mr. White, and said: "If you will extend it for a year, it will satisfy me." He said to me: "You are not going to give me any bother in the Committee, but will let my Bill go through?" I said: "I will give you all the bother I can if you do not do justice to these people," and I added: "Extend it to 1887, and I will be satisfied." Then he changed the six to seven, making it 1887. That is the way it was done; and I would to Heaven the House to-day would consider the situation. The situation is this: That we put our name to a bond, and when the bond comes due we cancel it. We can do it, because we are a powerful Parliament: but what should be thought of a private individual who would do it? And when you say it is a bad policy, whose bad policy is it? Not the settlers'. It is our bad policy; it is the bad policy of the department itself; and if it will not listen to advice and at once repeal the Act, it is responsible to the country for any additional inconvenience that may occur. The sage manner in which the department first regulated this second homestead matter was by providing that any man, to get it, must take it up within forty miles of where he was settled, which made it necessary that a man would have to leave the other homestead and go forty miles away. We got that changed from forty miles to six miles, and after that from six miles to any land lying near the homestead of the settler; so that at the present time in the settled parts of the North-West, there are not a great many persons who will avail themselves of this privilege if it be given to them. It is a great mistake to suppose that a large amount of land will be taken up. On the contrary, a very small amount will be taken up; but no matter whether it be great or small, it is in the interest of the people of Canada, in the interest of this Parliament, in the interest of the North-West, and in the interest of settlement, that no small considerations of policy should tempt the department or the Government to turn a deaf ear to the claims of justice, and follow the trail of a particularly unjust, severe and ignoble policy.

Mr. DEWDNEY. This is the annual motion of the hon. gentleman which he has thought proper, in the interests of his friends in the North-West, to bring before the House. The resolution which he moved last year I do not think was quite so objectionable as the one which he has moved to-day, and before I sit down I will give the reason. The hon. gentleman prefaced his remarks with a reference to the debate which took place in the last session of the last Parliament, and he again made an apology—or, perhaps, it would be better to say an explanation—to the House in reference to the delay of which I accused him last year in bringing his resolution before the House. I presume he makes these remarks to-day because this resolution has been standing on the Orders of the Day for the last three weeks, and in order that his constituents——

Mr. DAVIN. I rise to order. I was requested each time by the Government not to press my resolutions.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is exactly what I was going to say. He wished, at any rate, that the electors in the North-West should know that the fault was not on his shoulders this year, but was because of a combination of circumstances which occurred, and that the delay took place with the consent of the Government. I acknowledge that that was the reason; but if there is any hon. gentleman in this House to whom it should be a cause

of great gratification that that delay took place, it is the hon. gentleman himself. I do not know that I should say why I state that: not only has it been palpable to the members of this House, but it will be palpable to the hon. gentleman's constituents. I shall not refer more particularly to that. It is a painful subject to myself; I am sure it is painful to the hon. gentleman, and I am equally sure it is painful to every hon. member of this House. Now, the hon. gentleman has made a very unfair attack upon me to-day. A most unfair attack has been made upon me; and before I am through, it may be an excuse for me to lay before the country and the hon. gentleman's constituents what we have had to contend with in this House, the first month of this session, so far as the hon. gentleman is concerned. I happen to know, having been in the North-West Territories during the last election, what occurred there during that election, and what did occur is what makes it more painful to myself and more painful to the hon. gentleman and his friends that he should have made such an exhibition of himself as he has during this session. With reference to the personal matter which the hon. gentleman has made the basis of an accusation against me, I shall give the House the whole history of that transaction. During several seasons in the North-West, the hon. gentleman knows the weather was dry and unfortunate for the settlers, and for two or three years in succession the district to the north-west of Regina, along the borders of Long Lake, had been exceptionally dry; and the gentleman referred to, Mr. John Cowan, a most respectable man, a man with one of the largest families in the North-West Territories, and who brought into the country capital which he invested in stock, commenced to build this grand house of which the hon. gentleman speaks, and it was a very good house for the time and the locality. He had built a frame house on substantial sills and had not completed it when he came to the conclusion that he had made a mistake in settling in that part of the country, because he found it unfit for agricultural pursuits. Therefore he and some other friends and relatives, numbering forty or fifty people, made up their minds to remove their location to a point west of Calgary. Mr. Cowan had arranged with his neighbours to transport the whole of their goods and cattle, and they had started and were on the road some three weeks, when he came to me and said: Governor, I have a house partly finished on my homestead with which I cannot do anything. It is all that is keeping me here and I am anxious to overtake my people on the road. Will you give me something for it and let me go. I asked him what it was worth. He said: It cost me $1,000, but I will take anything for it. Well, I said: I have not seen it and know nothing about it, but will give you $300. I bought the house because on the banks of Long Lake there are beautiful places where many of us proposed to build houses for summer residences. I bought the house intending to move it down to the banks of the lake, thinking the Long Lake Railway would be built and a steamer put on the lake. When I found, however, that the railway was not going to be constructed, I made up my mind not to build on the lake. In the meantime a gentleman, Mr. Grant by name, came to my office and asked me to sell him the house, as he could get an entry for the homestead on which it was. He offered me $500 for it, and I told him I would take $600. The bargain was not struck, and he went away for some weeks. When he came back he said he had found out that I could not move the house, as it was a homestead, without the permission of the Government, and that he would not give me $500, but only the money I had paid for it. That is the whole story. I tried to get the $500, but could not get more than $300. I found that, under the land regulations, I could not enter for the homestead myself, nor could I get any friend to enter for it, and the only way I could obtain a refund was to allow this man to make an entry for it, the Government protecting me to the extent of the amount I had paid. Had the hon. gentleman spoken to Mr. Cowan on the subject he would not have undertaken this case, because he would have been told that I had done Mr. Cowan a charitable action. He would have been informed that I had assisted Mr. Cowan, after repeated requests, as he wanted to get off with his cattle and take up a new home, which he has done, and I am happy to say, successfully. With reference to the statement as to money expended for improvements on lands by homesteaders having been at one time returned to the settler, as far as my knowledge goes, it was never given to the settler. The improvements have been valued, and the money has always been paid to the Receiver General for the benefit of the Government: and since I have had the honour of administering the affairs of this department no change has been made in that respect. With respect to the second homestead, the hon. gentleman last year asked that these homestead regulations, which had already been extended twice, might again be extended. After I objected, as I had done in the previous session, the hon. gentleman, feeling that the House would not support him in his contention, withdrew his resolution. The resolution of the hon. gentleman to-day asks that all settlers who have come into the country between the 1st June, 1883, and the 2nd June, 1886, should, on completing their improvements, be granted the second homesteads. That would be re-opening the whole question, and be far more objectionable than the gentleman's resolution of last year. The simple history of the homestead question is this: that in the early days it was thought that, by adopting this system, a number of people who had carried out their homestead conditions, might be kept in the country. At the time this was first recommended to the department, some of the officials expressed their views against it. They were uncertain as to its success, but it was pressed so strongly by gentlemen living in the east that the Government were convinced there might be something in it, and allowed the second homestead privilege. It was shown, after very few years, to my predecessor, the late Mr. White, when he was travelling through the country, that it was most objectionable, as it had depopulated certain sections, and the boards of trade in the settlements which these parties had left expressed themselves against the second homestead system, and were asking that some means should be taken to re-settle the abandoned districts. I hold in my hand a paper dated no later than the 22nd of this month, in which it is stated:

"Mr. Davin is going to move that settlers located in the Territories between June, 1883, and June, 1886, be granted second homesteads. These second homesteads occasion-

ally, but not always, benefit the men who get them, but the experience of the districts where they have been most freely granted is that they are an unmitigated curse to the counties they lie in, the deserted farms standing in the way of local improvements, because the number of farms abandoned on this account is far in excess of the demand for them."

Mr. LAURIER. What paper is that from?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The Saskatchewan *Herald* of 22nd May. I do not propose, as I stated before, to give way on this matter, and certainly not in the direction the hon. gentleman has asked the House to accept in this resolution of his. If we were to allow the further extension the hon. gentleman has asked, we should be precluded from making any amendments to our Land Act at all. Every man who felt aggrieved would come to us and would want to be placed in the position of the original holder, and we would be precluded from making any amendments whatever to the Land Act. I think the Land Act has been tinkered with more than it should have been, I think it is more complex than it should be, and I think it should be made as plain and simple as possible, so that every settler may understand it. Complications have arisen under the different regulations which have been made, and difficulties have been caused thereby. I hope to simplify the Land Act, and to some extent I hope to do that before we separate. I suggest that it would be better for the hon. gentleman, if he sees fit, to move an amendment, when I introduce my amendments to the Land Act, and take the sense of the House on that question. In the meantime I shall oppose his motion, and I hope that my friends will do the same.

Mr. DAVIN. I doubt very much if the hon. gentleman's memory is accurate in regard to this transaction. I have letters here which will show exactly how the thing stood, and I shall subsequently move for the papers so that they may be made official, though I have them all here. This is strictly germane to the question before the House, and I will tell you why. The reason that the Minister of the Interior now seizes on the improvements on the homesteads is because they are escheats to the Crown—they belong to the Crown. But it makes all the difference whose ox is gored. The point I want to make is this: that, when he was interested, because he had bought the improvements of an outgoing settler, the department conveniently took the view, Mr. Smith conveniently took the view that they were not escheats to the Crown at all, but that a man buying an improvement on a cancelled homestead, although it was the land of the Government, was the proprietor of that improvement. Here is a letter, dated 10th November, 1887, written by Mr. Commissioner Smith to myself in regard to this matter, because I had correspondence with Mr. White and Mr. Smith about it. This man, when he found he could not get the land for $300, went to the office at Regina and said: "I want to leave the country, give me back my deposit;" and they would not give him back his deposit. At last he came back here, having lost the best year we have ever had in the North-West, in consequence of the action as told in a plain unvarnished tale, told with so much dignity and truthfulness, by the Minister of the Interior. Mr. Smith wrote:

"I have no objection to his retaining it for the $300 he has already paid."

Everything was accepted. The $300 was paid in to Mr. Stevenson. It was a matter of course that he had to pay the amount that Cowan had sold it for, and he had to go on. If anyone else in the North-West Territories had been in it, Grant would have had his entry in 1887, but there was a special person in it over whom a Divine Providence was spreading his wings—a child of fortune. My Lord Bacon tells us that "some men are born great, some achieve greatness, and some have greatness thrust upon them." To which class the hon. gentleman belongs the House can infer. The letter of Mr. Smith says:

"I have no objection to his retaining it for the $3 0 he has already paid, provided Mr. Dewdney—"

Mark you this—

—"provided Mr. Dewdney is agreeable to that arrangement, of course the house being the property of Mr. Dewdney and not of the department."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would ask whether, on the question raised by this motion, it is proper to discuss private transactions as between Mr. Dewdney on one side and Mr. Grant and Mr. Stevenson on the other? The hon. member has discussed this subject, he has received the answer of the Minister of the Interior, and I submit that he should not discuss this particular question any further when it cannot have any possible relation to the subject-matter of this resolution.

Mr. DAVIN. Of course, any suggestion from the hon. and learned gentleman the Minister of Justice, I would be very unwilling to controvert for a minute, but may I point out to him that the Minister of the Interior has made a statement about this matter. The time to raise the point of order was when I first raised this question, and the Minister of the Interior has made a statement in regard to it which, I submit, shows a defective memory on his part.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman says I might have interfered sooner, but, if it has no relevancy to his resolution, it is out of order now as well as at any other time.

Mr. SPEAKER. I was about to call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that he was not keeping very closely to the question. I thought that at the outset when he dealt with this matter, but I thought that perhaps it would turn out to have some bearing on the motion. So far as I can see, I do not think it has any bearing on the question at issue which the hon. gentleman has raised by his motion.

Mr. DAVIN. I submit, with all due respect to the hon. and learned gentleman, whether it is not admissible to address the *argumentum ad hominem* to a Minister of the Crown. I am speaking to the point of order. I thought this was relevant for this reason——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will see—

Mr. DAVIN. I am arguing the point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is too late. My own opinion is that there is no relevancy as to the transaction between the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories and Mr. Grant in connection with the question of a second homestead.

Mr. DAVIN. Then I will go on with the reply to the other part of the speech, but I may say that I will bring up this whole transaction and move for the papers at a future time. Now, I had pointed out

that the Minister of the Interior, on a previous occasion, was incorrect. I have all the dates here He made a statement there that was wholly incorrect. It so happens that from the moment I put those motions on the paper the last time, there was not a day that I did not speak in the House, as can be shown by the *Hansard*, and some times I spoke at great length. Now, the same malice, the same petty malice, the same small-minded malice, that inspired the remarks of last year, has exuded—

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. DAVIN. Oh, am I out of order?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member will agree with me that he is going a little too far, that he is straining the point of order.

Mr. DAVIN. Really, Mr. Speaker, I have had a good deal of experience in a great Parliament, as great a Parliament as this, and I did not know that an hon. gentleman can be called to order for using the verb *exude*.

Mr. SPEAKER. My hon. friend ought not to make use of that expression in an accusation that the Minister of Interior was actuated by malice.

Mr. DAVIN. Then I would say that the hon. Minister of the Interior was actuated by Christian charity; I say that the Minister of the Interior palpably showed himself, in the early part of that speech, to be a gentleman, a thorough gentleman, a truthful gentleman, a gentleman so truthful that his remarks created astonishment in the minds, and led to exclamations on the part of everybody around me here. He knows well that the words he has uttered will be taken by a little clique that belongs to himself up there, that they will be misconstrued, and that conclusions will be based upon them wholly false, as everybody round me here knows. I say that the implications and the suggestions of the early part of that speech were—What shall I say? Well, they were the implications and the suggestions of a perfect gentleman, of a man of the most truthful character, of a man to whom malice is a stranger, of a man who could not possibly take advantage of a poor settler. Now, if the hon. gentleman wishes any further eulogy, he can have it. In regard to this question, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman sees a difference between my motion of last year and the present motion. Well, Sir, I may not understand my own language, and I may not be able to understand a proposition when stated, although it has been my business to use the English language, and to criticize the English language for twenty-five years. I suppose the hon. gentleman will be surprised to hear that my motion of last year means precisely the same as my motion this year, although the reading is not exactly the same. The motion this year calls for the rights of those who came in between 1883 and 1886, under the Act of 1883; the motion last year called for no more and no less. But the acute mind of the hon. Minister of the Interior, that piercing glance that belongs to him, sees at once a great difference. Of course, I am only a poor humble member of this House, not a great statesman, and I cannot see any such difference in the language that a statesman can see; but I may tell you, Mr. Speaker, and I tell the House, that these motions mean precisely one and the same thing. Now I address an appeal once more to this House. There are 70 new members here. I appeal to the members of the Conservative party, who have been appealed to, in a sense, by the Minister of the Interior. He said he would ask his friends to vote with him. Well, let me say to the Conservative members of this House: On considering this matter, if you feel that there is justice on the side of these settlers, will you think that the mere call and beck of the Minister of the Interior is enough to turn you away from the demands of justice on the part of those settlers? I say to the Reformers around me: You have heard the argument, and I hope you will stand by the people of the North-West Territories and their just demands.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). We always do.

Mr. DAVIN. I address now especially the members of the same party as myself. I address the Conservative party. There is no confidence or non-confidence implied in this motion. If you affirm that those persons are entitled to what they were promised under the Act of 1883, then the Government will have to embody it in a small Bill; or even if there is a strong expression of opinion in this House, though this motion may not be carried, the Government will have to embody this in a Bill. I do hope, therefore, that when it comes to be voted on hon. gentlemen will vote on the side of justice.

Mr. LAURIER. The House, in my opinion, should remember that the principle which is involved in this motion is not the principle of a general policy. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) does not propose that the House should at all depart from the policy which now obtains in the North-West Territories with regard to the settlement of land; but he points out very forcibly, in my opinion, that certain men may be suffering injustice if they are not granted what he now claims for them. What he now claims for them is that the provisions of the law, such as they existed when these men settled in the North-West Territories, should be carried out in their entirety. By the Act of 1883 the settlers in the Territories were allowed a second homestead. The object of Parliament, I suppose, in granting a second homestead was to induce settlers to go in there. So far as my knowledge goes, on the other side of the line settlers are only entitled to one homestead and nothing more. This Parliament granted a second homestead obviously for the purpose of inducing settlers to go in there, and it is to be presumed that when they came in and settled, they expected they would have a second homestead instead of having only one, as on the other side of the line. Now, for some reason or other, which I do not question here, the law was altered in 1886, and we came back to the provisions which obtained before, that settlers should be entitled only to one homestead; and the hon. gentleman now asks, not for any departure from the law as it now exists, but he submits that it would be only fair, just and equitable that these settlers, who settled under the law of 1883, and from that year up to 1886, when the law was altered, should be treated exactly as they expected to be treated when they went into the territory. Now, this can apply only to a dozen or two dozen cases, and not more. What reason can there be why this should not be granted? There is certainly a measure of justice and of equity, which must strike every man in this House, in the plea that every settler who went

into those territories on the faith of the Canadian Parliament, expecting that he would receive certain privileges on certain conditions, should not be deceived, but that the promises made to him by the Canadian Parliament should be kept. This is simply what is now asked by my hon. friend. What is asked is, not that this law should apply to sales which occurred in 1886, but simply within the years 1883, 1884, 1885 and up to 1886, when the law was altered. In the name of justice, equity and common sense what reason is there why this should not be granted? Certainly land is not scarce in the North-West, for we have an abundance of it, and we know certainly, after the speech of the hon. gentleman, there were many reasons why settlers would not go into our North-West if what is said is true, for settlers have suffered many seasons of drought and met with other difficulties. Under these circumstances it seems to me that Parliament would do only what is just and fair by granting the motion of my hon. friend. After all, the motion affects only a few men, and it is better in point of policy that no man should be able to complain that the Canadian Parliament and the Canadian Government have not dealt with them fairly and justly and granted all to which they are entitled. Such a measure of equity and justice is embodied in the motion of the hon. gentleman. I feel bound to support it. I was sorry to hear the Minister of the Interior appeal to his friends to reject the motion. I could understand such action if this were a matter affecting the policy of the Government, or suggesting that the policy be altered. But nothing of the kind is proposed. It simply sets forth, that a few hundreds of acres should be granted to men who came to the country in the belief that they would obtain it, and certainly they should obtain it.

Mr. WATSON. As this is a matter regarding past legislation, I desire to say a few words in regard to it. In 1883, when the Land Act was introduced, I strongly supported second homesteads, as did all the members from Manitoba, the North-West Territories not having representation in the House. We must all admit and regret that the Act proved a failure, inasmuch as people did not come into the country as we expected. It was thought at that time that settlers who had fulfilled the conditions of their original homesteads would sell out to other people, proceed further west, take up second homesteads, and thus act as pioneers in the North-West. Unfortunately, from several causes, this did not occur, one of the causes being the vacillating land policy of the Government, under which the land regulations were frequently changed, and, indeed, I believe one of the greatest causes of the discontent in the North-West during the past ten years has been this vacillating land policy. To my mind, the best land regulation was that by which 160 acres of homestead were granted on three years' settlement. But the Government changed that. Not only have people who expected to obtain a second homestead grievances, but those who have only 80 acres have grievances likewise. Other people who came out later were able to take up 160 acres of homestead and 160 acres of pre-emption. These changes have been very annoying. As has been stated by hon. members, it would be well to carry out the conditions and pledges made to settlers and give them all the privileges promised by the Government in pamphlets and circulars distributed in the old country. There are not many people in Manitoba who would avail themselves of the second homestead privilege, comparatively few of them having settled during the years mentioned in the resolution. These men mainly settled in the neighbourhood of Regina. I was very sorry to hear the reference made by the Minister of the Interior to the very inhospitable region where a man built a house costing $1,200 and sold it for $300. I did not think there were such places in the North-West. My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) says Mr. Grant has found it one of the best homesteads in the country. I hope he has found a good house also. The policy pursued in regard to large land corporations has proved a failure in the North-West. The Government apparently wish to get all they can from the sale of the lands. I have always thought it would be much better to throw the odd sections open to actual settlers than to sell them for the paltry sum of $2 or $2.50 per acre. It can be clearly demonstrated that it would be much better to dispose of them to actual settlers on colonizing conditions than to speculators. We have at present a very bad state of affairs prevailing in Manitoba in consequence of a large quantity of the land granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company having been sold to the North-West Land Company. Those lands cannot be taxed because the title has not been vested in the present owners. Very great hardship has been inflicted on Manitoba by the disallowance of an Act whereby the Local Legislature were to take authority to compel the land corporations to pay taxes on unoccupied lands held for speculative purposes. I believe the land would be very much better in the hands of the settlers, even second homesteaders, than in the hands of the speculators to-day. Sympathizing with the motion of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), and feeling that injustice has been done to those people who were promised second homesteads, while not agreeing with the principle as a rule, I support the motion that the people who came to the North-West in consequence of pledges given by the Government should obtain a second homestead.

Mr. TISDALE. While I have a good deal of sympathy with the motion of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) I think it would stand a much better chance of being favourably dealt with if the mover adopted the suggestion of the Minister and allowed it to stand over to come up as an amendment to the Bill. I must confess that while I am opposed, and always was opposed to the principle of second homesteads, there seems to be a great deal of justice in the cases presented to-day. As to the number of them, as to the particular effect they may have on subsequent legislation, how far they may open the door to other special cases under special circumstances, I am not sufficiently informed to express an opinion. While sincerely desirous of promoting an honest investigation of the subject, I think the motion will stand a much better chance of being fully and properly discussed if it is postponed until such time as there might be a full debate on it, with full information, and if this is done I promise to give it my most earnest and serious consideration.

Mr. MACDOWALL, So far as the North-West is concerned in regard to this question, I am of the opinion that the large majority of the people are opposed to the principle of second homesteads. I recollect when the question came up in 1887, at a meeting held at which the Minister of the Interior and the North-West members were present——

Mr. DAVIN. We are all opposed to the principle. I am opposed to the principle of second homesteads.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I am glad to hear the hon. member say he is opposed to the principle, because it is thus so much easier to settle the question of which he is speaking. During the debate which took place on 11th June, 1887, when this question was raised, I made the following remarks :—

"I believe this clause as it stands would satisfy most of the people of the North-West, and I trust that if there should be any case of hardship, every member of this House, on whatever side he sits, will support the hon. Minister of the Interior in meeting such a case. I know that in introducing a new system we cannot expect to benefit the general public without doing some injury to a few; and if a few are injured in this case, I have no doubt that their cases could be provided for by means of an Order in Council. But we ought to oppose the creation of a second class of speculators by means of second homesteads, which would be totally inconsistent with the principle of the Dominion Lands Act. The principle of that Act as I take it, is that the Dominion Government offer lands to actual settlers who will come into the country and make it their home, and by doing that contribute to the wealth and prosperity of the country. But if in this way you bonus speculators, as it were, by locking up the most valuable lands in the country, I believe you will be committing a great mistake."

When I said that, Mr. White nodded his head across the House in assent that the question could be settled in this manner. The consequence was, that this, if it were done, would have got over the whole difficulty which the hon. gentleman has raised. To show that the people of the North-West are not in sympathy with this resolution of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) I will quote a paragraph from a recent copy of the Saskatchewan *Herald*. That paper says :

"Mr. Davin is going to move that settlers located in the Territories between June, 1883, and June, 1886, be granted second homesteads. These second homesteads occasionally, but not always, benefit the men who get them, but the experience of the districts where they have been most freely granted is that they are an unmitigated curse to the counties they lie in, the deserted farms standing in way of local improvements, because the number of farms abandoned on this account is far in excess of the demand for them."

There is also a further objection to the resolution of the hon. member to be found in the fact that the whole spirit of the sentiment of the people of the North-West is against the land of that country being locked up in the hands of speculators. It is natural for us to speculate and we cannot help having speculators, but at the same time ought we to go out of our way to create a new class of speculators ; a class that possibly may be a pauper class of speculators, and not a class with wealth to develop the country in any way. Though an injury may appear to be done some settlers, yet in carrying out a broad policy for the benefit of the whole country there are generally instances where individuals suffer. And though there may be some sufferers, yet the hon. gentleman should never, in the interest of the North-West Territories, advocate the principle of granting second homesteads.

Mr. DALY. In regard to the wording of the resolution before the House, I would point out to the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) that he must admit that if the final portion of his motion were carried into effect it would, I believe, be the cause of a great deal of injustice to a large class of persons. The resolution reads :

"That, whereas in 1883 an Act was passed granting second homesteads to those settlers who had completed the conditions of the first homestead entry; and whereas in 1886 an Act was passed abolishing the policy of second homesteads; and whereas in 1887 an Act was passed which acknowledged the principle and right of those second homesteads, it should now be enacted that all those settlers who came in between 1st June, 1883, and 2nd June, 1886, should, on completing their improvements, be granted a second homestead."

That explicitly states that any person might go into the North-West in 1884, and never having taken up a homestead, nor never having made a homestead entry, yet, after the passing of that resolution and the legislation which will be founded upon it, he could now make a homestead entry and he would be entitled to a second homestead upon the completion of his duty. I would much desire that the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) should comply with the wishes of the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) and allow this resolution to stand until such time as the Bill which the Minister of the Interior is about to introduce to amend the Act, is brought before the House. A provision could then be made in the Bill dealing with peculiar cases such as the hon. gentleman refers to, by giving the Minister of the Interior power to arrange them under an Order in Council. I do not know that in the large district which I represent there are many settlers in the same position in which the hon. gentleman states settlers in his district are in. I would be sorry to see any injustice done to any settler in Manitoba or the North-West Territories. I would like to see the settlers whom the hon. gentleman represents get justice in the matter ; but when he has further considered the matter, I think he will come to the conclusion that what he desires can be better obtained by an amendment to the Dominion Lands Act than by this resolution. The hon. gentleman has had the benefit of a discussion on the subject this afternoon, he has heard the views of different members from the North-West, and I think it would be better in the interest of himself and in the interest of the settlers whom he represents, that he should allow the matter to stand until the Minister of the Interior brings down the Bill to amend the Dominion Lands Act. Now, Sir, clause 5 of the Dominion Lands Act of 1887, says :

"5. Clause forty-three of the said Act is hereby repealed, and the following substituted therefor :—

"43. No person who has obtained a homestead patent or a certificate countersigned by the Commissioner of Dominion Lands or a member of the Dominion Lands Board, as in the next preceding clause mentioned, shall be entitled to obtain another homestead entry; provided, however, that any person who, on the 2nd June in the year 1887, had obtained a homestead patent, or a certificate of recommendation for a patent, countersigned by the Commissioner of the Dominion Lands, or who had complied with the homestead provisions of the Acts then in force relating to the Dominion Lands, entitling him to such a certificate, or any person who has been permitted, under the terms of section 38, 'Dominion Lands Act, 1883,' to create a charge upon his homestead, and had completed his homestead duties on the said second day of June, 1887, shall be permitted to make a second homestead entry."

By that clause the hon. gentleman will see that any person who, before the 2nd of June, 1887, had obtained a homestead patent, or a certificate of recommendation, could get a second homestead.

Whatever sympathy I might have with the hon. gentleman and his resolution, I cannot vote for it as it is now worded. It says:

"And whereas in 1887 an Act was passed which acknowledged the principle and right of those second homesteads, it should now be enacted that all those settlers who came in between 1st June, 1883, and 2nd June, 1886, should, on completing their improvements, be granted a second homestead."

By this provision he would include a class which I am sure he does not desire to protect. If his resolution read according to the Act I think that justice will be done to these people. I again express the hope that the hon. gentleman will allow the question to stand until the Bill is introduced.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think that the suggestion which has been made by the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) is a very practical one indeed. The hon. member who has the resolution in hand will notice that it amounts to nothing more than the affirmation of a principle which would require a statute subsequently to carry it out. The hon. gentleman has laid upon the Table of the House to-day a petition which he has drawn my attention to in the course of the remarks which he made, and it seems to me that he was under the impression, if I correctly understood his remarks, that this petition would disclose cases of real hardship and cases which appeal to our sense of equity with regard to the administration of the old law as to second homesteads. It is impossible we can give consideration to that subject to-day. It is impossible we can give consideration to claims which, the hon. gentleman says, are advanced for the first time in a petition presented to-day. As the hon. the leader of the Opposition said a few moments ago, we are not asked to legislate with respect to the general principle of second homesteads, but we are asked to provide redress for particular cases. I think the hon. gentleman, therefore, will see that by pressing his resolution this afternoon he could expect to make no practical progress, because the matter would have to be made a subject of legislation. The hon. gentleman, even if his motion met with defeat this afternoon, would no doubt renew the discussion when the North-West Territories Land Act comes under the consideration of this House. In endorsing the suggestion which came from my hon. friend from South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), and which was supported by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly), I do not wish to be so uncandid as to lead the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) to suppose that we are urging that proposal upon him with any promise that the policy of the Government in this regard will be changed. That must depend, of course, on the proof which he is able to show, or the proof which the document he has presented will be able to show, as regards the merits of each particular case. As regards the principle of this resolution I may say, that for the present, I am entirely unconvinced that it is a sound one for this House to adopt. The hon. leader of the Opposition has based his remarks solely on the ground that we ought to be gracious and generous in regard to the large territory which is at our disposal, and in relation to which persons may have claims that they have suffered considerable hardship. That may be all very true. There is nothing so easy as to make a case for an individual against the Government in relation either to grants of money or grants of land when anything like hardship can be shown to have existed; but it is the bounden duty of those who sit here charged with the duties of administration, unpopular and ungracious as it may seem, to take the side of the Crown and insist that unless a a claim comes within the terms of the law, it shall not be recognized. When I say within the terms of the law, I admit that in administering the public domain, as in administering the public revenue, we ought not to bind ourselves by strict technicalities of the law, but we ought to give a claimant the benefit of any consideration which in a court of equity would entitle him to relief. But what is the position these claimants occupy? I am speaking not of any individual case that may be made out, because I do not know the merits of any individual case; and I do not wish to prejudice any claim that any individual may show himself to have possessed under the Act before it was repealed; but what is involved in this resolution is the position of these claimants as a class. As I understand it, their position is this: In 1883 this Parliament enacted that a settler who went on lands in the North-West, made a homestead entry, and performed all his homestead duties, extending over three years, would have the right, upon the completion of all these homestead duties, to apply for a second homestead. That remained the law for three years, and during that period Parliament became fully convinced that it was an unsound system and an unwise policy, and must be put an end to. The policy, therefore, is admittedly a bad one, as the hon. gentleman admits, and as I understand he was of opinion at the outset. Now, who had any vested interest to entitle him to complain that that policy was not continued? Not a single man who had not completed his homestead entry when the Act was repealed; because such a man not only had no right to a second homestead, but he had no right to apply for one; not only had he no vested interest to apply for a second homestead, but his right to apply for one had never accrued. But subsequently, and in order that no claims and no outstanding rights could possibly be prejudiced, the time was extended for a whole year, and those who had completed their homestead duties in 1886 were given a year in which to apply for a second homestead, and the hon. gentleman admits that he was satisfied with that concession in 1887 when he asked the Minister of the Interior of that time to make it. But what is the principle on which his resolution of to-day is founded? It is that every one who had made his homestead entry between 1883 and 1886, although he had not performed his homestead duties when the Act was repealed, and although no right had accrued to him to apply for a second homestead at all, should now for the first time, out of bountiful sentiments and charitable considerations, be considered to have acquired that right by the mere circumstance that he came to the country, made a settlement there, and possibly had hopes that the existing law with regard to second homesteads would not be repealed. I submit that those who come to this country and who settle here undoubtedly have a right to expect permanence and security as regards the right to property which they may acquire from time to time; but they have no right to expect that the laws of the country

will not be changed—that the Customs laws, or the Excise laws, or the provincial laws will not be changed. It might as well be claimed on behalf of these settlers that inasmuch as it was shown to them before they came here that the provincial and municipal taxes were very light, they had a right to expect that they would not be increased. They came to the country, I admit, entitled to security as regards the vested rights they should acquire from time to time; but when no rights had accrued to them, they had no just reason to demand that the laws of the country ought not to be changed with regard to the mode of acquiring property in the future. We have also to consider another circumstance—that this policy was well considered in 1886, and also in 1887 under the hon. gentleman's own supervision. I think the subject has been brought up almost every year since. Last year it was well discussed by the hon. gentleman himself, Mr. Blake, and by the present Minister of the Interior; and the House came to the determination that this resolution—because the hon. gentleman says it is practically the same—ought not to be adopted by the House; and the most forcible statement made, I think—with all deference to the forcible way in which the hon. gentleman presented the case of those with whom he sympathizes—was presented by Mr. Blake when he found fault with us for indicating that any proposal to change the policy would even be considered. He called the attention of the House to the fact that the North-West Council had petitioned to have the law changed in the way that the hon. gentleman now proposes; my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior intimated that he would take the opinion of his colleagues on the question again, upon which Mr. Blake remarked that it would be better for the Minister of the Interior to have answered the Council thus: "That thing shall stand in its present place, or I shall not remain in my place;" and Mr. Blake said, with great force, that we perhaps had been hasty in repealing the law, that perhaps it would have been better to have given a little longer time, but that having fixed the day for repeal, it would be most unwise to adopt a vacillating policy and give those encouragement to think that rights which were not possessed in 1883 would be granted to them, based on the new principle that the right to a second homestead would accrue not only to those who had completed the settlement duties of the first homestead, but to those who had begun them. I see serious grounds for doubting the propriety of reversing the policy adopted in 1886, 1887, 1888 and 1890; and, subject to any claims for which the hon. gentleman may be able to give good reasons with regard to individual cases, I submit that the proposal made by my hon. friend is a more reasonable one, and one of a more practical business character, than the one contained in the hon. gentleman's motion.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It seems to me that no better opportunity can occur than this for the House to say what are its views on the subject before us, and if the hon. Minister of the Interior proposes to introduce legislation on the subject at a later period of the session, he will have the opinion of the House to guide him in preparing the Bill. I see no such objections to the resolution which the hon. gentleman has submitted as those presented by the hon. Minister of Justice. What are the demands of this resolution? The fact is that a number of settlers went into Manitoba and the North-West Territories between 1883 and 1886, and took up homesteads, with the assurance that upon completing their improvements and being entitled to their patent, they acquired a right, if they saw proper, to take up a second homestead. It seems to me that the moment these parties entered their names in the Dominion Lands office for the first homesteads, they obtained the pledge of this House that upon the completion of the improvements and residence on the first homestead for a certain length of time, they should be entitled to a second homestead. The Parliament thought proper to repeal the law; but Parliament has no right to take away the right it promised these people they should enjoy upon the completion of the first homestead. If Parliament acted unwisely in the adoption of that rule, that was a very good reason for repealing the law, but so far as these parties are concerned, who went there under this assurance, founded on the statute, they have a vested right. Supposing a party was there two years, nine months and twenty-nine days and had made his improvements, he could not apply for his patent and could not apply for admission to enter a second homestead, because a statute is passed repealing the right of a second homestead, and the Minister said there is no vested right. I think there is a moral right on the part of the party to claim that this House, acting for the community at large, shall keep its promises and fulfil its obligations, and cannot relieve itself of those obligations by repealing the statute. The general principle laid down is sound that Parliament ought to keep its promises, and that those parties who acquired their first homestead while the statute was in force, are entitled, on the completion of their improvements, to the second homestead, whether any other party coming in subsequently be so entitled or not. That being the case, the House ought to support the resolution of the hon. member, and then it will be for the Minister of the Interior to give effect to his views when he proposes the measure to which he refers. I might be disposed, personally, to go further than the hon. gentleman has gone. I never saw any good reason for adopting the policy of giving the settler two homesteads at the same time; but I have never been able to understand why a man who has acquired a homestead and obtained his patent should not, after disposing of it, be at liberty to acquire a second homestead and remain a settler if he sees proper. At an early period I adopted that view, and I see no reason to change it. It is not a question of repealing a statute which gave a party the right to acquire two homesteads without having parted with the first; but it is a question as to whether we are to keep faith with those who came into the country while such statute was in force. The hon. gentleman, by his resolution, asks us to keep faith with those parties, and I think that is not an unreasonable request.

Mr. TROW. If there are a few isolated cases, as mentioned by the leader of the Government, in the North-West and Manitoba, of parties who are entitled to a second homestead, I see no reason why this resolution should be objected to by the

Government. If we are to have sympathy with anybody, it is with the honest and poor settlers. We have an abundance of land, and have, under the statute, given them a vested right to a second homestead if they have performed the duties on the first. I approved of the second homestead law at the time, and still approve of it for various reasons. In the first place, the pioneer in any country—not merely the North-West and Manitoba, but Ontario—generally becomes exhausted of all surplus funds after clearing a few acres and putting up some temporary buildings for shelter to themselves and family. Another settler comes along with a few hundred dollars cash, who is anxious to procure a homestead for himself where he can place his family immediately under shelter without delay, and who is willing to buy the other man's improvements. You have, therefore, a settler placed on the first homestead, and by your pernicious act, in refusing a second homestead, the original settler is driven from the country. I know that there are scores of our settlers who have taken up lands in Dakota where they could procure a homestead, and who would have remained in Manitoba and the North-West had they been able to secure a second homestead. I believe the grievance stated by the hon. member for Assiniboia is worthy of the consideration of the Government. We have nothing to lose and everything to gain by allowing our people every advantage to which they are entitled under the law.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I have had some little experience in a matter analogous to this in the free grant district of Ontario, and have more than once had occasion to denounce what I thought was the unjust conduct of the Provincial Government in departing by subsequent legislation from the conditions upon which settlers had occupied their lands, and under which they had acquired rights equivalent to those acquired in the case under our consideration; and I am not at all prepared, by my vote in this House or elsewhere, to say that a different rule ought to be applied to provincial legislation of a similar character to what ought to be applied to Dominion legislation in the North-West, unless I am clearly convinced, which I am not so far by the remarks of the Minister of Justice, that these people, who entered on certain conditions, have forfeited their right to the fulfilment of these conditions. I cannot avoid, therefore, voting for the resolution of the hon. member for Assiniboia. At the same time I think that the suggestion made by the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) is a good one, and that there may be difficulties which we do not at present fully realize in the discussion so far. I would very much prefer that the suggestion should be adopted, but am not prepared to say that a man who entered the North-West or elsewhere upon the faith that one system would be applied to him should lose his right so acquired, simply because the Government thought proper, for very good reasons, to alter that system.

Mr. SPROULE. I may say that when travelling through the North-West, from information I received throughout the country, I can fully agree in what has been said by the hon. member for Saskatchewan, that one of the great evils which had to be contended with out there was this moving about of settlers from place to place after they had made a few improvements on their lots. I came to the conclusion that the privilege of a second homestead was a very bad one and should never have been adopted. It resulted in settlers leaving lots after a little ploughing had been done, and some crops taken off, and then selling out their claims to some people from Ontario, or other parts of the country, and going elsewhere to get a second homestead. The result of it was that the country was thinned of its population, that these places grew up with weeds, and that the country was disfigured. In many cases it left the people without the settlement they had expected would continue when they went into the locality, and deprived them of the assistance they anticipated in organizing and building their schools. It was claimed that this second homestead policy was a mistake, and I think it was. Possibly some one might settle in a locality which was not suitable for a farm, but I do not think there are many people, especially those coming from the older settlements, who would not know the nature of the soil and would make such a mistake. I believe that the Government ought to deal with each case on its merits, and I think the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) should allow his motion to remain until the Land Act is under consideration. Then, if he cannot get the redress to which the parties for whom he is working are entitled, it will be right for him to take such action as he thinks necessary to accomplish the objects he has in view. I do not think any object can be accomplished by this resolution now, and I believe this would open the door to a great number of claims for second homesteads from all parts of the country, many of which we know nothing about to-day, and it would be a very troublesome thing and not at all for the benefit of the country. If the hon. member were to take the course suggested, I believe he would receive a larger support than he will to-night.

Mr. GERMAN. I would probably not occupy the time of the House on this subject were it not for the fact that I have friends who have interests in the North-West which may be affected by this resolution. It has been stated that, if this resolution were carried, it would have no effect. I believe that, if this resolution is carried by a majority of the representatives of the people, they will force the Government to pass such legislation as will give it effect. It has been said that we will have bogus claims put in from parties who have no just rights to second homesteads. There is no force in that, from the fact that the date of the homesteading of every piece of land in the North-West Territories is, I presume, known to the Government, so that they can easily tell whether the claim is bogus or not. It is stated that no vested rights are interfered with, but I contend that vested rights are interfered with, and that the Government, by their legislation in 1887, acknowledged that vested rights were interfered with when they extended the period for second homesteads for one year, giving the settlers who had come in a year after the passage of the Repeal Act, that is, those who came in in 1884, the right to a second homestead. If those who came in in 1884 had a right to a second homestead, why have not those who came in in 1885 or in 1886 a similar right, and that is all this resolution asks. We have ample territory to give to these people second homesteads without any injury to

this country or detriment to its welfare. The hon. the Minister of Justice says that the people have no right to suppose that the law will not be changed. Perhaps they have not, but I contend that they have a right to suppose that the law shall not be changed to their detriment. A few years ago the Government passed a law respecting the extradition of criminals who came here from the United States. When they passed that law, telling these criminals that they had no right to remain here, they were very careful not to ask for legislation which was retroactive, but I say that the legislation passed by them in regard to this matter has been retroactive, seeing that people who came in since 1883 in the expectation of getting a second homestead have been deprived of that privilege. I contend that the Government should be at least as fair to settlers in the North-West as to criminals coming from the United States. I think it is only fair that this resolution should be adopted.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I spoke to the leader of the Opposition at the beginning of this sitting, and, though the news we had then was not so serious as that we have now, I said we would probably ask for an adjournment at 6 o'clock, and the hon. gentleman agreed with me. I will now move the adjournment of the debate, and we will take care that the hon. member for Assiniboia will not lose his place on the paper.

Mr. DAVIN. Do I understand the leader of the Government to say that my question will stay at the head of the paper?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We will give the hon. gentleman a chance of having his motion discussed.

Mr. DAVIN. Will the leader of the Government fix a place on the paper for it? I ask this question because I am pledged to divide the House on this question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Divide it now.

Mr. LAURIER. I must say to my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), that, according to the Rules of the House, if a motion for the adjournment of the debate is carried his motion goes to the bottom of the paper. I should myself object to the adjournment, because I think a vote ought to be taken, and I believe he has a grievance. It is true that the hon. gentleman opposite told me at the beginning of this sitting of the condition of Sir John Macdonald, and that I said I would be ready at any time to adjourn the House, but I am not ready to agree to the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. DAVIN. For the reason I have stated, I cannot consent to the adjournment of the debate. I have carried my constituency with the whole weight of authority against me, and I am pledged to my constituents to divide the House on this very question.

House divided on motion of Sir Hector Langevin to adjourn debate:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Adams,	Macdonald (King's),
Baker,	Macdowall,
Barnard,	Mackintosh,
Bergeron,	McAllister,
Bowell,	McDonald (Victoria),
Burns,	McDougald (Pictou),
Cameron (Inverness),	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McKay,
Chapleau,	McLean,
Cochrane,	McLennan,
Cockburn,	McNeill,
Corbould,	Madill,
Costigan,	Mara,
Curran,	Masson,
Daly,	Miller,
Davis,	Mills (Annapolis),
Denison,	Monerieff,
Desjardins (Hochelaga),	Montague,
Desjardins (L'Islet),	Ouimet,
Dewdney,	Patterson (Colchester),
Dupont,	Pope,
Fairbairn,	Prior,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),	Putnam,
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Robillard,
Foster,	Roome,
Fréchette,	Ross (Dundas),
Frémont,	Ross (Lisgar),
Gillies,	Ryckman,
Gordon,	Skinner,
Haggart,	Sproule,
Hazen,	Stairs,
Henderson,	Tarte,
Hodgins,	Taylor,
Hutchins,	Temple,
Ingram,	Thompson (Sir John),
Ives,	Tisdale,
Jamieson,	Tupper,
Kaulbach,	Tyrwhitt,
Kenny,	Wallace,
Langevin (Sir Hector),	Weldon,
LaRivière,	White (Shelburne),
Léger,	Wilmot,
Lépine,	Wood (Westmoreland).—87.
Lippé,	

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Harwood,
Allison,	Hyman,
Amyot,	Innes,
Armstrong,	King,
Bain,	Landerkin,
Barron,	Langelier,
Beausoleil,	Laurier,
Béchard,	Lavergne,
Beith,	Leduc,
Bourassa,	Lister,
Bowers,	Macdonald (Huron),
Bowman,	McGregor,
Brown (Chateauguay),	McMillan,
Brown (Monck),	McMullen,
Burdett,	Mignault,
Cameron (Huron),	Mills (Bothwell),
Campbell,	Monet,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Mulock,
Casey,	Paterson (Brant),
Charlton,	Perry,
Christie,	Proulx,
Colter,	Rider,
Davidson,	Rowand,
Davies,	Sanborn,
Davin,	Savard,
Dawson,	Semple,
Delisle,	Simard,
Devlin,	Somerville,
Edgar,	Spohn,
Forbes,	Sutherland,
Fraser,	Trow,
Geoffrion,	Truax,
German,	Vaillancourt,
Gillmor,	Watson,
Godbout,	Welsh,
Grieve,	Yeo.—73.
Guay,	

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Mr. Cleveland,	Mr. Carroll,
Mr. Desaulniers,	Mr. Legris,
Mr. Joncas,	Mr. Choquette,
Mr. Corby,	Mr. Gibson,
Mr. Stevenson,	Mr. Scriver,
Mr. Wood (Brockville),	Mr. Hargraft,
Mr. Coatsworth.	Mr. Featherston.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. TAYLOR. I notice by the pair book that the hon. member for Maskinongé (Mr. Legris) has paired with the hon. member for St. Maurice (Mr. Desaulniers); the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne) has paired with the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Dyer); and the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) has paired with the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Pelletier).

Mr. LAVERGNE. That is not correct as far as I am concerned.

Mr. LANGELIER. I refuse to pair with any one.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will read the pair book.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this in order?

Mr. SPEAKER. I have nothing to do with any pairs. I must declare the motion as carried or lost according to the vote in the House, and I declare this motion carried.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I paired with the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Joncas).

An hon. MEMBER. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Cleveland) has not voted.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I paired with the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Carroll).

Mr. AMYOT. The hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) has not voted.

Mr. SCRIVER. I paired with the hon. member for the West Riding of Peterborough (Mr. Stevenson).

Mr. OUIMET. Although, Mr. Speaker, your ruling is quite right, when you say that you have nothing to do with the pairs, still, I think it is well that the House should know how this pairing business works. When an hon. member has paired with another he ought to be sure, when he leaves the House, that his vote will not be lost to his party by the member with whom he has paired voting in favour of his own party.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). Let the pairs go on record.

ADJOURNMENT.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand the hon. gentleman moves the adjournment in view of the critical condition of the Premier?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. To-morrow is a Government day; do the Government propose to go on with their business, and if so, what business?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is impossible for us to say now what business will be taken to-morrow. We have a report that Sir John is very low, and we cannot say what may take place before the House meets to-morrow. If we proceed, we will go on with Supply.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is what we have a right to know. The hon. gentleman is aware that there is a motion on the paper censuring Sir Charles Tupper. That, I presume, will proceed at once, if the hon. gentlemen go on with any business at all. That ought to be understood?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If we go into Supply, of course that motion will come up first. But we may take a Bill or two before we go into Supply.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 6.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 2nd June, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. LARIVIÈRE moved:

That the First Report of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates of this House be now concurred in.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the hon. Secretary of State to the manner in which the French version of the Debates is published and distributed in this House. The House has been sitting for over a month, and although the French version of the Debates is supposed to be published at the same time as the English version, or very soon after, such is not the case. The English Debates have been distributed up to 29th May, and form a volume of 638 pages, while the French version is only up to 13th May, and gives us only 191 pages of translation. Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit that the French version becomes utterly useless: and unless measures are immediately taken for having the French of the Debates not only translated and printed, but also distributed in this House as promptly as circumstances will allow, that is to say, three or four days after the English version, the French members will find themselves in a position of intolerable inferiority. Indeed, the Debates are, in that way, becoming completely useless to them in the House and for distribution in the constituencies for the information of the electors. I do not know where the fault lies. The translators hold that they follow the English version closely, and the printers hold that they print the French copy as soon as it comes. But one thing is certain, the members get the French version only two or three weeks after the English version has been distributed. This is a matter which, to a large extent, depends on the Department of the hon. Secretary of State, and I particularly draw his attention to these facts, in order that he may take steps to bring about an efficient and immediate remedy to the grievance.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If it were a matter dependent on my own diligence, I must say that the request of the hon. gentleman, that the French translation of the Debates should be distributed not later than a couple of days after the English publication, would be immediately attended to. Hon. gentlemen, perhaps, do not realize exactly the difficulty of publishing the French version. We all know that

more than nine-tenths of the business of the House is done in English, and consequently the translating staff is constantly employed translating the Debates. That translation, to be correct, must be read over and revised, so as to obtain uniformity in the translation; for, while several translations might all be correct, yet there might be difference in style, which would lessen the character of the work as a whole. I believe it was understood that the chief of the translating staff should perform the duty of first reading the copy and revising at least one proof; but, as I stated last year, it was found utterly impossible, physically, for the chief translator to read even the first copy of the work of eight translators and do the work correctly. There is not a man who has been editor of a paper who will not understand that it is impossible for one man to read properly the copy of eight translators day by day. I understand that Mr. Beaulieu, who is a hard-working, painstaking man, has had to work at times sixteen hours a day in the endeavour to read over the copy so as to send it to the printing office the next day. Last year I was told that the Printing Bureau should have good proof-readers to revise the copy; but that is not their business; they correct errors of printing, but not the style of the writer. The revise must be read again in order to correct errors which might, by inadvertence, have been committed in the translation—not by the printer or the proof-reader, but by the translator. Last year there was a request for further assistance to Mr. Beaulieu. That request has been repeated this year. Mr. Beaulieu has done his best, and I challenge any hon. gentleman to do that work of reading over the copy of eight translators and then checking the revise. There is a report of the committee, I understand, recommending that an assistant be appointed, which recommendation I hope will meet with the approval of the House, and the grievance complained of by the hon. member for Berthier remedied.

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I can corroborate in every particular the remarks of the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil). Three or four times during last session I have complained of the time it required for the French translation. There may be differences of opinion on the usefulness of the official publication of the Debates; but whatever opinion one may have in this respect, there is one point on which every one must agree: that is, that if it is expected that the Debates shall have any usefulness at all, they must be published as soon as possible after they have taken place. I need not ask the hon. members of this House what they think of a debate published in French a month and a month and a half—last year the delay was six weeks—after it has taken place. As well give mustard after dinner, as the French saying goes. The thing is absolutely useless. Nobody minds them. They are kept as a kind of ammunition which may come handy in the case of elections, and if no elections come they serve no purpose. It is money utterly lost, to publish the French version of the Debates so long after the English. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will not gainsay what the hon. Secretary of State says of the work entailed by the revision of the translation. I admit, with him, that it is impossible for a chief translator alone to revise all the translation which may be done in a day by four or five translators—

Mr. CHAPLEAU. By eight translators.

Mr. LANGELIER. By eight official translators. I know that such a thing is absolutely impossible, and I believe it should not be undertaken. I speak without very much experience in the matter, but I believe we cannot expect that from the chief translator. I think that his work should not consist of the constant revision of all the translation done by the different translators, but that he should simply, from time to time, revise the work of each of the translators to see if they are competent. I have not the slightest doubt but that some of the translators are altogether incompetent, or are very negligent, if I judge from their work. Every one knows the Italian proverb: *Traduttore, traditore*, "A translator, a traitor." This proverb has found its application in the case of the translation of the speech of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Laurier) on the Address. I call the attention of my hon. friends who know French, to this masterpiece of bad translation. It is such a translation as one reads in patent medicine advertisements. I will quote only one word of it, to give an idea of the manner in which it was done. The hon. leader of the Opposition, referring, if I remember well, to the fact that European mails were now sent by way of the United States, said: "Treason is rampant on the other side of the House." Now, does any one wish to know how this was rendered? This is the way the translator puts it: "*La trahison est rampante de l'autre côté de la chambre.*" "Treason is crawling on the other side of the House." It is an absurdity. It is absolutely the reverse of what my hon. friend said. I lay no blame on the chief translator. But he must be in a position to put an end to this state of things, for really it is no benefit to the French-speaking members to have such a French translation. If, perchance, this speech of the hon. leader of the Opposition was to be read on the other side of the ocean by persons knowing French, they would surely say: "In the name of heaven, who is the Iroquois speaking such a language? It is not French which is spoken in Canada, but a kind of English badly turned into French." And they would surely form a poor opinion of us. Mr. Speaker, I hold that if we pay such large sums to secure the rights of the French language, these rights should be secured effectually. A translation as badly done as that which I have spoken of, not only is of no advantage to the French race, but is altogether to its disadvantage. I draw the attention of the chairman of the Committee on the Official Report of the Debates to the manner in which the translation is made. I repeat it: it is not French that we are given. Sometimes and often enough we are given a mixture of French and English, English with French terms. It would be better, in my mind, to be content with the English text alone than to have such a translation made.

Motion agreed to.

SCRIP FOR MILITIA ENGAGED IN NORTH-WEST OUTBREAK.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON moved that on Friday next the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolutions:—

1. Resolved, That, whereas the persons hereinafter mentioned and described, being "members of the enrolled Militia force actively engaged and bearing arms in the suppression of the Indian and Half-breed outbreak," within the meaning of the Act passed in the session held in the 48th and 49th years of Her Majesty's reign, chapter 73, as amended by the Act passed in the session held in the 49th year of Her Majesty's reign, chapter 29, have not as yet received the land or scrip by the said amended Act authorized to be granted, and the time within which, under the provisions of the said amended Act, they might have received the same has elapsed; and there may be other persons in the like case; it is desirable that authority should be given for the granting to such persons, notwithstanding anything in the said amended Act contained, of the bounties thereby contemplated.

2. Resolved, That notwithstanding any limits of time in the said amended Act prescribed, the Minister of the Interior be authorized to grant free homesteads or scrip to the persons hereinafter mentioned or described, upon warrants, in favour of such persons respectively, issued by the Minister of Militia and Defence, as provided in the said amended Act: provided that any person in whose favour such warrant is issued, or his duly constituted substitute, shall, within six months after the date of the issue of such warrant, select and make entry for the two quarter-sections to which he is entitled thereunder, and shall thereafter perfect such entry and reside upon and cultivate the lands so entered for in accordance with the terms and conditions prescribed by the Homestead provisions of *The Dominion Lands Act*.

3. Resolved, That any person may, in lieu of such land, take scrip, as provided by the said amended Act, but that any person choosing to take scrip must notify the Minister of the Interior of his choice within six months from the issue of the warrant in his favour.

4. Resolved, That all the provisions of the said amended Act shall, so far as the same are applicable, extend and apply to grants of land and scrip issued under the foregoing provisions.

5. Resolved, That the foregoing provisions shall apply to:

(*a*) Members of the corps known during the outbreak as the Regina Volunteer Company;

(*b*) Members of the corps known during the outbreak as the Battleford Home Guards;

(*c*) Walter William Phelan, of Regina, a scout actively engaged during the outbreak, whose services have been certified to by competent authority;

(*d*) The following members of the troop of scouts known as the Steele Scouts, that is to say:—James Rolland, Frederick Rolland, William Rolland, John Whiteford, R. E. Steele, G. M. Steele, W. Chamberlayne, Peter Nelson, George Beatty and John Calder;

(*e*) Such other persons as hereafter establish to the satisfaction of the Minister of Militia and Defence that they were respectively, within the meaning of the said amended Act, members of the enrolled Militia force actively engaged in bearing arms in the Indian and Half-breed outbreak, and that they have not received the land or scrip by the said amended Act authorized to be granted.

Motion agreed to.

KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK.

Mr. TARTE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works to a motion which was made on my behalf by the hon. member for Lévis (Mr. Guay) on the 5th of May last. My hon. friend moved in my name for all papers and correspondence in connection with the awarding of the contract of the Kingston Graving Dock. It is a month since those papers were asked for, and I have not yet heard anything about them. I wish to warn the hon. Minister of Public Works that I have been informed—accurately informed, I believe—that the same fraudulent practices, which have taken place during the last eight or ten years in connection with other contracts in his department, have taken place in connection with this contract. I wish to tell him before the House and before the country that I believe I have the complete proof of money having been paid to men in connection with his department to obtain information on which Messrs. Michael and Nicholas Connolly, witnesses heard this morning before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, based their calculations to obtain that contract, although they were not the lowest tenderers. I hope that the hon. Minister will see that these papers are brought down as soon as possible, because the experience we have had to-day before the Committee on Privileges and Elections proves that, if we have delay, witnesses and papers may disappear.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is not in order in referring to anything which took place before a committee.

Mr. TARTE. I am perfectly willing to bow to your decision, but I am through.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The papers the hon. gentleman has mentioned are being prepared in the department. I am writing now to the deputy of my department to ask if they will be ready to-morrow, or when they will be ready.

CHIGNECTO SHIP RAILWAY.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the report of the Committee of the Whole on resolution respecting the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company be received.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understood that the hon. gentleman intended, before the report was received, to have laid before the House a list of the shareholders in that undertaking. It was strenuously pressed by my hon. friend from Queen's, and I understood that the list would be forthcoming before the report would be received.

Mr. FOSTER. I said there was no objection to laying the list before the House. I have had it cabled for, and it will be here probably in ten days, which will be in ample time before the Bill passes through the House. What I desire now is to have the resolution passed and the Bill introduced, so that it may be printed and considered by members of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You will not proceed with the Bill until this list is produced?

Mr. FOSTER. I think we will have it within ten days.

Report received, resolutions read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 97) to amend the Acts respecting the granting of a subsidy to the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company, Limited.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY—THE HIGH COMMISSIONER.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply," and the motion of Mr. Laurier in amendment thereto.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). When the House adjourned on Friday night, we were discussing the attitude of Sir Charles Tupper as High Commissioner of this Dominion to England, and the attitude of Sir Charles Tupper as a political bulldozer during the last Dominion election and since the

last Dominion election. The charges preferred by the leader of the Opposition against Sir Charles Tupper, are three, clear, distinct, concise. He is charged with having interfered in the elections while he occupied the high and distinguished position of High Commissioner to England: he is charged with having characterized the Liberal party with being actuated by treasonable and disloyal motives; he is charged, thirdly, with having improperly and unnecessarily interfered with the Grand Trunk Railway, and with having used his position in England since the election, to interfere with the Grand Trunk Railway. He was defended by the Minister of Justice, not, in my judgment, in the broad and generous spirit that one statesman ought to defend another statesman, but rather in the character of an attorney defending a criminal accused of petty larceny, first declaring that the evidence did not satisfy the charge, that the evidence was not strong enough, and then he made a strong appeal to the jury, the gentlemen behind him practically cracking over their heads the ministerial whip and begging of them to vote down the motion of the leader of the Opposition, to vote it down whether the evidence established the guilt of the implicated individual, or whether it did not. The Minister of Justice denied the charges, but he submitted no proof that Sir Charles Tupper denied them. He knew, everybody knew throughout the length and breadth of this wide Dominion, that Sir Charles Tupper had been so charged in the press, at least two months before the charges were levelled against him upon the floor of Parliament. The Minister of Justice knew it. The Minister of Justice is in daily communication, I apprehend, or at all events, may be, with the High Commissioner in England, and yet, although the Minister of Justice denies that Sir Charles Tupper made use of the language that is charged against him, he does not produce before Parliament and the people of Canada a tittle of evidence that Sir Charles Tupper himself denied it. We have the denial of the Minister of Justice, we have no denial from Sir Charles Tupper, and it is not a violent assumption that Sir Charles Tupper, the High Commissioner to England, has known for the last two months, at all events, that those charges were bandied about, both in the English press and in the Canadian press, scattered broadcast all over the world, and yet, so far as we know, the mouth of Sir Charles Tupper is closed, and his lips have been sealed upon this question. The Minister of Justice denied the charges, with the hon. gentleman's usual ability; and perhaps it was to be expected that he would defend his old patron, and the one that warmed him into political life. But altogether I submit to this Parliament, confidently, and to the people of this country, that the defence made by the Minister of Justice was an exceedingly lame defence. The Minister of Justice denied that Sir Charles Tupper had ever called the Liberal party or the leaders of the Liberal party, "ruined gamesters." But Sir Charles Tupper has never made a denial, that I am aware of, either through the Canadian press or through the English press, or by communications to the Minister of Justice. We are asked in this Parliament to take the statement of the Minister of Justice that Sir Charles Tupper made use of no such language. However much confidence I may have in the Minister of Justice, I prefer having the denial from the individual implicated, that he made use of no such language. The Minister of Justice says that Sir Charles Tupper made use of no such language. I believe the testimony is beyond all reasonable doubt, that Sir Charles Tupper, after the elections were over, if not pending the elections, described the leaders of the great Liberal party in the Dominion of Canada, as "ruined gamesters." How dare Sir Charles Tupper or anybody else stigmatize men that are infinitely better than he is, men whose shoe latchets he never was worthy to unloose, as "ruined gamesters?" If the charge is established, as I believe I will be able to establish it—at all events submit evidence in corroboration of the evidence submitted by my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), that Sir Charles Tupper stigmatized the leaders of the Liberal party as "ruined gamesters"—that it is true is manifest from the echo upon the other side of the House.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I proved that Sir Charles Tupper did not use such language towards the leaders of the Liberal party.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I heard nothing in the hon. gentleman's speech except some stale extracts from stale speeches of the member for South Oxford, that did not appear to me to have any application to, or any bearing whatever upon, the guilt or the innocence of Sir Charles Tupper. Has Sir Charles Tupper himself denied the charge that has been levelled against him? Sir, we are able to produce proof from Conservative papers—and I hope hon. gentlemen will take the utterances of their own organs and of the English papers—that he made use of such language: again I say, how dare Sir Charles Tupper make use of such language? —a gentleman that is known in Parliament and known from one end of the country to the other, throughout his long political life, as having a record of boodle and plunder, from the hour when he first touched the Spring Hill Coal Mine until the hour when the Canadian Pacific Railway was completed, and he became an English Baronet and a Canadian millionaire. And yet we are told by hon. gentlemen opposite that Sir Charles Tupper used no such language. Let us see what the Montreal *Star*, which I do not think is at all favourable to the Liberal party but whose sympathies are with the Conservative party, said regarding the use of this language by Sir Charles Tupper. The *Star* said:

"Sir Charles Tupper gives the parting shot in a letter in the *Times* to-day in the Tyler discussion. He says in this letter that Sir Henry Tyler, like a cuttle-fish, endeavours to escape under the cover of an inky cloud. Sir Charles asserts that it is now proved that the Grand Trunk went to shameful extremes to aid 'ruined gamesters' in attempting to subvert British institutions in Canada. Sir Charles hopes, he says, that the Grand Trunk may yet be redeemed from its miserable, ruinous mismanagement."

Does the Minister of Justice still declare that Sir Charles Tupper never made use of the language? If so, the Minister can obtain abundant proof from the papers published in the locality where the language was uttered. I never heard Sir Charles Tupper make use of this language, but that he did make use of it appears to be reasonably clear from the evidence submitted. Whether Sir Charles Tupper is really a ruined gamester or not, I know not; but this I know, that his political career for twenty-five years shows him to be anything but a ruined gamester. For a quarter of a century he was a member of Parliament, a member of the Government, or ruling

the Government of the country. He was not a millionaire a quarter of a century ago when he came to this Parliament. He left Canada a year or two ago, as I have already intimated, an English baronet and a reputed Canadian millionaire. Everybody knows that a member of Parliament cannot become a millionaire on his sessional allowance, and that a member of the Government cannot become a millionaire within a few years out of his official salary, if he discharges his duty as a member of the Government and an occupant of the Treasury benches. If a gigantic fortune cannot be acquired in that way, how can it be acquired?—echo answers, how? Canada will be startled some day to know the means whereby Canadian statesmen acquire English baronetcies, and even English peerages, and at the same time become Canadian millionaires. I do not care how Sir Charles Tupper acquired his fortune or his baronetcy. All I say is, that it is exceedingly improper, injudicious and unwise for a man occupying the position Sir Charles Tupper occupies, to interfere, directly or indirectly, with Dominion elections: exceedingly injudicious, occupying the position he occupies as a sort of ambassador from the court at Ottawa to the Imperial Court at St. James, to dabble in anything outside of his office. He is sent there, not by the Conservative party, but as the representative of the whole people of Canada, one-half of whom, if not more, are Liberals: his office salary is not taken out of the pockets of the Conservative party, but it is paid by Canadian taxpayers, and Sir Charles Tupper, or anyone else occupying a position of that kind, ought to remain quiescent, and, if he does not do so, it is the duty of this Parliament, if the Government will not muzzle him, to muzzle him. One is curious, when such language is made use of, to know exactly the political record of the utterer of the language while he was a member of Parliament: one is curious to know the opinions which his political adversaries, as well as his political friends, held regarding him: one is curious to know the record of a gentleman who ventures on a public platform to denounce his political adversaries as "ruined gamesters," and to know what his own friends think about him. I will venture to read from the Debates of Parliament some years ago an opinion given of the High Commissioner to England by a gentleman who sat beside him in the councils of the Dominion, who was one of his old adversaries in the old Province of Nova Scotia, when Sir Charles Tupper was Provincial Secretary of that colony, and one of his colleagues here. What this Minister said of Sir Charles Tupper is in the following words:—

"But the picture, dark as it is, has something blacker still. I see there standing in the background, the Provincial Secretary of Nova Scotia privately handing over to this same engineer a contract for the whole work. I see him shroud it in darkness and bury it for months in the grave of secrecy. And now the Provincial Secretary comes forward and tells us it was so hidden to serve the public interest; to enable Sandford Fleming, after he had taken the contract, to make better terms with the old contractors: to grind a few more dollars out of them. Public interest indeed! Mr. Sandford Fleming's interest alone. Sir, I know not what term to apply to such conduct in a Government. I know not what to call it—I shall not venture an opinion; but in private life it is called extorting money under false pretences, and our laws make it indictable knavery."

That is pretty strong language, but it was uttered by a Nova Scotian, in regard to a Nova Scotian who was formerly Provincial Secretary. He is not satisfied with that, but he goes on to say:

"They have heard of men riding in public conveyances with a loose mantle about them and a pair of false hands folded in front to lull suspicion, while the real hands were finding their way into their fellow travellers' pockets, and they now think that when the hon. gentleman put on the mantle of Herbert Huntingdon and the old Reformers, the hands he put to the plough were not real—that the real hands were hidden that they might better get to the arm-pits in the public chest, and they wait, they long for the opportunity to sweep him from his position. Therefore, Sir, there was no necessity to bring this case here to excite public opinion. But, Mr. Speaker, if having brought it for investigation, in the discharge of a public duty, what if the people should, on an examination of it, decide that the public interests have been bartered away and betrayed—that the man whom they once believed in as the apostle of retrenchment has become the great high priest of jobbery and corruption? Who then shall restrain limits to their just indignation as they take him, loaded down as he may be with the share of the offerings that fall to the priest, and impale him on the horns of the altar at which he ministers."

Those were the words made use of by a one time colleague of Sir Charles Tupper; and yet this man has the brazen impertinence to charge the Liberal party with being a set of ruined gamesters. The Minister of Justice desired to convince this House that Sir Charles Tupper made use of no improper or undue influence respecting the Grand Trunk Railway. Sir Charles Tupper, as the Minister of Justice desires us to believe, approached the Grand Trunk Railway in the innocence and simplicity of his nature. He informed the General Manager, in the innocence and simplicity of his character, of his innocent mission. He interviewed some of the prominent employés of the Grand Trunk Railway, simply as an individual, and not as Sir Charles Tupper, seeking the assistance of the Grand Trunk Railway: he simply asked them to stay their hand and not to take violent action against the Government of Canada; he simply asked them to allow their employés to do, and act, and vote just as they liked. Now, does any man believe that, who has known Sir Charles Tupper for twenty-five years as a politician, who now knows Sir Charles Tupper as a political partisan, and who knows the ways and methods of Sir Charles Tupper upon the public platform and during an election campaign? I do not think the Minister of Justice will get many people to believe that story, even assuming that there was no evidence to the contrary. Does any man who knows Sir Charles Tupper and who has known him for ten or fifteen years, believe that he went to the General Manager of the Grand Trunk Railway and that all that he asked him to do was to stay his hand. Does any one believe that, in face of the absolute declaration of that General Manager that Sir Charles Tupper wanted him to interfere actively on behalf of the Government? Does any man who knows Sir Charles Tupper for the last fifteen or twenty years believe any such thing? Ah! Mr. Speaker, we do not forget in the olden days the methods of Sir Charles Tupper: we do not forget the famous telegram to Pembroke in 1882, pending a general election, when the people of Pembroke were led to believe that if they voted for the Government candidate they would be relieved of $70,000 due the Government, and of which they were subsequently relieved. I do not think that the Minister of Justice was in Parliament at that time, but I do think that if he knew much about the methods of Sir Charles Tupper he would not, in his.

innocence and simplicity and superabundant confidence in Sir Charles Tupper, have made the statement which he did. Have we forgotten the campaign of 1887; have we forgotten the raids made by Sir Charles Tupper upon the eastern Provinces in 1887? Sir, if we have forgotten them, the Dominion treasury will not forget them for many years. We know perfectly well that upon that occasion Sir Charles Tupper pledged the credit of this country to the expenditure of enormous sums of money, and we know just as well that the Parliament of this country, controlled by hon. gentlemen opposite, implemented nearly every one of these promises. We have not forgotten that, later on, Sir Charles Tupper bullied and bulldozed through Parliament a scheme for the construction of a railway parallel to an existing line of railway, upon his assurance to Parliament that it would shorten the distance to a given point by forty when it only shortened it by five or six miles. We have not forgotten the methods of Sir Charles Tupper in the old parliamentary days when he forced through Parliament a scheme for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway upon the solemn assurances that it would not cost the people of this country a single cent, and yet the people of this country have to pay every farthing of the cost. We have not forgotten that in those days he assured us that there would be a population of half a million in the North-West Territories by this time; we have not forgotten the glowing picture which he drew of the North-West Territories, and how he pointed out that in a few years the North-West Territories would be able to produce six hundred and forty million bushels of wheat for export; we have not forgotten that he told us that the Dominion Lands in the North-West would pay every farthing of the cost of constructing the Canadian Pacific Railway, and we know now, that instead of paying every farthing of that expenditure, we are nearly a million and a half of dollars behind for the management of the North-West lands alone. We are asked, in the face of all this, to believe that this simple and innocent man went out upon this simple and innocent mission, saying to the manager of the Grand Trunk Railway in gentle tones: "Stay your hand, Mr. Seargeant; do nothing, do not interfere with the Government; your men are all in favour of the Government now, and let them vote as they wish." These are not the methods of Sir Charles Tupper. Sir Charles Tupper had a different mission, and Sir Charles Tupper attempted to carry out a different mission, and he failed in his mission because the Grand Trunk Railway Company had made up its mind to remain neutral between the contending parties and to let them fight their own battles. Herepath's *Railway Journal*, speaking of Sir Charles Tupper's conduct, says:

"Shame and amazement must be the predominant feelings in judging of Sir Charles Tupper's scandalous attack on Sir Henry Tyler and the Grand Trunk management generally, * * * but if anything could make us believe that the charges against the Liberal party in Canada are baseless and only made to serve the party ends of the Conservatives, it would be Tupper's abuse of the Grand Trunk for not accepting his corrupt offers."

The *Shareholder* of Montreal also refers to the subject. I do not think the *Shareholder* is a Liberal paper, but, I believe, if it has any politics at all, it has Conservative leanings. The *Shareholder* says:

"Canada's High Commissioner should not bring discredit on the country by exhibiting so much rancour and rashness. He is the paid servant of the country, and as such should let politics alone. His conduct in the matter has been simply indecent."——

That is the opinion of a non-partizan paper. It goes on to say:

—"and the sooner his employers silence him the better it will be for Canadian interests."

So say I, Mr. Speaker. Whatever be the politics of the man who penned this article, he says right when he says that the sooner the Government of this country muzzles Sir Charles Tupper and keeps him clear of politics and other interference with Canadian interests, the better it will be for this country. But Sir Charles Tupper has not only attempted to interfere with the management of the Grand Trunk Railway, but he charged that great corporation, as the extracts I have read show, with extravagance, jobbery and corruption. He was speedily brought to book for that, and he backed down to some extent by saying that this extravagance, jobbery and corruption was perpetrated during the construction and under the early management. Why, Sir Charles Tupper had been in Parliament for nearly twenty-five years, except when he was lording it as High Commissioner in England, and for all these long years the Grand Trunk Railway had intimate relations with Sir Charles Tupper, and Sir Charles Tupper had intimate relations with the Grand Trunk Railway managers, and yet he never said a word about that extravagance, jobbery and corruption. So long as the Grand Trunk Railway was prepared to subserve the interest of Sir Charles Tupper or the Government of which he was a prominent supporter, or member, so long as the Grand Trunk Railway did nothing more than give the Government their sympathy and indirect support, the Grand Trunk Railway was not guilty of extravagance, jobbery or corruption, but the moment the Grand Trunk Railway ceased to serve the interests of the political party to which Sir Charles Tupper belonged, then, in the eyes of Sir Charles Tupper, the Grand Trunk Railway was guilty of extravagance, jobbery and corruption. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, I ask this House, does Sir Charles Tupper realize thoroughly the damage he is doing to this country by so talking of a company such as the Grand Trunk Railway—a company that this country will be forever indebted to, a company that has done more to open up and to develop the resources of this country than all the Tuppers that have ever lived, or all the Tuppers that will live until the Day of Judgment? Does Sir Charles Tupper realize the damage he is doing to Canadian interests; does he not know that in the city of London where he lives, there are thousands of investors who have their little all invested in the Grand Trunk Railway; and yet Sir Charles Tupper openly declares that the Grand Trunk Railway is managed by extravagance, jobbery and corruption. Does he realize the damage that he is doing Canadian interests by so declaring, or does he realize that by interfering in politics at all he is damaging Canadian interests. If he does not realize all this, it is high time that the Government should recall him, and if the Government does not recall him, it is high time that the Parliament of Canada should muzzle Sir Charles Tupper. Let me read what the *Railway News* wrote of Sir Charles Tupper. It says:

"If, by any means, they—[the Grand Trunk managers]—could have succeeded, then many of the friends of Sir Charles would not have had the opportunity of being numbered amongst the wealthiest of Canadians; and if they had failed, as they assuredly would, for lack of that support, which has been so lavishly given to the friends and supporters of the Government in Canada, the proprietors of the Grand Trunk would have had occasion to lament, even ten times more bitterly than they now do, the disastrous results of the confidence which they reposed in the promises and pledges of the Canadian Government—among others, that the line would pay 11 per cent. upon its capital, and that it should be practically free from that railway competition which has of late years been so recklessly encouraged."

I also read from Herepath's *Railway Journal* the following extract with regard to the charge of extravagance, corruption and jobbery:—

"We on this side have a much better opportunity of judging of the ability and honesty of the Grand Trunk management than has Sir Charles Tupper, and we can tell him that it has been characterized by sterling honesty, prudent foresight, and the best form of conservatism."

It is a pity, Mr. Speaker, that we could not introduce into Canada a little of the best form of conservatism. Now, I shall vote heartily for the resolution of my hon. friend. I believe the conduct of Sir Charles Tupper is wholly without justification; I believe his active interference at all in politics is wholly without justification; and had the motion of my hon. friend gone further than it does, I would have voted for it; I would have voted to abolish the office and to abolish Sir Charles Tupper at the same time. I never could see the utility or necessity for this office. I see it now less than I ever saw it before. Every hour, I think, gives us convincing proof that the office itself is wholly unnecessary. When that office was created we were informed by the Administration that it was created for certain purposes. The Commissioner was to act as the representative and resident agent for Canada in England, and was to exercise such powers and perform such duties as might be assigned to him by the Governor in Council. The Governor in Council was to direct him what to do. He was to supervise immigration; he was to carry out the instructions he might receive from the Governor in Council respecting the financial, commercial and general interests of Canada. Now, I would like the Government to point out to this House what Sir Charles Tupper has ever done in the general interests of Canada; I would like them to point out to me a single Order in Council that they have passed giving Sir Charles Tupper directions to do something for the general benefit of the people of this great country. Let me ask the hon. Minister of Justice, who has taken up the hopeless task of defending Sir Charles Tupper, was it by Order in Council that, in 1884, Sir Charles Tupper was induced to abandon his mission to England, to leave the charmed circle on the outskirts of aristocratic life there and come to Canada, and take his place in the Government and the House, and bully through Parliament a large additional subvention to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company? Let me ask the hon. Minister of Justice if it was by Order in Council that, in 1888, Sir Charles Tupper again came to Canada, and again occupied a seat on the Treasury benches, and forced another subvention to his masters the Canadian Pacific Railway Company through Parliament. Let me ask the hon. Minister of Justice, was it by Order in Council that Sir Charles Tupper lent the influence of his name and position as High Commissioner to his dear friend Mr. Isaacs in order to establish the Dead Meat Company at the charming city of Three Rivers, by which thousands of English investors were induced to put their money into this enterprise, and lost it? Was it by Order in Council that Sir Charles Tupper was brought, in 1891, from his mission to England, where he is supposed to be of such invaluable service to the people of Canada, in order to take part in the heat and turmoil of a political contest in this country? Was it by Order in Council that Sir Charles Tupper appeared on a public platform in the city of Quebec, and, for the purpose of carrying a constituency or two pledge the credit of his country to a million of money? I do not know whether he did that or not, because I was not there; but I will read an extract from the Quebec *Chronicle*, which I am told is a Conservative paper. Hear what it says:—

"Sir Charles spoke some hopeful words for the bridge. But he was also most emphatic on the old North Shore Railway bonds question. He stated to his enthusiastic audience, which applauded almost every sentence that he uttered, that the Canadian Pacific Railway could be relieved of that $1,000,000 worth of obligation without its costing the country at large one cent."

It is the old, old story: you can assume a liability, involving the expenditure of millions of money, and yet it will not cost the tax-payers a cent. Sir Charles Tupper is full of promises.—

"The High Commissioner painted a beautiful picture, full of roses and things. He said that elevators would be erected, that grain in enormous quantities would be shipped from here, and that the Government would do its part manfully to help forward the Quebec boom. Sir Charles then read a telegram, which came hot from the wires, from the Premier of Canada."

There you have the assurance of Sir Charles Tupper on the public platform. Were these given on the faith of an Order in Council passed by the Governor General in the presence of his advisers? Was it by Order in Council that Sir Charles Tupper went to Montreal and attempted to bulldoze the Grand Trunk Railway Company to coerce their employés to vote for the Government party? Was it by an Order in Council that Sir Charles Tupper was instructed to assume an attitude calculated to strike a fatal blow at the credit of this country in the English market? Is it by an Order in Council that Sir Charles Tupper has been acting in the way he has been doing for the last three or four years? If so, then all I can say is, that by virtue of an Order in Council Sir Charles Tupper's conduct has been offensive and insulting to a large majority of the people of Canada, and I believe, also, to a great many people in the mother country. If Sir Charles Tupper must engage in politics, let him resign his office. I have no objection to Sir Charles Tupper taking the field in the Canadian political arena, if he must dabble in politics on behalf of his political friends on the other side of the House; but if he does so, let him resign his office. Do not let him remain as the ambassador of Canada to the Imperial Court and draw a salary amounting, with those of his employés, to about $25,000 a year, and at the same time act as a political partisan or a political bully and bulldozer from one end of this country to the other. And if the Government do not wish to check him, then the Parliament of Canada ought to check him; and if Parliament does not do so, the people of this country will do so when they get an opportunity. Who ever heard of an English ambassador inter-

fering in the politics of a foreign court? We know of one celebrated instance, when an English ambassador wrote a political letter during the heat of a political campaign in the United States, and no sooner was that letter drawn to the attention of the Imperial Government than that ambassador was recalled. Our ambassador engages in all kinds of schemes in England, in waterworks and gas manufacturing industries, and then slanders and abuses people and institutions in this country. I say it is high time the people of this country should put a stop to Sir Charles Tupper's conduct. He is not only a useless appendage to the body politic, but he is a mischief and a nuisance to Canada and in England. He serves no good purpose there; and besides all that, he is an exceedingly expensive ornamental figure-head at the Court of St. James. I find that this great man, who, if we are to believe the hon. the Minister of Justice, deserves rather the commendation of the whole people of Canada than the condemnation of the right-thinking people of this Dominion, is paid by us a salary of $10,000 a year and $2,000 allowance. We pay about $13,000 for his employés, and I suppose we pay his travelling expenses. Even when he takes up his gripsack and goes to Spain to negotiate a reciprocity treaty, in the pleasant season of the year, or when he comes to Canada to engage in a political contest, we have no doubt to foot the bill. And besides all this, we have to pay his gas bill. And we are charged a gratuity paid by him to Mrs. Wilkinson, of $68. If our High Commissioner chooses to be generous and charitable to Mrs. Wilkinson, is that any business of ours, and why should we be called on to pay for his generosity? We are also called on to pay his gratuities to postmen and others. But if Sir Charles Tupper chooses to give ten cents or twenty-five cents or a dollar to the small boy who brings his letters, I ask is it not an outrage that the tax-payers of this country should be called on to pay it? We provide him with a free house and free furniture, and yet we have to pay his income tax of $250 a year and other taxes. I suppose that every hon. member in this House pays his own taxes. I suppose that the officials pay their own taxes out of their own pockets. Why, then, should we make an exception in favour of Sir Charles Tupper, even though he be an English baronet and Lord High Commissioner to England? Why should we pay our ambassador's railway tickets, and his newspaper bill amounting to $196.04, and his parochial rates $349.47, and his porterage? If the High Commissioner cannot carry his own gripsack but chooses to employ a porter, why should we pay for that? Yet we are charged $5.47 for it. Why should we pay his subscription to Ashburnham Gardens, $10.95, and to the Colonial Institute, $9.73? One has only to read those items, in the light of the information we get from the Auditor General's Report and the Public Accounts, to be amazed that any Government, even this, should be so utterly reckless of what is due the tax-payers of this country, as to sanction the payments of these large sums. I will vote for the motion, and if my hon. friend had introduced a Bill to abolish the office of High Commissioner, it would have received my cordial support. I think it is the bounden duty of the Parliament, if the Government is, as usual, recreant to the trust reposed in it by the people of Canada, to stamp with their disapproval the conduct of the High Commissioner.

Mr. DAVIN. I have listened with interest to the remarks of my hon. friend, whom, if he will not think it impertinent on my part, I welcome back to the Parliament of Canada, though I should have preferred, of course, to see in his place my friend Mr. Porter. My hon. friend the member for Huron illustrates the principle of abstention, in which he and I believe. He had too much Porter, and he could not come up to time. The Porter was removed from his locality, and there he is, and I am very glad to see him. As we had to have a Reformer, there is nobody I should prefer seeing here than my hon. friend. Now, the speech of my hon. friend, to which we have just listened, divides itself into three parts. The first part dealt with what might be called the figurative language of Sir Charles Tupper. The next part dealt with the career of Sir Charles Tupper before he became High Commissioner, and a small portion of the close of the speech dealt with him as High Commissioner. Now, for middle-aged men and some past middle age, it seems to me very extraordinary that we should be so sensitive to a phrase—that it should irk the soul of the hon. member for Huron that he and his fellow leaders of the Reform party should be called "ruined gamesters." What did Sir Charles Tupper mean by that expression? He could not have meant that my hon. friend the member for Huron is given to playing the seductive game of poker and loses heavily. He could not have meant that any of the other leaders, take, for instance, the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), were given to that interesting game and lost heavily at it. It is evidently a figurative phrase applied to them as politicians. What could it mean? It could only mean that they had bet on a certain policy and had lost—that they had bet on unrestricted reciprocity and commercial union and had lost. And what then were they but ruined gamesters? But, Sir, still more extraordinary is it that gentlemen so sensitive about a figurative phrase should, in the very breath in which they complain of that phrase, have used also figurative language; for the hon. member for Huron, in the very sentence in which he complained of the phrase "ruined gamesters," called Sir Charles Tupper a "political bulldozer." Now, really there is not much difference. If you were to take a pair of scales and weigh the two phrases—if you would put the phrase "ruined gamester" in the one scale and "political bulldozer" in the other, I venture to say they would balance each other almost as nicely as a pair of apothecary scales weighing some infinitesimal prescription. Not only that. My hon. friend left the figurative; he departed from the imaginative field and came to plain language, and he declared that for twenty-five years the career of Sir Charles Tupper had been one of plunder. Well, that is a strong phrase especially coming from gentlemen who are so sensitive about being called "ruined gamesters;" and then my hon. friend cited a quotation from a speech of Mr. Mc Lelan, made in 1876, in the Nova Scotia Parliament, in which he spoke very harshly, and also in a figurative manner, of Sir Charles Tupper. But, Sir, in this very House—I was here at the time—Mr. McLelan, who, I think, was then Finance Minister or Postmaster General, got up and

repudiated all those phrases which have been read out with so much unction by the hon. member for Huron. My hon. friend complained of Sir Charles Tupper's enthusiasm over the Canadian Pacific Railway and the North-West. Sir, I doubt if I should be standing here to-day troubling the House, if it were not for what Sir Charles Tupper has done for the North-West. There is no man in Canada, not even his illustrious leader, to whom the North-West is more indebted than to Sir Charles Tupper. He always believed in the North-West; and, Mr. Speaker, indeed at that time, which was a time of doubt and despondency —and we know very well that amongst Reformers despondency is a disease more common than with Conservatives—we needed an enthusiastic man, a man of eager, burning character like Sir Charles Tupper to give enthusiasm to the people and make them believe in the future of their country. Why, the hon. the leader of the Opposition, when he was speaking of this Canadian Pacific Railway, declared—I was reading it in one of his speeches in a book with which I was presented, and very glad I am to have been presented with a volume containing his speeches—that the idea that the railway could be built in the time within which it was agreed it could be built was preposterous. He declared it would take a much longer time. But Sir Charles Tupper built it in a much shorter time. I think the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) said that all the resources of the Empire would not be sufficient to build that railway in the time it was contracted to be built, but, nevertheless, Sir Charles Tupper built that railway in four years less than the specified time. He is a man of great energy, and that is a great railway, and has made Canada something in the eyes of the world. If the Minister of Justice claims that Sir Charles Tupper has rendered great services to Canada, the building of that railway is not the least he has done in the interest of Canada. Then, it is said he spoke of the Grand Trunk Railway as being given up to jobbery, corruption and extravagance. I know nothing about the jobbery, I know nothing about the corruption, but I do know that the last contest illustrated the extravagance, and, I think, also the corruption of that company. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) complained the other night, that the Canadian Pacific Railway had given some assistance to this Government in the late contest. I do not know whether it did or not, but I do know that throughout one whole division in my constituency—though I am aware since that date that it was without the knowledge or consent of Mr. VanHorne—the whole influence of the Canadian Pacific Railway was used against me. If so, we have here again a specimen of consistency. My hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Cameron) complains of Sir Charles Tupper's figurative language, yet calls him a bulldozer, and these gentlemen, who hold up their hands in holy horror at the action of the Canadian Pacific Railway, had no objection to accept the assistance of the Grand Trunk. I hold in my hand *L'Electeur*, which, I believe, is one of the organs of the leader of the Opposition,

An hon. MEMBER. And a very good paper, too.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, it is a very good paper; I read it frequently. It says here, and I hope hon. gentlemen who speak French will excuse my *accent déplorable:*

"Two Grand Trunk trains, one of twenty-three, the other of twenty-seven cars, arrived yesterday from the United States with Canadian voters. It is calculated that more than 2,000 of our countrymen have come back to Canada to give their vote. The twenty-three car train which arrived at Point Lévis with voters for the Eastern Townships, was drawn by three locomotives. The Grand Trunk had even been generous enough to send locomotives and snow ploughs ahead to clear the track encumbered by the storm. All these brave fellows were unanimous in favour of Mr. Laurier and reciprocity. They were shouting "Vive Laurier!" at every station, and communicated their enthusiasm to the crowd of friends that had come to meet them."

Here is the hon. gentleman himself pictured in this paper, and here is "La couronne de Laurier." But they crowned him, they arrayed his brow with laurels in advance. And if I may be allowed to make a pun in his own beautiful language and quote a line from one of the greatest of its writers, they should have remembered that

"Avec tous vos *lauriers* craignez encore la foudre."

And there was a lightning coming which they did not dream of, and a bolt they were not expecting, and, when the ballots came to be counted, my hon. friend, who, if ever the Reform party should win—which Heaven forbid—I should be more glad to see at the head of the Government of Canada than any other man, found that he was mistaken. I will not go into what might be called the ancient history of the Springhill Mine, or anything of that kind. In fact I know nothing in reference to those matters, and they have nothing to do with this question. We are dealing with Sir Charles Tupper in his acts as High Commissioner of Canada, and he must stand or fall by his acts as High Commissioner of Canada. There is a Latin maxim which says *Qui hæret in literâ hæret in cortice;* that is to say, that anyone who sticks merely to the letter goes only skin deep. Let us not be deceived by the phrase "civil servant." Let us ask the House if there is any strict analogy between the position of Sir Charles Tupper and that of an ordinary civil servant. Is he within the restraints and bonds that bind the ordinary civil servant? Is it not well known that, if the Government changed to-morrow he would go out from his office? It is well known that that would be the case. But let me argue the case, and I will particularly address myself to the leader of the Opposition, because I am going to appeal to him to change his motion. Suppose Sir Charles Tupper was an ordinary civil servant and had no political record at all, we must take the definition of the moral situation from Sir Charles Tupper himself, and what does he say? He declares that, in his opinion, the course the Liberal party was taking, was a disloyal course. That is his opinion, and we have to take it as his honest opinion. When the leader of the Opposition declares, as he does in this House, that he is as loyal as any man of the party to which I belong, I believe him, because I know him to be a gentleman, and I know that he would not say what was not true; I take him at his word. When Sir Charles Tupper declares that the course pursued by the Liberal party was a disloyal course, and was calculated to lead to annexation, we have to suppose that he believes it. In fact we have Mr. Blake expressing the same opinion. He is no longer sitting in this House. Why? Because he came to the conclusion, so far as

I could gather from that letter of his, that somehow or other the policy of the Liberal party, to which he belonged, would lead to annexation. However, we have nothing to do with that, it is merely by the way. We have to take Sir Charles Tupper's words as to what his belief was. Now, suppose he is an ordinary civil servant without any political record. It is known that he is a man of great power on the platform, and the head of the Government he serves sends word to him: "Come over. You are a man of great political power on the platform—come over and help us. According to the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), you have luxurious chambers, but still, come over here, we want you to help us. You know what these people, our opponents, are fighting for. They have raised a disloyal cry, and we want you to beat it down." What would be thought of him if he did not obey that call, even supposing he had no political record whatever, once he was told by the head of the Government that he could render his country a service? And if he were a patriotic Canadian, and were honest in his belief, what would be thought of him if he hesitated? I will go further than that, and I will say this: The man is not in that position at all; he is a man with a political record; he is an ex-Minister of the Crown. It is only the other day that he was sitting there where the Finance Minister is now sitting. There is hardly an item of expenditure that has been incurred by this Government during some 14 years, for which he is not responsible. He is responsible for the policy which is the main plank in the platform of the Government at this hour. He fought for it in 1878; he fought for it session after session. He is a Privy Councillor; he is sworn to do all he can, therefore, to secure loyalty to Her Majesty, and so far as he is able, he is bound to preserve the allegiance of this country to Her Majesty. Well, Sir, this man is told that the country is in danger, that the colleagues who sat by his side are in danger, and are fighting for their lives, that the country is in the balance and at stake, and he is asked by the Prime Minister to come over here and fight in the battle that is impending. What would be thought of him, let me ask you, if he looked round on those luxurious chambers of which the member for North Wellington speaks so eloquently and so fondly, and thought to himself: "How can I leave this? How can I leave the luxury of London? How can I leave rubbing elbows with Dukes and Duchesses, and go over to the rough-and-tumble fight of a Canadian election?" But we may even go further than that. We may fancy people near and dear to Sir Charles Tupper coming to him and saying: "You are old; you are no longer what you were; you fight with diminished force; you must feel a lessened force. Why should you go across the Atlantic and leave your duties here, which are important to the country? Why should you go over there to engage in the rough-and-tumble fight of a Canadian election?" If he had any touch of baseness in him you could fancy him hesitating; but I need hardly tell you that that is not the character of the man. I believe he has often been called the war-horse of Cumberland; he is like the war-horse in Job, he "smelleth the battle afar off." And you may be perfectly certain that when he was summoned to come over here to fight in the elections, he did not hesitate for one moment, but he put on his armour, and he took down his sword: and perhaps I may quote words that indicate a situation not at all unlike, the words Schiller puts into the mouth of Hector when he hears Achilles roaring along the walls of Troy. When the Achilles of the Reform party, the member for South Oxford, was roaring along the walls of our citadel, we can fancy Sir Charles Tupper saying, in these immortal words of Schiller:

"Theures Weib gebiete deine Thränen
Nach der Feldschlacht ist mein feurig Sehnen
Diese Arme schützen Pergamus."

Now, if there are any hon. gentlemen here who do not understand German, I will translate these words, although my translation will be feeble compared with the original:

"Dearest wife, dry your tears,
My heart burns for the battle field;
These arms protect Canada."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say that if you look at the situation as described by my hon. friend from North Wellington, will you say that Sir Charles Tupper is a culprit? My hon. friend from North Wellington is an eloquent man, he is a great master of figures, and most eloquent men are great masters of figures. He is a great master of detail——

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). Of tails.

Mr. DAVIN,—and he has told us by the hour, on many and many a night, of those luxurious chambers, of the immense and ascending income of Sir Charles Tupper, of the fearful luxury in which he lives. He is a sort of Domitian, surrounded by every kind of abounding luxury. He has told us all this. Well, Mr. Speaker, if Sir Charles Tupper is a civil servant, according to the usual definition of the phrase, and if he imperils all that, for the sake of his belief in Canada, and for the sake of opposing a policy which he regarded as dangerous to the country and disloyal, why, instead of being a culprit, he is a hero.

An hon. MEMBER. Second homestead.

Mr. DAVIN. There is nothing about the second homestead in this, but when you come up to the North-West we will give you a second homestead and a shack as well. We are told that Sir Charles Tupper's action with regard to the Grand Trunk Railway has a tendency to lower the value of the property and destroy the credit of Canada. Now, I am not at all certain that it may not turn out that Sir Charles Tupper's criticism of the Grand Trunk will be a benefit to the Grand Trunk ultimately—not at all certain but that it may prove so. Well, suppose it should depress. Suppose that his assaults on the Grand Trunk Railway should, for a passing day, lower the value of shares; suppose that be the case, what are we to think of charges like that made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright)? He does not merely decry one railway enterprise, he decries the whole country with one fell swoop. We have seen *Grip*, that is edited by Mr. Bengough. I know him, and my impression is that he is a Reformer. He is the caricaturist of *Grip*, and the other day there was a cartoon of the member for South Oxford, who was represented as an artist painting a picture of the future of Canada. There was not much light and shadow in the picture, it was all one black daub. That, on the part of a Liberal critic, is the view taken of the future of Canada by one

of the leaders of the Reform party. And yet they condemn Sir Charles Tupper because he uttered some strong language about the Grand Trunk Railway. Suppose Sir Charles Tupper talked of the Grand Trunk Railway with what might be called patriotic fervour, you have to take the position as defined by himself. He regarded the Reform party in that contest as engaged in a struggle that would lead to disloyalty and annexation. If that be so, and the Grand Trunk Railway was assisting them—and I have shown that the Grand Trunk Railway in one place alone brought in 2,000 voters, according to one of their own papers—is it a very extraordinary thing that Sir Charles Tupper, indignant at the course taken by the Grand Trunk Railway, should have used strong language against the company? At all events, it does not lie in the mouths of hon. gentlemen who decry the country, as hon. gentlemen do, to speak very harshly of Sir Charles Tupper for criticizing adversely one company, when they by one fell swoop darkened the whole horizon. One thing that has been referred to in this debate, and I think it is not without being germane to the matter, is the immense sums which it is said those Tuppers have received. I do not know what it means. Sir Charles Tupper has been a Minister of the Crown for a long time; his son has been a Minister of the Crown for some years. No one supposes a Minister of the Crown is overpaid in this country. I agree in what the hon. member for Montreal (Sir Donald Smith) said that both the judges and our Ministers are underpaid. And if men serve their country and are paid for it, is it money taken from the country? I think it is money paid for the equivalent of services received. But my hon. friends ask, what has Sir Charles Tupper done? I say, he has created the High Commissionership as we have it now; I say, just what Lord Dufferin did for the Governor Generalship of Canada, Sir Charles Tupper has done for the High Commissionership in London; I say, he has done more than any man, more than all his predecessors, in bringing Canada before England and Europe, and his conduct in the Colonial and Indian Exhibition placed this country under great obligations to him. But there was one small incident which occurred a few years ago for which we in the North-West Territories are grateful to him, and Canada should be grateful to him also: I allude to the time when our cattle were supposed to be suffering from pleuro-pneumonia. What did he do? He rolled up his sleeves; he is a dissector in more ways than one; he had an animal killed, and it was shown that the cattle were not suffering from pleuro-pneumonia: and that one act was of more value than all the money the Tuppers have ever received from Canada. Look at the live stock trade from Canada to England, and you will find that it reaches more than $30,000,000 since that. If it had not been for Sir Charles Tupper's energy and resource, and if that report had been allowed to go by the board, we would not have been allowed to send our live cattle to England, but would have been obliged to slaughter them here, and our immense trade in live cattle would have been destroyed. Talk of the services rendered by the High Commissioner. I say, that for his services as High Commissioner, for his services as a Minister of the Crown, if we gave decorations for political services, as they do in England for military services, the breast of Sir Charles Tupper would be covered with stars. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) thought it was beneath the dignity of the High Commissioner to attend to turkeys and eggs. One reason why I admire Sir Charles Tupper is that he attends to our minutest items. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) said he did not; but if the hon. member will read the High Commissioner's report, and watch the daily papers, and see his eternal wakefulness and activity, he will find there is not a single detail of our commercial interests to which Sir Charles Tupper does not attend, and the fact that he looks after our turkeys and eggs, and gives good advice about our not sending them all to Liverpool, but some to London, and thus divide the supply on the market, and furnishes information that is most useful to our farmers and farmers' wives, comes home to our business and our bosoms. I believe that most of the Reform party, in fact I believe all the Reform party, as far as I know its members, are loyal; that is to say, they are subjectively loyal. But objectively, if I may make a distinction known to German metaphysics, they are disloyal. No doubt they mean to be loyal. You can easily understand a man getting on a railroad that would lead to disloyalty and annexation, and yet deceive himself that every sleeper he travelled over was a loyal one, and on every rail there was the hall-mark of devotion to the Empire. Nevertheless the rails would lead him to a disloyal goal. That is the position our friends occupy. When Sir Charles Tupper gets angry with them for being in that position, they must put it down as zeal for his country and zeal for the Empire. I knew a Church of England clergyman, a young man, who was accustomed to get into violent fits of rage. His sisters reproached him, for they were all Christian people, and he said he did not get angry, but he felt righteous indignation. So with Sir Charles Tupper: I think it is righteous indignation. A commercial unionist may deceive himself, and he may think himself loyal, that he could not be a traitor. Natural history brings us into acquaintance with a very interesting animal, the tadpole. It is not a fish, yet it dare not venture on dry land, but the microscope will reveal rudiments of the legs—of the legs to be. It does not require a very powerful political microscopic examination of a commercial unionist to find out the rudiments of those feet that would lead him across the line. In fact, and I do not mean to be offensive, your commercial unionist is a tadpole traitor. To the leader of the Opposition I must say that he cannot possibly ask the House or his own party to vote with him in favour of this motion. The Prime Minister the other night took the whole responsibility for Sir Charles Tupper's action. What could Sir Charles Tupper do when asked to come over? How could he refuse as a chivalrous and honourable man? I do not see how he could have done otherwise, and it seems to me one of the most ungenerous things, one of the most unchivalrous things possible, to bring forward a motion like this condemning a man who was our colleague the other day. You remember that a great Englishman, writing from the Roman forum, said, "The air breathes, burns with Cicero;" and at this very hour, in this very Chamber, you almost hear the echo of Sir Charles Tupper's voice. Are you going to divert all your condemnation against an individual who was bound to take the

action which he did, because, as he tells us, he believed that the enemies he had to fight were pursuing a disloyal course? He was bound in allegiance to his chief and to his colleagues to take that course, and yet you ask us to condemn him. I think I have shown the House that after all there is not much to condemn Sir Charles Tupper for. The chief charge against him, as the Opposition allege, is a figurative phrase which he used, and his remarks about a railway which took a strenuous part in the election. If some hon. gentlemen believe that it was so wrong for the Canadian Pacific Railway to take part in the election, it must be equally wrong for the Grand Trunk Railway, and it was, therefore, a proper thing to denounce it. Now, even supposing Sir Charles Tupper had committed an error, is it a proper thing for members of this Parliament to condemn, because of one error, a man who has done such great services for the country? Why, if Sir Charles Tupper were to fall to-morrow there is not a man in this House who would hesitate for one moment to vote money to build him a statue on these Parliament grounds; and yet we are asked to-day to condemn him as an individual for an action for which the Government is really responsible and for which, if it was a fault, it was a very trifling fault compared with his great services. The hon. the leader of the Opposition is a man of chivalrous character, and he should not ask the House to vote on this motion. Let him withdraw this motion and change it to one condemnatory of the Government for inviting Sir Charles Tupper out here, and then we can discuss it upon broader grounds. I maintain that no chivalrous man can condemn Sir Charles Tupper on the grounds stated, first by the leader of the Opposition, then by the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and then by the member for Huron (Mr. Cameron). Their chief complaint is that Sir Charles Tupper took part in the election, although it is well known that he is as much a politician now as he ever was; and their next complaint is that he used some figurative language against them, while they at the same time use as strong, and stronger, language about him. The fact is that any man who considers the motion and the arguments which have endorsed it, will place little faith in it, when he remembers it is directed against a man who has rendered great services to Canada, and who, when the history of this young people comes to be written, will be acknowledged as one of the great forces which united and built up this young Canadian nation, stretching from the stormy Atlantic to strands swept by Pacific seas.

Mr. MULOCK. It is not my intention to follow the examples of some who have preceded me, for I shall endeavour, if possible, to confine myself to the issue before the House. My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), at the commencement of his speech, pointed to himself as one of the great products of the Canadian Pacific Railway; and if I never before felt grateful to the Government and to the country for having constructed that road, I must now acknowledge my gratitude, because the hon. gentleman has told us that the Parliament of Canada was indebted to the Canadian Pacific Railway for his presence in this House, and when I learned that, I felt that we had in some measure been paid for all our trouble and expense. Now, with regard to the merits of this question. In my opinion, the defence voiced by the Minister of Justice, who gave the cue to the other speakers on the Government side of the House, is possibly the only one the case admits of. My hon. friend who spoke last (Mr. Davin) contended that, out of generosity, this House should not condemn an old colleague, but no one can admit that plea. He contended further that because the High Commissioner was a Privy Councillor that position entitled him to step into the arena of politics. Why, Sir, every day we have examples of Privy Councillors stepping out from the party lines and serving their country in other spheres.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). On the bench.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes, on the bench, as my hon. friend from Bothwell says. Is it to be admitted that because a man holds a position as Privy Councillor, he can enjoy all the freedom that had attached to the office held by him at an earlier period? The hon. the Minister of Justice presented as a defence to the House, that the charges against Sir Charles Tupper were not proven. The resolution, he said, charged Sir Charles Tupper with having slandered a portion of the people of Canada and attacked a great institution, and the Minister declared that at no period during the campaign, or subsequent thereto, had the High Commissioner been guilty of this offence. The Minister of Justice stated that he had attended on the platform with Sir Charles Tupper on numerous occasions; and I presume, from his general statement, that he took the responsibility of all the utterances of Sir Charles Tupper, when he declared that at no time had he been guilty of the offences charged. The Minister of Justice, before entering into that general defence, controverted the statement advanced from this side of the House, that the High Commissioner occupied a position somewhat analogous to that of an ambassador. He controverted that proposition and illustrated his opposition to the principle by declaring that the High Commissioner should at all times be in sympathy with the political Government of the day, and to that extent must continue to enjoy and pronounce his political views. Not only that, Sir, but the Minister of Justice declared that the High Commissioner in no way occupied the position analogous to that of ambassador. I will give the House the opinion of another gentleman as to what is the true status of the High Commissioner for Canada. That opinion is as follows:—

"I hold the opinion that a person holding the high office of representative of the Dominion of Canada in England should be as nearly as possible in the position of an ambassador. You know that the British Ministers representing their country abroad do not change with the Government of the day. They remain at their posts discharging the duties allotted to them without reference to what party may be in the ascendancy for the time being."

That is the opinion of a high authority.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Who is the authority?

Mr. MULOCK. Sir Charles Tupper is the authority. I am quoting from a speech of Sir Charles Tupper which my hon. friend will find reported in the Halifax *Herald* of the 16th February, 1891. Sir Charles Tupper goes on to say:

"I felt anxious that the position of High Commissioner should as far as possible be the same, and from the first hour I held that office, when I was not a Cabinet Minister, I carefully abstained from taking any part whatever in party controversy."

Thus you will see that his own view of the office and its duties, for a time at all events, compelled him to conform to the opinion of his duties and responsibilities that we contend for.—

"I looked upon myself, not only as a representative of the Government of the day, but as the representative of all parties and classes in this country, and I was ever ready, as a good many persons can bear witness, to place my best services at the disposal of Canada in whatever way they were required, without reference to party consideration at all."

Sir, these are the words of Sir Charles Tupper himself, and are but echoes of the sentiment expressed by the hon. leader of the Opposition in moving this resolution, that it was the duty of the agent-general of Canada at all times to hold his services available for the various interests of Canada, whether affecting the party with which he was in sympathy, or the party opposed to him. With that admission of his, I think I can drop the argument of the hon. Minister of Justice, leaving him to settle that question with the High Commissioner. And now I come to the evidence on the point. The hon. Minister of Justice declares that there is no evidence in support of the charges contained in the resolution. Those charges are as follows:—Sir Charles Tupper is charged with interfering in the recent elections. Is there any evidence in support of that? I am not aware that there has been any evidence; but, I think, it is a matter we can take judicial notice of. Perhaps the hon. Minister will put us to the truth of it; but I will pass over that clause. The High Commissioner is charged with "imputing treasonable and disloyal motives to a large proportion of the people of this Dominion," and also with "assailing and vilifying the managers of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and reflecting upon the position of the said company." The hon. Minister of Justice has declared that there is not a tittle of evidence in support of these charges. In regard to the accusations of treasonable conduct, against a portion of the people of Canada, I need not trouble the House with evidence, because that has been supplied by my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). He stated it as Sir Charles Tupper's excuse for coming to Canada, that Sir Charles Tupper declared that, in his opinion, a large proportion of the people of Canada were disloyal.

Mr. DAVIN. No; the policy proposed.

Mr. MULOCK. That was the defence offered for Sir Charles Tupper by the hon. member; I took down his words. The hon. gentleman said that Sir Charles Tupper had declared that, in his opinion, the course of the Liberal party was a disloyal one, and would lead to annexation.

Mr. DAVIN. Hear, hear; that is it.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. member for West Assiniboia says that was the excuse for Sir Charles Tupper's conduct. We were told that the request of the right hon. First Minister was the excuse for his conduct. Now, in regard to the charges against the Grand Trunk Railway Company, I quote from the speech of the High Commissioner as reported in the Halifax *Herald* of 11th March last. Speaking of the Grand Trunk, he used these words:—

"I never believed they would be base enough to go back on England and come out in favour of the union of Canada with the United States, and using the power of the road to strike down British institutions in this country. If Canada has assisted the Canadian Pacific Railroad it has received a *quid pro quo*. But Canada has lent an enormous sum of money to the Grand Trunk and not a dollar has been repaid. We lent the Canadian Pacific $30,000,000 and every dollar of that amount was paid before it was due. When Mr. Laurier declared that the United States would be justified in retaliating, and cutting off intercourse with Canada; and Wiman declared that the cutting off of railway communication with Canada would bankrupt our railways; when Farrar writes down to Washington to get them to stop the bonding privileges, you find these craven creatures, the Grand Trunk Railway management, who are represented as being in the power of the United States, you find them joining with the enemies of Canada in playing the game of the United States which seeks to destroy and ruin them."

If that is not a vilification of the Grand Trunk, language fails, I think, to supply what would be vilification. If that is not an accusation that a great party in Canada were seeking to destroy British institutions, I cannot conceive what language would express such an idea. It is as clear as it is false, and it is absolutely clear. He goes on:—

"And you find Sir Henry Tyler lending himself and the great corporation which, unhappily for the shareholders, he dominates, not to the support of the institutions of the country where they have prospered, but throwing their whole weight and influence against us."

Sir, is it not an assault on the Grand Trunk Railway to tell the shareholders that, unfortunately for them, Sir Henry Tyler is their president? When did Sir Charles make the discovery that Sir Henry Tyler was unfit to administer the affairs of that company? For many years he had been its administrator, and during all those years he had, I believe, enjoyed the confidence of Sir Charles Tupper. How is it that that confidence only ceased when Sir Henry Tyler declined to be clay in his hands when his services in an election were needed? He goes on to say further:—

"I will say further that the worst blow Canada ever received in England was that caused by the loss of millions of pounds to English investors because of the jobbery, extravagance and corruption of the Grand Trunk."

Could there be a graver or a more explicit charge made? If there was jobbery, extravagance and corruption, there was robbery. There can be no such transactions as these in the management of a public trust without the commission of a high crime by the trustees; and Sir Charles Tupper, in charging the Grand Trunk management with jobbery, extravagance and corruption, has charged those responsible for the company with offences of a most grave and serious character. Surely the hon. Minister of Justice cannot have read this paragraph, before uttering such an unsound defence as he makes. Then, Sir Charles Tupper goes on to say:—

"While every man who invested a dollar in the Canadian Pacific Railway is drawing interest on his money, thousands of people who invested in Grand Trunk stocks not only receive no interest, but have sunk their capital."

That failure of the Grand Trunk Railway Company to meet its liabilities is of no recent date. It happened long ago, long before people of my generation were in public life. When Sir Charles was an active politician here, then was the time for him to speak in defence of the unfortunate shareholders, if it happened that they were suffering because of jobbery, extravagance and corruption.—

"It was these investments which so damaged Canada in the eyes of the British public, and even to-day with its wild and reckless purchases of additional railways, purchased for the purpose of obstructing or heading off the

Canadian Pacific Railway, in which additional millions of money are being sunk, is involving the Grand Trunk shareholders in still greater ruin."

Now, these are words fully covering the language of the resolution with regard to the Grand Trunk Railway, which language I may remind you again is as follows :—

"Assaulting and vilifying the managers of the Grand Trunk Railway and in reflecting upon the position of the said company."

As if it were not sufficient to have published that speech in the Canadian press, it was made to appear in the English press as well, in order that it might do its work, whatever that was—in order that it might injure the management of the Grand Trunk Railway and destroy the confidence of the proprietors in that management, the ultimate object probably being to overthrow the management by producing, in the meantime, a depreciation in the securities of that company. And so not satisfied with first of all publishing that speech in Canada *verbatim* in the Halifax *Herald*, the High Commissioner had it republished in the columns of the great thunderer, the *Times* of England ; and as if that were not sufficient, coming back to the charge again a little later, after time was had for reflection, and when, if there had been any overstatement there was the opportunity to tone it down, we find that Sir Charles Tupper followed up this accusation by a letter published in the *Times* and the *Canadian Gazette* of the 8th and 9th April, which he concluded as follows :—

"Allow me to repeat that it will give me great pleasure to meet Sir Henry Tyler in the presence of his shareholders, and not only to substantiate the accuracy of all that I have said, but show them how their best interests have been sacrificed by the miserable management of their president.

I think the Minister of Justice failed to see that report as well. We have clearly established that the statements in the resolution are statements of facts. If so, then the Minister of Justice, who seems to have adopted the principle of the resolution, must, if the facts are proved, as I contend they are, support it. The hon. the Minister of Justice did not pretend to defend the conduct of Sir Charles upon any ground whatever. He simply said that the High Commissioner did not do the things he was accused of having done. If these documents are true, if it is the case that the Halifax *Herald* correctly reported Sir Charles Tupper's speech, if it is true that he wrote the letter of the 9th April to the *Times*, the case is proven ; and the Minister of Justice will quiet his qualms of conscience, if he has any, and be satisfied the evidence is sufficient to sustain the resolution, and will support it. There are very grave interests of Canada entrusted to the High Commissioner. I, for one, think we are warranted in saying that a public servant, be he in a high position or in a humble position, should discharge the duties he is called upon to discharge. If this office be one the country demands—and I must differ from others in that regard, as I believe there are great Canadian interests which should be attended to, and that the office is one we ought to maintain—the incumbent of that office should be at all times on the spot where his services are required, instead of being free, as the present incumbent is, to come and go as he pleases. I do not say he came to Canada on his own motion, but he is constantly absent from his duties, and at critical periods. Take for example what is going on now. About a week ago there came across the wires news that the authorities at Liverpool had stopped a cargo of cattle from landing, on the charge that pleuro-pneumonia had broken out among the herd. Where was the High Commissioner on that occasion ? We are just commencing now our cattle shipments for the year, and I see by the press that Sir Charles Tupper has gone to Vienna. It is said that he has gone there to take part in some convention of a public character, having to do with the postal system ; but I maintain that the cattle interest alone, which has been referred to by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), is of such great importance to the country that the High Commissioner should not be for one moment out of reach during that shipping period. Let that trade be checked seriously for a moment, and the result will be great injury to the best interests of the people. But the unfounded and unwarrantable act to which I have referred, of stopping the landing of the cattle, depreciated the value of cattle in Canada. And yet, with the experience before us, with the possibility of that happening to-morrow, with the possibility of its happening even while we are engaged in this debate, the one trusted servant to whom we have given charge of our interests, and who, it is said, is so capable of guarding them, is away on the continent a thousand miles from the scene of danger. I say that his duties demand his attendance on the spot ; and whilst these exigencies do not exist in the winter months, yet, if he has to be at the beck and call of his party on all occasions, we may have him removed from his legitimate sphere of action at the very moment he ought to be there. But leaving that question aside and coming back to the resolution itself, whilst perhaps Sir Charles Tupper has not in his speeches, as the Minister of Justice has contended, expressly declared that the Liberal party and the electorate supporting it are disloyal, yet he has endeavoured to hold out to the people that there was a very disloyal sentiment in Canada ; and he has been pluming himself since the election on the assured fact that he and his allies succeeded in saving Canada to the British flag. His whole attitude bears out the statement in the resolution before us ; and whatever may be said with reference to the accusation brought against the Liberal party, there is no controversy as to the facts with regard to the Grand Trunk. So far as the Liberal party is concerned they can withstand such assaults ; their record is sufficient to carry them safely through any such attacks. It may serve party purposes to make these accusations ; it may serve hon. gentlemen opposite to give colour to the accusation of the High Commissioner, but I contend the Liberal party is true to the interests of Canada. And it is ungenerous and unpatriotic on the part of the High Commissioner or a Minister of the Crown, or any member of the House, to assail any portion of the community and to thus inflict an injury upon the whole country. The fact that the party opposite endeavoured to capture a victory on any such ground explains why they will not to-day admit candidly that a great mistake has been made and promise amendment for the future. Why, the hon. member for Assiniboia admitted that, when he pleaded for mercy to the High Commissioner——

Mr. DAVIN. No.

Mr. MULOCK—on the ground that he had committed an error.

Mr. DAVIN. No.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman asked us: Are you going to punish a great man like the High Commissioner, who saved the cattle trade, for one error?

Mr. DAVIN. I said, if there was an error.

Mr. MULOCK. Why speak of hypothesis at all. If there was no error, why dream of error. There was no error, according to my hon. friend's judgment, because what the High Commissioner did was not done accidentally. At the same time it was in strictness, as he says, an error, but I am not prepared, because of the services that a public man may have rendered in one capacity, to entirely free him from responsibility for errors he may have committed. Praise and blame come to all men. Men ought to receive due recognition for their services, and if they transgress they should receive censure, and that is the position in which Sir Charles has placed himself. The facts being proved, as the Minister of Justice admits, the resolution should pass, and I trust the House will pass the resolution.

Mr. TUPPER. I shall have to ask the indulgence of the House while I intervene in this debate, not so much to press any individual argument of my own home to the minds of those who have followed the motion, but, in justice to one who is absent, to produce some evidence and some statements directly in point and upon which, if anything, this motion is based, but which, strange to say, and not to their credit, hon. gentlemen who ask the censure of this House upon Sir Charles Tupper have refrained from producing. The hon. gentleman who last addressed the House drew its attention to a portion of the argument of the Minister of Justice, and I think his statement of a portion of that argument was as fair as the statements made by other hon. gentlemen during this debate. The hon. gentleman, in stating the position of the Minister of Justice, forgot entirely what the Minister of Justice said. The Minister of Justice pointed out, not merely that no evidence had been produced by the leader of the Opposition in support of the very serious and very grave amendment which he presented to the House, but he stated two or three things—first, that it was significant and extraordinary that a motion of this kind should be presented to the House without any presentation of the evidence upon which it was based; secondly, that the evidence could not be produced; and, thirdly, that this evidence went to show that, if the facts were presented to the House, there would be no reason or cause for censure. Now, the hon. gentleman, in endeavouring to strengthen the position of his leader, has to resort to evidence which was never alluded to by the leader of the Opposition. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) has been compelled to rush off to the columns of a newspaper and to give extract after extract in support of this motion, stating that that language justified the motion, that that was the proof, and yet the leader of the Opposition, wholly regardless of that evidence, without having it under his hand, asked the House to rush pell-mell, without any evidence, into a condemnation of a political opponent. I say—and I speak under some difficulty and shall be careful, as I hope not to allow myself to be carried away too much by personal feeling—that the records of this House, from the first time of its history down to the present, do not show such an indecent haste as has been exhibited here in connection with the motion now under consideration. I say that men who have held not half such important positions as that of the High Commissioner in England to-day, when charged with having committed any impropriety against the Rules of this House, or with having improperly discharged their duties, have had the charges presented to the House in a formal and decent manner. If this case is anything like as serious as hon. gentlemen pretend it is, if it were not connected with political spleen, and party spite, and party malice, you would have seen a very different resolution from this one, a resolution which embodied some spirit of fair-play. If these hon. gentlemen were sure of their case, if they were sure that a case could be made out justifying a vote of censure, they would have asked either for a special committee, where all the evidence could be marshalled and examined, or, at all events, they would have given the officer holding the high position which they say the High Commissioner holds, an opportunity of meeting them face to face, at the Bar of the House. But it will be remembered that, when the High Commissioner was inside the Bar, these charges were not made in the same tones or with the same animus as we have heard them declaimed in this debate. The hon. gentlemen who have forgotten themselves in the language they have used in this debate were then the most polite members in their references to Sir Charles Tupper. I will admit that this does not apply to the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), whose language was always as abusive, as personal, and as—I was about to use a worse expression, but perhaps the Rules of the House would not permit it—when that hon. gentleman was present, as when he is absent, and the language he now uses will, no doubt, be as effective in the House and in the country outside as the arguments which he indulged in before. But, outside of that hon. gentleman, who has never been guilty of civility to anyone in this House, whether in his own party or opposed to him, an hon. gentleman who has never been known to say a kind thing in regard to anybody—and I have sat in Parliament with him for a long time—what are we to think of the other hon. gentlemen who have taken part in this discussion? The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), after being one of the most polite men Sir Charles Tupper had a chance of meeting in political life, either in this House or out of it, was in such haste to heap up abuse on that hon. gentleman that he even forgot the Queen's English. He spoke of him as an "unveracious calumniator."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I used the words of his leader.

Mr. TUPPER. I can stand, and the High Commissioner can stand, all the other epithets used by the other hon. gentlemen so that I need not expose them in this House, nor need I dwell on that unfortunate family history of theirs, but I insist, on behalf of the High Commissioner, that good English should be used in this House. Foul words flow across this House very frequently, but a professor of law at a great university, a distinguished philosopher, should not make such an exhibition of ill-

temper as to abuse a man in such bad English as that.

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

After Recess.

Mr. TUPPER. When the House rose for recess I was about to do what the hon. gentlemen who are promoting this resolution of censure, have largely abstained from doing, and that was to consider what the charges in that motion were, what those charges involved, what evidence there was to support them, and what the facts of the case really were. Hon. gentlemen have been listening to fierce phillipics against the character of Sir Charles Tupper, they have listened in this House to a repetition of all the stale slanders that are found in the political pit of garbage for the last thirty years, during which time the character of the hon. gentleman which is under discussion, has been so acceptable to the majority of the people of this country as to excite the intense envy, hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness of the leaders of the party which he has damaged so materially, not merely in the last election but in all the elections in which he has been engaged more or less over that very long period in the life of a public man. The proposed motion of censure is, I submit, not supported in fact, cannot be supported in fact. Those who are promoting it have carefully abstained from the most satisfactory course that could be adopted to prove either the truth or the falsity of the charges therein contained. In several particulars the resolution proposed is extravagantly inaccurate, extravagantly false, not to say cowardly in the extreme. It reads:

"The conduct and language of Sir Charles Tupper' High Commissioner of Canada in England, in interfering in the recent elections and in imputing treasonable and disloyal motives to a large proportion of the people of this Dominion, and also in assailing and vilifying the managers of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and in reflecting upon the position of the said Company, is a breach of the duties of the office——"

And so forth. These statements have not been supported except from the mouths of gentlemen who are smarting from the effects of a defeat at a time when they confidently counted on victory. Those gentlemen have said what they considered the words "Liberal party" to mean. It is true those hon. gentlemen said that Sir Charles Tupper did all these terrible things, but they have each and every one failed, and I believed they feared, to read to this House the extended remarks of any speech or the whole of any article written by that gentleman. But they have attempted to garble speeches, to give an extract here and there, and quickly coupled with that extract their own partisan and heated interpretation. There has been, in my humble judgment, no attempt at fair play. I admit, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I am not the best judge of the mode of conducting the debate on this subject. I speak under all these difficulties, I see them face to face: but, notwithstanding that, whatever may be the motives that may be supposed to induce me to speak as I do, I am fully aware that in this House and out of it, no mere word of mine will influence the opinion of any man, woman, or child in the country. But to the record I appeal, and the record of the gentleman attacked is, I submit, strong and unimpeachable. Now, the hon. gentlemen have, I contend, not been able to show that Sir Charles Tupper imputed treasonable and disloyal motives to a large proportion of the people of this Dominion. On the contrary, the position taken by that hon. gentleman in the contest, at an important period in the history of this country, at a crisis in the history of the Dominion of Canada, is the position taken by the majority of the people of this country, is the position taken by the majority of the members of this House, is the position sustained by the overwhelming majority of the province from which that gentleman came, and in which that gentleman is best known, and is a position sustained, I am sure, by a majority of the hon. gentlemen opposite. For, mark you, Mr. Speaker, Sir Charles Tupper was as careful as the leaders with whom he worked in the late campaign, clearly to distinguish the opinions of the electors of this country from the opinions of certain leaders of a certain political party in this country. I took an important part in the campaign in one of the smaller and minor provinces, as some gentlemen are pleased to call them. I was on many a hustings outside of my own county, and continuously in that county, and I never heard in any part of the Province of Nova Scotia, or in the county I have the honour to represent, any friend of mine, or any member of the Liberal-Conservative party, bring the charge alluded to against any appreciable proportion of the people of this country. We were careful not to do so. We believed that the record of the Liberal party was such as to preclude the truth of such a charge being established; we believed that the history of Canada from 1867 to the present day had been such that it was only necessary for a public man to point out the dangers of a course of the kind that was being pursued by politicians and by men anxious to obtain power by any means, in order to secure its condemnation and annihilation. I say, coming from the Province of Nova Scotia, that had it not been that the Liberals professed to be out of sympathy with such a course as the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), for instance, has laid down; if the hon. gentlemen now sitting in this House, some of whom I have heard on the platform, had not taken the earliest opportunity to insist that they would never support the policy defined by the member for South Oxford, that of discriminating against the mother country in favour of a foreign country, instead of there being three, or four, or five members from the Province of Nova Scotia supporting that hon. gentleman, not one man could have been returned from any constituency in that province. Why, so far from it being true that we waged the battle on those lines, so far from it being true that this was a general charge that was hurled against the Opposition, it has been stated over and over again by members on this side of the House, and by their friends in this country, that there was no real annexation sentiment in this country or in any province of it, but that the people were being tricked and played with. That was the charge made openly, on the hustings, before the people. And the great difficulty was to open the eyes of all the electors to the serious conspiracy that was going on, aided and abetted as it was by men in a foreign country, supported as it was by men high in position in the political arena in this country;

but the confidence of the Liberal-Conservative party was that so soon as the electors realized the designs of those designing leaders, of those reckless leaders, of those leaders who seemed for the moment to stoop to anything to deceive the people, their opinions would be declared. I have heard the expression "ruined gamesters" used. There were gamesters in the fight, and the people understood who the gamesters were. The Liberal-Conservative party and its leaders felt their only duty was to expose the game, not on the part of the Liberal Opposition of the country, not on the part of a great proportion of that party, but on the part of their leaders, and the outside allies of those leaders in a foreign country. Sir Charles Tupper, with all the faults that have been laid at his door, has been admittedly to some extent a successful and not entirely a stupid politician. So far as his experience has gone, or the experience of the country has decided, is it to be supposed that he branded the whole Liberal party, and thereby a large portion of the people, as traitors and as disloyal? To take the lowest ground of political expediency, can it be believed that Sir Charles Tupper was guilty of the first charge contained in the resolution, and, second, that it was necessary or politic to take such a position in this country. I can show by the record, by the written words, by the reported utterances of the man whose character is maligned, of the man who is attacked by men who desire to wound him, as far as they can notwithstanding all their ineffectual attempts in the past, the statements in the resolution to be false and shamefully false. For instance, take the statement of the issues involved in the late campaign. When reviewing them in an article already alluded to, what was the language of the gentleman concerned? Some references have been made to these articles and to his speeches, but they were fragmentary and incomplete, and consisted of extracts prepared to suit a purpose. In an article in the *North American Review* for May, 1891, published by Sir Charles Tupper, this is the statement made, and I ask the attention of those hon. members who desire, before recording their votes, to consider the material facts involved:

"Mr. Wiman boasts that he is a British subject; yet after he had propounded his scheme for commercial union in an address to the Boot and Shoe Club at Boston, in January last, when exception was taken to it by Mr. Murray on the ground that it did not insure the annexation of Canada to the United States, the Boston *Herald* of January 22 reports:

"'Mr. Wiman briefly replied to the arguments used by Mr. Murray. The speaker urged that, if it was desired to lessen the power of England, that end could not be accomplished better than by Canada trading with the United States and ceasing to trade with Great Britain.' * * * 'The very thing Mr. Murray wants to accomplish,' said Mr. Wiman, 'will be better accomplished by the plan I propose than by the plan he proposes.'"

I may say for the information of those hon. gentlemen who have not studied this question, or looked into it, that Mr. Murray's plan was the kind plan of starving us out, of refusing unrestricted reciprocity or reciprocity of any kind, so that the design would be accomplished, according to this patriotic citizen of the United States, of bringing our country finally and fully within the confines of the American union; and Mr. Wiman urged that his proposal of commercial union would more speedily bring about that desired end than that system of force and compulsion. Sir Charles Tupper goes on to say:

Mr. TUPPER.

"If that is not sufficient, read Mr. Wiman's sworn evidence, page 752 of testimony taken by the Senate commission:

"Suppose your commission should report in favour of unrestricted reciprocity between Canada and the United States; then suppose at the next general election, which takes place within the next eighteen months, the Liberal party, adopting that as the sole plank in their platform, should be returned by a large majority, and Parliament should take on a commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity complexion——"

I stop merely to remind those hon. gentlemen who are following me that that was the scheme to bring about, in the opinion of Mr. Wiman, political union, and not merely the opinion of Mr. Wiman, but in the opinion of Mr. Blake also.—

—"they would be in control of the Government; they would meet your invitation by a vote; that would have to go to England to be consented to by the royal authorities."

Any schoolboy, let alone a member of this House, is aware that this allusion to 1776, and the Boston tea-party, means resistance to the wishes and desires of the mother country. Sir Charles Tupper continues:

"Suppose the English Government refused; then the Canadians would be relieved from their fealty, which would be as much a justification for a Boston tea-party as there was in 1776 or prior.

"So that nothing could contribute so much to bring about annexation, if it is thought in the end to be desirable, as to have closer commercial relations."

He concludes this article by saying:

"But the ugly fact remained that Mr. Wiman, convicted by the letters of Mr. Farrer——"

I may mention that Mr. Farrer occupied a very high and responsible position on a paper supposed to be controlled and largely owned by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) —the Toronto *Globe*. Mr. Farrer was the brains of that paper, and was the acknowledged editor, and the significance of this statement is proved more strongly by the fact that when the designs of that man were exposed to the electors of the country a flank movement had to be executed, and a man, his junior on the paper, a man not possessing the ability to fill it as compared with Mr. Farrer, was placed in the position, and Mr. Farrer ceased to occupy the position of the editor of the Toronto *Globe*. Whether that statement is correct or not, this statement is notorious. Mr. Farrer is still the ablest writer in the columns of the *Globe*, the organ of the Opposition party, then or now largely under the control and inspiration of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright).—

—"and Mr. Hitt being engaged in a treasonable conspiracy to subvert British institutions in Canada, still implored for 'moral support' from Congress and the people of the United States for the Laurier-Cartwright party, and the Government were sustained by a larger majority than they had at the previous general elections. To complete the discomfiture of the Opposition, this was followed by the publication of a letter from the Hon. Ed. Blake, one of the most able and respected members of the party who, rather than bind himself to their policy, had ceased to be their leader——"

I take it that no one will deny the accuracy of that statement. I take it that that statement has been proved, and the only answer is the outraged feeling expressed by the hon. member for South Oxford that we obtained the evidence of treason and conspiracy in an underhand manner. Sir Charles Tupper continues:

—"and who now declares that his refusal to go into the battle with them was because he was unable to fight under false colours."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. TUPPER. Some hon. members say "Oh, oh." No doubt their feelings are aggravated by the verification of that statement. I ask the House to mark these words, written in May, 1891, and which are germane to the words in the resolution of censure :—

"Mr. Blake, who I may say, represents the great body of the Opposition, who, with few exceptions, are loyal to British institutions, has rudely torn the mask which Farrer fixed, from the faces of the conspirators and the delusion of unrestricted reciprocity may be regarded as dead and buried."

Some hon. gentlemen may claim that unrestricted reciprocity is a pretty lively corpse, but that it is a corpse I do not think anyone denies, and that it has been decently buried can hardly be gainsaid with safety. I had the opportunity of taking part in an election after the general elections and it seemed to me that the hon. member who now sits for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) accepted the situation like a man, and got in very quickly behind the form of the late leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blake) and not behind the present leader of the Opposition. But Sir Charles Tupper is on record further in reference to what he did say, and mark you, Mr. Speaker, all that I have read and all that I propose to read from the pen or from the lips of Sir Charles Tupper is in perfect accord and on the lines of the statements made by the recognized leaders of the Liberal-Conservative party in this country, and which were endorsed and ratified by the people at the polls. The remark applies to all, with the solitary exception as to the statements made and the proofs admitted in the press, concerning the action taken by that corporation known as the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada. That portion alone of the censure is to some extent, so far as we have evidence before us, separated from the policy upon which the people have already pronounced, and upon which they pronounced in so unmistakable a manner. In the *Contemporary Review* for May, 1891, Sir Charles Tupper further explains, for the benefit, no doubt, of hon. gentlemen who with malice for him and general ill-will towards the party on this side of the House, have stated his views to be exactly contrary to what he himself has expressed them to be. He says :

"About four years ago an Americanized Canadian who has resided in New York for the last quarter of a century, found them, like Japhet, in search of a policy——"

It is to be noticed, Mr. Speaker, that the Opposition did not complain of that language, and I take it that they not having denied it, and not having cavilled about it, and not having made any great fuss over it, that they do admit they were in search of a policy, that they were on their last legs so to speak, and that Mr. Wiman or any other gentleman who was in control of considerable funds in the neighbouring country, might very well be the leader for those who had found such great difficulty in organizing within their own country and on their own resources.—

"About four years ago an Americanized Canadian who has resided in New York for the last quarter of a century, found them, like Japhet, in search of a policy, and an easy prey to his scheme of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. Sir Richard Cartwright and Mr. Laurier joined hands with Mr. Wiman, and the Hon. Mr. Hitt, a member of the House of Representatives in the United States, in agitating this policy in the press, on the platform, in the House of Representatives in the United States, and in the Canadian House of Commons. Sir Richard Cartwright obtained the services of Mr. Ed. Farrer to edit the *Globe* newspaper, his principal organ. Mr. Wiman, in the United States, pointed out the means of 'capturing Canada,' and utilizing her 5,000,000 of consumers to promote the interests of American manufacturers, while Sir Richard Cartwright agitated Canada, both in and out of Parliament, with the pernicious doctrine of utter dependence upon the United States."

I recollect, in this connection, that until the last election, when the eyes of the people of this country were really opened as to what the conspiracy meant, that these two gentlemen—at Ingersoll, I think, one of them, and at Oakville, I think, two of them—used to refer to these gentlemen across the border as "our allies in the United States;" but in the last campaign not one of them was man enough to continue that appellation. Mr. Wiman, who wrote very mischievous articles—articles that, I freely admit, assisted us materially in the campaign, by exposing the designs and giving proof of the conspiracy that was alleged by the people and by a large number of their representatives—Mr. Wiman was utterly ignored by them. Indeed, on some platforms he was actually denounced, but, nevertheless, the people understood that at picnics where Mr. Wiman was present with a good and leal Liberal of this House, or an Attorney-General in a good Reform Cabinet in one of the provinces, or no matter where he was, his utterances were reported in the columns of the Toronto *Globe*; his pamphlets were distributed over this country, and all the good was taken that could be taken out of the mouth of an admitted traitor, out of the mouth of a man who was a self-confessed traitor and conspirator at public meetings in Massachusetts and before committees of Congress. This man is the man with whom it is stated Sir Richard Cartwright and the Hon. Mr. Laurier joined hands; and they also joined hands with the Hon. Mr. Hitt, a member of the House of Representatives in the United States, in agitating this policy in the press, on the platform, in the House of Representatives in the United States, and in the Canadian House of Commons. He proceeds :

"The Honourable Mr. Hitt had reported a resolution from the Committee of Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives proposing commercial union with Canada. He described it in these terms :

"What is commercial union with Canada? It means, as set out in this resolution, the adoption by both countries of precisely the same tariff of duties or taxes to be levied on goods coming from abroad, abolishing altogether our line of custom houses on the north, by which we collect tariff duties on goods coming from Canada; abolishing their custom houses along the same line, by which they collect duties upon goods we send into Canada; and leaving intercourse as unrestricted between this country and Canada as it is between the States. The line of custom houses would follow the sea and include both countries.

"The internal revenue system of taxes on liquors and tobacco in the two countries would also have to be made uniform in both.

"The proceeds of taxation thus collected would be equitably divided, and the fairest way would seem to be in proportion to population."

I may call the attention of the hon. gentlemen of this House to the fact that Mr. Hitt is the man who only a short time before the general election was fondly numbered among "the allies of the great Liberal party of this country." It goes on to say :

"Mr. Hitt had invariably resisted any action in Congress for freer trade relations with Canada. The 'Congressional Record' reports him as saying on the 8th of June, 1888: 'I am in favour of unrestricted trade with Canada, and still more of commercial union, and with the hope of such a solution of all our troubles in the north."

Their chief troubles in the north are that they could not obtain any share of the fisheries which belong to us as a right, but which they desire to have, and which any State in the Union would be just as zealous of guarding from any other State as we are zealous of guarding them from the United States, or any other country in the world. It continues:

"I have thought we should not at this time touch the tariff of lumber and the other products of Canada while they are a motive for an active movement toward us from this side of Canada. At the great meeting in Toronto on the 17th of February, Sir John Macdonald charged Mr. Farrer, the leading editor of the *Globe* newspaper, the organ of the Opposition, with having secretly printed twelve copies of a pamphlet containing these atrocious suggestions for the destruction of Canada, and forcing it into annexation with the United States."

This is the language of one of the men now I believe, and certainly then, in the pay and in the service of hon. gentlemen opposite or their leaders, or of those acting with them and for whom their leaders are responsible:

"The imposition by the United States of a tonnage tax on all Nova Scotian vessels, laden whole or in part with fish, would speedily put an end to seizures, and, indeed, the whole controversy. Another ready way of bringing the Government and all concerned to their senses would be to suspend the bonding privilege, or to cut the connection of the Canadian Pacific with United States territory at Sault Ste. Marie. Either of these methods would rouse the full force of Eastern Canada influence against the Government.

"It would be better still to oblige Britain to withdraw her countenance and support from the Canadian contention as she did in 1871. That would secure the end desired, without leaving the United States open to the charge of being animated by hatred of Canada, on which Sir John Macdonald trades. Whatever course the United States may see fit to adopt, it is plain that Sir John's disappearance from the stage is to be the signal for a movement towards annexation. The enormous debt of the Dominion ($50 per head), the virtual bankruptcy of all the provinces, except Ontario,——"

One would imagine the hon. gentleman from South Oxford had written this, and not his editor—

—"the pressure of the American tariff upon trade and industry, the incurable issue of race, and the action of the natural forces making for the consolidation of the lesser country with the greater have already prepared the minds of most intelligent Canadians for the destiny that awaits them, and a leader will be forthcoming when the hour arrives."

"Mr. Farrer admitted the publication, but attempted to excuse himself by saying:

"'Not a single one was circulated in Washington or elsewhere. I can vouch for that. They were not intended for the eye of any person in Congress, nor had I the remotest intention of prejudicing the case of Canada in respect of the North Atlantic fisheries. I wrote freely and privately concerning what I regard as the illogical, unfair, and wholly out-of-date policy which the Government of the Dominion has pursued towards the vessels of a friendly neighbour, and, having been asked, proffered my view of the mode which I should favour, were I an American, of bringing about a more rational state of affairs for both countries.'

"The *Globe* supported this denial by the following statement in its issue of February 21——"

And I call the attention of this House to this important part of the statement made by a man, whether he is the High Commissioner, or whether he is a Conservative politician who has achieved a great success to the chagrin of his opponents, now savage and wild from their continued defeats, as a statement not only worthy of the notice of the two contending parties in this country, but worthy of careful consideration, which I believe it got in the main, at the hands of all people interested in the welfare and the autonomy of the Dominion of Canada.—

"The *Empire* alleged yesterday that the pamphlet written by Mr. Farrer was written for the information of Mr. Hitt, Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission at Washington. Mr. Hitt telegraphed yesterday as follows:—'I never saw or heard of the pamphlet described by Sir John Macdonald. Nor have I ever heard of Canadians coming here for political consultations, although I have seen many distinguished Canadians, both Conservatives and Liberals, whom I have met socially, but nothing more.—R. R. HITT.'"

"Finding," says Sir Charles Tupper, in answer to this:

—"that we were face to face with a formidable conspiracy to subvert British institutions in Canada, and annex it to the United States, I felt it my duty to lay before the public, at a meeting at Windsor, 23rd February, the following evidence in my possession which conclusively proves that Messrs. Farrer, Wiman and Hitt were united in that conspiracy:—

"'TORONTO, 22nd April, 1889.

"'MY DEAR MR. WIMAN,—Our Ottawa man will send a good summary of your speech, so that on our account you need not go to the trouble of preparation. At present the commercial union movement is at a standstill. First of all the Jesuit agitation, which is here to stay, has to some extent supplanted it.'"

That was what the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) thought when he made certain references to the leader of the Opposition with which I did not sympathize.

Mr. CHARLTON. You ought not to have stolen the letter.

Mr. TUPPER. Ah, there is the cry. The only defence to the exposure of this conspiracy is: "You ought not to have stolen the letter." But I think the main thing is to lay the traitor by the heels.—

"'Secondly, the general belief is that the Republicans would not listen to any such scheme. Thirdly, a very large number of persons are inclined to think that we had better make for annexation at once instead of making two bites on the cherry. Lastly, the old parties here are rapidly breaking up, and when Sir John goes we shall be adrift without a port in sight, save annexation. Moreover, although the Liberals have taken up commercial union they are not pushing it with any vigour.'"

No; scandal is the stock in trade of some parties.—

"'For these reasons the *Mail* has, in the slang of the day, given the subject a rest. There is really no use talking it up to a people whose politics are in a state of flux, and whose future is wrapped in doubt. I saw Mr. Hoar while at Washington, and told him just what he says I did, namely: That the smaller forces favour annexation, and will favour it all the more if commercial union be withheld. It seems to me, and I have talked the matter over lately with maritime members as well as with Manitobans, that commercial union would only delay the coming of the event those people most desire. Hence, in the provinces referred to commercial union does not take hold, whereas annexation will always demand a hearing. In Ontario the Jesuit campaign has brought that aspect of things home to thousands who would not look at commercial union. The littleness——'"

I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to listen to Mr. Edward Farrer now.—

—"'The littleness and half-heartedness of the Liberals is also very disheartening.'"

I ask especial attention to this.—

—"'Then, again, the truth is that every man who preaches commercial union would prefer annexation, so that the party is virtually wearing a mask.'"

Why is not Mr. Farrer censured, I ask? Why is he not brought to the Bar of this House for slandering these hon. gentlemen? I believe he told the truth about hon. gentlemen opposite; I believe he knew of what he was talking about when he spoke of the "littleness and half-heartedness" of these hon. gentlemen who he said were wearing a mask; but I do not include in that the rank and file of the Liberal party, as I said before. The design-

ing leaders—those are the men that Mr. Farrer and I have in view just now. Then he says :

"'Can't you come round this way and have a talk.

"'Yours very truly,

(Signed) "'E. FARRER.'"

I know that hon. gentlemen opposite have forgotten these letters. They were all astray, Mr. Speaker, when they singled out Sir Charles Tupper; they had forgotten all the documentary evidence. Certainly it is charitable to say so, because they produced none. Then, this is from Washington :

"HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
"WASHINGTON, D.C., April 25, 1889.

"ERASTUS WIMAN, Esq.,
314 Broadway, New York,

"DEAR SIR,—I am greatly obliged to you for sending to me the proof slips of the *North American* article, and have been much interested also in Mr. Farrer's letter, which surprised me somewhat, as I did not think from his conversation, which gave me a very favourable impression, that he would be so easily discouraged. The reasons he gives existed before the commercial union movement began, with greater force than to-day. The Republicans, as protectionists, it was apprehended would be against it. They are not. Their representatives voted for it, their newspapers have received it kindly, and often with warm approval. The Jesuit agitation, which has taken the place of commercial union, in his mind, is largely sentimental, and will probably not last long. The other commercial union is a business question that concerns each citizen, and in a way which he does not understand at first, but sees more and more clearly the more he talks intelligently about it."

No doubt of that.—

"There is some logic in what F. says of not making two bites of a cherry, but going for annexation at once, but I think he is misled on that point in a way that often occurs. Where a man is thinking much upon a point and discussing it, he is liable to narrow his horizon to those within his reach; and his own mind, and, perhaps, those he meets, having passed on by discussion to distant results, he takes it for granted that the wide world, which is so wonderfully slow, has kept up with him, and has the same results in sight. We must be very patient with the slow moving popular mind. If the Canadian public of farmers, artisans, lumbermen, miners, and fishers, can be in three years argued up to the point of voting commercial union, and giving sanction to the movement in Parliament, it will be great progress. Slow as such movements are, the comforting thing is that they never go backward. To you personally it ought to be, in your moments of reflection, a consolation that long hereafter, when this ball which you set rolling has gone on and on, and finished its work, every one may then look back and see and appreciate the service done to mankind by the hand that set it in motion. I shall look with interest for what you say in Ottawa. The *North American Review* article will have a powerful tendency to keep our public men from scattering away on annexation next winter, and I hope we can get the offer of commercial union formulated into law. I return the proof slips of the article, and the letter of Mr. Farrer.

"Very truly yours,

(Signed) "R. R. HITT.

"P.S.—Just received yours of yesterday, with Goldwin Smith's; it reads admirably."

And said the man now under indictment :

"These letters had been sent to me by a gentleman who received them from Mr. Wiman himself, and who did not disapprove of the use I made of them at so important a crisis. No man can read them and arrive at any other conclusion than that the object and design of Messrs. Wiman, Hitt and Farrer was the annexation of Canada to the United States. They only differed upon the best way in which to accomplish that object. Mr. Farrer was for taking off the mask and acting boldly; Messrs. Wiman and Hitt thought that would endanger success, and that a surer way of obtaining the same result would be to induce the Parliament of Canada to declare for free trade with the United States, with discrimination against England, which must inevitably lead to a quarrel between England and Canada and the severance of the tie that binds us to the Crown."

And to conclude, Sir Charles Tupper quoted the language of another gentleman, who held a distinguished position in this House, and who occupies now, and so long as he lives will continue to occupy, a distinguished position in this country. I refer to Mr. Blake; and if hon. gentlemen opposite had been fighting for a principle, if they had not been seeking merely to give vent to personal abuse and personal explanations, they would have coupled the name of the Hon. Edward Blake with that of Sir Charles Tupper in a considerable portion of the resolution of censure now under consideration. Mr. Blake, as Sir Charles Tupper said in the article from which I quote, used these words :

"The tendency in Canada of unrestricted free trade with the States, high duties being maintained against the United Kingdom, would be towards political union, and the more successful the plan, the stronger the tendency, both by reason of the community of interests, the intermingling of populations, the more intimate business and social connections, and the trade and fiscal relations, amounting to dependency, which it would create with the States and of the greater isolation and divergence from Britain which it would produce, and also, especially through inconvenience experienced in the maintenance and apprehensions entertained as to the termination of the treaty, our hopes and our fears alike would draw one way. We would then indeed be looking to Washington."

And yet because he spoke in support of that statement of the Hon. Edward Blake, they ask that Sir Charles Tupper be censured, for having imputed treasonable and disloyal motives to a large portion of the people of this Dominion. According to these hon. gentlemen, he and Mr. Blake imputed those motives to a large proportion of the people of this country. Sir, they imputed them, I impute them, to the men who advocated the scheme of unrestricted reciprocity, reciprocity in conspiracy or in conjunction with the men in the United States, whose utterances I have just read. Why, Sir, not Sir Charles Tupper alone did that. The members of this Government, whom hon. gentlemen opposite have been so anxious to separate from the High Commissioner, have done that. Why is it that throughout this debate, after the leader of the Government stated that it was at his desire the High Commissioner came to this country and spoke the utterances for which he is now called to account, there is so transparent an effort on the part of these hon. gentlemen to remove all blame from the members of the Treasury benches? How is it that they are endeavouring to stir up the feeling that there is a desire on the part of the Government to put all the blame on Sir Charles Tupper? Their opinion certainly, under the circumstances, should be infinitely worse of the late colleagues of Sir Charles Tupper than of that gentleman himself; and the gentlemen who have spoken in this debate have not attempted to conceal what their feelings are personally towards their old opponent. I can assure those hon. gentlemen—those gentlemen honourable by the position they hold, but who have stooped to the language we have heard for the past two days in this House, those gentlemen who have taken pains to rake up the old *Hansards* to find where men have fouled their lips by using language for which they cannot be called to account—I can assure them that, as the language they quoted fell lightly on the head of the man against whom it was uttered, and as the people have treated those statements and charges and the men who made them and now repeat them, so they fall lightly on my head and so they will again be received by the people. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) endeavoured to grow excited the other evening, and it is seldom we see him excited;

it is seldom a man of his curious temperament, who is always so judicial, surprises us all as he did, by stating that he was highly indignant at any improper or treasonable motives being imputed to him : and in an outburst of anger and resentment, he endeavoured to reach a grand period in his denial of all those charges. The man he said, who would make these charges against him face to face, he would brand as a coward. It seems to me the man who would do so might be branded by many names according to the facts ; but surely the hon. gentleman should prefer that the charges be made to his face, and in that event his charge of cowardice, it seems to me, would fall rather flat. But before Mr. Farrer took possession of the *Globe*—or the hon. member for South Oxford, I do not know which—at any rate, before Mr. Farrer—or Mr. Farrer and the member for South Oxford—was in charge of the Toronto *Globe*, there were men in control of that paper who would rather cut off their right hand than be guilty of the utterances of the hon. member for South Oxford or Mr. Farrer, to which I have referred, and which were before the people of this country. In 1880, I suppose it was the late Hon. George Brown who was in charge of the editorial columns of that paper. At any rate, I could give to the House language far stronger than that used by Sir Charles Tupper, characterizing the aspirations of the leaders of the Reform party and the significance of the policy that they put before the people, and which they endeavoured to strengthen by co-operating with Messrs. Hitt and Wiman in the United States. In 1880, this was the language used by the Toronto *Globe* :

"What is the main promise of those who wish to detach the Dominion from Great Britain in order to make the country a preserve for Yankee manufacturers, who are totally unable to compete with British manufacturers on fair terms."

And we know that the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) stated in Ingersoll, and at Orillia in February last, and elsewhere, that his scheme of unrestricted reciprocity meant a discrimination against the goods of the mother country in favour of those of the United States. Indeed, in no other way, he said, could it be obtained. The *Globe* went on to say—was the *Globe* then charging disloyalty or not ?

"One little corner of the 'market of 50,000,000 people' is offered to Canadians as the price of their national extinction ! Men who advocate a base surrender of their country for money do not cease to be disgusting though they become also ridiculous when it is evident they are duped by their own sordid imagination."

There is a phrase in that under which hon. gentlemen who have so much addressed themselves to this subject to-night, might take a certain amount of comfort. The *Globe* speaks of them as dupes, not as out-and-out unmitigated traitors ; and perhaps the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) may take advantage of that, and may say that he does not mean what Messrs. Wiman and Hitt consider to be the result of his policy, but that he has all along been a dupe, to use the language of the Toronto *Globe* in 1880. The principal feature of the question under discussion has been only passingly alluded to, and that is the conduct of a public officer. When we started out, and these gentlemen's hands were not fully exposed in this debate, it seemed that it was not so much Sir Charles Tupper, that it was not so much an old opponent whose character was being assailed, but that it was a great principle that was involved, a principle of tremendous importance in the Government of this country that was at stake—that was how far a public officer could engage in a political contest with justice to the Government and to himself. The hon. gentlemen impugned the conduct of the Government, who invited and controlled the action of Sir Charles Tupper in this country, as a violation of our constitution. Some people who have not followed the action of these hon. gentlemen might be led astray by this course of debate, they might think that of all men the leaders of the Opposition were the men to denounce that course of action and to oppose any interference with the election. I have already called the late leader of the Opposition to the rescue of Sir Charles Tupper. I now call the present leader of the Opposition to the rescue of the man he has now denounced and seeks to censure. If there was any principle in the good old days of reform, as it was first preached in Canada, it was the principle that members of Local Governments should preserve the autonomy of the provinces and should sacredly observe the distinction between federal and local politics, so that it would be discreditable for any members of Local Governments to interfere in federal politics, and the hon. gentleman, who was then a follower of the hon. gentleman to whose utterances I am now alluding, no doubt subscribed to those doctrines. In 1871, Mr. Blake used these words, speaking for the Province of Ontario :

"My friends and myself thought and my Administration now thinks * * * that there should exist no other attitude on the part of the Provincial Government toward the Government of the Dominion than one of neutrality. * * * We believe that the Government of this province ought not to assume a position of either alliance or hostility towards the Government of the Dominion."

That would be consistent with the line of argument adopted on a very important part of the question now under consideration, but we have changed all that. A new leader has come to that party, and, with that new leader, there has come a new doctrine, and I ask the attention of the House to the new doctrine as laid down by the leader of the Opposition, who seeks to censure a gentleman for having to some extent adopted that principle, although, as I can show, his position is much stronger, as it is very different, from the position of a Local Government in a federal contest. Hon. gentlemen will admit that, in the last contest, while they were very confident of victory, it was a tremendous struggle, and they will also agree with me that a very large number of the people of Canada believed that we were passing through the most important crisis we have had to face since the year 1867. While some believed we were only a stage removed from civil war and civil strife, I can say, as a young student of political history, that political precedents should weigh very little in such a case with the men who have to bring the ship of state safely through the political storm. Members of the Conservative party went to the country and said they thought it was necessary to elect the Government again, no matter what side issues might be raised, because the national welfare was at stake. Of course hon. gentlemen opposite denied this, as they always deny any such statements, but it was a great crisis, and every effort was put forward by both parties to achieve success. For a moment I

will give the hon. the leader of the Opposition credit for believing that his policy was to redound to the benefit of his party, and that, therefore, he was justified in resorting to a course which was not quite in the same line as that laid down by his late leader :

"Mr. Mercier, he said, would take off his coat and go to work and would be ardently supported by the members of his Cabinet. Mr. Laurier expressed the hope that the members of the Liberal Government of Ontario would do in this province what Mr. Mercier and his friends were doing in Quebec."

But I need not appeal to the utterances of the leader of the Opposition. In my own province it is notorious that the business of the Local Government was almost entirely suspended during the late federal campaign, that men who wanted to go into the mines office on important business had to be turned away with the statement that the Commissioner was in Lunenburg opposing my hon. friend (Mr. Kaulbach), who, I am happy to say, was not only able to overcome the regular opposition, but also the influence of the Local Government. The leader of the Government in that province went from one end of the province to the other, neglecting his duties, to use the language of the hon. gentleman with reference to the High Commissioner, and, while he did us great benefit, we are not so small as to ask that he should be indicted. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite say, that Sir Charles Tupper's efforts in Ontario were very ineffectual, but they have spent a great deal of time in considering how to counteract what he did in that province. Well, every member, the Attorney General, the Government of that province, all of them have taken this course, and while it could be said: What have we to do with the conduct of a Local Government? and while that answer might be urged against the argument I am now addressing to the House, I submit that there is much in it to show what the impulse is behind hon. gentlemen opposite, whether it is to uphold the constitution, whether it is to proclaim a regular and proper conduct on the part of public officers, or whether it is not to aim a blow, one out of many, to see whether it will not be more effectual in damaging the gentleman now under censure than the blows they have delivered so aimlessly before. The hon. member for South Oxford once alluded to this subject, and he said that when a public officer went into a political contest, he took his office in his hands. He went no further. That has been the principle all along, that is the principle laid down in the books, that when a public officer does that, he takes his political life in his hands. The English Parliament, this Parliament, and the Local Legislatures, have gone further on that general principle, and have legislated specifically so as to prevent certain officials leaving their offices and taking part in an electoral campaign. But the hon. member for South Oxford never, until it occurred to him in this case, took further ground, and said that the Government were bound to dismiss that officer. A distinction is now drawn ; there are officers and officers ; there is a great difference between the duties and functions of officers. Now, the House will bear with me while I attempt, with great diffidence, the defence of Sir Charles Tupper in a case of this kind. I would rather deal with a subject upon which I can freely speak. I claim, and I submit to the judgment of this House, that what he did and what he said, was in an entire accord with his leader, with his colleagues, with the men with whom he fought in that great national crisis. But I come to this other point, and I appeal to the hon. gentlemen, in considering the conduct of Sir Charles Tupper, to say whether there were not other peculiar circumstances connected with him and with his position. He was a public officer, forsooth ; he was a civil servant, supposed to be removed from all the feelings that pervade this Chamber and actuate men in political life. He was to be an impartial servant to this Government, and he was to keep aloof from all party politics. Did the hon. gentleman believe that? Did that statement come from their hearts, or was there not a smile on the face of many of them? Why, since 1884, when Sir Charles Tupper went to England, down to the present day, there has never been a session of this Parliament at which the time of this House has not been taken up by alluding to the utterances, the opinions of that gentleman upon questions of the day, and by asking this House to animadvert upon his conduct as a politician, not as an officer. They have singled out the items of the expenditure for the office of High Commissioner. They have supposed that the minds of men in this country were so small that they would resent these expenditures, which are large in ordinary life, I grant you, which are not large in the life that gentleman leads at the desire of the Government and people of this country, and they did this in order to prejudice the people, and in order to prejudice this House against him as a statesman. They have gone further, and they have endeavoured to influence—for there must have been some purpose of that kind—the electorate and the members of this House, by insisting that on the great question of the day, on the question of trade, and on the question of our relations with the United States, Sir Charles Tupper—not the High Commissioner, but Sir Charles Tupper—was diametrically opposed to his colleagues and to the Government of this country. I say that you cannot get an audience of free men together in the Dominion of Canada, and lay before them the attacks that have been levelled against that gentleman, the political allusions to him on these great questions of the day, and get them to say that it was not fair, that it was not decent, that it was not proper for him to come as he did, when that question was in the hands of the people, and explain to them, not merely that he was in sympathy with his old colleagues, but that the statements made against him by his old opponents were false, utterly false, hollow, miserable, and incapable of proof, going as he did before his old opponents upon the hustings in every part of Canada and challenging the popular verdict. You say he took his office in his hands, you ascribe all sorts of monetary considerations to him, all sorts of mean propensities. But he did this whether for good or bad reasons ; he took a step that certainly would have cost him his office under any circumstances, and he submitted, not merely his own case, he not merely answered the personal attacks that had been made upon him, but he submitted his own views as to the important crisis through which we were passing, and he has the satisfaction, after reading all that hon. gentlemen may say against him to-night, of knowing that the people of this country agreed with him, endorsed him, showed their confidence in him, and that position is, I think, a little

pleasanter than the position of those gentlemen who have gone back to these old charges and have called him "bulldozer," "unveracious calumniator," "Canadian millionaire," "falsifier of facts," with "a black record of jobbery and plunder." Why, Mr. Speaker, whom have they not so attacked who has ever risen to any position of importance in the politics of this country? I ask what leading Conservative statesman of long standing in the Dominion arena, has ever been free from these calumnious charges, these miserable slanders. I regret to say, from the evidence we have now in this House, that no man can rise to a prominent position in political life in Canada without being the target of that kind of abuse, not merely in this Chamber, but from every little rag from the *Globe* down to the smallest two-penny-half-penny organ in the country. It is sad, but it is so. We must pass through that crisis as well, and, I hope, as happily as we have passed through the one to which I alluded. Now, if time permitted I would like to travel into another field. I would like to remind hon. gentlemen opposite of some evidence of the verdict of the people of this country, that it was not safe, considering the views expressed and the means taken to obtain a victory at the polls, to entrust hon. gentlemen opposite with the reins of power. I have already carefully stated that through the different ridings in my province, the charge of treason was not levelled at the Liberal party. I have read the statements of Sir Charles Tupper, where he guards himself carefully in this respect. But of treason to Canada, as well as to Great Britain, we had ample evidence. Since that question has been raised let me draw attention to some of the treason with which the Liberal-Conservative party has had to grapple, and in which, in most cases I think, and in all cases, it has been able to trample out in this country. For instance, I have alluded to the allies of the Liberal party in the United States. We have given—and I merely refer to the fact—tolerably good evidence of the object of certain people living in the United States in connection with their co-operation with the Liberal party in the Dominion of Canada. But has the House forgotten that allies of the Liberal leaders in this country declared their dire hatred of Canada and of their union with this country? I ask the hon. gentleman to recollect the language of their allies in the province from which I come, of the language used by men who acknowledge reform principles, so called, in Canada, who worked with them, who hoped for their success, and who have co-operated with them from the start down to the present day. I refer to the secessionists in Canada, to those men who preferred annexation and stated in the halls of the legislature they preferred annexation to the United States to union with Canada, and asserted that this was a revolt against Canada and nothing else. Those gentleman find pleasant company on the benches opposite, and the Attorney General of that province in former days, and at the present time, has not hesitated to say that the great question of the party there was Nova Scotia against Canada, and that was the issue. But I call on the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to furnish evidence of the traitorous effect of the doctrine he preaches. He asked for the proof, I have given the proof before my peers, the people have passed on it. This is the language in which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) declared what the doctrine he now advocates really means:

"Consider what is involved in saying that this country is dependent on the fiscal policy of a foreign power. These men who tell you that it is impossible to exist as a commercial people unless you have reciprocity, might as well tell the United States that if they want to drive you into the union, all they have to do is to refuse you reciprocity for a certain number of years longer, which is the very best way that could be adopted of inducing the American people to refuse to enter into commercial relations with us. For my part I will deny that we are dependent upon them in one way or another, and no Canadian statesman can do a worse service than to spread that idea among a great number of his fellow countrymen."

That is his own construction of the language he he has used on husting after hustings and it is language now recorded on the journals of this House. But I could go further, and give further proof. It is true I am merely telling what hon. gentlemen have read before, but we must, in order to be decent in the consideration of this question, place these matters on record and have the whole question fairly considered. This is the language used by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) at Boston, Massachusetts, when the hon. gentleman received his new title; and since the day he was appointed Senator of the United States for the Province of Ontario, no one, I believe, has ever seen the Order of St. Michael and St. George, or any sign that he belongs to the British aristocracy, against which the member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) sneered so vigorously. The hon. member for South Oxford said:

"Briefly, Sir, if this project can be carried out it will mean for you the addition of half a continent for commercial purposes and the creating of a complete new tier of Northern states, with an enormous area of unoccupied fertile land, with very great mineral resources, with a present population of some 5,000,000 but with the capacity of maintaining fully 50,000,000, and the certainty in such a contingency of a very rapid increase; which population, and I hold this no small matter, is essentially in character as your own, with much the same habits, customs and prejudices even."

And again he said:

"The advantages of your position for securing a very large part of our trade are great. You own, as I have said much of our mineral wealth. Many of our chief trade routes centre here. You are the natural shipping port especially in winter for very large sections of our territory. You lie within very easy distance of our chief cities, and of the most populous portions of our Dominion. In one word, given free trade with Canada, and you rise at one stride from the position in some respects of a frontier city with no great extent of territory secured to you, to that of a central entrepot, with the practical monopoly of a great region behind you whose commerce no man can take away from you."

The gentleman presiding over the meeting said:

"Our Liberal friends, Fielding and Longley, of Nova Scotia, Davies of Prince Edward Island, Mercier and Laurier of Quebec, Cartwright of Ontario, and a host beside, look to us, the people of the United States, for the sign by which they shall conquer. Can we deny them. The whole region of Canada will, when this commercial union is established, become as if she were so many vast territories added to our domain, and up and down a continent the world will see the result of an unrestricted trade in all that continent produces, natural or manufactured."

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. TUPPER. An hon. member says "hear, hear," and so was the hon. member for South Oxford cheered when he was announced as the Senator for Ontario. The Attorney General for Nova Scotia, not to be outdone by the hon. member for South Oxford, spoke as follows:—

"Under such a policy as that American fishermen may enter Canadian waters at will and take all the fish they can find. Under such a policy they can enter Canadian ports for bait and supply, and send all the fish they require to markets at home."

If hon. gentlemen think the Attorney General spoke with authority on that occasion they have only to look at the representation of the counties in Nova Scotia interested in those questions, and they will find how we deal with men even suspected of treason in the provinces down by the sea. I may be prejudiced in the view I take of the utterances of the Liberal party; but you will find in the United States there are men who consider those references lead in the same direction that I have submitted they lead. Mr. Hoar, Chairman of the Committee, and a gentleman whose name has been alluded to in the correspondence on 13th March, 1889, during a discussion respecting the appointment of a committee to consider the question of trade relations between Canada and the United States, said:

"It is useless for us to be blind to the fact, and no discretion requires us to be silent in regard to the fact that there is a large and growing body of men in Canada who desire annexation to this country. Political power is likely to turn and hinge upon that question in the near future in the Dominion of Canada, and upon the question whether the American people desire such annexation or not. Nobody proposes to accomplish it without the free and intelligent and instructed will of both countries. It was impossible for the Committee on Foreign Relations, it was impossible for any other general committee of this body to enter upon, and still more impossible to exhaust the field of enquiry which this committee proposes to itself."

As showing how these movements are watched in that country, I find Mr. Morrill stating:

"The senator has made his statement, but my idea is that the whole agitation of this subject is preposterous. There never was a time when the Canadians were more intensely loyal than they are to-day to the British Government, and the idea that we can, by starting any measure here, break down the Tory Government and enable the Liberals to supersede it in Canada, is entirely, in my judgment, without any foundation."

I can give this House proof after proof, not only from the *Tribune*, but from members of Congress and Senators, that there they regard the movement of the Liberals of this country as a movement against Great Britain and in favour of the United States, ultimately ending in annexation, just as the leaders in this fight who met them and who vanquished them in battle believed their doctrines tended. If that is so, if this is the belief not only of hon. gentlemen in this House and the electors in this country, but of people in the neighbouring republic, surely the man whether official or politician or both who says so, and in so saying agrees with Mr. Blake the late leader of the Liberal party, is hardly deserving of the censure of this House. I have attempted to deal with the general question and the real question submitted to the people and decided by them, but I cannot sit down, in justice to the man who has been attacked and who is now absent, without asking the further indulgence of the House while I ask the attention of hon. members to another phase of the question. I have dealt with the charge of treason. I have shown it was a charge levied at the leaders and not at the party or at the people, and it was not a charge made by Sir Charles Tupper alone. It was a charge endorsed, as I said, by the people of Canada; whether they meant it or not was another thing, but the language they used and the efforts they were making had but one result. Now, then, Sir Charles Tupper is not believed by the hon. gentlemen who wish to indict him. I would observe that it is the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite in many cases to make a charge, and they then, through their press and by one innuendo and another, ask that their suspicions be confirmed without proof. In this instance hon. gentlemen opposite say they believe Mr. Seargeant and they take Mr. Seargeant's statement as to what occurred between Sir Charles Tupper and Mr. Seargeant, but they refuse to accept Sir Charles Tupper's contradiction or statement, confirmed as it is by Mr. Hector Cameron, a gentleman who once sat in this House. I believe notwithstanding this that there are hon. gentlemen in this House who, whether they sympathize politically with Sir Charles Tupper or not, are not ready to condemn him, when he has set up a denial, in the absence of any enquiry or investigation either formal or ordinary at the hands of this House. Sir Charles Tupper asked, what I take it a Canadian would have granted quickly, namely, an opportunity to meet face to face with Sir Henry Tyler whom he had impeached and to discuss the question with him before the people most interested. When hon. gentlemen opposite talk about the injury done the Grand Trunk Railway, let me remind them that there are a large number of men in England who own stock in the Grand Trunk Railway who sympathize with Sir Charles Tupper in his exposure of the management of the Grand Trunk Railway by the present board of directors. These stockholders supported Sir Charles Tupper in his attitude, and Sir Henry Tyler would not give an opportunity to Sir Charles Tupper of making good the charges he had preferred, and which, as he claims and as the full correspondence shows, were made in the interest of the Grand Trunk Railway, although they were certainly to the detriment of the men who, as he conceived, are mismanaging it so grossly. Sir Charles Tupper states in one of those letters that he was prepared to meet Sir Henry Tyler, and that he had asked for the opportunity, but that he had never got it. As to the visit which he made to Mr. Seargeant, he makes the following statement, and I claim on his behalf that it should be accepted, no matter what some hon. gentlemen may think, until they have some proper evidence before the House to contradict it. Sir Charles Tupper says:

"Sir Henry Tyler says he will be prepared to expose the inaccuracies of my speech at Amherst, of which you published a cable summary, on March 9.

"In reply, I beg to inform Sir Henry Tyler that my remarks on that occasion were deliberately made, in discharge of what I considered to be my duty to Canada and to the stockholders of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and that I will be ready to maintain their accuracy in the presence of the shareholders of his company, at any time, after my return to London, when he will afford me an opportunity of meeting them.

"Sir Henry Tyler has favoured your readers with a very inaccurate account of my visit to Mr. Seargeant, which, if true, is irrelevant. I did not go 'cap in hand to Mr. Seargeant,' but visited that gentleman at his own invitation, sent to me by Mr. Hector Cameron, Q.C., for the purpose of discussing a question in which they were both deeply interested—that of a subsidy to facilitate the Grand Trunk Railway Company in reaching Halifax, and upon which Mr. Seargeant admits I refused to give any pledge, except that Sir John A. Macdonald would submit their proposal to his collegues after the elections.

"Mr. Cameron was present during the interview, and reported the substance of it in writing to Sir John A. Macdonald. Mr. Seargeant has seen that report, and confirmed its accuracy. That report shows that I made no request 'to Mr. Seargeant to issue instructions to his officers and employés to vote for the Government.' All that I asked

Mr. Seargeant to do was to recall the instructions he had given to them to do all they could against the Government, and to inform them that those who desired to support the Government were at liberty to do so.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Where is the evidence of these instructions?

Mr. TUPPER. Where is the evidence of Sir Charles Tupper's statement as to which the hon. gentleman asked the condemnation of this House? Which evidence should be first produced—the evidence against Sir Charles Tupper or the evidence in his favour? Is the hon. gentleman's law as bad as his philosophy or his English? I ask hon. gentlemen who have singled out Sir Charles Tupper for attack because he came here at the request of the Government and did his duty, to give attention to this. He continues:

"How that just demand from a Government to which the Grand Trunk Railway Company was so deeply indebted was responded to, may be learned from Sir John A. Macdonald's statement, in the *Times*, on March the 13, as follows:—'Sir Charles Tupper, in a speech at Amherst, on Monday last, referred to the attitude of the Grand Trunk Railway Company in the recent contest. His observations were fully justified by facts. The Government lost several seats in Ontario by the hostile course of that company which went to shameful extremes.'

"Sir Henry Tyler's letter is rather remarkable for what it does not contain. Evasive as it is, he does not venture to say that he did not instruct the management in Canada to do all they could to support an Opposition which had put discrimination against England in favour of a foreign country upon its banner. He has not favoured you with a copy of Mr. Seargeant's manifesto supporting the Opposition or the public statement of an Englishman, Mr. Reeves, the General Traffic Manager of the Grand Trunk Railway Company in Chicago, who said:

"It is true that we carried between 150 and 200 Canucks to Canada a day or two before the elections. We also carried several hundred from various points on the line in Indiana and Michigan. They went to Canada for the purpose of voting the Liberal ticket, which favour a closer union with the United States. I am not ashamed of it. I am an annexationist and have been for twenty years. I would like to see the Stars and Strips floating over every mile of the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific systems. I wish we had been able to muster thousands more. As it was, we could not muster enough, for the elections went against us. * * I see now, however, that I made a mistake in not working harder. I ought to have organized bureaus, and induced every Canuck in the Western States to have gone and voted against Macdonald and that traitor Van Horne. As it is I don't think we persuaded over five or six hundred to go home and vote. You can say that I have done nothing that I am ashamed of, unless it was that I did not work hard enough."

Is that conduct not to be denounced? Is it to be supposed, setting aside the main question involved in that controversy, that the Government of this country will allow even the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway, not merely to actively oppose it through its influence over its men, but to coerce their employés and to bring in from the United States on a crisis like this men living and residing there free of charge in order to try and oust the Government of the day. A more indecent position for a corporation to take could hardly be conceived.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear," but I have no doubt that people who are able to judge fairly between the two parties will be ready to believe that if the Canadian Pacific Railway undertook to act in that way, when these hon. gentlemen opposite got into power their first act would be to denounce in the most vigorous manner such improper interference by any large corporation holding the privileges which these railway companies do.

Mr. TUPPER.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is improper only on one side.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman says it is improper only on one side. I am not discussing their support either to one party or the other, but I say Sir Charles Tupper has a right to be believed, he has a right to ask credence at the hands of his opponents until they formally confute his utterances by an enquiry properly organized and conducted. He has insisted that all he denounced is the coercion exercised by that company over their employés, their exercise of an improper influence against the Government of the day, and their refusal to issue instructions that their employés could vote as they pleased. That is the position Sir Charles Tupper has taken up, and instead of these hon. gentlemen denouncing him—if they were not desperate as I believe them to be, and if they were not actuated by only political considerations—they should join Sir Charles Tupper and the Canadian Government in resisting such interference on the part of a corporation such as the Grand Trunk Railway. Another statement is as follows:—

"Mr. Corby, one of the supporters of the Government, requested Mr. Wainwright, a high official of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, to allow their employés to exercise their judgment in casting their votes. He received the following reply:—

"'MONTREAL, 4th March, 1891.

"'Yours received. The company's policy not being in accord with the Government party, I am unable to assist you in the present contest. The staff, I presume, knows what the interests of the company are. It is not a personal matter in any way.

"'W. WAINWRIGHT.'"

On the face of it the answer reads fairly enough. The request was, however, based evidently on the knowledge that influence was being exerted, that coercion was attempted. Fair and manly instructions were desired, and those instructions were refused. The Government candidate at Lévis makes this statement:

"My intimate friends in Lévis have requested me to expose to you what the Grand Trunk Company did in the last election. At first I was assured that there would be no interference with the opinions of the electors. But on Tuesday afternoon, the second day preceding votation, two of their principal men came down by express train from Richmond, where they had been working for the Hon. W. Laurier, and on Wednesday, the coercion was such upon the employés of this company that according to my revisers we were at a loss of about 125 to 140 votes."

There is a statement as to coercion, and it was with this statement that the High Commissioner was dealing. With regard to extravagance, that has been alluded to. No hon. gentleman who has asked for his explanation of that part of his attack has given Sir Charles Tupper's own statement. It is this:

"Sir Henry Tyler knows that I referred to the original construction of the Grand Trunk Railway, which was so marked by 'extravagance, jobbery, and corruption' as to waste an enormous sum of money, and involve those who had furnished the capital in all but a total loss. The 188 miles of road from Quebec to Rivière du Loup, which the Government engineer estimated could be built equal to the rest of the Intercolonial Railway for about £372,000, cost the Grand Trunk shareholders no less than £944,000.

* * * *

In conclusion, permit me to say that I considered it an imperative duty to Canada and the Empire to make the remarks I did at Amherst. I knew the misrepresentation and abuse to which I would be subjected, but having devoted thirty-six years of my life in untiring efforts to build up and consolidate a great and powerful British community in North America, I felt that I should fail in my duty if I did not expose this attempt of a great corporation, sustained by Englishmen, at a most important

crisis, to strike down the Government who were maintaining British interests and British institutions, in support of a party whose avowed policy was free trade with a foreign country, and discrimination against England which, as Mr. Blake—the most eminent man in the Liberal party—has admitted, must inevitably lead to the annexation of Canada to the United States and the loss to Britain of one of the most important portions of her Empire. Canada has a right to know whether 23,000 shareholders of the Grand Trunk Railway sustain the admitted policy of Sir Henry Tyler and Mr. Seargeant of looking to Washington."

Now, the only additional statement from the pen of the High Commissioner to which I would call attention, in conclusion, is the statement upon which hon. gentlemen opposite based the accusation that he had alluded to the Liberal party as "ruined gamesters." Well, there are opinions as to whether they are or are not. If the judgment of the House is to be passed upon him for having said that, well and good; but why was the letter not laid on the Table in which that statement was made? Why was resort made to the columns of the Toronto *Globe*? Would that paper be received in the smallest court in the country as furnishing evidence for the meanest case that could possibly be tried? The statement to which the hon. gentleman referred was but a cablegram. There was nothing in that paper purporting to be a full statement of the passage referred to. But here is the letter, published in the London *Times*; and since hon. gentlemen found the shoes to fit them, of course they put them on. But the High Commissioner did not call them "ruined gamesters;" he applied the term to allies of their leaders, to men who were engaged with them in the fight, and it is because these hon. gentlemen believe that what is applied to Messrs. Wiman and Farrer is applicable to them that they have spoken so indignantly. But this is what the High Commissioner says:

"I have shown that Sir Henry Tyler—like Artemus Ward, who was ready to sacrifice all is wife's relations to the war—having by his fatuous mismanagement reduced his company to the greatest straits, turned his back upon the Government, which according to his own letter had saved the Grand Trunk Company, and united with Messrs. Wiman and Farrer, who were suggesting to the United States the means of reducing the Grand Trunk Company to bankruptcy, in an attempt to subvert British institutions in Canada. Fortunately for Canada, and for the Empire to which it belongs, this last throw of these ruined gamesters has not been successful, and their designs now stand revealed."

How hon. gentlemen could apply that language to themselves, unless the language actually fits the case, and includes them with Messrs. Wiman and Farrer, is something I leave them to explain. But I know that in the province from which I come the few who have been able to come to this House and throw in their lot with hon. gentlemen opposite had to protest that they had no sympathy with unrestricted reciprocity as defined in the west by Sir Richard Cartwright, Mr. Laurier and others, in so far as it involved a common tariff against Great Britain. There is not one member from that province who will read the speech delivered by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in this House some time ago on what commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity mean, and who will say that he adopts that definition, and the reason is, that while in the Province of Nova Scotia there may even be found men who are disloyal to Canada, though I am glad to say that feeling is fast fading away from the minds of all, there are not as many men as you could count on your fingers, or any men whose names would be known in this House, who are disloyal to Great Britain; and it is for that reason that the statements made by Sir Charles Tupper on this question received such an endorsement at the hands of the people of the Province of Nova Scotia. I cannot resume my seat without thanking the House for the great indulgence—for it is an indulgence—which they have accorded to me in doing what was distasteful to myself, and I have no doubt to many in this Chamber in one respect,—that was, to make such frequent references to long extracts. My reasons were good. In the first place, I thought that those documents ought to be before this House, and then the verdict could be as it might; and in the second place, I felt that the language that summed up all the views of the High Commissioner as given by him would be language on which he would be content to take not only the verdict of his countrymen, as he has taken it, but the verdict of this House as well.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker, I shall say but very little with reference to the speech which has just been made by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I shall allude to some of his observations, however, before I conclude what I have to say on the resolution moved by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has addressed to the House a very long speech; but I think it will be very difficult for the hon. gentlemen who are sitting behind him to ascertain what relevancy that speech, or the greater portion of it, has to the amendment which my hon. friend has put into your hands. The hon. gentleman has delivered here a stump speech. He has given extracts from newspapers and from speeches, some of which are old, having been delivered in this House nearly a quarter of a century ago; but what relation they have to the charges made against the High Commissioner it will be very difficult for hon. gentlemen on either side of the House to determine. The hon. the Minister of Justice delivered a speech to the House, the manner of which I have nothing to find fault with; but I disagree with the observations he made in opposing the resolution moved by my hon. friend. He said, in effect, that there is no evidence of the accuracy of the complaint contained in that resolution. He said we have no evidence before us that Sir Charles Tupper has either denounced any of the leaders of the Opposition or the members of the Reform party, or has assailed the Grand Trunk corporation or its managers. The hon. the Minister of Customs, however, did not altogether agree with that view, for I noticed that when the hon. member for South Oxford was addressing the House, the Minister of Customs expressed, quite incidentally, his opinion that those charges were true. I can well understand the silence of hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches when the Minister of Justice affirms that there is no evidence of any of the statements complained of having been made at all and the hon. Minister of Customs says that the charge is true.

Mr. BOWELL. Do not pervert what I said.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have no desire whatever to do that; and if I have misapprehended the Minister of Customs, he will, of course, at a later period, correct me. I admit I have sympathy with the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I

admit that his task is a difficult one, all the more difficult because what is affirmed in the amendment is quite within the truth. I sympathize with him also because his many colleagues, able to take part in this discussion, who sit on the Treasury benches beside him, instead of coming to the defence of the High Commissioner left that task to the hon. gentleman. I do not concur in the statement made by the Minister of Justice that although the office of High Commissioner is non-political the officer is not. I do not at all agree with the contention that the High Commissioner is not a civil servant. Why, under our constitutional system we have two classes of servants of the Crown. There are the civil servants of the Crown and military servants of the Crown. I think it is perfectly clear that the High Commissioner is not a military servant of the Crown, but a civil servant and nothing more; and he is not a servant of the Crown, having behind him the support of the people as a representative. Therefore his position is non-political; and if it is intended at all that it shall be permanent, as was intimated when the appointment was made, then it is perfectly clear he has no right whatever to mingle in the ordinary political strifes of the hour. The hon. gentleman has himself again and again admitted the accuracy of this contention; he has himself admitted that his position is not unlike that of an ordinary ambassador, that his duties are of an ambassadorial character, and that as far as the representative of a dependency at the capital of the Empire can be ambassadorial, his duties are of that character. Now, it is well known that an ambassador does not take part and is not supposed to take part in the ordinary strifes between the political parties in his own country, any more than he is supposed to take part in the political contests of the state to which he is accredited. It is only a few years ago since Sir Austin Henry Layard, the British ambassador at Constantinople, took strong grounds against the policy of the Government of Mr. Gladstone, and the moment a change took place in the Imperial policy on the Eastern question Mr. Layard was removed and superseded by Mr. Elliott; so that the principle is well recognized that if there is any party who ought to abstain from political contests in order that he may be readily approached by any person, no matter to what political party he may belong, at the capital to which he is accredited, it is the party holding a position such as that now held by the High Commissioner. If parties on this side of the House should have in England grievances which they might think it necessary to bring under the attention of the High Commissioner he should be as easily approached by them as by those to whom they are politically opposed; and it is impossible he can retain that position unless he abstains from taking part in political contests. Why, the hon. gentleman has addressed to the House to-night an argument which, if it had any value at all, would be just as applicable to Sir Charles Tupper as Lieutenant Governor of Ontario as it would be to him in his position of High Commissioner. The hon. gentleman said that Sir Charles Tupper freely took part in political questions at issue in this country, that he expressed opinions upon them, that his views upon those subjects had been subjected to criticism since he left the House. That may be equally true of a Lieutenant Governor, or of a gentleman appointed to the Bench who was formerly a member of this House; and the hon. gentleman might, with as much propriety, defend the conduct of a judge or a Lieutenant Governor taking part in a political contest as that of the High Commissioner.

Mr. TUPPER. I do not want to interrupt the hon. gentleman's argument, but he has not seized the point I made. It was not that hon. gentlemen opposite had discussed the views formerly held by Sir Charles Tupper, but that they were continuing to discuss and misrepresent the views he held at the time of that discussion, when he was in England, holding different views from his colleagues on the trade questions that then came up.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) The hon. gentleman does not accurately state the position taken on this side. We all know what happened in this House. We know the position taken by the Minister of Justice with reference to putting certain articles on the free list, and we know what the Government said in that matter. We know also what Sir Charles Tupper said within a week after he came back and took his seat as Minister of Finance, and what took place after communication was had by telegraph with the Government at Washington. But those were subjects of discussion in this House after Sir Charles Tupper returned to England and resumed his duties of High Commissioner; and I say that he was not justified in entering the political arena, because this continued to be a live controversy between gentlemen on the Treasury benches and gentlemen on this side, because at one moment of time he happened himself to have been connected with that controversy. Now, what we complain of in this matter is that, while Sir Charles Tupper is the paid servant of the Crown, holding a non-political office, he has become the agent of one party and the vilifier of the other party. All the hon. gentleman has said shows that Sir Charles Tupper has vilified gentlemen on this side of the House, and that he is himself prepared to join him in that vilification. I say that, no matter what his views may be in regard to the conduct and policy of gentlemen on this side of the House, if Sir Charles Tupper wished to take part in the controversy or to wage war against any party in this country he ought to have tendered his resignation, to have withdrawn from the office and to have taken the responsibility of meeting those gentlemen in this House as a member of this House in discussing those charges which he brought against them. That is not his position. He has simply assumed a position, which is discreditable to the Government, which is discreditable to himself, of being the paid opponent of those who are in opposition to the Government. He has simply drawn his salary as a stump speaker on behalf of the Administration, and I say that is a position wholly unworthy of one who holds the office of High Commissioner and receives a salary of $12,000 a year for the discharge of the duties of that office. We know that, in 1887, the hon. gentleman returned to this country without resigning his office, that he became Minister of Finance, that he still held the office of High Commissioner, that he then resigned his position as Minister of Finance and returned to England and undertook again to discharge the duties of High Commissioner. It is true that during that time he only drew the salary of a Minister, but his conduct showed that the office of High Commissioner might

be left in a condition of suspended animation for a considerable time without the country suffering anything. In the campaign of 1891 the hon. gentleman returned again, and the reason given for his coming out is that he was not an ordinary civil servant of the Crown. I deny that altogether. I say there is no such distinction. I say that there is only one class of civil servants of the Crown who are permitted to engage in party warfare, and that is the hon. gentlemen who sit on the Treasury benches. They have that right, but Sir Charles Tupper is not a representative of the people, he is not a legislator in the other House, he has no more right to take part in the political warfare carried on in an election than the Deputy Minister who presides in any one of the departments of State in this capital. The Minister of Justice informed us that there was no evidence that Sir Charles Tupper imputed any disloyal conduct to those who sit on this side of the House, that we had nothing to complain of on this side of the House. I think we are entitled to take notice of what that hon. gentleman said when he was addressing the electors of this country. While he was at Windsor he was subjected to an interview by a representative of the Detroit *Free Press*. I believe that he himself prepared the report for that paper, and I have that report before me. What statement did he make in that interview in regard to one hon. member of this House, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright)?

Mr. TUPPER. Is not that a comic paper?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No; it is not a comic paper. He is asked the question: "What effect will the Farrer article have on these elections?" The elections had not yet occurred, recollect. He replies: "It is the death-blow of Gritism." We know what he called "Gritism." It is the views entertained by the Opposition, by the party known by those who hold its views as Reformers, and designated by hon. gentlemen opposite as Grits:

"It is the death-blow of Gritism. Mr. Farrer is the guide, philosopher and friend of Sir Richard Cartwright. He has been sent to Washington time and again——"

Not that he went of his own accord, but that he was sent by the gentleman who employed him, who was his master, according to Sir Charles Tupper's representation.

—"He has been sent to Washington time and again as the agent of Mr. Cartwright——"

Where is the evidence of that? The hon. gentleman challenged the production of proof before a committee. Where is the proof?—

—"to carry out the nefarious plot, and the exposure has shown the Canadian people what these people would do."

What what people would do? Why, the Grits, of whom Sir Richard Cartwright was a leader and of whose views and desires he was a prominent exponent. It is impossible to read that extract and accept the statement of the Minister of Justice, or to limit the charge, as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has tried to limit it. It is clear that Sir Charles Tupper did charge, at all events, one of the leaders of the Liberal party and those whom he designated as Grits as seeking political annexation to the United States, and he refers to Mr. Farrer in no other capacity than as a mere instrument in the hands of other parties. It is absurd, after a statement of that kind has been made, to undertake to argue that Sir Charles Tupper's charges related simply to Mr. Wiman and Mr. Farrer, because Mr. Farrer himself is spoken of as being the mere instrument here in the hands of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). Then, when we look at an article contributed to the *Contemporary Review* by Sir Charles Tupper we find the same charges repeated. We find that the High Commissioner associates Sir Richard Cartwright and my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Laurier) as the parties of whom Mr. Wiman and Mr. Hitt and Mr. Farrer are the mere instruments; and yet we are told that the Opposition have nothing to complain of, that these charges referred to parties outside, and that, if we do not feel we are guilty, and are associated in these nefarious enterprises with them, we are not charged at all. That is not so. It is perfectly clear that the High Commissioner did not intend to be so understood. It was not simply at Mr. Farrer, or Mr. Hitt, or Mr. Wiman, that the High Commissioner was aiming his blows; they were aimed at the hon. member for South Oxford, at my hon. friend who sits beside me (Mr. Laurier), and those hon. gentlemen in this House who entertain similar views as to the trade policy of this country. Why, the hon. gentleman has undertaken to argue that the views which we entertain on the subject of trade necessarily point in the direction of annexation. Well, Sir, we are equally strong in the conviction that the policy which hon. gentlemen opposite have pursued for the past twelve years, necessarily points to annexation. Nothing can be clearer than this. By that policy you have sent a million of people over the border; you have made them citizens of the United States; you have annexed them to the United States; and do you suppose that if you persist in that policy, which will shortly carry half the population beyond the border, you can ever keep these people politically separate? If that system is persisted in you will have at some period in the near future one-half the people of Canada arrayed against the other half. But while I have strong opinions as to the tendency of the commercial policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, I do not say that they have entered upon that policy with the design of bringing about these results, which I think in the end are likely to follow from that policy if nothing unforeseen intervenes. But that is not their position towards us. True, some hon. gentlemen on the other side, broad in their views, charitable in their feelings, say that they think the tendency of our policy is in the direction of closer political relations with the United States, but they do not charge us with deliberately aiming at any such result. But that is not the position of Sir Charles Tupper. His position is that a great conspiracy existed, and that he has come out to this country, as Sir Don Quixote, for the purpose of preventing that conspiracy being consummated. His object and aim, his patriotic endeavour, has been to prevent the Opposition, and the leaders of the Opposition, from carrying the people of this country into political union with the United States. Well, however widely the people may differ as to the views which he entertains—as to the accuracy of his conclusions—they would attach more importance to their disinterested character if he had resigned his position and had come out here without his office and assumed all the responsibility of placing his views before the people, as an ordinary citizen of this country. But that is not

what he did. Now the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has undertaken to defend the conduct of the High Commissioner in his attempt to coerce the Grand Trunk Railway Company and its officials into giving the influence of that corporation to the support of the Administration. He says that Sir Charles Tupper has denied that charge, and we ought to accept that denial; but the wonder always has been what brought Sir Charles Tupper and the manager of the Grand Trunk Railway Company into communication with each other on the subject: what gave rise to this interview? The hon. Minister has told us to-night that Sir Charles Tupper simply asked that the Grand Trunk Railway Company should withdraw that order which they had issued against the Administration. Has that order been published? Has Sir Charles Tupper given to this House or the country any evidence of the existence of that order? It is assumed that a certain order existed, but he has given the country no evidence of any such order. On the contrary, Mr. Seargeant and Sir Henry Tyler both declare that no such order ever was issued, and yet he pretends to tell us that Sir Charles Tupper went simply to ask those gentlemen to withdraw an order that he could not have seen, that had no existence, and to place the Conservative party upon a footing of equality with their political opponents.

Mr. HAGGART. When did Mr. Seargeant say so? Where did you get any authority of his for your statement?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think I have seen it. I will read an extract in due time from Sir Henry Tyler upon the subject, and I think that upon a subject relating to the administration of the company, the declarations of Sir Henry Tyler and Mr. Seargeant are to be taken as true so long as there is no evidence produced to the contrary. When such declarations were made, if Sir Charles Tupper had seen any such order, it was easy for him to have confuted Sir Henry Tyler by the production of that order. But, Sir, I think I know something with regard to the conduct of another powerful corporation in this country; I think I have seen from the manager of that railway corporation a manifesto against anything like unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. And yet if I am to judge by the uniform conduct of that company, there is no portion of our population that have made greater efforts to secure intercourse with our neighbours than that corporation itself. I am making no complaint, but I state that that corporation has put forth extraordinary efforts for the purpose of securing a portion of the American trade. It is seeking in every possible way to secure unrestricted reciprocity, so far as its own interests are concerned, with the people of the United States; and certain advice was given, and a certain course was pursued, of which we have made no complaint, but which I think was very unfair indeed to the people of this country and to the Liberal party, and the more so because the conduct of the corporation itself was at variance with the doctrines which it preached as being good for other people. There is a complaint made by Sir Charles Tupper that the Grand Trunk Railway Company issued free tickets to those who were politically opposed to his party, in order that they might reach the polls. Sir Henry Tyler says in reference to that charge:

"Sir Charles Tupper has already been informed that though a telegram was sent by Mr. Edgar authorizing the issue of tickets previously guaranteed to be paid for, those tickets were not actually issued, and this cannot be considered more heinous than the running of special trains ordered for his (Sir Charles Tupper's) own purposes, which trains have not yet been paid for, the account of which is still waiting settlement."

It will be an interesting question to know by whom that bill is to be paid, whether it is to be paid by Sir Charles Tupper, whether it is to be paid by contributions of the hon. gentlemen who have profited by his efforts, or whether it is to be paid out of the public treasury of this country. Now, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries complains of the "indecent haste," the "spleen," the "spite," the "malice." What do all these words mean? The hon. gentleman, perhaps, will give us a lecture on synonyms, and tell us whether this is good English or not, tell us whether these are synonymous expressions or not. He will also, perhaps, tell us, with a filial regard for what is due to another, what "craven cowards" mean. Perhaps, if the hon. gentleman will take his own speech and take the letters of his distinguished parent and put them together, he will find ample material for a criticism upon the subject, if he is disposed to turn his attention in that direction. I might say to the hon. gentleman that while I have no ill-will towards him, and I admit that he has shown good ability as a member of the Government, I do not think that lectures on the Queen's English are in his line, nor do I think he is calculated to shine in that direction. The hon. gentleman complained this evening of the use of the expression an "unveracious calumniator," and he seems to think that it is not good English. I do not know on what ground the hon. gentleman's claim is based; whether he means to say that unveracious is not English, or calumniator is not English, or the combination is not English.

Mr. TUPPER. The combination.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not agree with the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman will remember that Shakespeare makes one of his characters say with respect to the communication from the witches that they lied like the truth.

An hon. MEMBER. You are not Shakespeare.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). While that might not be a calumnious statement it might be an unveracious one. The hon. gentleman might also remember that calumnies are often conveyed by a shrug of the shoulders, and by pretending to conceal something which, if told, might have a very different effect. While I should say an action like that might be calumnious, I would not say it was an unveracious calumny, nor the party who used it was an unveracious calumniator. But when an hon. gentleman is very specific, though not very accurate, in the use of his English, and when he undertakes to state what is not the fact, and when he is very precise in that statement, I am inclined to think he is not only a calumniator, when the statement he makes is an untrue one, but he is an unveracious calumniator. And, although I have no intention of entering into a discussion on the subject of synonyms or on the use of quotations, I think I can satisfy the hon. gentleman, if he wished to discuss the subject, that unveracious calumniator is very good English, and it does not apply to every untruthful state-

ment, but it does apply, and apply with perfect accuracy, to untruthful statements of a certain class made in a particular way. The hon. gentleman has spoken of interference in the elections by members of the Local Governments, and he has declared that they have interfered quite as improperly as the High Commissioner. Members of the Local Governments are not our officers. They have reached their position by the votes of the people. They are responsible to the people who appointed them, not to us. If the people disapprove of their conduct they will remove them no doubt in the proper way, and if we disapprove of the conduct of the High Commissioner it seems to me we ought to adopt a similar policy. The hon. gentleman made a very extraordinary interruption in the speech made a few evenings ago by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). He undertook to justify a statement made by the Minister of Justice in a memorandum in regard to the action of Newfoundland, in which the Minister pointed out that the United States had laid down a doctrine that Canada cannot avail itself of the United States markets, while our people continue their allegiance as British subjects; and the hon. gentleman, not satisfied with the statement of the Minister of Justice, that he had based that observation on a speech delivered by Mr. Blaine some three years ago, interrupted the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and read an extract from Mr. Blaine's speech, to show it was impossible we could have access to United States markets unless we became American citizens. That was the position taken by the hon. gentleman. Now the hon. gentleman will perhaps tell us how, under these circumstances the High Commissioner and two of his colleagues came to go to Washington. Did they start on a fool's errand? Did they know beforehand what Mr. Blaine had said and feel confidence that they possessed in it conclusive evidence as to the position of the United States on this question? If that be so, what did the High Commissioner, the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Finance mean by those two trips to Washington? Did they go to seek the annexation of this country to the United States? Did they go to assure the United States Government they would lay aside their allegiance to the British Government for the purpose of securing reciprocity in trade? Were they prepared for the mere advantage of securing material prosperity to give up their allegiance to Great Britain? What mean these negotiations in the face of this extract from Mr. Blaine's speech, which the Minister of Marine considers so perfectly conclusive? I am not going to discuss the tendency of this or that particular policy. I am disposed to consider what I believe to be best for the material prosperity of this country, trusting to the future to lead us along that line which will be in the end best for us. I am not going to assist in opposing what I believe to be in the interests of our people because some hon. gentleman is afraid they may lead him where he does not want to go. I do not think a more improper course could be pursued on any question, and I am not disposed to take it on this, and I do not think the people are inclined to take that view. Hon. members will recollect that in an interview the High Commissioner declared the Liberal party would be swept out of existence, because it was impossible they could support the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and those who held to the policy of unrestricted reciprocity without at the same time supporting political union with the United States. In the face of that declaration, here is the fact that a majority of the members of old Canada sit on this side of the House. If that be true, then it is clear, according to the statements of Sir Charles Tupper, that the majority of the people of this country, or at all events of old Canada, are seeking political union with the neighbouring republic. I do not admit that conclusion, I deny it altogether. I maintain that the position taken by Sir Charles Tupper does great injustice not only to the Liberal party but to the people of this country, by the false impression it is calculated to make in the mother country. The High Commissioner has published letters attacking the Grand Trunk Railway, has published articles in the *Contemporary Review* and the *North American Review* attacking the Liberal party, intimating that that party was led by men who are seeking to bring about the political union of Canada with the United States. That is the object he is aiming at; he has laboured steadily to damage the Liberal party in the minds of the English people. It is a position that cannot be tolerated, and the Liberal party will continue to protest against this country being represented in a non-political office by a gentleman which has slandered the members on either side of the House. I am not speaking in the interests of the Liberal party in denouncing the position taken by Sir Charles Tupper, whose charges are calumnious and whose statements are altogether unfounded, but in making this statement I declare I am as ready to denounce similar charges made by any officer of the Civil Service of this country as well against hon. gentlemen opposite, as against hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to deal out to us the same measure of justice they may desire to have dealt out to them if they were in our position, as they undoubtedly will be very soon.

Mr. DICKEY. The discussion upon this question has taken a somewhat wide range and I do not propose to follow it in its irrelevancy. Before proceeding to discuss the resolution I will first address myself to some remarks which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) made towards the latter part of his speech. The hon. gentleman seemed to make much ado of the fact that the Minister of Marine had read to the House a speech of Mr. Blaine's in order to prove that the United States Secretary of State would not accept reciprocity, and the hon. member for Bothwell desired to know how the Minister of Marine expected that the Commissioners of the Government could go to Washington with any hope of getting reciprocity in view of that declaration by Mr. Blaine. In my opinion it would be much better that the hon. member for Bothwell—before he made those remarks at the expense of the Minister of Justice—had read the speech of Mr. Blaine to which the Minister of Marine referred. I will again quote to the House part of the speech of Mr. Blaine which the Minister of Marine read, and I think they will see from that speech that what Mr. Blaine objects to, is the unrestricted reciprocity which members on the other side of the House advocate, and not the limited reciprocity which the Government is endeavouring to obtain. Mr. Blaine says:

"Beyond the frontier, across the river our neighbours chose another Government, another allegiance. They are

subjects of Queen Victoria; they are loyal to Her Majesty. They live under a foreign flag. They do exactly as they have a right to do. I neither dispute their right nor envy their situation. It is their right to choose for themselves, as it is our right to choose for ourselves. But I am opposed, teetotally opposed, to giving the Canadians the sentimental satisfaction of waving the British flag, paying British taxes, and enjoying the actual cash remuneration of American markets. They cannot have both at the same time. If they come to us they can have what we have, but it is an absolute wrong against the rights of American citizens that millions of men who owe the United States no allegiance, who have no part or lot with us, who are not of us, but choose to be foreign to us; it is an absolute wrong for Congress to say that they shall have exactly the same share in our markets and the same privileges of trade under our flag that we have. So far as I can help it I do not mean that they shall be Canadians and Americans at the same time."

If the hon. member for Bothwell will study that speech he will find that Mr. Blaine has not said one word against the fair reciprocity treaty which the Government in Canada are anxious to obtain. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) went over a good deal of ground in his speech, and it was well that some time elapsed between the beginning and the close of his remarks, else his charge of irrelevancy against the speech of the hon. Minister of Justice might have been made against himself with a good deal of force. The hon. gentleman treated on the position which the High Commissioner occupies in reference to the Government, and he held that the High Commissioner was in the capacity of an ambassador. Now, for the last few years in this Parliament, I have heard hon. gentlemen opposite avail themselves of every occasion that offered to hold Sir Charles Tupper up as being opposed to the Government on certain important issues. The hon. member from Bothwell and his friends have argued in this House that Sir Charles Tupper was opposed to the Government on the reciprocity question, that he was willing to go further in this matter than they were, and that upon other vital questions he was opposed to the Ministry. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen opposite to say now that Sir Charles Tupper was a Minister when they attacked him in this House, and out of it that he is a mere political servant of the Government, open to criticism, but when they accused him and when he comes to offer his defence to the people of Canada, before whom every public man in this country must expect to go for a verdict on his conduct, it is a sorry excuse for them to plead that he is an ambassador, and that in consequence he should be refused the opportunity of making his defence. After abusing Sir Charles Tupper during the past few years, I maintain that it is not fair that hon. gentlemen opposite should deny him the opportunity of making his defence, because they are pleased to say that he is an ambassador and that his mouth is to be closed. I am not sufficiently versed in constitutional law to know exactly what the position of the High Commissioner is with regard to the Government, but the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says that Sir Charles Tupper is an ambassador, and I suppose the hon. member is perfectly familiar with the fact that if he be an ambassador this House would not have any right to discuss or to vote upon his conduct. Hon. gentlemen on the other side also say that Sir Charles Tupper is a civil servant. Now waiving for a time any technical question as to what Sir Charles Tupper's position is, or what the position of High Commissioner is, let us look at the question from a common sense standpoint. It is quite clear that he is not an ordinary member of the Civil Service, for if hon. gentlemen opposite should by any chance come into power, they will admit, that while they would consider it an unjust act to turn out the deputy head of any department without cause —because he is an officer who was entitled to the protection with which custom and law surrounds the Civil Service—yet if they should come into power they would not for one moment permit Sir Charles Tupper, who had no sympathy with their views to represent them at the Court of St. James. Therefore, whatever may be the fine legal distinction in reference to the High Commissioner's office, yet from a common sense point of view there is a broad distinction between it and the position of ordinary members of the Civil Service. Sir Charles Tupper holds an office which depends upon the existence of the Government for its continuance, and he must necessarily go out with the Government whose representative he is. In that respect he stands in a distinct position from other civil servants. I observe that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), in quoting evidence as to the statements of Sir Charles Tupper, had to resort to an alleged interview in the Detroit *Free Press*. We all know that interviews in American newspapers are about as unreliable evidence as can be produced in support of any assertion, and the hon. gentleman must have been very hard pressed for some corroboration of the allegations made by the other side of the House when he said that this interview bore internal evidence of having been written by Sir Charles Tupper himself. I say that the hon. member for Bothwell in advancing such a theory to this House, as evidence upon which they should base their judgment in passing a vote of censure upon Sir Charles Tupper, was trifling with the intelligence of the House. As he read the article I noticed, although I do not pretend to be a literary critic, that Sir Richard Cartwright—I use his name because it is mentioned there—was referred to in it as Mr. Cartwright, and I ask hon. gentlemen if it is likely that Sir Charles Tupper would, in writing, refer to the hon. member for South Oxford as Mr. Cartwright. The hon. member went on to say that in his judgment the National Policy led directly to annexation, and he was kind enough to tell us that he would not for that reason impute to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House any disloyalty to Great Britain or any anxiety for annexation; and he claimed in the same way that, although members on this side felt that the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite led to annexation, the same courtesy should be extended to them. Well, personally I am quite willing to accord that courtesy to the hon. gentlemen. I am quite willing to admit that there were very many gentlemen working for commercial union who did not and who do not to-day realize where that policy would lead them. But I would remind the hon. member that he does not find in this country any person supporting the National Policy who is in league with people in the United States; he does not find that in the United States there is an organized band of persons favouring the National Policy in this country with the view of driving us into annexation with the United States. The argument of the hon. member for Bothwell is a mere abstract argument that the National Policy leads to annexation. But in connection with commercial union we have as the hon. Minister of

Marine has pointed out so well to-night, the evidences of a conspiracy in the United States, which no hon. gentleman opposite has attempted to deny, avowedly for the purpose of bringing Canada into a political union with that country; and we have hon. members in this House, and leaders of the Liberal party who are not in this House, rewarded for favouring the policy of commercial union with dinners given to them in the United States by those who desire the political union of the two countries. The hon. member for Bothwell referred to Sir Charles Tupper's interview with Mr. Scargeant as an attempt to coerce the Grand Trunk, and with perfectly calm indifference he waived aside altogether Sir Charles Tupper's statement with regard to that interview, in which he alleges that he made no attempt to coerce the Grand Trunk, and he also waives aside Mr. Hector Cameron's declaration in support of Sir Charles Tupper. This is the spirit in which the hon. gentleman treats Sir Charles Tupper, and in which he considers the evidence offered by the hon. Minister of Marine in Sir Charles Tupper's defence. The hon. gentleman also says that if the policy of unrestricted reciprocity leads to annexation the majority of the members of this House from old Canada are in favour of that policy, and, therefore, the majority of the people of old Canada are in favour of annexation. It may not be very much to the point, but it is quite as much to the point as the hon. gentleman's argument, and it is just as well to remind him of it that although the Opposition have perhaps a majority of the representatives of the two old provinces of Canada in this House, they represent a minority of the people from those provinces. Now, I must say that of all the many great compliments that Sir Charles Tupper has got in his public career, both from his country and his Queen, I do not know of any that does him more credit than the speech delivered by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) in this debate. That hon. gentleman, in a motion confined to the narrow issue of whether or not it was right for Sir Charles Tupper to take part in the late election, did Sir Charles Tupper the honour to go back to 1866 to rake up stale and exploded scandals against him for the purpose of damaging him in this House. The House will remember that in 1866 Sir Charles Tupper stood alone in Nova Scotia as the maker of Confederation, and was battling to bring that province into the Union, so that it could assist in building up the Canada we have to-day. In doing so he met with intense hostility from various quarters, and in the course of that bitter and stubborn fight, in which only the great ability, perseverance and tact of Sir Charles Tupper succeeded in bringing Nova Scotia into the Union, he met with such charges as have been retailed during this debate; and the hon. member for West Huron is, I conceive, doing Sir Charles Tupper great honour in reminding the House that in working patriotically for the promotion of this Confederation he faced even such calumnies as those which the hon. gentleman has uttered against him. Now, these things have been discussed again and again, for hon. members of the Opposition in Nova Scotia, in Ontario and in Quebec have again and again been offered the privilege of meeting Sir Charles Tupper on the public platform and discussing these matters before the electorate of the country. Sometimes they have accepted that offer, but more frequently they have not. I believe that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) declined that honour on several occasions before the people of Ontario.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When, pray? Be good enough to state.

Mr. DICKEY. I cannot give the hon. member the date, and if he denies it——

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Most assuredly. I may just say to the hon. gentleman, as he puts the question, that I was never asked to meet Sir Charles Tupper; but I rather think that on two or three occasions we asked that Sir Charles Tupper should join in a sort of tournament, but he did not see fit to accept the invitation.

Mr. DICKEY. I accept the hon. gentleman's denial, and I would accept it with a good deal more grace if he had not made a statement as to which I think he must have been misinformed, namely, that Sir Charles Tupper ever declined to face him or any other man who proposed to meet him. Those various offers of Sir Charles Tupper to discuss his character and reputation before the electors of this country have, one after the other, during the last thirteen years, resulted with unvarying effect in an endorsation of Sir Charles Tupper and the policy he has been propounding. This has been particularly true in the Province of Nova Scotia where Sir Charles Tupper is best known, where he spent his younger days, and where he led a Government. To-day the party Sir Charles Tupper supported comes back to this House with sixteen out of twenty-one members from the Province of Nova Scotia and that is quite sufficient argument to meet the charges which the hon. member for West Huron has thought proper to make in this House against him. I do not know what view the hon. member for West Huron and those who, like him, go back years for the sake of hurling these exploded charges against the High Commissioner can have. Possibly they want to go down to posterity by hanging on to his coat tails, or perhaps they want to be immortalized as notorious for having assailed and vilified a man who will ever be known as one of the makers of Canada. Whether that be their aim or not, I do not know; but as regards all those charges affecting his past life, I shall say nothing specifically, because they have been answered again and again, both in this House and before the people. Now, coming to the resolution before us, it is divided into three branches. It involves the affirmation that Sir Charles Tupper interfered with the elections, that he imputed treasonable motives to a large portion of the people of Canada, and that he vilified the managers of the Grand Trunk Railway. Now, unless every hon. gentleman in this House is satisfied as to the accuracy of those statements, he cannot support this resolution. With regard to the interference of Sir Charles Tupper in the elections, I would simply justify that upon the ground of fair-play. His position having been assailed, what could be fairer than that he should appear upon the platform, willing to meet anybody in a free discussion before the electors. If he had sulked in London and had refused to discuss these questions, there might have been some imputation against him; but I hold that, from his own point of view, regarding himself simply as an individual, he had the right, under every principle of fair-play, to be heard before the people. But that is not the posi-

tion. Sir Charles Tupper came here at the request of the leader of the Government, and this resolution being a personal matter, it is, therefore, not entitled to any support. It should have been made against the Administration which brought Sir Charles Tupper out here and not against the High Commissioner. I will put it to hon. gentlemen opposite if this man is a civil servant and the Government ask him to come out and help them, what is he to do? Is he to disobey that command and be dismissed, or to come out and work as requested. Therefore the blame, if there be any in this matter, is chargeable to the Government and not to the High Commissioner. When one considers the speeches of the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) and the others who discussed this question, it seems to me that an attack is made directly and personally against Sir Charles Tupper and that there is no desire to draw the Government into the matter. The evident desire is to get at Sir Charles Tupper and give the hon. member for West Huron and others a text on which to hang abusive speeches of an absent man, who, always ready to defend himself when present, cannot do so now owing to absence. If a charge is to be made against any body, it should be made against the Ministers of the Crown who are here, well able to defend themselves. I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite, supposing a Deputy Minister were guilty of any misconduct, what would be the force of a resolution censuring him, without any enquiry, without his being present or being given an opportunity to reply in any way. If the hon. member for Bothwell is right in holding that Sir Charles Tupper is a mere civil servant, Sir Charles Tupper stands on the same plane as a deputy head of a department, and this motion should be rejected as being a mode of enquiry which would never be sanctioned in the case of any other civil servant, and for that reason violating the first elements of fair-play. Administrations are attacked because they take the responsibility of what they do and have to defend it; but to attack in this House a civil servant behind his back, without giving him a chance to defend himself, is to violate every principle of fair-play. In the second division of the resolution, we are asked to commit ourselves to the statement that Sir Charles Tupper imputed treasonable motives to a large proportion of the people of Canada. Now, I have listened carefully, and have never yet heard from any hon. gentleman opposite one tittle of evidence on that subject. The hon. member for South Oxford started out, as I thought pretty bravely, to prove it, but he wound up with a charge of treason against Mr. Farrer, Mr. Wiman and Sir Richard Cartwright; and as we cannot yet consider those gentlemen to be a large proportion of the people of Canada, we cannot consistently support the resolution. Why, not one of the hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken have been able to prove that Sir Charles Tupper imputed treasonable motives to a large section of our people. He said, it is true that some parties were treasonable. He imputed treason to Messrs. Wiman and Farrer, and I do not know whether any hon. gentleman on the opposite side is prepared to defend those two gentlemen. I do not know why after having received the aid of Messrs. Wiman and Farrer, hon. gentlemen opposite should, now that the battle is over, leave these friends of theirs without a defender. I do not know why they do not defend them against the charge of treason: for I have no doubt the hon. member for Bothwell could prove by the text-book and by authorities that Mr. Farrer and Mr. Wiman do not come within the definition of levying war against the Queen, and therefore are not traitors. But even that he has not attempted to prove, and these gentlemen stand charged, and I think properly, with the crime of treason. In the face of the fact that hon. gentlemen opposite have not offered any evidence that Sir Charles Tupper charged the Liberal party or any considerable portion of the people with treason, we have, in the very article which the hon. member for South Oxford cited as proof of that assertion, a distinct statement by Sir Charles Tupper that no considerable part of the people of Canada are disloyal or in favour of annexation. And for the House to come to a resolution of that sort proposed would not only be violating every principle of fair-play, would not only be condemning a man in his absence, but would be condemning him against the evidence. They would be giving what a judge would call a perverse verdict, opposed to every principle of evidence. There is another view to take, and that is that, if hon. gentlemen opposite are so careful of the dignity of this Dominion, if they are so careful that no imputations of treason should be made, I invite the House to consider why they did not read the declaration of Sir Charles Tupper in those articles that he did not charge that party with treason, and why they did not refrain from placing on the Journals of the House the false statement that a man in Sir Charles Tupper's position alleged that the Liberal party were in favour of annexation? I ask them why they would allow it to go to England, to the United States, and to all the world, why they would spread the report, the scandal, the slander that Sir Charles Tupper made any such statement as this when they had the evidence that Sir Charles Tupper made no such statement, but in fact stated the very opposite? So I think if any gentlemen are to blame in this matter, in giving the idea that Canada is honeycombed with treason, they are the hon. gentlemen opposite, who, in this resolution, invite the House to resolve that Sir Charles Tupper stated publicly throughout the country that the Liberal party were committed to the policy of annexation. The third charge is that Sir Charles Tupper vilified the managers of the Grand Trunk Railway. What are the facts? Sir Charles Tupper was in Cumberland on declaration day, and, as a matter of course, being the old member of the county, and the people being glad to see him, he was invited to speak. He discussed the issues of the day and the battle which had just been fought and the reasons why in some provinces the Government had lost and why in other provinces the Government had succeeded. In going over these reasons, he naturally came to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and he discussed their conduct in opposing the Government, and, as was perfectly natural under the feelings engendered by the struggle, he did so warmly. I do not know that there is anything very much out of the way in the leader of the Opposition accusing 215 revising officers of this Dominion as being unblushing partisans. He charged them with being guilty of the most disgraceful frauds, and this language was used by him in regard to the causes of the defeat of the Liberal party. Sir Charles Tupper, in

discussing the reverses of the Conservative party in sections where the Grand Trunk Railway held sway, gave expression to his opinion of their action. I do not see anything very serious in that. In connection with that matter, Sir Charles Tupper was attacked most virulently by Sir Henry Tyler. It was asserted that he had tried to make a corrupt bargain with the Grand Trunk Railway in reference to the elections. He met that statement with a denial on his own part and also one by Hector Cameron. Various charges and counter charges were made, and what did Sir Charles Tupper do? I ask anyone who can fairly look at the question if any proposition could have been more proper than the one which he made. He said: "I will go to your own meeting, and there, before your own shareholders, before the people whose business you have been managing for years, before people with whom I have no interests, but who are intelligent Englishmen, I will discuss the charges I have made and produce the proofs I have to offer, and you shall produce whatever proofs you have to offer, and the meeting shall decide between you and me." I ask the House what fairer offer could have been made by Sir Charles Tupper or any other man. But that challenge was not accepted, and consequently Sir Charles Tupper had to write the letters, some parts of which are complained of by members of the Opposition. It only comes to this, that Sir Charles Tupper, in stating the causes of the defeat of the Government in certain places, fell foul of the Grand Trunk Railway, that Sir Henry Tyler attacked him and that he had to defend himself as best he could. After all, Sir Charles Tupper's chief complaint against the Grand Trunk Railway was that they interfered unfairly in the elections, that they did not allow their employés to vote as they wished. His statement is corroborated by Hector Cameron, and, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, I hold that we are bound to assume that is correct. Therefore on this head the motion is untenable. It is untenable on all grounds, but I submit that, as to the allegation that Sir Charles Tupper attributed treasonable motives to any considerable portion of the people of Canada, not only is there no evidence to support it but there is considerable evidence against it, sufficient to satisfy any one with a fair and open mind. Therefore, I appeal to hon. members on both sides of the House, whether they can come to a resolution involving a statement of fact such as appears in the middle branch of that resolution. As I said before, I think this motion should have been directed against the Government, or, if it was directed against the official, he should have had an opportunity to be heard. It involves a misstatement of facts, a statement contrary to all the evidence we have before us, and, therefore, I hope that this House will vote down a motion, which, in my opinion, was extremely ill-judged, a motion which appears to be the outcome of extreme ill-feeling against Sir Charles Tupper personally, an ill-feeling which was engendered by Sir Charles Tupper's successful efforts during the political campaign, a motion which the people of this country will see has been made on account of the success of Sir Charles Tupper's arguments and eloquence during the late campaign. I hope that a motion of this character, a motion which violates every principle of good taste and fair-play will be voted down by this House, and I trust by an overwhelming majority. If it is so voted down, it will show that this House has a rough-and-tumble sense as to what is due between man and man, that this House has not forgotten the work Sir Charles Tupper has done, work which we know is appreciated by members on both sides of the House, work that this country in the future will be proud of and for which it would honour him to-morrow if he were struck down by sickness or death. I hope the House will not allow a man with a record like that to be treated as he would be by the adoption of such a motion as this, and I hope it will be voted down by such a majority as will make it very satisfactory to Sir Charles Tupper when he hears of it in England.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The speech which the hon. gentleman has just delivered does more credit to his heart than to his head. I would not have been disposed to follow him at all were it not for one observation which he uttered, at least three times, and which I think calls for refutation from those who are supporting the present amendment. That observation was to the effect that not a scintilla of evidence had been attempted to be offered to the House in support of the charge that the High Commissioner of this country had charged treason against a large portion of the population. That assertion of his has brought me to my feet, and I will deal with it in a few moments. If I understand the position correctly which the hon. gentleman assumed, it was that Sir Charles Tupper did not occupy, in any sense, the position of a diplomatist or an ambassador. He ventured, with the becoming modesty with which he generally speaks in this House, to say that he did not speak as a constitutional lawyer, and I suppose, to some extent, he formed his opinions upon those delivered by the Minister of Justice when he spoke. Arguing from that position, he said that the High Commissioner therefore stood in the position simply of a deputy head; and if I gathered correctly the argument which he intended to present to the House it was this: That it was perfectly proper, and a course which he would defend, for a deputy head of any of the departments to leave his office, leave unfulfilled the duties which he is paid to perform, and enter upon a campaign from one end of this country to the other, and indulge in any language he pleased to use against one political party or another.

Mr. DICKEY. I do not think that the hon. gentleman wishes to misrepresent me, but he is doing so. My argument was the very opposite. I said that Sir Charles Tupper is not a civil servant subject to a Minister, like a deputy head, and in that respect I differed from the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills).

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I fail still to understand the hon. gentleman. Will he tell us what position Sir Charles Tupper does occupy? Sir Charles Tupper does not occupy in any sense, he says, the position of ambassador or diplomatist. Now, he tells us that he does not occupy the position of a civil servant like a deputy head. What position, then, does he occupy? I think the position he occupies in the mind of the hon. gentleman is that of a man above all law and above all rule, and amenable neither to this House nor to any other authority. That is the one ground upon which he can be defended. Let us look at the position that Sir Charles Tupper really does occupy. When the Minister of

Justice assumed his defence in this House he did it upon two grounds. He was aware, he could not but be aware, that if Sir Charles Tupper did occupy the position of an ambassador or diplomatist, his conduct in the late campaign was indefensible and indecent, and the Minister of Justice took the bull by the horns and laid down what he conceived to be the position, in very clear language. He said:

"It is perfectly true that the High Commissioner holds a very high and important position in respect to this country. He is one of our public functionaries, but conceding all that, I deny the hon. gentleman's proposition that he holds any such position as a foreign ambassador occupies. A foreign ambassador must necessarily keep himself, to a great extent, free from party politics. He must avoid anything that would impair the relations between himself and the court to which he is sent, because he is a medium of communication between the Government he represents and that court. The High Commissioner in our service occupies no such position; he is nothing but the agent of this Government living in London. * * * He does not occupy in any sense or in any degree such a position as an ambassador in diplomatic service in the British Government holds."

Now, if he could have supported that position, he might have had some grounds for the subsequent argument which he offered to the House. But let us, at this part of our enquiry, ask, is that position of the Minister of Justice sound? What did we hear to-day? We heard from an authority which I think the hon. gentleman from Amherst (Mr. Dickey) will respect, no less an authority than the High Commissioner himself, a definition of his own powers and his own position. And what did he claim for himself? He was in no sense a civil servant, but he was, as the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) showed, quoting from Sir Charles' own speech, a diplomatist, and in a sense an ambassador. My hon. friend went on quoting the language of the High Commissioner in which he claimed to hold a high and responsible position, one in which he did not feel himself free to deal with disputes between parties; he stood in such a position to both parties that he could deal frankly and fairly with them both, and he felt that if he could not occupy that position, he would be unfit for the position of High Commissioner. Sir, I believe the High Commissioner properly and rightly conceived the responsibilities and duties of the office which he holds. If the authority of that gentleman is not sufficient to justify the statement I make that the position of High Commissioner is akin to that of a diplomatist in another country, I shall give the hon. gentleman another authority which I think he will respect. When that office was created in this country, we had a debate upon the subject, and the present leader of the Government (Sir John A. Macdonald) was asked to define the position which this officer would hold towards the respective parties in the State, and towards the Government of the country, and he laid it down then in language so clear that it could not be misunderstood, in language which has been understood ever since, that the gentleman who occupied that position for the time being was in the nature of a diplomatist, or an ambassador. The Prime Minister said:

"It is believed that by having an officer holding a quasi-diplomatic position, in fact holding a diplomatic position, so far as is consistent with our position as a dependency of the Empire——"

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Let the hon. gentlemen cheer after I am through—

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

—"his statements, and actions, and prestige will be generally accepted by the public, and will greatly assist in giving a direction to the emigration from the United Kingdom and from Europe generally."

He was to hold a position free from party and above party, a position so high above party that his statements, when made publicly, were to be accepted by the public at large as true statements; and the English public and the world were asked, on the statement of the First Minister of this country, to pay, not the respect that is paid to the voice or the statement of a politician, but they were asked to give that weight to the High Commissioner's statement, when made as High Commissioner, which should be attached to the statement of a man standing above and aloof from all parties. He went on to say:

"Therefore the Dominion, like the other Colonies of the Empire, has been, to a great degree, unrepresented; and it is of great importance, at the present juncture, to have in Europe a resident agent, or Minister, who will be on the spot for the purpose of being consulted upon any negotiations that are going on between Her Majesty's Government and the various European powers in commercial matters. Her Majesty's Government have, as will be seen by the papers laid before the House, assented to the proposition of Canada. They are willing to receive and to give proper position and prominence to such an officer. They will give him such a diplomatic position as is consistent, of course, with the subordinate position of Canada as a dependency of the Empire."

Further on he said:

"I would say, Sir, that I believe in all sincerity that it is not only a very important step, but that it is a very wise step that Canada should at once as a Dominion, as an auxiliary kingdom, if I may use the expression, have a resident Minister, representing our wishes, to receive instructions from us and take at once a position among the *corps diplomatique*, which has not latterly been accorded to any portion of Her Majesty's Empire."

What is the difference between a resident minister at the Court of St. James and an ambassador? I do not catch what an hon. gentleman opposite says, but, perhaps, he will explain the difference if he knows it. We have here the declaration of the First Minister defining the duties of the office. We have the statement that the occupant was to be above political party contentions, and that he was to occupy a position that would ensure for any statement made by him in England the most ample belief and confidence, and the opinion was expressed that he would be one of the *corps diplomatique* and the representative of an auxiliary kingdom at the Court of St. James. If that is so, what is the meaning of the language which the Minister of Justice found himself driven to use, that Sir Charles Tupper occupied no such position, but was merely a civil servant. We start, therefore, with this proposition, that on the evidence of the First Minister who proposed the establishment of the office, and on the evidence of Sir Charles Tupper, who fills the office, his position is not one akin to that of a deputy minister or a civil servant, but is one above and beyond such position and akin to that of a diplomatist. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to produce a precedent in history where a diplomatist accredited to a foreign country engaged in political warfare against one of the parties of that country and continued to hold his position. We remember the false step taken by a former Minister who represented Great Britain in Washington. He wrote a letter, not a very strong letter, in which he expressed a slight preference for the policy of one of the political parties. Few hours elapsed before he was obliged to leave his position,

after the fact that he had written the letter was made public. He had to leave Washington and lose his position, and he has regained neither his position nor his prestige.

Mr. FOSTER. Sir Charles Tupper did not interfere in English politics.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) It does not matter whether he interfered in English politics or not; but I will show how he interfered in English politics. He attempted to lead the English people into the belief that half the Canadian people were traitors. He basely took advantage of the position which he held to decry the Canadian people to the English people to whom he was accredited. That being the position of Sir Charles Tupper, the question is whether hon. members should attempt to justify his conduct or language during the late elections. It is said that we should not blame Sir Charles Tupper, but the Government. If the High Commissioner so far forgets the dignity and respect which he owes to his position and steps down into the turmoil of political life, and becomes a public calumniator, he should not escape the condemnation of Parliament. I understood the hon. gentleman who preceded me to intimate that this House of Commons is not the tribunal to pass judgment on an officer who mistakes and abuses his position. There is not a tribunal in the Dominion of Canada so competent to pass judgment upon an officer holding the position which Sir Charles Tupper occupies as is this tribunal which represents the people. For what purpose are we here? To maintain our own dignity and self respect.

Mr. DICKEY. I was quoting Todd's Parliamentary Government.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not know from whom the hon. gentleman was quoting. The hon. gentleman never could get the authority of Mr. Todd for such a position. I will undertake to sit down if the hon. gentleman can quote from Mr. Todd a case in which a diplomatist abused his position by using such language as Sir Charles Tupper used and acted as he acted, and the House of Commons was held not to be the proper tribunal in which to bring him to book for that offence. Having established, as I have satisfactorily established, that position, what is the next point to be considered? It is that the High Commissioner, occupying that elevated, diplomatic position, made use of language towards one of the parties of the State, which the resolution characterizes as involving a breach of the duties of the office which the High Commissioner fills. Did he do so? It is a question of fact. How does the Minister of Justice meet the charge? By the statement that no evidence had been offered in support of the allegation contained in the resolution. My hon. friend and leader who moved the resolution thought that at least this House would be entitled to use knowledge which is common to us all. He thought it was common knowledge that Sir Charles Tupper was High Commissioner, and that he came to this country. Then we had the statement of the First Minister that Sir Charles Tupper came here to interfere in the elections, and that he spoke in favour of one of the political parties. Moreover, the press during three months teemed with his speeches abusing the Liberal party and the Grand Trunk Railway. Since the return of the High Commissioner to England he has not failed to vilify, abuse and traduce that great corporation to which Canada owes so much, the Grand Trunk Railway. The High Commissioner did not satisfy his spleen with the speeches he made in this country, but since returning to England he has done his worst to abuse the management of the road, and to diminish, if he could, the value of the shares of that great corporation in the English market. I do not think he has been successful; his statements have been discounted because he has become known. But that does not excuse him, because he did his worst in that matter. The Minister of Justice said that no evidence had been offered up to the time he spoke in support of the charges in the resolution, ignoring the fact that a two days' debate had occurred in which evidence was submitted without stint in support of the resolution. I heard the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) say that no evidence had been furnished in support of the proposition that the High Commissioner had vilified one of the great parties of the country, and had accused them of treason. Of all the representatives in this House, that hon. gentleman should have been the last man to make such a statement, because he came from the county, and the very county town in which the slander was uttered. I hold in my hands the Amherst *Gazette*, and I do not desire to quote from it, for the echoes of its language have barely died away; and yet the hon. gentleman does not remember that such language was uttered. What did Sir Charles Tupper say in the course of his carefully prepared and revised speech, a speech uttered in cold blood on declaration day, when the heat of the election was over? Speaking of one of the great parties of this country he said: "There are two great parties in Canada, one loyal to the mother country, the other alien thereto and turning its back on Great Britain." Did the hon. gentleman ever hear that language uttered? He may believe it to be true or false, but he must not deny that it was uttered by Sir Charles, and was a disgrace to the High Commissioner in view of the position he occupies. It was open to Sir Charles to throw up his position and declare that the issue between the two great parties was so important he would resign, and as a private citizen take part in the struggle. If he had resigned the emoluments of his office and the prestige attaching to the position he held, and, standing on a common level with other electors, have chosen to vilify, blackguard and abuse his opponents, he would have been met in proper fashion. But for the High Commissioner—whose words the First Minister says from his very position will be accepted by all parties in the Empire as true—to stand upon a public platform and charge that which he must know to be false, namely, that one of the great parties in this State was prepared to hand over the country to aliens, is a charge that cannot go unchallenged, a charge which is false in itself, and a charge which I do not think there are twenty gentlemen on the Government benches believe in. Under the circumstances, and considering the position which Sir Charles Tupper held at the time, I not only characterize the charge as false but the man who made it as acting indecently when he made it. More than that: Sir Charles Tupper was not satisfied with blackguarding and vilifying one of the great parties in the State, but he must needs vilify one of the greatest corporations in this

country. The hon. gentleman attempted to make the House believe that there was no charge against the Grand Trunk Railway, but that it was all against Cartwright, Wiman, and Farrer. Is that true? Are we to shut our eyes to the record? Are we to believe what Sir Charles Tupper's own newspaper says he spoke on the occasion to which I refer? According to his own paper he said:

"When this election came on, notwithstanding all we had done for this company, it issued a circular commanding its thousands of employes to vote against the Government. He never could have believed that a company of English shareholders could be induced to use its great power and influence to strike down British institutions in this country."

Is that a charge against the Grand Trunk Railway or is it not? Is it not a charge that the Grand Trunk Railway was conspiring with these treason-mongers to whom Sir Charles Tupper previously referred. He goes on to say:

"The Grand Trunk Railway also, since the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, has been ruining its own shareholders in its vain attempts to try to obstruct that line and going into wild purchases of lines to embarrass it."

What could be more calculated to injure the interests of that great corporation than this language of Sir Charles Tupper, which was telegraphed to England and put into the hands of every shareholder of the Grand Trunk Railway, with the malicious purpose, I contend, of damaging the interests of that corporation, so far as any statement made by Sir Charles Tupper could damage those interests. I maintain that if there is a corporation in Canada which it is our interest to speak respectfully of, it is the Grand Trunk Railway. Why, you cannot float any great financial scheme for the country without that scheme being referred to those in that company who have great influence at home, and if you attempt to destroy the interests of the Grand Trunk Railway, just to that extent do you damage and destroy the interests of this great country. Sir Charles Tupper is not satisfied with denouncing the whole Liberal party as traitors, but he must single out for his abuse the leader of the Liberal party, the leader whom we are proud of, the leader whose policy we believe in, and advocated and supported at the polls, the leader whose policy only, we believe, can bring prosperity to this country; he singles that leader out and without a shadow of evidence to justify the vile charge he classes him with traitors and treason-mongers. Sir Charles Tupper says:

"Now you find Laurier, Wiman, Farrer, and the Grand Trunk Railway Company, these craven creatures who have been representing us as people whose life could be crushed out by the United States, leading and abetting a party which turns its back on England."

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman who said "hear, hear," cannot mean it. He surely does not mean to characterize the leader of the Liberal party as a coward, he is too much of a gentleman and he has sat too long with the Hon. Mr. Laurier in this House to do so. He knows that there is no man in this Parliament of Canada less open to the foul charge, than the eloquent, the able and single-minded leader of the Liberal party. I denounce the language used by Sir Charles Tupper on that occasion not only towards the party as a whole, but towards its trusted leader, as unworthy of any man holding a position in the Civil Service, let alone a man holding the exalted position of High Commissioner. The hon. Minister of Justice asks his friends to vote down this resolution. Does he himself justify the use of that language, dare he rise in his place as a respected member of this House, and one for whom I have the highest respect, and say he will take the responsibility of endorsing that foul calumny? No, Sir, he will not, nor do I believe that there are ten men on that side of the House who will do it. While that language stands there uncontradicted, published in Sir Charles Tupper's own organ, circulated throughout the length and breadth of this country, telegraphed to England for the wicked purpose of injuring the Grand Trunk Railway and the Liberal party, we are not only within our rights in asking the House to condemn him, but I believe there are numbers of gentlemen on the other side of the House who if they do not condemn him by their votes will condemn him in their hearts. The hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) places in my hands the *Morning Chronicle* of Quebec in which the very same foul charge is repeated from the very same foul lips, and yet in the face of these charges, and in the face of this evidence which is overwhelming, we have an honoured and respected gentleman of this House, who perhaps did not hear it across the floor, denying that such charges were ever made at all, and calling on his friends to whitewash Sir Charles Tupper because he said there was no evidence: when the evidence is overwhelming. I will be prepared to submit it to the hon. gentleman himself as a lawyer and ask him can he give any other verdict than guilty? The hon. gentleman, who is Minister of Marine and Fisheries came forward in a very gallant attempt to do that which his colleagues shrank from doing, and one cannot but sympathize largely with the Minister of Marine in his gallant attempt. He was standing up for an absent father, and the sympathy of the House went out in a large measure to him, but it must be painful to him to find that these men whom it is said Sir Charles Tupper put in their places, these men supporting the party which it is said he returned to power, remained mute and silent and left it for his own son to defend the High Commissioner. We have it stated to-night that whatever apology or excuse can be offered for any other living man no apology can be offered for Mr. Wiman, because he is an "admitted traitor and scoundrel." That is what he was called to-night. I do not know Mr. Wiman, I never saw the gentleman in my life, I never had any communication with him, but he may be, as I believe him to be, a very clever man. I heard Mr. Wiman's character once described in this House, not by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, but by no less a personage than the High Commissioner, when he held the position of Finance Minister in the Government. My recollection does not enable me to say that upon that occasion Sir Charles Tupper called Mr. Wiman an "admitted traitor." I rather think that upon that occasion, and it is only a few years ago, the High Commissioner eulogized Mr. Wiman as a gentleman entitled to the gratitude of the Canadian people, as the personal friend of the then Finance Minister, the man who had invited him to approach Mr. Bayard when he offered unrestricted reciprocity to the United States; and, Sir, the thanks that Mr. Wiman, the friend of the then Finance Minister, gets for paving the way and smoothing the difficulties between this country and the United States,

are the denunciations of him as an admitted traitor which we have heard to-night by the hon. Minister of Marine. Is this an indication of what the policy of the Government is to be? Is the language we have heard to-night likely to favour and assist the negotiations which we are told are to take place next October at Washington on the subject of reciprocity? Sir, I think the people of this country have a right to charge, against some of the Ministers at least, that they have not been wise, that they have not kept a proper control over their tongues, that they have forgotten the responsibility of their position, that they have made use of language which will rise up before this country when in the persons of her representatives she appears at Washington to negotiate a fair treaty of reciprocity.

Mr. CHARLTON. I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on, go on

Mr. LAURIER. I am sorry to see that the proposal to adjourn the debate is received in the spirit which is apparent. It is now a quarter to twelve o'clock, and I would say to the hon. gentleman who leads the House that four or five hon. members on this side of the House yet intend to speak on this question, so it is not possible to close the debate to-night, unless we continue to sit through the small hours, till four or five o'clock in the morning.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go ahead.

Mr. LAURIER. It can go ahead, and if hon. gentlemen want to have that kind of game, they know that it does not always have the result it is supposed to have. I do not want to enter into that game, and I hope the hon. leader of the House will understand that the proposition is a perfectly reasonable one. We have been endeavouring to carry on the business of the House by mutual agreement on fair terms. If we are to cease to have that, let us know it at once.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman who has just proposed the adjournment of the debate sent a note across to me about half-past ten asking whether an adjournment, if proposed, would be acceptable to our side of the House. I consulted with my friends, and the decision was that we would prefer to go on with the debate and finish it to-night. That was stated plainly to the hon. gentleman. He told me there were several other members who wanted to speak. I said that of course they could speak, as it was not yet late. Now, this is the second or the third night of this debate, and unless we sit to a later hour we cannot finish our work. There is a large attendance of members this evening: let us finish this debate. I have no doubt that hon. members will not make long speeches now after the full discussion we have had.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would remind the hon. gentleman who has just spoken that no opposition at all was offered to a very early closing on the first day of this debate, and the courtesy then extended by my hon. friend without the slightest reluctance on his part ought in all common reason to be extended to us now. In fact, as the hon. gentleman knows nothing is to be gained in promoting public business by refusing reasonable concessions; and he knows that a very large number of the members of this House have to be present at a moderately early hour to-morrow morning at a very important investigation. Practically most of the members of this House have been at work from ten o'clock this morning till nearly twelve o'clock to-night, and it is not reasonable that men should be kept at work from twelve to fourteen hours a day. We do not want to engage in any filibustering tactics: but I can assure hon. gentlemen opposite that if it is their disposition to refuse reasonable concessions, they will have to be met in the same spirit, and it will not be convenient for them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think this proposition is a reasonable one. Many of us sat in the committee this morning from half-past ten till one o'clock, and we have been sitting here till about midnight, and it is unfair to ask us to go on longer to-night with this discussion. It is desirable that business should be conducted in a way acceptable to both sides of the House. There are a great many members in this House, as there are a great many people in the country, who are very much opposed to the speeches and statements that have been made by the High Commissioner, and it is just as well that the subject should be threshed out in this discussion.

Mr. TISDALE. My principal reason for objecting to the motion for adjournment is this: that the ordinary courtesy, which I understand usually exists between political parties, to accommodate members who are called away by important private business, has been refused to us. If that sort of thing is to continue, I am prepared to sit night and day to get through the business, in order to have an opportunity to attend to matters of a personal nature which are only second in importance to my duties as a member of this House. While I am satisfied of the sincerity and force of the demand of hon. gentlemen opposite that we should not be detained here too long, still I should like to have a better understanding on both sides.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman ought to remember that upon the first night of this debate he asked me to consent to an adjournment at an early hour, under an expectation which luckily has not been verified up to this moment, but which, unfortunately, may be at any moment: and I think it would not be advisable, under the circumstances, that we should engage in a wrangle which would be most unseemly.

Mr. BOWELL. Under the circumstances, I do not think the hon. gentleman should consider a matter of this kind a matter of courtesy.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I say it is a matter of courtesy.

Mr. BOWELL. It is a matter of agreement. It would have been brutality in the one case, as it is ungentlemanliness in the other.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I am surprised to see the Government unwilling to accede to the request of the hon. leader of the Opposition. I may tell them that soon, perhaps, they will be only too glad to have the leader of the Opposition concur in their wishes. During the present debate, personal accusations have been made against the hon. leader of the Opposition. We, the French members, in order not to take the time of the House, have been so good natured

as not to take the floor; but if, with the half of members and strength, a sort of tyranny is to be resorted to, then we will demand our rights and those of our chief, and may take the time required to lay stress upon the arguments we may think necessary.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I understand that there are several gentlemen on that side of the house who wish to take part in the debate.

Mr. LAURIER. That is so.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I must say that on our side of the House the feeling is that we should not adjourn, and the reason which made me ask for an adjournment the other day was one that struck the House at once as a very good and strong reason.

Mr. LAURIER. Certainly.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am afraid if we continue the debate after the bulletin I have just received, we may find ourselves in the midst of it when the event we all dreaded the other night may occur. Under these circumstances, I will consent to the adjournment, but I may ask the hon. gentleman when he expects we may finish the debate?

Mr. LAURIER. That will be altogether at the discretion of the Government, and I promise we will finish it at the next sitting.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have just received a bulletin signed by the three medical men It reads as follows:—

"The Premier passed a quiet day without notable change since seven o'clock this evening. Since that time he has shown signs of great prostration, evidenced by perspiration and a laboured respiration, numbering 30 per minute: pulse 135, weak and irregular; took usual nourishment at nine o'clock.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12 o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 3rd June, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PAYMASTER OF MILITARY DISTRICTS Nos. 5 AND 6.

Mr. LÉPINE (translation) asked, Who is the officer temporarily acting as paymaster of Military Districts Nos. 5 and 6? Has the said officer furnished security? Has he always discharged the duties of the office to the satisfaction of the Government? How much has he been paid for his services during the past twelve months? Is it the intention of the Government to appoint a permanent paymaster, or to retain without security a temporary officer in that important position?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, in answer to my hon. friend, I have to say that the officer temporarily acting as paymaster of Military Districts Nos. 5 and 6 is Lt.-Col. D'Orsonnens, the commanding officer of District No. 7. This officer has only been appointed temporarily, and, as temporary officer, has not been required to furnish security. He has discharged his duties to the satisfaction of the Government. He has not been paid anything extra for the services which he now performs. The question of the appointment of a permanent paymaster is still under consideration.

TIGNISH BREAKWATER—WHARFAGE DUES.

Mr. PERRY asked, Whether the Department of Marine and Fisheries has obtained from the wharfinger at Tignish Breakwater, Prince Edward Island, a return showing the amount of wharfage collected during the year 1890? If so, what is the amount? If not, will the department order a return to be sent in? And how soon?

Mr. TUPPER. On the 15th December last the usual circular was sent to the wharfinger at Tignish, asking for his return showing the amount of wharfage collected during the year. The return not having reached the department, the wharfinger was instructed on the 21st May to send in his return, and the agent at Charlottetown has also been asked to report on the neglect of the wharfinger to forward his returns.

BEAVERTON DOCK.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, What is the name and post office address of each party who tendered for the Beaverton Dock? What was the amount of each tender? Who received the contract? Have the plans or specifications been changed since the contract was let? If so, what is the nature of the change, and what additional cost will it entail?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will give the names of the parties who tendered, consecutively. They were as follows:—Patrick Navin, Lindsay, Ont., $12,400; George J. Wilson, Ottawa, Ont., $11,400; John Stewart, Ottawa, Ont., $14,800; Richard Tobin & J. C. O'Keefe, Ottawa, Ont. (together), $12,500; Henry Smith & John Heney, Ottawa (together), $9,917; H. Watters, Lindsay, Ont., $9,832; Robert Grant & Co., Toronto, $9,603; Charles Wynn, Peterborough, Ont., $8,300; Thomas Treleaver, Beaverton, Ont., $11,775; David Porter, Wiarton, Ont., $7,500; A. J. Belcher, Peterborough, and E. Thomson, Burleigh Falls (together), $10,570; John Burns, York, Ont., $11,490. The party who received the contract was David Porter, of Wiarton, the amount of his tender, $7,500, being the lowest. The hon. gentleman asks if the plans or specifications have been changed since the contract was let. Yes; the change has been caused by the construction of a block to fill in between the two outer blocks of the wharf, for the purpose of giving additional strength to the work at that point and the better shelter of vessels, and also an additional length of 50 feet of stone embankment required to place the outer end of the wharf in the depth of water stipulated in the contract. The additional cost is $830, which, with the amount of the contract, makes a total of $8,330.

INDIAN RESERVATION—BIRD ISLAND.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) asked, Was Sea Bird Island, B.C., set apart as an Indian reservation? If so, when, and in favour of what Band of Indians? Had said Band of Indians then another reservation? If so, was Sea Bird Island intended to be given in lieu of the one then occupied? And if so, why? Were any conditions attached to the exchange or grant? And if so, what were the conditions? Have they been complied with within the time limited, or since? Has any other disposition been made of said Island, or any part of it? If so, what? Has the said Island, or any part of it, been otherwise disposed of, granted, leased, or conveyed? If so, when, to whom, and on what conditions, and for what consideration? Have any white settlers located on said Island? If so, when? How many? Have their claims been recognized? If not, why not? Have such white settlers been removed from said Island? If so, by what authority and for what reason?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Sea Bird Island was set apart as an Indian reservation on the 13th June, 1879, for all the Indians between Cheam and Spuzzim. These Indians had other reserves, but Sea Bird Island was not intended to be given in lieu of any of them, but the Indian Reserve Commissioner for British Columbia reported, in connection with the allotment of this Island as a reserve, that the other reserves which those Indians had were for the most part poor soil, and that the Yale Indians in particular had no good land, and that some land had to be found for them. The conditions of the allotment were that if the Indians had not within six years from the date thereof used the land sufficiently, in the opinion of the Government of Canada, the unused portion was to cease to be Indian land; that is, that the allotment of the unused portion as an Indian reserve might be reconsidered. In 1888 the Indian agent for the locality reported that twenty-eight Indians had been in occupation of locations on the Island which had been cultivated by them for different periods ranging from one to thirteen years, and that some of their families resided on the Island. And that the work that had been obtainable by the Indians in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway had prevented more extensive and general cultivation of the land by the Indians, but that in future, that work having ceased, they must rely more upon the cultivation of their lands, which, without Sea Bird Island, would be insufficient. No other disposition had been made of said Island. No part of the Island has been disposed of, granted, leased, or conveyed. On the 10th February last the Department was informed that twenty squatters had settled upon the Island. Their claims have not been recognized, because the land was not available for settlement by white men. The white squatters were notified by the Indian agent, acting under authority of the Department, to leave, and they did so.

FISHING LICENSES—GRAND RIVER.

Mr. BROWN (Monck) asked, Whether the Government did, during the months of March and April, 1891, issue fishing licenses granting privilege to fish in the Grand River? And were such licenses issued at the village of Dunnville and in the County of Haldimand? If so, what is the date of the latest license issued, and for what term was it issued?

Mr. TUPPER. The Government issued no fishing licenses during the months of March and April, 1891, in the Grand River.

Mr. BROWN (Monck) asked, Did the Government, during the months of March and April, 1891, issue an order prohibiting fishing in the Grand River? If so, the date thereof?

Mr. TUPPER. An order was issued on the 23rd of March last, prohibiting fishing with seines in the Grand River.

Mr. BROWN (Monck) asked, Has the Government refunded any moneys to licensees collected for fishing privileges in the Grand River, or is it their intention so to do?

Mr. TUPPER. The Government has not refunded any moneys accompanying applications for fishing privileges in the Grand River. If it is decided to continue the prohibition against seine fishing after the expiry of the present close season (on the 15th of this month), these fees will, of course, be refunded.

Mr. BROWN (Monck) asked, Is it the intention of the Government that no fishing shall hereafter be done in the Grand River?

Mr. TUPPER. I have asked the superintendent of fish culture for a special report on this subject, and I will be in a position to answer the hon. gentleman before the expiry of the present close season.

SCHOONER *MARIE ELIZA*—SALE.

Mr. LANGELIER asked, Whether the Government has knowledge:—1. That, during the year 1887, the schooner *Marie Eliza*, belonging to one Philippe Caron, while in whose hands it had been seized by the collector of Customs at Rimouski, has been sold? 2. That it has been bought by one Pierre Pinault? 3. That the said Pierre Pinault only lent his name to the said collector of Customs at Rimouski, Mr. J. A. Martin, and that it is the said J. A. Martin who is the real owner of the said schooner? 4. That since the said schooner was in this way bought by the said Pierre Pinault, acting for the said J. A. Martin, it has been employed in the smuggling trade, for the benefit of the said J. A. Martin? Does the Government intend to take steps to put an end to the said smuggling, if it is proved that it was carried on by the said schooner? What are the names of the bidders and the purchaser at the sale of the said schooner? What was the price which was paid for it? And to whom was this price paid?

Mr. BOWELL. 1. In 1887 the schooner *Marie Eliza* was seized for smuggling, condemned and sold. 2. The auctioneer's return showed that the vessel was sold to one P. Pinault. 3. The department has no knowledge of Pinault having lent his name to J. A. Martin, nor has it any knowledge of Martin being the owner of the vessel. 4. The Government has no knowledge of the vessel having been used since for smuggling for the benefit of J. A. Martin, or any one else. 5. When it is ascercertained that the vessel is, or has been engaged in smuggling since her sale, all steps necessary for her capture and the stopping of smuggling, will be taken.

The department has no knowledge of who were bidders further than that it is stated in subsequent correspondence, that a Mr. Hudson, who held a mortgage on the vessel, was present at the sale and made bids: and that a Mr. Ringuet was present for the purpose of purchasing on account of Captain Lavoie, but the price obtained went beyond the limit he had placed upon it. The price paid was $200: that sum, less charges and expenses, was paid to the account of the Receiver General.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, as nothing but notices of motion will be in order before six o'clock, of making an intimation, for the convenience of the House, with regard to the first matter which will be on the Order paper this evening, if the House sits after six o'clock, and that is, the resumption of the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson). It may be convenient for the House to know what is proposed to be done with that subject, in order that any other business that may be ready, or that may be urgent, may not be delayed by the anticipation that that debate will necessarily be resumed. When this day was fixed for the resumption of that debate—last Wednesday, I think it was—the Premier's unfortunate illness was but slight, but now it has reached such a very serious stage that, as the House is aware, there is no hope of a favourable issue. The motion of the hon. member for Lanark is one which, if carried, would affect seriously the policy of the Government, in fact it invites the House to declare that a serious change in the fiscal management of the country should take place. Consequently, I feel bound to ask the House to suspend the discussion of that resolution until the issue of Sir John A. Macdonald's illness is known. According to the constitution, if that illness should result fatally, it would be necessary that other advisers should be called in by His Excellency, and under these circumstances it would not be reasonable that the House should proceed to fix an important question of policy of this kind, at such a critical moment. Therefore, we shall have to ask, if the House should sit after six o'clock, that the debate be further adjourned.

COMMISSIONER HERCHMER.

Mr. DAVIN. In regard to my motion respecting an enquiry into the conduct of Commissioner Herchmer, I intend to allow the motion to stand, with the consent of the Government and the House. It is the wish of the person whose conduct is being questioned to have these words added to the motion: "and generally into the conduct of Lawrence W. Herchmer from the date he became commissioner to the present time." I move accordingly.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have no objection to the addition being made to the motion as it appears on the Notice paper.

THE RIDEAU CANAL.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK moved for:

Return of all letters and memorials complaining of the high water in the Rideau Canal between Kingston and Jones' Falls: copies of letters from Colonel By and others, showing the depth of water allowed for vessels navigating the canal; a statement showing the average depth of water in the canal for the first forty years after construction, and for the last ten years: also for copies of plans and reports of engineers engaged on the survey of the Kingston Mill Level, showing the estimate of cost of lowering the water and the quantity of land to be reclaimed if the water is lowered.

He said: This motion has been standing for some time in the hope that the Minister of Railways would be in his place: but, under the circumstances, I move the resolution, and omit saying anything upon it, simply asking the House to adopt it.

Motion agreed to.

WRECK OF THE BARQUE *MERMERLY*.

Mr. FRASER moved for:

Correspondence with the Department of Marine respecting presentation of binocular glasses to the volunteers rescuing the crew of the barque *Mermerly*, lost on Roy's Island, Pictou County, in November last past.

He said: In November last the barque *Mermerly*, timber laden, was wrecked on Roy's Island, in the County of Pictou. The Department of Marine saw fit to order that binocular glasses should be given to six men who risked their lives in saving part of the crew. Those six men were commanded by Captain Graham, of New Glasgow, and, as might be expected when any deed of daring was to be performed, the majority of those who did the work were Liberals. The glasses were ordered by the department. Previous to the last election, I think, perhaps, eight or ten days or more, one of the parties, Mr. McGlashan, was presented with a pair of glasses at a public meeting, with some show of enthusiasm, by one of the candidates who was running in Pictou. Another, a native of the County of Richmond, received his glasses with the same formality, and the hon. member who now represents that county had the pleasure of showing the gratitude of the Government for the bravery displayed. The others have not, up to this date, or rather had not at the time of the date of this motion, received their glasses. Where they are, no one knows. They did not receive them before the election, nor did they after. In making this motion for papers in this connection, I wish to state that the English Royal Society were so impressed with the bravery of the men that it gave each a medal, and those medals were sent from England, and according to the correct custom, I think, followed in that country, they were sent direct to the collector of Customs and were handed to each of the brave men. I feel a little ashamed for my country that this recognition should come from England and be presented, before the recognition from Ottawa could be tendered to the brave men who performed these services; and brave men they are, for they risked their lives for their fellow-beings. My object in moving for these papers is to call the attention of the House to a system in the Department of Marine, which I think is a wrong one and which should be altered, namely, that these two glasses were presented during the heat of an election contest. The senior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), whom I do not see in the House at the present time, I understand, refused to make the presentation during the heat of an election, as he did not wish that the recognition for heroic services should be given during that time. I understand that this is

correct, but at all events I saw it so stated in the newspapers. Now, I believe that the department is not responsible for this. I am sure my hon. friend the Minister of Marine would not knowingly permit such a thing to occur, and I call the attention of the House to it to show that things are done without his cognizance which would not be done if he himself had knowledge of the fact. I submit that when brave men gallantly risk their lives, a recognition of their heroic conduct should not be made at election times, but if this system is to be carried out I submit that it should be carried to its full extent, and that all the men who are deemed worthy should be placed upon the same level and receive the recognition of their services at the same time.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection whatever to bringing down all the correspondence connected with this matter. It is only right, however, that I should say a word or two in reference to the subject which the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) has referred to. He has very kindly told me that his object in making this motion was to bring out the facts he has mentioned to the House, and I am glad of this, for I was previously at a loss to know what his object could be. The papers themselves will give definite information, but I may say, speaking from recollection, that, on the report of the collector at the port of Pictou, I gave, in the usual way, the order for procuring the binocular glasses for those heroic men who risked their lives to save the lives of others: and I take it, that in the usual course the orders were sent to England for these glasses. The department endeavours to keep a supply of suitable articles on hand for presentations in such cases, and when these events occur, the glasses, or perhaps a watch in some instances, are sent to an engraver for a suitable inscription. That causes some delay, but the principal delay in this case was, I believe, due to the fact that the department was out of a supply at that time. The hon. gentleman mentions that Mr. McGlashan received his glass some time ago, but I do not remember how that came to be. I never knew of the politics of these men, and I regret to say that I cannot remember the names of some of them. Dr. McLean and Captain Graham are two gentlemen whose names come to my mind at the present moment. I observed recently in a local paper in the county that these glasses were on exhibition in some window, so I take it that since the hon. gentleman received his information the glasses have arrived. Probably the reasons that the medals to which he alluded came more quickly from England, was that we had to send to England for the glasses, have the inscriptions made on them, and then send them to the different recipients. I am quite satisfied, however, that the correspondence will show that, so far as the department is concerned the usual course was adopted, namely, that on receipt of the report as to the services rendered and the heroism displayed, an order was given by the head of the department for these glasses to be procured and to be forwarded—as is the invariable course, not only in my own time, but in the time of all my predecessors in any Government—to a prominent man in the district to present them in the most public manner possible to the recipients on behalf of the Government. The question of good taste on the part of these hon. gentlemen is one about which there can be various opinions. It might be that some would say, that in the heat of an election it was not the time to make the presentation, but, on the other hand, in a district near "Roy's Island" it might be the very opportunity for obtaining a large audience from the surrounding district, to make the presentation for heroism at a public meeting called by both parties. I am quite satisfied that neither my colleague in the representation of the county (Mr. McDougald) nor the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Gillies) would at a public meeting of that kind endeavour to claim any particular credit for a political party in the distribution of these recognitions of bravery. In fact, I take it that these heroic men themselves thoroughly understood the principle upon which Parliament makes an appropriation every year out of which recognitions of this kind are granted. However, when the papers are laid before the House, the full facts will be disclosed.

Mr. FRASER. I forgot to mention the names of those brave men who earned this recognition. They are Mr. John McGlashan, of Merigomish: Mr. Boudrot, of Descousse: Dr. E. P. McLean, of New Glasgow: Mr. W. Williams, of New Glasgow: Mr. David Fraser, of New Glasgow: and Captain Peter Graham, of New Glasgow. I wish to say that it is somewhat strange that if the department sent the whole order to England, a large house in England should have sent two of the glasses before the others and that the presentation should have been made to two gentlemen who are supposed to have leanings in one direction. I would suggest that the department in future should send the order to England and get all the articles sent over here at the same time. I think it would be much better if the presentation was made simultaneously to the brave men who rendered these heroic services on the same occasion, so that some of them, who are equally brave with the others, may not be disappointed in not receiving the recognition of their services at the same time as the others.

Mr. TUPPER. I hope the House will not understand that I am stating positively that the reason for the delay was that the department was out of a supply of these articles at the time. On the contrary, I surmise that that is the reason which the papers will show. I have not looked into that particular point: I have merely made a guess, as it were, that the reason for the delay was that we were out of the supply: because I know that we do receive these glasses from England. I make no positive statement as to that: the papers will show.

Mr. McDOUGALD (Pictou). I regret that the hon. gentleman who has made this motion did not give me notice of his object in doing so, as I would have given him some explanation that would have satisfied him that this matter was dealt with properly, and with due regard to the worthy men who risked their lives on that occasion. In January last I received the following letter from the Department of Marine and Fisheries:—

"OTTAWA, 21st January, 1891.

"DEAR SIR,—I have sent to your address by express today five binocular glasses which I have great pleasure, as Minister of Marine, in awarding to the undermentioned persons in recognition of their humane and gallant exertions in the rescue of the shipwrecked crew of the barque *Merwerly* on the 14th of October last:—Capt. Peter Graham, of New Glasgow: David Fraser, of New Glasgow: Watkin Williams, of New Glasgow: Dr. E. P.

McLean, of New Glasgow; James McGlashan, of Merigomish. I will be obliged by your presenting these testimonials to the parties concerned in as public a manner as you deem it advisable, and inform me when presented."

The box did not arrive until some time afterwards, and as the parties lived in different parts of the county it was inconvenient to get them together so that the presentation of all the glasses might be made at the same time. There happened to be a large political gathering east of Merigomish, in a remote part of the county, at which the two political parties were present: my old opponent, Mr. Carmichael, was also there; and before the close of the meeting I made the presentation to Mr. McGlashan, stating that it was not a political act at all, but a recognition of his brave and gallant services on the occasion referred to. On one of the glasses there was no inscription, and one of the parties I could not ascertain the whereabouts of, and I had no further opportunity to collect these parties together at a convenient place during the heat of the contest, or before I had to leave the county to come here and take my seat in the House. I, therefore, sent the testimonials to the collector of Customs at New Glasgow, with a copy of the letter which I had received from the department, requesting him to deliver the glasses in the manner directed by the Department of Marine. I think that will be a sufficient explanation to satisfy the hon. gentleman that what has been done has been done in good faith, and with no political object.

Mr. FRASER. All I have to say in reply to the hon. gentleman is this——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FRASER. I only wish to say a word of explanation. I am glad to know that the hon. gentleman has made the explanation he has, and I have only to say in reply that Merigomish is much farther away from the home of the hon. gentleman than New Glasgow——

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid that this is not a personal explanation.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FRASER. I have only two or three words to say. If one of the glasses was defective in not having the name upon it, I wish to state that we have an excellent engraver in New Glasgow, who will compare favourably with any man in England in doing work of that kind. He is a Liberal. I wish further to say that those four men lived in New Glasgow, which is only five miles from the hon. gentleman's residence, and he had ample time in which to make the presentation. I am glad that his explanation is made, and that there will be an opportunity for it to be read in the county from which the hon. gentleman comes.

Motion to adjourn withdrawn, and motion agreed to.

BAY OF FUNDY FISHERIES.

Mr. BOWERS moved for:

Return of papers, correspondence, reports and other documents in the possession of the Government relating to the subject of the fisheries of the Bay of Fundy and its adjacent waters, during the past year, including the report of the conference of Fishery Officers held at Ottawa on the subject.

Mr. McDOUGALD (Pictou).

He said: Mr. Speaker, the County of Digby being one of the principal fishing counties bordering upon the Bay of Fundy, the people of that part of the Dominion are deeply interested in all that pertains to the preservation or destruction of their means of livelihood. Only a few years ago the people of our shores were not at a loss to obtain herrings for bait, by which they were enabled to ply their avocation of catching cod, pollock and other scaled fish in sufficient numbers to afford them profitable employment. Almost any season of the year, by simply setting their gill-nets, they would obtain not only a sufficient number for bait for their own use, but often sold large quantities to the fishing schooners that frequented our harbours. In those days our line fishermen worked from six to seven months of the year and lived comfortably. Now they work the whole year round and can hardly eke out a living. What is the reason of this? It is on account of the almost total failure of the herring fishery in the Bay of Fundy and its adjacent waters, and our fishermen believe, whether rightly or not, that the greatest if not the sole reason is the enormous and wanton destruction annually of thousands of hogsheads of small herrings on the southern shores of the coast of New Brunswick, and about the Grand Manan Islands. By means of weirs and traps, placed at almost every point, ledge and inlet, herrings in all sizes are taken in immense quantities. Large numbers are packed as smoked herrings and exported, while many are pickled and sold to the dealers in such goods. These industries will soon be extinct under the present destructive system. Under the old way of catching in gill-nets, only such sizes as were used were caught, but at the present time often thousands of barrels are taken, most of which being too small for use are either allowed to rot or pressed as fertilizers. Again, the sardine business takes many thousands of tons yearly of these very small fish, and if the weather is very hot—and a very little heat spoils them—immense quantities are thrown overboard and wasted. In this connection I will read a short extract from the Digby *Courier*, which came here yesterday, to show what takes place in Digby County:

"We are informed that quite large hauls of herring, too small for bait, are being taken from the weirs at Smith's Cove and the Joggin, and are being spread on the grass grounds and heaped up for compost. This, the fishermen complain, is a great injury to the herring fishery, and hope that our Fishery Overseer will look into the matter in time to protect their interests."

This you see, Mr. Speaker, is going on all the year round. Many thousands of tons, yearly, of these small fish are thus taken, and if the weather is very hot, the heat spoils immense quantities.

Mr. SPEAKER. I thought, when my hon. friend commenced his speech, that he was reading the motion, but I observed, when my attention was drawn to the fact, that he is reading his speech: and of course the hon. gentleman must know that is not permissible.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman is a new member and is entitled to the indulgence of the House: and I am sure the House will remember when we have had speeches read of four hours duration.

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course, I am not to be bound by what has occurred previously. The rule

as my hon. friend knows, is imperative, that written speeches cannot be delivered in the House. Of course, if the hon. gentleman is only reading extracts he has a perfect right to do so.

Mr. BOWERS. I am reading from extracts and copious notes. Some people argue that herrings are so plentiful they cannot be diminished by any means that man can invent. Such arguments I believe to be wrong, and in confirmation I will read an extract from the report of the Fisheries Department, 1890, as given by Lieutenant Andrew R. Gordon at page 22 of the Fisheries Report:

"The fall herring fishery was at one time one of the great fisheries of eastern Nova Scotia; it was from these fish that the food of the people was taken; but of late years this fishery has failed. One reason of the failure is, I believe, the excessive fishery on one spot or spawning ground. In the Bay of Fundy the fishermen now recognize the benefit accruing to them from the preservation of the spawning beds on Grand Manan. And I would strongly urge on your notice the advisability of protecting what I believe to be a similar spawning ground for the fall school of herring near the mouth of the St. Mary's River, Guysborough. This ground has, for several years past, been visited each fall by a regular fleet of vessels, some carrying as many as a hundred nets, and not only have they injured, not to say ruined, the fishery, but this mass of nets, brought from all parts of the coast, has prevented the local resident fishermen from getting a reasonable share in the catch.

"I would recommend that the area which can be swept by a radius of seven miles from Wedge Island light house be set apart as a spawning ground for herring, and that between the 15th day of September and the 15th day of November, no net shall be allowed to be set in the waters of said area, save by those holding licenses therefor, such licenses only to be issued to local resident fishermen, and quantity licensed not to exceed 1,000 square fathoms of net to each boat owned in the coast of the district so set apart. This amount of net will not interfere with the fish coming in, but will be sufficient to enable these local resident fishermen to get the food supply which they require for themselves and their families. I feel that I cannot too strongly urge on your notice the advisability of adopting, with the least possible delay, this measure of protection for a much depleted fishery.

"I cannot do better than close this part of my report with a quotation from the report of the Fisheries Commissioners of Newfoundland, who say: 'It is useless for mere theorists to tell us that fish is so prolific that they cannot be exterminated: that for some unknown causes fish come in plentiful some years, then become scarce, and after years of absence return in abundance: that we cannot calculate their erratic pelagic movements: that man cannot exhaust the great ocean. These specious, but utterly baseless theories, are confuted by the undeniable fact that in all our great bays the supply of cod has been steadily diminishing, never increasing, and that several of them are almost depleted, so that the fishermen are driven to other distant places in search of fish. For such a decline there must be causes. It is our part to search out and remove these causes and use remedial measures.'

"These words are as fully applicable to Canada as they are to Newfoundland. I have endeavoured in my work to find out the causes, and I have placed before you what I deem to be remedial measures."

This is simply on a line with the report of W. H. Venning, late Inspector of Fisheries, for 1886 and 1888, as regards the great destruction of mackerel and herring by means of the purse-seine. This is another way in which large quantities of fish not available for food are thrown away, being too small to be salted and saved for that purpose. I will also read a short extract from a report of Mr. John H. Pratt, of the Dominion steamship *Dream*:

"A large fleet of schooners each autumn moor in Three Island Harbour, Grand Manan, and set their nets in the surrounding waters. About forty schooners are anchored there and in its vicinity at the present time, and as pickled herring commands a good price, and the catch being good, our fishermen will be enabled to make a good fall's work.

"I write the foregoing to show how important this herring industry is to the fishermen of the Bay of Fundy, and what an immense quantity of fish are taken and packed by them during a season."

After Mr. Pratt had written this, the good fall's work which he predicted turned out to be a failure. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the herring fishery has been more uncertain year by year, until this last winter scarcely a herring has been seen, where, in former years, they were so plentiful. A wilful waste makes a woeful want in this case as in many others. Now, the failure of the herring simply means the gradual extinction of our cod, pollock, haddock, and other deep-sea fish, which follow the shoals of herrings in their passage into the bays and inlets of our own coast. Consequently these fish have been growing scarcer every year, until it seems that the Government should take hold of the matter and ascertain if some steps cannot be taken, not only to check the depletion of our fishing grounds, but to again, by wise legislation, place them in a condition whereby they may be a continual source of increasing wealth. There are spawning grounds for all kinds of fish about our coasts, and by preserving these natural hatcheries we are persuaded that our shores and bays would stand a better chance of being restocked than they would by the artificial hatcheries operated by the Government. I find no fault with the Government in this matter as they deal with it, as is reported by their inspectors, who, oftentimes, having eyes see not, and having ears hear not, those things detrimental to the rules and regulations of the Fishery Department. As to the preservation of the lobster fishery, there are so many ways of looking at it, that I recognize the Government will always have difficulty in enacting laws to suit every section. However, I think that the department should not have a cast-iron rule applicable to all localities. In the waters of the Bay of Fundy, owing to so much windy and stormy weather in the spring months, the season for catching should be extended until 1st August, as July is, undoubtedly, the best month for the fishing, and also one of pecuniary profit, the lobster, during that month, bringing a better price in the American market. Our fishermen would be well pleased with the enactment of a law prohibiting the catch of any lobster under 10½ inches, realizing that all taken under that size are not to their pecuniary advantage; and in a short time these small ones would be large enough to send to the Boston market, and would thus bring a much greater price. Mr. Speaker, I have given a few ideas, as they prevail in our county; and if the Government, instead of appointing commissioners to go out to Scotland and other parts of Europe, to find out how to preserve and salt the herrings, would appoint a commission to try and obtain information whereby the herrings and other fish can be saved from extinction, I think that it would be far worthier, and would merit the lasting gratitude of the hard-working fishers of our shores.

Mr. HAZEN. In moving the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, I called the attention of the Minister of Marine to the condition of the herring fishery in the Bay of Fundy, and I pointed out that the impression among the fishermen, whether right or wrong, was, that this was due to the operation of the brush weirs. Since then I have received a letter from a practical fisherman in my constituency, bearing on the subject, and it might not be improper for me to read that letter. It is as follows:—

"DEAR SIR,—You wanted me to give you an account of the failure of our fisheries, and as I follow the fishing solely for a living, and as there are hundreds affected as I am, I will give you the facts as they are. First, let me say that the brush weirs are the chief cause, as they destroy all the young herring that frequent our waters, thereby robbing our waters of all the food for all other kinds of fish; and as an instance of this, there is used in Eastport alone, 500 hogsheads daily, besides great quantities destroyed in Grand Manan and other places along the north shore and used for manure and pumice, thereby cutting off the supplies as soon as they breed. In proof of this, say 10 or 15 years ago, since they began to fail, that is, our large herring, there was one man, a Mr. Thomas, told me he had shipped eleven million frozen herring, and the season not over then. Besides, there were twenty other buyers. Eight or ten years ago, I saw coming out of St. Andrew's harbour alone, one day, 25 sail of vessels all loaded with frozen herring, carrying from two to six hundred thousand apiece, besides other vessels loading in Beaver Harbour, Blisses and Lepreaux; and since then, there has been a gradual falling off, so that now it is a total failure. We used to own at that time in Carleton 30 sail of fishing vessels, large and small. They have all gone into decay or been sold but one or two, besides mine, and they are laid up decaying. I am prepared to prove, whenever you fish with nets, they are a benefit instead of an injury to the fishing ground. Thirty or forty years ago, when they had the privilege of fishing at the southern head of Grand Manan, they used to have to watch their nets for fear of getting too many fish in them. Now, these last ten years you would not get any. There is not the first sign of any fish there in the proper season, that is, spawn fish. I would recommend that that should be enquired into. I cannot estimate the loss we have suffered from the failure of our fishing, when we consider there were hundreds of our people along our shores engaged in it besides the merchants who supply them. I hold the overseers responsible for the weirs, in recommending the erection of them to the Government and having them protected by law, and a great many of them are owned by the men who own the sardine factories in Eastport, and the most of our people only get enough out of them to keep soul and body together. I would say, sweep every weir out of existence and let every man take his lawful nets, and our fishing would soon return. The best proof I can give you of this is, that I would not be surprised to hear that the Government would be called upon to help the people living along our shores and islands, as there is already great distress among them for the lack and failure these three years of our fishing. I also wish to state that there is another great evil; that is, trawling for lobsters around the Nova Scotia shores, which the herring frequent to spawn, and it drives them off and they are forced to spawn in places where the spawn perishes. There is another injustice to the fishermen; that is, the law governing what they call the spawning ground of Grand Manan. It is only a sham, and should be taken off, as it was only made for the inhabitants, and to keep off all other fishermen. We are indebted to the Nova Scotia shore, I might say from Cape Sable to the head of the Bay of Fundy, for all of our young herring, for that is the breeding ground for them. Years ago our bay used to be alive with them, and all kinds of fish would be feeding on them. Nowadays you will hardly see any. Their course was always for the north shore where there were harbours, bays and inlets to take shelter in; so you see how easy it is for the weirs, that are built in every place they can put one, and a great many weirs lie idle. The owners do not take the fish out of these hundreds of hogsheads, and when we consider that it would take 100,000 of the smallest fish to fill a hogshead, you can have an idea how great the destruction is. There is this fact to bear in mind—they will try to make you believe that the Americans will catch them all on their side of the water, but do not believe them, although it would be as well to have an understanding with the American Government about it."

I read this letter because it has been sent to me by a practical fisherman, one who has been engaged in the fishing industry for the last twenty or twenty-five years, one who understands the matter with which he deals. From matters which have been brought to my attention by the fishermen there, it is evident that the herring fishing industry in the Bay of Fundy, which is a very important industry, has fallen off in comparison with what it was in past

years, and I would again call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who has always taken a deep interest in the preservation of the fisheries, to the effect the brush weirs have, not only on the herring, but on the other fisheries in the Bay of Fundy which follow the herring. I would ask him to instruct the officers of his department to make a thorough investigation, and, if they report that the brush weirs are doing this injury in the Bay of Fundy, I would urge that regulations should be passed to cause this injury to cease.

Mr. SKINNER. I wish to give evidence as to the herring industry in the Bay of Fundy. That is a very important industry and one in which a large number of people are interested. The fishing season is, to a large extent, in the winter, and, therefore, a business which a large number of people have grown up to consider one from which they get their subsistence, is entirely swept away. A few years ago estuaries of the Bay of Fundy were, so to speak, crowded with herring which came there to their natural spawning ground. It seems to be the home of the herring, but they seldom visit there now, and, consequently, great loss has accrued to the fishermen of that locality and great injury has been done. It may possibly be that the fishermen may be mistaken as to what causes the destruction of the fisheries, but, whether they are or not—and upon that point a non-practical person cannot express a very decided opinion—the Department of Fisheries could, by having the necessary enquiries made, ascertain what has caused the depletion of that most valuable fishery in that part of the country. The sardine factories in that part of the State of Maine which fronts on the Bay of Fundy have been alluded to, and, of course, they consume a large quantity of these small herrings. Of course they are called sardine factories, but, as a matter of fact, they are not sardine factories at all. The sardine is a particular species of fish, and they only call the small herrings sardines, because they resemble them in appearance when they are caught. By taking so large a quantity of the small herring and using them at the time they do, they destroy to a great extent the productiveness of the fisheries, which suffer great and permanent loss. I think it is time for the Government to consider how far it may be right that those people carrying on that business along the line of the State of Maine, should be allowed to destroy these young fish, even though they make money out of the operation, if the destruction of those fish is going to lead to the final extermination of herring in the Bay of Fundy. Therefore, in any way in which the matter may be looked at, it is of the utmost importance to hundreds of people, to a great many families along the shore, as has been remarked by the hon. gentleman who preceded me, that something should be done in their interest. There can be no question that if the herring fishery on that portion of the Bay of Fundy is destroyed, it will lead to the destruction of the larger fish that come and feed upon the herring, because if the herring are destroyed, they have nothing left to feed upon; consequently this question involves not only the herring fishery itself, but the cod fishery and other fisheries as well, and they are all very valuable resources to the population of that part of the province. I hope, therefore, that not only will this House

be impressed with the necessity of having this matter enquired into, but that the Department of Fisheries will take it up, and, after an investigation, that it will apply such remedy as may be necessary for the preservation of those fisheries, so valuable to that part of our country.

Mr. FORBES. I second this motion with a great deal of pleasure, but I must say that I am surprised to learn from the two members from St. John, that such a terrible indictment can be presented to this House against the Government on the question of the fisheries in the Bay of Fundy. We have it from their own mouths that the fisheries on that part of the coast of Nova Scotia have almost been depleted. Surely the Minister of Marine cannot, or will not, say that his attention has not been drawn to this matter; his reports are full of it. The mover of this resolution, the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Bowers), has stated that these officers, either under instructions or otherwise, shut their eyes to what is going on. They may do so, or they may not; all we know is that the state of facts as presented by the junior member for St. John and his colleague, actually exists to-day. I am grieved to know that such is the case, and more especially because that portion of the coast of Nova Scotia is particularly adapted for the prosecution of this great industry of supplying bait. Lately we have had an interference on the part of this Government with the Government of Newfoundland, there having been negotiations between that Government and the home Government, and also that of the United States, as a result of which our fishermen are to-day excluded from the privileges of the Newfoundland bait market. In all reason, we should have an opportunity of looking to our own bait grounds to supply any deficiency, and the very moment our attention is turned to the subject, the fishermen are driven to seek new markets in which to purchase bait. It has now been forced upon the attention of the Government that these grounds are completely exhausted. The Minister of Marine may not personally have been aware of this, but his officers are aware of it, and although this may be the first time that any supporter of the Government has so strongly brought it to his notice, I trust it will not be very long before he will turn his attention to the matter and apply a remedy. We were told during the late campaign that our fisheries were to be given away to the Americans, that they would come in and destroy them and take whatever they could get for the mere trouble of taking them. In relation to that I may say that wherever I had the pleasure of addressing my constituents, I impressed upon them the fact that while such might be the case, the Americans would always have to give us a *quid pro quo*, that they could come and take these fish if they desired, but only upon condition that they opened their markets to our fish, and they could only catch these fish subject to restrictions and regulations imposed by the Government of Canada. I think that when the Government imposes these restrictions, and protect the fisheries as they should be protected, not by a mere phantom ship floating around the coast, but by some effective means, when this is done I really believe that that industry will largely develop and be much more profitable to the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. TUPPER. There is no objection, so far as I am concerned, in adopting this resolution. I would ask the hon. mover and seconder of the resolution, however, to consent to add the word "herring" before the word "fisheries," merely for the purpose of making the motion definite. I have no objection to bringing down any information the hon. gentlemen desire on any other subject, but as the motion now reads it is slightly ambiguous:

"Return of papers, correspondence, reports and other documents in possession of the Government relating to the subject of the fisheries in the Bay of Fundy, &c."

As the subject relates chiefly to the herring fishery, to which the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Bowers) confined himself, I make that suggestion.

Mr. FORBES. The word "fisheries" occurs twice; before which one does the hon. Minister wish to insert the word "herring?"

Mr. TUPPER. In the phrase "relating to the subject of the fisheries." I may say that this subject has engaged the attention of my department for a long time, but the solution of such a subject I need not tell those hon. gentlemen who have had greater experience than I in connection with the matter, is a very difficult thing indeed. The fishermen differ among themselves upon the means that should be employed to remedy the state of affairs alluded to by the officers of the department, and the hon. members for St. John have shown how far apart these views are. For instance, the moment that we attempt, as we have already attempted, to prevent the great injury being done by the erection and operation of brush weirs for herring fisheries, where these weirs were, as heretofore, placed on the spawning ground of the herring, by reducing the number of weirs, at once there springs up a cry among those fishermen who are not able to obtain permission to work and operate one of those brush weirs, that there is a monopoly in favour of the few who do the work. The owners of the weirs assert that the nets are the cause of the trouble, that they are not limited to the day time, that they are in the water day and night, and that, consequently, we have the destruction that is going on. I may say that the subject of the habits of fish for the last hundred years, has been debated with great interest in the mother country, and men who have given a lifetime to the subject are still trying to ascertain how far, in reference to the herring, we can assist in the preservation of that industry, and how far it is proper to interfere with these different fishing engines. But the Fisheries Department and those connected with it know well when a measure of relief is proposed in any of these directions, very great opposition is met with, the fishermen as a whole objecting to the slightest interference with them in their attempts to obtain from the sea as much as possible of the article in which they wish to deal. In addition to what may be found in the Fisheries Report, I may say I have since made an inquiry, and I am not at all satisfied that I see my way clear at present to take any other course than that we are now pursuing, namely, keeping the spawning grounds as free as possible from fishing engines of any kind. The herring and mackerel spawn near shore, and we can localize those places. Hitherto, it has not been the habit of the department to specially guard those grounds. Many of the officers feel that it is not necessary to further interfere with the opera-

tions of the fishermen, so far as herrings are concerned, except in that direction. However, the various officers to whom I have referred the matter have not agreed among themselves, and their reports are being carefully considered and will receive the closest attention. I am glad to obtain the views of hon. members coming from the fishing districts, upon this subject, and I am sure they realize the great difficulty in the way of arriving at a satisfactory settlement of the question. Even in the report of Captain Pratt, to which reference has been made, it will be seen how contradictory are the arguments used. For instance, great objection is taken to the sardine fishery, which is a very large industry in the Bay of Fundy, and an enormous number of people obtain their entire living from that industry, and to stop that suddenly would be in no way justified unless we had ample proof that that was the root of the evil. Captain Pratt, a man with great experience, a man who is sailing there constantly, takes a different view, and is of the opinion that it is not necessary to adopt such stringent measures. He also alludes in that report to the various conditions regarding the fisheries with which we have to do. I have not had the advantage yet of carefully considering the report of the fishery officers of the different districts. They did not conclude their labours until the beginning of the Session, and I have not had the opportunity of gaining that knowledge which I hope to obtain from a study of their views on the subject. Meanwhile, we will gather all the information possible.

Mr. GILLMOR. The Minister of Marine is, no doubt, aware that great difference of opinion exists in regard to matters connected with fishing, and more especially in regard to herring fishing. It is all very well to have the fisheries protected, but it will be useless if, as a result, the fishermen cannot get any fish. With respect to the weirs, I fail to understand how they exhaust the fisheries. If large quantities of fish come into the weirs and there is no market for the catch, they are not taken. No fisherman takes out of his weir a quantity of herring unless he can sell them; and this is a matter about which there is no doubt. As to the protection of the spawning ground of herring, it must be remembered that herring spawn wherever the water is shoal enough and warm enough. Figuratively speaking, the ocean is full of herring, but if they do not come to a certain spot at a certain time, then, by some means, they are thought to be exhausted. With respect to the winter fishing, the senior member for St. John (Mr. Skinner) spoke as if the winter fishing had been in operation for a very long time. I remember very well when there were no herring whatever taken in winter. It is an industry of comparatively recent date, for only during the last twenty or twenty-five years have herring been taken in the Bay of Fundy, a market being found with Gloucester vessels, who come there to buy frozen herrings for bait or for food. Last winter the herring did not come into the bay in any quantities, and there was, comparatively speaking, no winter herring taken except in a sheet of water on the south side of Grand Manan, Dark Harbour. A few fish went through a narrow passage into that harbour, but where the rest of the school went it is impossible to tell. I have been on Grand Manan and have found that the habits of the fish are hard to understand. One fisherman has one theory, and another fisherman another theory, but the united opinion of those most experienced is that the ocean is full of herring, not only for the use of man, but for the fish of the sea. The department talk about protecting the spawning ground two or three miles around Grand Manan, at a cost of $200 or $300, but fishermen and those acquainted with marine matters know that herring spawn at certain seasons all along the shore. Cod, hake, pollock and haddock all live at certain seasons on the spawn of the herring, and although the herring may not come to a certain spot to be caught every year, yet I have no fear of the herring fishery being exhausted, and I fail to understand how we can improve the condition of the fishermen by preventing men obtaining their living out of the catches of their weirs and their seines. The man who has a weir thinks it does no harm to the fishing, while a man who does not possess a weir thinks it does a great deal of harm, and the man who has no weir, and so takes a net or seine may be stopped by an Order in Council issued at the instance of the Fisheries Department. Altogether, this is a most perplexing question, and I have no doubt the Department have done all they can do. It would never answer to stop the great industry of sardine fishing. And why should the Department stop it? No man takes out of his weir sardines unless he can sell them. I have known a man take $1,500 worth in half-a-day out of a weir. The herring of that particular school seemed to find their way into his little pen, and they were caught. Doubtless millions were outside. In my opinion, not one herring in a million that come into the Bay of Fundy is caught, but for some reason the herring did not come into the bay to any extent last winter. The movements of the fish of the sea, particularly the herring, constitute a mystery, and we cannot understand them. Fishermen have various theories on the subject. I heard an experienced fisherman say that during the early part of the winter there were heavy northern gales which carried the food on which these great schools of herring feed, off shore, and, as the herring followed the food, they did not come into the bay. That is a very reasonable conjecture. There is no evidence that the small herring taken for the sardine business is the same as is taken in winter, that it grows to be the herring of which the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Skinner) spoke. That is all matter of conjecture. It is the idea of some fishermen that the fishing was destroyed because the spawning ground had not been protected, and the young herring had been killed, and, therefore, the large winter herring were not caught. But the weirs might be empty one week and the next week be bursting with fish. So it is almost impossible to know how to deal with the question. The Minister seems to have the idea that he can protect the spawning grounds. Well, he has got to protect hundreds of miles of coast if he is going to protect every spot where herrings leave their spawn. I have seen the fishermen, particularly when they used the hemp ropes for their boats, bringing them up in the morning when the herrings were spawning, covered from one end to the other with herring spawn. The only thing I fear is that perhaps the herring, for some reason or other, may take their departure from the coast. For instance, there were plenty of herrings this last winter in Newfoundland, while

there were none to speak of in the Bay of Fundy or around that coast. I do not believe that the Minister of Marine in this or any other Government will stop the people from catching herrings so long as it does not destroy the herring fishery. My own impression is, that the Department is doing the best it can under the circumstances; they may protect the lobster and some other fisheries, but in regard to stopping people from taking herrings I am sure they will never adopt any such plan. The winter fishing is very important indeed, but these gentlemen who say that the herring fishing industry is principally carried on in the winter know very little about the matter. Nearly all the smoked herrings produced in the Dominion of Canada are produced in the county I represent. We prepare from a million and a half to two million boxes annually in that county. These herrings are taken in the summer time and not in the winter, for they do not prepare smoked herrings in winter. They are a class of herring a little larger than sardines, and the winter herrings are larger still. In the Bay of Fundy we take herrings of some kind or another all the year round, and at all times that a man can work out of doors. It is difficult to arrive at what is the right thing to do, but I do not attempt to say that we must be so anxious to protect the fisheries as not to allow fishermen to catch fish, and to catch them in the way they can make most out of them. Of course fishermen themselves differ on this point, and I know the conflict of opinion must be perplexing to the Minister of Marine, who has got to exercise his best judgment on the matter. I believe the hon. gentleman will do the best he can, but I hope he will not attempt to prevent the people catching small herrings or sardines, simply because there were no herrings in the Bay of Fundy last winter.

Mr. BOWERS. It is not only during the last winter that the herring fishery has been a failure in the Bay of Fundy, but it is well known that year by year, spring, summer, autumn, winter and all the year round, the herrings are growing scarcer there. For three winters now scarcely any herrings have been taken in the Bay of Fundy in the winter time. Herrings have been destroyed there in immense quantities. Tons and thousands of tons of herrings are used, and have been used, as fertilizers, a statement of which I saw corroborated in the Digby *Courier* with reference to the herring taken in Smith's Cove, Digby County. There should be some law made that these herrings should not be allowed to be used as fertilizers, and in my opinion the entire fishery along the Bay of Fundy should not be destroyed for the sake of allowing a few persons near Eastport and Dear Island on the Bay of Fundy to catch sardines. It is well enough for the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) to talk in this way; I suppose his constituents wish him to do so, but he knows just as well as the rest of us that the herring fishery and the other fisheries have been failing for years because of the immense quantities of fish destroyed for fertilizing purposes.

Mr. KAULBACH. I do not wish to speak discouragingly in regard to the method of catching the small fish, but I do believe that it is an injury to the general fisheries of the coast. The small fish are taken by these weirs, and they are in a measure destroyed and cannot continue to be a source of profit. It would be well if legislation could be adopted which would in some way provide that the small fish should escape and the large fish remain. I do not wish to "wear" the House further by dwelling upon this "scaly" subject, and, therefore, I will allow the remarks as far as I am concerned to drop.

Motion agreed to.

COPYRIGHT LAWS OF CANADA.

Mr. EDGAR moved for:

Copies of all correspondence between the Imperial Government and the Government of Canada, on the subject of the Copyright Laws of Canada, and all other papers relating thereto, not already brought down.

He said: Mr. Speaker, for a good many sessions I have been trying to interest the House and the country in the copyright question, not only because there were a number of radical evils connected with the existing condition of the law, but because I felt that there was involved in it a very large question affecting the constitutional rights of Canada, the rights of Canada to legislate for itself, and the rights of Canada to self-government. When I first introduced this question to the House, I must admit that I did not receive very much encouragement from the Treasury benches. In 1885, when I brought the matter up first, I proposed an Address of the House to Her Majesty on the subject, and I remember very well that the Minister of Militia expounded the view of the Administration on that occasion, and he told me, in reply to my observations, that he could not agree in the conclusion that the law as it exists is anomalous or unfair to anybody or to any interest in the country, and the motion I proposed was killed by the adjournment of the debate. I persevered further, and in 1886 I took another course and proposed a committee of the House to enquire into this somewhat complicated matter, but that also was killed by the adjournment of the debate, proposed, I think, by the Minister of Public Works on behalf of the Government, and his excuse then was that the Berne Convention was in session trying to bring matters to a favourable conclusion on the subject of International Copyright. In 1887, I again drew the attention of the House to the matter, and I was told that the question was an important one, and that it was under consideration. Again, in 1888, I ventured to bring it up, and I was again told that it was under consideration. In 1889 I proposed to move an Address to the Crown on the subject, when the Minister of Justice explained to me that his contentions on the subject were what I would consider to be exceedingly satisfactory ones, and that he proposed, not only to introduce legislation on the subject in this House correcting the admitted evils, but also to press upon the Imperial Government the absolute right of the Parliament of Canada to legislate on the subject. Well, Sir, he did introduce that legislation, and on the whole, I think the Act of 1889 is a satisfactory Act. But that Act is not in force; it provided that it should not come into force until a proclamation should be issued by the Government. That proclamation has not yet been issued, and I would be very glad to hear all the reasons for the delay, although I think I know some of them. The Act of 1889 was, I believe, an exceedingly moderate and fair piece of legislation. All it did was to give the

Canadian Government power under certain circumstances to issue a license to Canadian publishers to publish British copyright works. The circumstances under which that license would be issued were these: In case an author should not take out a Canadian copyright, either before or simultaneously with taking out his English copyright, and in case the book is not printed and published in Canada within one month thereafter, then the Canadian Government might issue a license to a Canadian publisher to print and publish the work. But the Act provides, and, I think, amply provides, for the interests of the British author. It provides that the publisher, who is authorized to publish a work here, shall give security satisfactory to the Government for the payment of 10 per cent. of the retail price to the author; and so far as I can learn, that is about as much as any ordinary author, unless he is a man of celebrity and fame, can get from a publisher who takes the risk and expense of publishing his book, and that is exceedingly reasonable and fair. Now, why has that Act not been brought into force? I think I partly know. Last session the hon. Minister of Justice laid on the Table of the House a return containing correspondence which he had with the Imperial Government on this subject, in which he contended that under the British North America Act this Parliament had the absolute right to pass that law, and further, what most people here believe, that when the British North America Act gave the Parliament of Canada the exclusive right to legislate upon a number of subjects, including the subject of copyright, it meant that we could absolutely deal with copyright in Canada without reference to the Imperial Parliament. As far as I can make out, the hon. Minister of Justice has not been able yet to convince the English Government that his position is correct, and he has informed them that he is awaiting their pleasure and their assent before the Canadian Government issues the proclamation to bring the Act into force. Now, Sir, even if it were true that we have not the legal right to pass this law, still, the least that the Imperial Parliament could be asked to do would be to pass such legislation as would place within our control unequivocally and distinctly the absolute right to legislate on this subject. Now, Sir, the motion which I propose to make is for papers which have not already been brought down. I do not know whether the Government took the press into their confidence intentionally or not, but I think they must have done so. In the *Empire* of Monday, the 29th December, 1890, I find what purports to be a copy of a despatch from the hon. Minister of Justice to Lord Knutsford on this subject. I suppose that among the papers to be brought down in answer to this motion we shall find this correspondence, and I hope a good deal more, bringing the question to a successful issue; but I only refer to this correspondence in the *Empire* for the purpose of calling the attention of the House to some expressions in it with which I entirely and absolutely concur. The hon. Minister in it says that he desires to express to the Colonial Secretary:

"In the strongest terms which can be used with respect to the dissatisfaction of the Canadian Government and Parliament with the present state of the law of copyright as applicable to Canada, and to request most earnestly from Her Majesty's Government that they will apply a remedy, either by giving approval to a proclamation to bring the Canadian Act of 1889 into force, or by promoting legislation in the Parliament of Great Britain to remove any doubt which may exist as to the power of the Parliament of Canada to deal with this question fully."

Notwithstanding the answer that was given to me in 1885 on behalf of the Government, the hon. Minister of Justice seems to have discovered that this grievance, which still exists to-day, had been existing for forty years, because in another part of this paper he goes on to say:

"After a lapse of more than forty years, I am charged with the duty of reminding your lordship that the promise contained in that despatch of Earl Grey has never been fulfilled, and respectfully to ask its fulfilment at the hands of your Government. The lapse of time which has intervened, has strengthened ten-fold every one of the reasons which induced it to be made."

I concur with him there again, Sir. In another place he says:

"Your Lordship cannot be surprised that after Earl Grey's promise more than forty years ago, and after more than twenty-two years of agitation on the part of Canada, by Addresses from both branches of our Parliament, by memoranda from our Ministers of Finance and Agriculture, by Minutes of Council and by statutes passed unanimously in both Houses, introduced by three successive Governments, representing opposite political opinions, and with encouragements held out at every stage of the agitation to expect a reasonable and favourable consideration of our representation by Her Majesty's Government: the Canadian Government believed in 1889 that the Act then passed to give effect to what had so often been asked for, to what had never been refused, and to what had been recommended by the highest authorities in Great Britain, after most mature deliberation, should receive a favourable consideration at the hands of Her Majesty's Government, when the Government of Canada asked for the assent of Her Majesty's Government to the issue of a proclamation to bring it into force."

Now, I do not quarrel with the views of the hon. the Minister of Justice. On the contrary, I applaud them and concur in them: but he says himself that most able papers from Canada, Addresses from Parliament and everything else, have been hurled at Downing street on the subject, and nothing has been done. As far as the House knows, there is no answer to the strong representations made by this House, and to the legal arguments presented by the hon. Minister of Justice. What I would ask the hon. gentleman to do is to take this House into his confidence, and ask us, by way of Address or remonstrance to the Imperial Government or the Queen, to bring before the Imperial Parliament this matter and let them understand that this House and country are perfectly in earnest. I am sure there will then be no more pigeon-holing in this important matter, but that our rights of self-government will be conceded to us.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I agree with the hon. gentleman that the Act of 1889 on this subject was a perfectly fair measure, that it preserved all the rights of authors to as full an extent as they deserved protection, and that it was necessary to the Canadian interests involved. I have not changed my opinion in the slightest degree, and can say the same for every member of the Government, as to the justice of that measure and the necessity of pressing its coming into force. The Act was immediately communicated to Her Majesty's Government, in view of the provision it contained that it should only come into force when proclaimed. The House will readily conceive that in dealing with a very important interest of that kind—an interest in respect of which Her Majesty's Government had entered into negotiations and formed ties with foreign powers—it

was necessary we should adopt one of two courses: it was necessary we should either have the Act reserved for Her Majesty's assent, or that it should contain a suspensory clause providing for its coming into force only when proclaimed. We adopted the latter course as more suitable, and immediately communicated the Act to Her Majesty's Government, with the wish that we should be informed, as soon as possible, that it pleased Her Majesty's Government to issue a proclamation bringing it into force. Among the correspondence already brought down is an Imperial despatch indicating that Her Majesty's Government were not pleased that a proclamation should issue to bring the Act into force. Two years ago it became my duty to set out at large the reasons which should prevail upon Her Majesty's Government to approve a measure of that kind. Soon afterwards a visit, perhaps of a semi-official character, was made to this country by Mr. Daldy, who represents the interests of the authors and copyright holders in Great Britain, and who has been for a number of years the honorary secretary of the association of authors and copyright holders there. I do not for the moment remember what the name of the association is, but I think it is the Authors' Association. Mr. Daldy had interviews with the First Minister and myself, and other members of the Government, and I had an opportunity of bringing him into conference with a number of our own publishers, who were able to discuss with him the bearings of this question on the publishing trade of Canada. I was present at that conference, and I was never more convinced of the fairness of the provisions of the Act of 1889 and of the necessity of its coming into force than I was when I heard the discussion which then took place. I have not in the slightest degree changed the opinion I expressed to the House, when promoting the Bill, as to our right, under the British North America Act, to legislate in the lines of the Act of 1889. It is unfortunate for us—and that is the only way I can express it, being very strong in my opinion of the legal ground on which the Act is based—that the interests of British authors in the United Kingdom have been paramount, not only as regards legislation, but as regards judicial and legal interpretation on the other side as well; and the result has been that powers which are conceded to us by legal opinion and by judicial decision in the highest courts of that country, as regards every other subject placed within our charge by the British North America Act, are denied to us when it comes to a question of the mode in which the interests of authors living in the United Kingdom are to be dealt with in Caanda. It is no fault of ours that the Act has not been promulgated, but it is due to an unfortunate method of construction, or an unfortunate accident of construction, which we must do our best to get rid of. We thought the best way and the shortest way was to adopt the Act of 1889. Challenging discussion as to our right to pass the Act, I insisted, as we shall do, that if we had not the right under the British North America Act, we should have the right conferred on us as soon as possible. Now, following the visit of Mr. Daldy, there were several other despatches leading, I am sorry to say, to a very unfavourable result as regards the expression of opinion—the apparently final opinion—of Her Majesty's Government on this subject. The House is aware that the Berne convention had only then been recently concluded; and the adoption of legislation of this kind by this Parliament seemed to the minds who control this subject in Great Britain, the untying of the cord which bound up the union of nations under the Berne convention. For that reason Her Majesty's Government were very reluctant to accede to our wish, and the immediate reason assigned was that legislation was about to be introduced into the United States in the direction of the Berne convention, and Her Majesty's Government were opposed to putting our Act in force while there was hope that the Congress of the United States would follow the example of the United Kingdom and adopt a liberal Copyright Act. But, in the course of last summer, I had the opportunity of pressing this matter on the attention of the Secretary of State for the Colonies and some other members of the Imperial Government, and I think the hon. gentleman, when he comes to see the papers which we can lay on the Table in response to his motion, and when he hears the explanations I have to make, will not persist in the conclusion either that we have been dilatory in pressing this subject on the attention of the Home Government, or that our representations in past years have been simply pigeon-holed in the Colonial Office. The fact is that the current of opinion and interest in the mother country has been dead against the current of opinion and interest in this country, and I do not hesitate to say, even as a member of the Administration, that the time has come when we will insist that the interests of our own people shall be considered and that, while giving due consideration to the rights and the interests of others, this country shall not be kept a close preserve for authors or publishers in any other country, but that this Parliament shall regulate the laws on this, as it does on any other subject within our jurisdiction. The substance of the interviews which I had with the Colonial Secretary would, perhaps, be to long too detain the House with this afternoon, but the result was that I obtained permission to lay before Lord Knutsford the letter which the hon. gentleman has quoted from the Toronto press. It is true that that letter was given to the press of both sides of politics in December last, and the reason was that there had appeared in the London press, extracts from that letter and criticisms of it which were calculated to put public opinion in possession of one side of the case only; and we, therefore, thought it proper that public opinion in this, as well as the mother country, should be addressed by any argument in which we could show how Canadian interests were involved. I think I have a right to say that we fully expect and fully believe that one of two results will be reached, and that before long. We believe that Her Majesty's Government will consent to the issuing of the proclamation which will bring the Act of 1889 into force, or that Her Majesty's Government will promote such legislation in the Imperial Parliament as will settle any question as our authority as to pass legislation of this kind. The hon. gentleman has quoted Earl Grey's promise from my letter, and I may say that that promise which is there referred to was solemnly made in the name of Her Majesty's Government no less than forty years ago, and I may say further that Mr. Daldy, who has been the principal authority against us, and Lord Knutsford himself signed the report of the Royal

Commission on this subject, recommending just such an Act as we passed in 1889, and, when I was asked to try and convince Mr. Daldy, I said it was a work of supererogation because I had a report in favour of the proposal, signed by Mr. Daldy's own hand. Of course these papers will be brought down. When I left England I had reason to hope that during the present session of the Imperial Parliament an Act would have been laid before that Parliament to give effect to our Act of 1889, if Her Majesty's Government should not think that without such an Act it could issue that proclamation. It is always easy, I am sorry to say, to account for delay in Imperial legislation, in consequence of the multitude of urgent measures which must be brought forward in that Parliament, and the vast amount of difficulty and delay in pushing through legislation there; but if I should be disappointed in that hope and should find reason to believe that we shall not have legislation in the Imperial Parliament during this session, I shall take steps to bring about an Address from both Houses of this Parliament in favour of the ratification of that Act taking place, or its being brought into force by proclamation. I have not thought it expedient to advise the adoption of that course so far, because, in 1889, to say nothing of what took place before 1889, this Act which is the subject of discussion to-day was unanimously passed by both Houses of this Parliament, and it seemed to me to be adding an unnecessary effort for both Houses of this Parliament to address Her Majesty's Government on the subject of giving effect to an Act which, a little less than three years ago, was unanimously passed by this Parliament; and I thought the strong representations of the Government of this country ought to have effect without moving Parliament again to adopt a solemn address on this subject. But, this course will be adopted if these measures fail, though I am still not without hope that they will not fail.

Mr. EDGAR. The Minister of Justice has referred to the existence of the Berne convention as an obstacle in the way of the Imperial Government conceding to Canada what we desire in this matter, but, if I recollect aright, the Minister of Justice in some papers which were laid before Parliament, stated, in the summer of 1889, that the Government of Canada had requested the English Government, on behalf of Canada, to denounce the Berne convention and to give the year's notice that was necessary to relieve Canada, as one of the parties to that convention, from its obligations. If that was done, the Minister will perhaps tell the House whether the British Government conceded that very reasonable and modest request of our Government made two years ago. I assumed, of course, that this step had been accomplished, and, if that was not done, I should expect to hear from the Minister of Justice very strong remonstrances on the subject towards the British Government; but I will have to assume that it has been done and that that difficulty has been removed. The Minister also referred, as a reason for the delay by the English Government, to the expectation that an international copyright law would be passed by the United States Congress. That has been done, and I think it is to come into force on the 1st July; but, as far as I understand it, that will only make the position of Canada worse than it is to-day, because, speaking of the Canadian reading public, who are interested in and benefited by receiving American reprints of British copyright works, if the American copyright law which was passed at last session of Congress facilitates the copyrighting in the United States of more British works, then the Canadian public will be to that extent restricted from having the benefit of the American reprints here. I suppose that will be the effect of it, and, instead of its being an advantage to the Canadian public, it will be a greater source of injury to them, although it may be a further advantage to the British author. The Minister said that he was sorry to state that the interests of British authors were, he found, paramount, and that our rights were denied. That is a most serious condition of affairs for a Canadian Parliament to contemplate. The Minister said it was no fault of ours—speaking, I suppose, of the Government. I do not say that up to this time we can blame the Government or the Minister of Justice for his action in this matter; but I do say that if it is allowed to linger any longer, and if this session of Parliament is allowed to pass and the matter be delayed for another year, without pronounced and decided action on our part, then I will not say that the Government and Parliament are not to blame. I do not think there is any doubt whatever, no one in this House can have a particle of doubt, that the Parliament of Canada ought directly to address the Imperial authorities on that subject, not contenting itself with simply passing an Act and withholding it from coming into force until a proclamation is issued, but by a direct vote of this Parliament to assert and repeat what the Minister of Justice said himself in his despatch two years ago, that we always thought we had this right under the Confederation Act. The Minister of Justice on that subject said that he would hesitate to press the legal point:

"If it were not to his mind perfectly plain that the people of Canada would hold him culpable if he failed to assert that was the only interpretation under which they received the constitution, and under which they were willing to be content with that constitution."

Now, Sir, the Minister of Justice has gone too far to retreat; I do not think he wants to retreat; I do not think the people of Canada want him to retreat, and I am sure that this House does not propose to suggest a retreat or to listen to a retreat. I think, for once, the Government has progressed in the right direction. They have taken a great step in advance of the position which was taken in 1885 by the Minister of Militia, who, speaking as the mouthpiece of the Ministry, recognized no injury to the people of Canada and no rights of the people of Canada. The Minister of Justice now, speaking on behalf of himself and the Government, recognizes not only that the present law is a great and growing injury to the people of Canada, but also recognizes and asserts fearlessly the rights of the people of Canada on that subject. I am sure if all their measures of legislation were characterized by the same progressive improvement which characterizes this action of the Government, the members of the Opposition would have an opportunity to support the Government much oftener.

Motion agreed to.

BRIGADE MAJOR--VACANCY.

Mr. BURNHAM moved for:

Copies of all correspondence relative to the vacancy caused in the office of Brigade Major for Military Districts Nos. 3 and 4, through the death of the late Lieutenant Colonel Lewis.

He said: I make this motion on account of a rumour that is current that it is the intention of the Government to abolish the office of Brigade Major in those districts. Formerly there was a Brigade Major in each district, but the two offices were combined into one, which was held for both districts by the late Lieutenant Colonel Lewis. I do not know in what way the Government propose to exercise supervision over the district, but I understand it is the intention to give the office to some member of the permanent staff, or the gunnery corps at Kingston. It does not appear to me that that can be effectively done, inasmuch as these officers are supposed to have duties to perform which would not permit them to undertake this work. It is a large district, extending from Bowmanville to Prescott, the largest in Ontario, and one of the largest in the Dominion, and it contains about 120 companies. The duty required is the inspection of these different corps, their arms and accoutrements, which takes a considerable length of time, and involves a considerable amount of trouble. The militia officers in the district look at this proposal as an attempt to do away with an office to which they might aspire, and which they are fully competent and qualified to hold. The officers of the militia force in this country do their work at considerable loss of time, and at a great expense to themselves. These appointments are the only ones to which they can look forward as a means of promotion, and I think they should be kept for that purpose. I do not believe that if the system proposed were to be carried out it would result in saving the salary for the benefit of the rank and file of the force. In my opinion, there should be certain militia offices which should be open to the members of the force, although I do not go so far as the member for North York (Mr. Mulock) and advocate the opening of the office of Major General to the members of the militia force. That involves a question of high policy, which has been heretofore to keep an Imperial officer in that position. I hope that the Minister of Militia will see his way to reconsider the matter, and allow the appointment to be made from the militia force of this country.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. There can be no possible objection to the papers to which the hon. gentleman asks for, being produced. But I must point out to the hon. gentleman that the districts, 3 and 4, are not at all different from other districts where it was considered that the efficiency of the service would not be impaired by the abolition of the office either of adjutant general or of brigade major. Districts 3 and 4 cannot be in any different position from several other districts where the department has considered that it was quite compatible with the efficiency of the force to have either the brigade major or an adjutant general in charge of the district. I must point out also the fact, which is well known, that in view of the number of men which we have in our present force, the amount of money now voted by Parliament, however large it may appear, is not by any means too large to keep the militia force of Canada in a state of efficiency. Both the Minister of Militia, who has examined into this matter, and those gentlemen who take an interest in militia matters, are all agreed that the greatest possible care must be taken in the expenditure of the funds voted by Parliament, if we would keep up the number of men which we now have in the force, and keep that force in an efficient state. Speaking for myself alone, I must say that the amount of drill which they receive under the present system is not sufficient. I would like to have them drilled every year instead of every second year, and if we are to keep up the force upon the amount now voted, every possible saving must be made. I consider that, at the present moment, an expensive staff would be a mistake. It would be far better, according to my views, that the money which is expended upon an expensive staff should be distributed among the rank and file, and the advantage of that outlay given to the militia proper. If it should be necessary, in time of danger, to secure a staff, we have within this country officers who can be obtained, at short notice, as we found during the rebellion in the North-West, officers who are perfectly capable of filling the duties of the positions they may be called upon to occupy. However, I can only say in regard to the present motion that the correspondence has not been very considerable, merely applications made by quite a number of gentlemen who were anxious to get the position; but whatever papers are to be found in the department will be brought down and submitted to the House.

Motion agreed to.

FISHING BOUNTIES.

Mr. FORBES moved for:

Return showing the names of all persons in the County of Queen's, N.S., to whom fishing bounties have been paid during the last five years, with the amount paid each; the amount still unpaid, with the names of the persons to whom such bounties are still due.

He said: I do not desire the Minister of Marine to think that the members from the Maritime Provinces are trailing their guns on him to-day. I look upon the members representing the several counties interested in fishing, and I represent one such county, as being channels of communication between the fishing interest and the Minister who has charge of that department, and I, therefore, trust that the hon. gentleman will not take umbrage at anything I may say in calling attention to this subject. The Act under which this fund was placed at the disposal of the Government, provided that it should be distributed to aid in the development of the sea fisheries, in the encouragement of the building and fitting out of improved fishing vessels, and the improvement of the general condition of the fishermen. I should like to call the Minister's attention to the fact that there are certain impressions prevailing in several of the counties as regards the disposition of the fund. One point to which I desire to call attention is, that the officers induce the men who are to receive money from this fund to believe that it is distributed from a board of charities somewhere, over which the Government has control. I do not know whether the Minister is aware of it, but such is the fact. I desire to obtain the information asked in the

motion in order that the people may ascertain whether the object of the Act is being subserved by the distribution of the fund. We can only gather that information by ascertaining whether the men who receive the bounty are obtaining increased sums yearly in consequence of the increased catch made by their vessels. I do not understand that any objection will be made to this motion, and it is, therefore, unnecessary to discuss it at length.

Mr. MULOCK. I suggest the words "and date of payment" be added.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

RESCUE OF THE SCHOONER *BLIZZARD*.

Mr. FLINT moved for:

Correspondence between all persons and the Department of Marine and Fisheries, recommending or with reference to a reward given to Captain Peterson of the American schooner *Seigfried* for his services in rescuing the captain and crew of the schooner *Blizzard* of Lunenburg, in October last.

Mr. KAULBACH. The request made by my hon. friend, the member for Yarmouth, for the "return of all correspondence, between all parties and the Department of Marine and Fisheries with reference to a reward given to Captain Peterson of the American schooner *Seigfried* for his services in rescuing the captain and crew of the schooner *Blizzard* of Lunenburg in October last," seems to me—with all due deference to the hon. member—somewhat singular, inasmuch as the schooner belonged to the port of Lunenburg, in the county I have the honour to represent, and the master and owner to the same place. I would reasonably have supposed the enquiring party or correspondent of my hon. friend would have applied for the information through me as the representative, instead of going so far out of his way as to give trouble to my hon. friend from Yarmouth. However, I think I see through the mystery, and can solve the enigma. The hon. member's correspondent I consider has no love or affection for the captain of the *Blizzard*, little for myself, and still less for the owner, and I believe his desire is, by strategy, to traduce, if he can, the character of the owner, and thereby interfere with the recovery of his insurance, and has taken this course through my hon. friend to make this request, thinking to reflect discredit upon the owner and at the same time not be known. As regards the owner, I may say his character is beyond reproach, as he is thoroughly reliable in every way, and as a citizen is very highly respected, having held, and is still holding, positions of responsibility and trust, in the town in which he dwells, with credit to himself and satisfaction to those whose interests he has had in charge. In fact his record is a perfect one, and to know him is to respect him. He has been employed by myself and others as a shipmaster, and so generally well liked that we were sorry to part with him. As to the captain of the *Blizzard*, I may say that I have known him for a number of years as thoroughly reliable, and believe he would not deign to do anything approaching barratry or wrong practice. Now to the main point, as to the right of the Government in granting a reward to the captain of the *Seigfried* there can be no question, as the papers in the Marine Department asked for by my hon. friend will clearly show. The captain of the American schooner clearly showed the perilous position the captain and crew of the *Blizzard* were in when he rescued them, and his leaving the fishing grounds without a remuneration to put into Shelburne to land them. The report of the captain of the American schooner himself, and of the captain of the *Blizzard*; the letter of the United States consular agent at Shelburne, and of the customs official from the port of Shelburne: the report of the press, all present such a clear account of the case, that I feel the Government were fully justified in giving the reward they did to the captain of the *Seigfried*, it being so well merited. Cases of this kind should be recognized at all times, more particularly when bravery and humanity is shown to British subjects by subjects of another nation, as in this case.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Reports from the Deputy Adjutant General of Military District No. 11 to the Minister of Militia, since January, 1888: 1st. In regard to "C" Battery barracks: 2nd. In regard to drill hall in Victoria: 3rd. In regard to removal of magazine from Beacon Hill Park; 4th. In regard to condition of guns, stores, gun platforms, &c. Also, copies of all correspondence between the Deputy Adjutant General of Military District No. 11 and the Minister of Militia, on the same subjects, since the same date.—(Mr. Prior.)

Return of all papers, petitions and documents relating to the establishing of a post office upon Lot 29 in the 14th concession of Galway, and particularly for any correspondence addressed to the Postmaster General or his department by one Charles W. McMahon, and of all letters addressed by or on behalf of the department to one James Wilson, the postmaster at Kinmount.—(Mr. Barron.)

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message as follows:—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons papers relating to the extension and development of trade between the United States and the Dominion of Canada, including the Colony of Newfoundland.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 3rd June, 1891.

ADJOURNMENT.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As the order for this evening will be to discuss the prohibition resolution, which my colleague the hon. Minister of Justice has spoken of as one that he would ask to postpone for this evening, and as a number of other matters follow which the promoters did not think would come up this evening, it is suggested that, under the circumstances, the House should stand adjourned from now until to-morrow afternoon. I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. JAMIESON. Of course, I suppose the hon. gentleman will give some guarantee that an opportunity will be given to continue the debate on my resolution.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Oh, yes; you will have an opportunity.

Mr. LAURIER. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jamieson) is quite wise in consenting to this, because I gathered from the Minister of Justice,

this afternoon, that the Government will have a policy on this question, which he never could induce them to have before.

THE LANGEVIN BLOCK.

Mr. MULOCK. Before the adjournment of the House, I wish to call the attention of the Government to the fact that, a week ago last Friday, the Public Accounts Committee passed an order for the production before that Committee of certain papers in connection with what is known as the Langevin Block. These papers have not arrived yet, although they are within a stone's throw of the Public Accounts Committee. I would like to know when the order of the Committee is to be obeyed with regard to these papers.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I understood from my department, that the papers had been sent to the Committee; I will see that they are sent to-morrow.

Mr. MULOCK. I waited until the last moment, and they had not then arrived.

CATTLE EXPORT TRADE OF CANADA.

Mr. MULOCK. It appears from the public press that legislation is now receiving the attention of the Imperial House of Commons in regard to the Canadian cattle trade, and that this legislation may or may not be to the advantage of Canada. Apparently it meets with the approval of the people of Canada, but the cattle trade is of such importance that I believe that it is only right that at every stage that legislation should be submitted to the people of Canada as a matter of courtesy, if possible, or that some person representing Canadian interests should be on the spot to be in communication with the Imperial Government, as that legislation passes through the English House of Commons. I understand that at this present moment we are without a representative in London. Who is going to look after the interests of Canada in this respect? I judge from the reports in the press that an announcement was made in the English House of Commons last night by Mr. Chaplin as to the intentions of the English Government in this matter, but when their Bill will be presented or the legislation completed, has not yet been announced. I think we should send over some person now to look after our interests in England, at all events until our High Commissioner is able to return to London. In connection with this matter I would further suggest that it might be possible to arrange with the English Government to appoint an officer in Canada who would have his office at the shipping point, so that his certificate might be of service in enabling Canadian cattle to be landed in England, without, as now, having to pass through inspection at the point of arrival. At all events, whatever may be the proper precautions to take, or the proper arrangements to make, I think that the present is a critical moment, in view of the fact that only a week ago our whole cattle trade was threatened with a serious blow by reason of the unwarranted act of an Imperial officer. Now that legislation is before the English House of Commons on this subject, it is the duty of the Canadian Government to give every attention to this important question.

Mr. TUPPER. I might say, that the authorities in England have been long since fully advised in detail of the views entertained in Canada regarding the proposed legislation touching the cattle trade, and I have at this moment every reason to believe that these representations will be successful. Legislation on this subject will be introduced in this Parliament, and a notice is now on the Order paper to that effect. I have reason to believe that, before we take many steps in that legislation, I can give the House more positive information as to its meeting the desires of the Imperial authorities concerning the shipping of cattle from Canada to England.

THE BUDGET.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it possible that the Minister of Finance can give us an assurance of any sort as to when he will not, rather than when he will, bring down the Budget? I take it for granted that he does not propose to bring it down next Friday.

Mr. FOSTER. It is very difficult to say, under present circumstances. It is not, however, impossible, if more unfortunate events do not take place, that the Budget exposition will be made on Friday.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With respect to the statement of the hon. Minister of Finance, my hon. friend has called my attention to the fact, which I had forgotten at the instant, that we have a motion undisposed of which can hardly be put aside; so that I suppose on that account we cannot go on with the Budget on Friday.

Mr. FOSTER. It is quite possible, on motion, to go into Committee of Ways and Means.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course that is possible, but it would, perhaps, be objectionable under the circumstances.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 6.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 4th June, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORTS.

Canal Statistics.—(Mr. Bowell.)

Annual Report of the Department of Public Printing and Stationery.—(Mr. Chapleau.)

Fisheries Statements and Inspectors' Reports, Supplement No. 1 to Annual Report of Fisheries.—(Mr. Chapleau.)

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

Mr. BARRON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 98) to amend the Electoral Franchise Act. He said: The object of this Bill is to make plain that which I think is not plain in the Act passed last session amending the Electoral Franchise Act. The Minister of Justice will remember that I pointed out to him the danger of allowing declarations to be put in by the revising officer, with schedules

attached, instead of the name and the qualification being in the declaration itself. The Secretary of State was good enough to incorporate in the Bill which he then had before the House, the views which I held, but, after looking over the Act which was passed last session, I think there still remains considerable doubt as to whether that Act really does meet the objections that I had in view at that time, and therefore it is to make that point clear that my Bill is now introduced. Then, also, I have found that some revising officers, notwithstanding the fact that the statute requires them to desist from receiving declarations on the 1st of August, do not, apparently, find that clause very clear, and some of them continue to receive declarations after the 1st of August, while others do not; and my Bill proposes to set that doubt at rest: it says that not later than the 1st of August shall the revising officer receive a declaration. Another clause provides that candidates, instead of being entitled to only four copies of the voters' lists, shall each be entitled to not less than ten.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ST. JOHN RAILWAY STATION.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) asked, 1. What is the "additional property accommodation" at St. John railway station for which a vote of $80,000 is asked, wanted for? 2. Was the necessity of this "additional property accommodation" reported upon by any Intercolonial or other official; if so, by whom? 3. How much land is at present being taken for the $80,000? Is it proposed to take any more land adjoining? Has the land proposed to be taken been valued by the arbitrators? If not, is it to be so valued? 4. Does the land proposed to be taken belong to the Harris Estate, Harris & Co. (Ltd.) or Jas. C. Robertson, or any and which of them?

Mr. BOWELL. The additional property proposed to be purchased is to furnish further railway accommodation for that station. The station-master at St. John complains of the lack of station yard accommodation, and the chief superintendent and district superintendent concur in his views. The quantity of land to be taken has not yet been defined. The land will be valued by arbitrators, before being purchased. The property, it is understood, belongs to the estate of the late James Harris.

STALLIONS AT EXPERIMENTAL FARM.

Mr. McMILLAN asked, Whether the Government have purchased or leased stallions stationed at the Central Experimental Farm? If purchased, from whom, and what was the price paid? If leased, upon what conditions, and from whom? If neither purchased nor leased, upon what conditions are the horses stationed at the Farm?

Mr. HAGGART. Horses have neither been purchased nor leased, but placed at the Experimental Farm upon conditions which are named in the correspondence, which will be produced if the hon. gentleman moves for it.

BLACK RIVER IMPROVEMENTS, IN THE COUNTY OF DRUMMOND.

Mr. LAVERGNE (translation) asked, Whether the Government has sent any engineer to visit the improvements commenced a few years ago in the Black River, in the Parish of St. Germain de Grantham, in the Township of Grantham, in the County of Drummond, in order to have a report as to the usefulness of completing these works or not?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) In answer to the hon. member, I have to say that no engineer has been sent to visit these improvements.

DREDGING AND IMPROVEMENTS IN THE BLACK RIVER.

Mr. LAVERGNE (translation) asked, Whether the Government intend to place in the Estimates, or in the Supplementary Estimates, the sum of $2,000, or any sum of money, for the purpose of completing the dredging and improvements commenced some years ago in that part of the Black River which crosses the Parish of St. Germain de Grantham and the Township of Grantham, in the County of Drummond?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) I will ask the hon. member to have patience until the Supplementary Estimates are put before the House.

BLACK RIVER INPROVEMENTS, IN THE COUNTY OF ARTHABASKA.

Mr. LAVERGNE (translation) asked, Whether the Government has sent any engineer to visit the improvements commenced a few years ago in the Black River, in the Township of Bulstrode, in the County of Arthabaska, in order to have a report as to the usefulness of completing these works or not?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (translation.) I am told in my department that no engineer has been sent.

SUGAR IN BOND.

Mr. McMULLEN. The question I have on the paper I wish to apply to the port of Montreal altogether. It is as follows:—What quantity of raw sugar was in the hands of manufacturers, being manufactured in bond, on the 1st of April last? The entire quantity of raw sugar in bond in Montreal on the 1st of May? The name or names of the ship by which the cargo was delivered; the date of the arrival; her gross cargo by Customs weight? How long each lot of cargo has remained in warehouse? Who are the owners of such cargo; the gross amount of duty payable thereon; with the owner's name? What length of time are manufacturers of sugar permitted to hold sugar under manufacture in bond, without paying duty?

Mr. BOWELL. The quantity of raw sugar in the hands of manufacturers (refiners) being manufactured (refined) in bond, on the 31st day of March last, as shown by quarterly returns, was, at Halifax, 15,546,008 pounds; at Moncton, 4,578,175 pounds; at Montreal, 38,754,899 pounds; total, 58,889,172 pounds. It is impossible to give the further information asked for, as no return other than the quarterly one is received, and though a monthly account of stock is taken, it is not done on any specific day, but purposely, for obvious reasons, at irregular intervals. Under the Customs Act, bonded goods may be allowed to remain in bond two years, but under the regulations governing refining in bond, sugars are not supposed to remain

longer than six months without duty being paid thereon.

LOUIS DOUCET, OF STE. FLAVIE.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, For what reason was Mr. Louis Doucet, of Ste. Flavie, discharged as an employé in the shops of the Intercolonial Railway, in the said parish?

Mr. BOWELL. Louis Doucet, of Ste. Flavie, was discharged for using insulting language.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. To whom?

REVISING OFFICER FOR RIMOUSKI.

Mr. GUAY asked, Whether the Government are aware that Alfred Drapeau, Esq., advocate, revising officer for the County of Rimouski, took an active part in the last Dominion election and made speeches in favour of the Government and of the ministerial candidate, in the said county? Is it their intention to discharge the said revising officer for having so acted?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Government have no information on the subject, and I have no power in any case to remove the revising officer.

LIQUOR CONFISCATION AT MONTMAGNY.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, Has the Government been informed: 1st. That Eugène Hammond, an alleged officer of Customs, at Montmagny, has illegally seized and confiscated a certain quantity of liquor belonging to F. X. Lamonde, tavern keeper, at Montmagny; and that after having sent it up to Quebec, he was afterwards obliged to give it back to the said Lamonde, inasmuch as the duty upon it had been paid in due form? 2nd. If the Government is aware of the facts of the above case, does it propose to reimburse the said Lamonde, for the expenses which this illegal act has put him to, and for the damage which he has suffered? 3rd. Does the Government propose to remove this officer?

Mr. BOWELL. The Customs Department was informed by Mr. Choquette, the member for Montmagny, that Mr. Hammond, the officer of Customs at that port, had seized certain liquor belonging to F. X. Lamonde, and such liquor had been returned to him. Upon enquiry it has been ascertained that on or about 29th April last Mr. Hammond did seize five packages of liquor from Mr. Lamonde, and he notified his superior, the collector at Quebec. It was then found that the said liquors had been shipped from Quebec and were duty paid, whereupon they were returned to Mr. Lamonde by order of the collector of Customs. Mr. Lamonde has, under the law, recourse against the officer for any personal illegal act done by him. The Government does not hold itself responsible for acts of its officers performed without instructions. The question as to the removal of the officer is one for consideration, when it is shown, after investigation, that the seizure was made without reasonable grounds therefor.

MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION.

Mr. DEVLIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would ask the Minister of the Interior when the papers in regard to the Manitoba School question, referred to in a motion which I made on 5th May last, will be laid on the Table of the House?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Minister of the Interior is out of his seat for a moment, but I will mention the matter to him on his return.

AMERICAN QUARANTINE REGULATIONS.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to draw the attention of the House to a very important matter to the farmers of my district, and no doubt also to a great many farmers throughout the Dominion. On 1st June, a question was put by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Landerkin) to the Minister of Agriculture, which was answered by the Postmaster General, as to whether the Government was aware of the fact that an embargo had been placed on lambs passing from Canada to the United States. The Minister on that occasion replied that no official information had been received by the Department of Agriculture with respect to the embargo referred to. Since that time several letters have been received—I have received no less than three, from parties who are deeply interested in this matter. This is about the season of the year when buyers go out to buy lambs with the intention of shipping them in the fall to the United States. On 30th August, 1890, the Americans amended their quarantine regulations, imposing quarantine upon sheep and swine coming into the United States from any other country save and except Canada. This Dominion was exempted on that occasion, but since that time representations appear to have been made to the Americans that sheep and swine are admitted into Canada without undergoing quarantine, and by that means they may pass from Canada to the United States, and consequently very seriously affect the flocks in that country. Under these representations the Americans have now imposed quarantine for fifteen days on all sheep and swine sent into their country from Canada. I will read the regulations, as follows:—

"UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.
"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.
"WASHINGTON, D.C., 19th May, 1891.

"Whereas under the Act of Congress approved August 30, 1890, it has been provided by the Department of Agriculture, in order to protect the sheep and swine of the United States from contagious diseases now existing in foreign countries, that all sheep and swine imported from Great Britain and Europe must be held in quarantine for a period of not less than fifteen days; and whereas the Dominion of Canada makes no requirement of quarantine for sheep and swine imported into that country from Great Britain and the continent of Europe; and whereas, to permit the importation of those animals from Canada into the United States without quarantine would be dangerous to the stock interests of the United States, owing to the failure on the part of the Canadian authorities to enforce this measure of protection, and would enable importers to avoid the quarantine of the United States ports; therefore, it is ordered that all sheep and swine brought from Canada into the United States are hereby made subject to the regulations of the Department of Agriculture, date of October, 1890, and the exception contained in the third and sixth regulations of said date, as applicable to sheep and swine, is hereby repealed, and all animals named in the said regulations, except cattle imported from Canada are subject to same conditions and requirements as if they were imported into the United States from Great Britain or the continent of Europe.

(Signed) "J. N. CRASS, *Secretary.*"

The Minister of Agriculture will see at once, that the imposition of this embargo on Canadian lambs and sheep entering the United States will prove a very serious matter. It is quite clear from the

extracts which I have read, that it remains with the Canadian Government to take action. If they continue to permit the importation of sheep and swine into Canada without quarantine regulations, that embargo will, no doubt, go into force. If they take the necessary steps to impose quarantine regulations, as therein set out, we will be permitted, no doubt, to export our sheep, lambs and swine to the United States free from the quarantine regulations that ordinarily prevail. It is exceedingly important, in the interests of the farming community, that the Minister of Agriculture should note that fact.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman does not intend to conclude his speech with a motion, I am afraid he is not strictly in order. It is true, that the hon. gentleman is in order in drawing the attention of the Government to the question, but, if he is to be allowed to enter into a discussion on the Orders of the Day being called, it will prove a very inconvenient mode of dealing with public questions.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have before me the motion which I intend to present to the House when I have concluded my remarks. I bring this to the attention of the Minister of Agriculture on behalf of a large number of persons who are deeply interested in the matter. Now is about the time when the buyers commence purchasing from farmers; they pay in cash the price of these animals, and it is about the first money the farmer receives and the first relief which he gets. They pay three or four dollars cash for each lamb, and generally the farmer feeds the lambs until the fall when the buyers take them away and pay the balance, if there is any balance to be paid. I have three letters from buyers of lambs in my section of the country, who are very anxious to know if the Government is going to put a stop to the permanent imposition of this embargo, for, if not, they will have to buy lambs at a less price than they now pay. The present duty on lambs going to the United States is 75 cents a head, and if these quarantine regulations are imposed, it will virtually amount to a duty of 75 cents per head more, making $1.50 in all. To show that this is a very important trade, I may point out that we sent to the United States the year before last 363,000 lambs, and this year 251,640. The Province of Ontario is deeply interested in this matter, and in view of the urgency of the case, I felt it my duty to bring it to the attention of the House in order to give an opportunity to other members interested to speak on this subject. I considered this mode was better to bring it before the House than to put a question on the paper, because questions cannot possibly bring out all the information needed. My object is not to find any fault, but to draw the attention of the Government to the immediate necessity of moving in the direction of trying to get this quarantine order of the United States repealed. I therefore move, seconded by Mr. Macdonald (Huron):

That such changes should be made immediately in our quarantine regulations as would prevent the importation of sheep and swine having contagious diseases, and thereby secure the removal of the embargo imposed by the United States upon sheep, lambs and swine exported to that country from Canada.

Mr. SPEAKER. This motion cannot be put to the House. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. member and of the House to the Rule respecting what may be said when the Orders of the Day are called, and I do this for the purpose of preventing, in future, a repetition of what has occurred to-day. It is a very inconvenient mode of dealing with these public questions, that hon. gentlemen, upon the calling of the Orders of the Day, should make a speech upon an important matter of this kind. The Rule laid down by Bourinot is as follows:—

"*Speaking on Calling of Orders.*—It is a common practice for members in both Houses to make personal explanations, or ask questions of the Government, before the Orders of the Day are taken up. They may make these explanations in reference to an inaccurate report of their speeches in the official record, or in the newspapers; or in denial of certain charges made against them in the public prints; or in explanation of certain remarks which had been misunderstood on a previous occasion, and which they had not before had an opportunity of explaining; or in respect to the incompleteness or inaccuracy of certain returns brought down under the Order of the House. Questions may be asked, when the Orders are called, relative to the state of public business, or other matters of public interest; but no discussion should be allowed when a Minister has replied to a question, nor after a member has made his personal explanation. In asking a question, a member must not attack the conduct of the Government."

I think the House will agree with me, that it would be very inconvenient if members were allowed, upon the calling of the Orders of the Day, to make speeches, as the hon. gentleman has done on the present occasion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not going to dispute the correctness of your ruling, Mr. Speaker, although as regards matters of fact, your memory, as well as mine, will remind you of occasions on which considerable latitude has been allowed to members on both sides of the House in many other cases. This is a matter of urgency, and although my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) cannot very well put his motion, and that he will, no doubt, withdraw it after your ruling, it seems to me that it deserves the immediate attention of the Government, inasmuch as that there is a very great risk that a valuable trade which is now a good deal interfered with by the operation of the McKinley tariff, may be now much further interfered with. I cannot but suppose that the attention of the Government has been called to this matter.

Mr. HAGGART. In reply to the hon. gentleman who has made the statement to the House, I may say that I admit that this is an important question. It has been, however, fully considered by the Government, and at the time I made the statement, some time ago, we had no official notice of the regulations, nor have we yet, but the department was immediately notified to find out from Washington what the regulations were, and as soon as we find these out we will adopt every means possible with a view to the public interest.

THE BUDGET.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it the intention of the Minister of Finance definitely to proceed with the Budget statement to-morrow?

Mr. FOSTER. I shall not proceed with the Budget statement to-morrow.

PAIRING OF MEMBERS.

Mr. LANGELIER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the House to a personal matter. After the vote the

other day on motion to adjourn the debate in connection with the motion of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), the member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) got up and said that I had been paired with another gentleman. I stated then, and I repeat to-day, that I had distinctly declined to be paired with anyone before I left Ottawa. I have enquired about the matter since and I find that I was not paired for that vote but that I was paired previous to it without my consent and knowledge. I regret that the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) is not now in his seat. I will not say any more on the question to-day, but I will not let the matter rest here. The hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has had further information on the matter since he spoke, and if he does not take back the insinuation thrown out against me I will not accept any pair in future so long as he is head whip of the Conservative party. I want to be respected, and I presume that when the head ministerial whip knows the facts he will make them known to the House, but I will not tolerate being charged by any whip with breaking what I consider to be my word of honour. I was not paired for the vote in question. I did not know that I was paired for any vote at all, and if I had known I would have said distinctly that I declined to be paired. There are some remarks of the member for South Leeds which I wish to be struck out of the official Debates, and I will refer to the matter further when the hon. gentleman is in his seat.

Mr. LAVERGNE. I was told that I had broken my pair. I denied it at the time, and I deny it now. But I see that the matter has got into the press, which states that we gentlemen have a very poor chance of getting a pair now. I must distinctly say that I did not wish to be paired, I did not authorize anyone to pair me, I did not know I was paired, and I do not wish to be paired any more.

Mr. FRECHETTE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a decided misunderstanding in this affair. The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Brodeur) and myself paired with the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) and the hon. member for Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne) on Friday last, the 25th, until 8 o'clock p.m. on Monday, the 28th ult. I was present when the member for Rouville (Mr. Brodeur) agreed to this arrangement. I am willing to believe that neither Mr. Langelier nor Mr. Lavergne would have voted, had they known of this agreement, and I believe that the member for Rouville forgot to make those hon. members aware of it.

Mr. LANGELIER. The other day I put the question to every whip on this side of the House. I first went to the head whip, who said he knew nothing of that pair. Then I went to the other whips, and the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Brodeur) told me distinctly, and he repeated it to-day, that I had been paired by him for only one vote and until three o'clock that day, whereas the vote to which the pair was stated to have reference, took place in the evening. I met the hon. member for Rouville that morning on the train, and he never said a word to me as to whether I was paired or not, and I did not suspect that I was paired, because I declined to be paired with anybody.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I believe that because of my having endeavoured to serve my hon. friends on the Government side, there is now an attempt made to put me in a false position. This is, in two words, what has taken place: The other day, the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Frechette) came to ask me whether I could find him a pair for the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Dyer), I believe. As the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) was absent, I thought I could take upon myself to pair him, not at all till eight o'clock on Monday night, but until three in the afternoon. Now, Mr. Speaker, I find that we, the Opposition whips, are very hardly treated by the employés, who seem to be there only to serve the Government whips. Indeed, the list of paired members was even denied me. Under these circumstances, while the only proof offered are the sayings of these people, who are the employés of the ministerial whips, I think that our word can be taken when we expressly declare that there is no truth in what those employés have said. I must add, Mr. Speaker, that in the report of the *Mail*, referred to by the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier), the name of the member for Maskinongé (Mr Legris) is mentioned. The member for Maskinongé was not present: he did not vote, and, therefore, there was no fault to find with him.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is only with the consent of the House that this discussion can go on.

Mr. FRECHETTE. (Translation.) I believe that my hon. friend, the member for Rouville (Mr. Brodeur) puts me in a false position when he charges the Government whips and the head of the Government whips with not doing what is proper. I was present when he paired the hon. members for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) and Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne) in the presence of the head whip.

Mr. CORBY. In the absence of the senior whip, Mr. Taylor, I may say that I was in the whip's room, and I heard Mr. Cameron say that he was present when this pair was made, and that he had written it down in the book.

ENQUIRY FOR PAPERS.

Mr. MULOCK. Before the Orders are called, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works when the clerk of the Public Accounts Committee will receive the papers which were ordered to be produced and to which I called his attention yesterday? I also desire to ask him when the order of the House, passed on the 27th of May, for the production of certain papers on the same subject, will be obeyed?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. After the question was put by the hon. member the other day, I enquired of the deputy of my department, first, why the order of the Committee had not yet been executed, and then, when the order of the House would be executed. The answer was that the papers had been looked after in the department, and that they were at that moment trying to give an answer at all events to a portion of the question put by the hon. gentleman in the address of the House. I told him that if he did that the Committee and the House would not have the documents at all during the session, and I gave him orders that he should obey, first, the order of the Committee by laying before it the original

documents as far as possible, and that if other documents asked for by the Committee required writing or copying, that must be done afterwards. The hon. gentleman will, therefore, understand that the answer to the address of the House must be delayed for a very long time unless the Committee look into the documents and return them soon.

Mr. MULOCK. I am quite satisfied with the explanation of the hon. Minister except the last remark. I mentioned, in moving the order, that I did not wish it to be observed——

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman will understand that an order of the Committee cannot be discussed in the House.

Mr. MULOCK. I am only going to refer to the order of the House. I mentioned to the House, in moving for it, that I did not wish it to be delayed by any order made by any Committee, and I, therefore, only asked that that portion of the order should be obeyed which could be obeyed without interfering with the order of the Committee, and I thought the hon. Minister so understood it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps I misunderstood the hon. gentleman. I thought he wanted, first, the order given outside this House, and secondly, that he wanted the address of this House executed secondly.

Mr. MULOCK. I will go over and explain the matter to the hon. gentleman and not detain the House.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If the hon. gentleman wants the address from the House to be answered first, it will take a good deal of time.

BETTER OBSERVANCE OF THE LORD'S DAY.

Mr. CHARLTON moved that Bill (No. 2) to secure the better observance of the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday, be read the second time. He said: Legislation for the purpose of securing the better observance of Sunday, or the Lord's Day, as it is more properly perhaps called, is not necessarily religious legislation: and the Bill now under consideration does not provide for any religious observance whatever. The preamble of the Bill is as follows:—

"Whereas it is desirable, in the interests of religion and morality and public welfare, that better provision should be made for securing the observance of the first day of the week, hereinafter called the Lord's Day, as a day of rest."

The Bill is not for any other purpose: it does not provide for any religious observance: but simply proposes to provide that this day shall be observed as a day of rest, and that better provision shall be made to secure its observance as such. Of course the right arm, if I may use that expression, of Sunday observance is religious conviction. The day of rest, the Sabbath, had its origin in the order of the Creator for religious observance: but there is another arm to this motive, which may be called the left arm, that is the purpose of making the Lord's Day, the seventh day, or whatever it may be designated, a day of rest—the civil Sabbath: and it is with reference to this day, as the civil Sabbath only, that I propose to discuss the question. It is held by a great number of men—men eminent in religion, eminent in politics, and in science,—that to deprive man of his day of rest against his will is a crime: and any law which contemplates preventing the depriving of the labourer or any other man of his day of rest cannot properly be designated as a religious law, although the provision with regard to this matter is contained in the fourth commandment: "Remember the Sabbath day and keep it holy." The Decalogue also makes other provisions which the civil law enforces. It provides against murder, theft, perjury, adultery, and other offences: and we ask that the offence of violating the day of rest which is set forth in the Decalogue, may be also forbidden by the civil law. We are told, upon the highest possible authority, that the Sabbath was made for man. Man is not the creature of the Sabbath, but the Sabbath is an institution distinctly ordained for man's benefit. It is a day of rest, as conceived by the beneficent Creator, for our good. The Sabbath being made for man, I propose to consider what is the best course to be taken to secure to man that Sabbath which a beneficent God intended he should enjoy. We have no reason to suppose that this Sabbath, ordained at the dawn of creation, when the Creator, after working six days, rested on the seventh, and hallowed that day as a day of rest, was observed continuously before that law was promulgated from Mount Sinai by the greatest of all labour reformers, the prophet Moses. Israel had been without a Sabbath, no doubt, during her bondage in Egypt, where the Jews were driven by hard-task masters, and required to perform tasks almost impossible—required, in fact, to make bricks without straw, and work without a stated day of rest. When Moses promulgated the law of the Sabbath he appeared as a great labour reformer, and gave his people, not only the blessing of one day in seven as a day of rest, but the Sabbatical year, or one year's rest in seven, and the jubilee year, which was one year of rest in fifty years, on which day all the slaves were set free. The Christian Sabbath has been changed—it is unnecessary to go into the reasons why—to the first day of the week in place of the seventh, which was the Jewish Sabbath. Suffice to say that the first day has been accepted as the Christian Sabbath with the common consent of nearly all Christian denominations, Catholic and Protestant, and is also recognized as the civil Sabbath.

There is no doubt but that one day's rest in seven is a natural period of rest. There is no doubt that it is a rest required by the physical man and the mental man, and that we cannot, with impunity, disregard this law of nature, if it may be so called, which requires for the good of man that he should rest one day in seven from labour. There is a story told of a college professor, who, calling some students to account for hazing their fellow students, said: "Do you know that this conduct of yours is displeasing to God?" It is;" and furthermore, he said: "I will not stand it." I say equally, with regard to depriving man of his rest, that it is not only displeasing to God, but that man himself ought not to stand it: and if the public have it in their power to redress this wrong, they may go further and say: the act is displeasing to God, and so we will not stand it, but will enact such a law as will protect us in this right to a day of rest which God has given us.

Now, Sir, this proposal that we should have a day of rest is not a proposal made in the interests of religion. Perhaps we have no right to say that

we should legislate in the interests of religion, but we have the right to say that we shall not legislate against the interests of religion; and if we refuse to provide for this day of rest, we, by that refusal, refuse to provide for, and do legislate against, the interests of religion. There can be no question that the State has the right to establish a day of rest. The State has a right to establish holidays. We have established two in Canada—the 1st of July, Dominion Day, and the 24th May, the Queen's Birthday. No man professes to doubt that the State has the right to establish days of rest. When this question was under consideration before a Committee of the United States Senate, there was a Bill before that body of similar character to the one now under consideration; and the infidel Wolff, who represented Ingersoll's "secular union" before the Congressional Committee, said:

"It would be legitimate for you to set apart a day of rest; you do set apart holidays where the people take recreation, are exempted from work and the performance of public duties, and that is going about as far as you have any right to go."

That is just as far as we ask Parliament to go. We simply ask Parliament to go so far, and to establish a day of rest and make that day of rest a legal day when labour cannot be exacted from our fellowmen. Before the Congressional Committee on Labour, a Jewish Rabbi, Rabbi Krausko, appeared, and he made this statement:

"Beyond the recognition, on hygienic grounds, that the human body needs one day out of every seven for rest and recreation, and beyond legalizing that day as Sabbath which is preferred by the greatest numbers of the people, and beyond protecting that day as much as is consistent with its authority, the State has no other duties in connection with the Sabbath."

That is a perfectly correct proposition. We do not ask anything further under this Bill than this Jewish Rabbi tells us the State may properly exercise. Now, we hear a good deal about personal liberty, and it is asserted that we have no right to take any course that will infringe upon the personal liberty of our fellow subjects. There are some things that the humane will not do, and we have a right to provide that the inhumane shall not do. It is perfectly right for the State to make provisions which may abridge personal liberty if it interferes with the general good. For instance, we make quarantine regulations. A vessel calls at one of our ports, and she may be properly quarantined and kept there for one, two or three weeks. That is an infringement of the liberty of her passengers, but it is a right exercised for the public good, and so it is in regard to the kind of legislation we are talking of to-day. A Bill such as we have under consideration is demanded by the Christian sentiment of this country; it is demanded in the interest of labour; it would be in the interest of the employer of labour; it is a Bill which would be in the interest of the State or the commonwealth, which would be in the interest of humanity, and perhaps, not the least of these considerations, will be that it is in conformity with the law of God. When we look carefully at the character of the opposition to this Bill, we will feel something, perhaps, as the Irishman did when he was going down a street and saw a house which attracted his attention. Someone looked out of a window and said: "Why, Patrick, do you think that this is a church?" "I did certainly," said Patrick, "until I saw the devil stick his head out of the window." When we look at the opposition to this measure, we find ourselves somewhat in the position of the Irishman. When we find that the anarchist, the infidel, the liquor dealer, the saloon keeper oppose Sunday rest, we are justified in saying that the devil's head is shown out of the window, and the opposition cannot commend itself to our approval or to our interest.

A great many interests are united in demanding a Bill of this kind. It is demanded by the dignitaries of the Catholic Church, by the Protestant element of the population, by the labour organizations, and the demand in favour of this Bill is very great and important. As to Catholic influence, as we have many Catholics in this House who, I am afraid, are not in favour of this Bill, I will call attention pretty fully to the Catholic utterances on this subject. First, I will quote the utterances of Pope Leo XIII on the subject, dated 23rd April, 1881, and, though the utterance is not very recent, it is just as binding as if it were used yesterday. His Holiness says:

"The observance of the Sacred Day which was willed expressly by God from the first origin of man, is imperatively demanded by the absolute and essential dependence of the creature upon the Creator. And this law, mark it well, my beloved, which at one and the same time so admirably provides for the honour of God, the spiritual needs and dignity of man, and the temporal well-being of human life. This law, we say, touches not only individuals, but also people and nations, which owe to Divine Providence the enjoyment of every benefit and advantage which is derived from civil society. And it is precisely to this fatal tendency, which to-day prevails, to desire to lead mankind far away from God, and to order the affairs of kingdoms and nations as if God did not exist, that to-day is to be attributed this contempt and neglect of the Day of the Lord. They say, it is true, that they intend in this way to promote industry more actively, and to procure for the people an increase of prosperity and riches. Foolish and lying words! They mean, on the contrary, to take away from the people the comforts, the consolations and the benefits of religion; they wish to weaken in them the sentiment of faith and love for heavenly blessings; and they invoke upon the nations the most tremendous scourges of God, the just avenger of His outraged honour."

His Grace Archbishop Taschereau, in a pastoral letter of the 26th April, 1880, referring to disorders and scandals, said:

"We mean, O dearly beloved brethren, those pleasure excursions made on Sundays and feasts of obligation, on steamers, on the railway, and sometimes in a long train of vehicles. Experience proves that they give rise to such disorders of intemperance and immorality that we feel obliged to prohibit absolutely, and under pain of mortal sin, pleasure excursions on Sundays and feasts of obligation. * * * Wherefore, having invoked the holy name of God, we rule and ordain as follows:—1st. We forbid, under pain of grievous sin, the faithful of this diocese, to take part, on Sundays or feasts, in pleasure excursions, on railways, on steamers, or in vehicles, even when the profit of those excursions is intended for a good work. It is not our intention, however, to condemn the pilgrimages made on those days, provided recollection, piety, and good order be observed."

Quite recently, Archbishop Fabre gives a pronouncement on Sabbath observance, which is as follows. I will read an article which gives the substance of his delivery—

"After mentioning the duty devolving upon him to protect the spiritual interests of his flock, the Archbishop quotes the commandment which makes the due observance of the Sabbath a divine law and mentions the chastisements referred to in Leviticus for the transgressors of this precept. The letter then goes on to say that the Sunday rest does not mean idleness, but positive acts of worship towards God, and adds that if to idleness are added profane and dangerous amusements, then God is most seriously offended and his wrath is aroused against man. Further on, the Archbishop refers to certain abuses which have been introducing themselves in our midst, and says: 'We denounce again and absolutely condemn

the clandestine liquor traffic on Sundays, the entering of taverns, and the more or less numerous gatherings in which young men and fathers of families, victims of the gambling passion, pass long hours, forgetful of their duties, their souls, their God, and exposing themselves, besides, to lose their peace of conscience and their honour. We forbid, in the same manner, on Sundays, those picnics and pleasure excursions, organized for the public for speculative purposes, and which, as experience shows, are nearly always occasions of debauchery, drunkenness, altercations and licentious conversations. We particularly deplore that kind of amusement recently introduced into this city of Montreal, in which by announcing inoffensive concerts and promenades, the crowd are invited, by lavish advertisements, to throng to a public place, to witness dances, perilous feats, and performances contrary to morals, in a word, what is seen in the least modest circuses. Not only have those sights been unscrupulously given on Sundays and holidays, but even during divine service hours, so as to keep the people away from churches, and make them lose all spirit of meditation. It is time to oppose these disorders by the check of a formal prohibition, which has for its motive the sanctity of the Sabbath, and the obligation which rests with us to watch over the preservation of public morals.' "

Then, turning from the utterances of prelates in Canada, let us see what Catholic opinion is in the United States of America. We have the deliverances of the Catholic Lay Congress at Baltimore on the subject. We have the utterance of Cardinal Gibbons, we have the utterances of Cardinal McCloskey, of the Bishop of Buffalo, and of various other Catholic dignitaries. The Bishop of Buffalo, in calling attention to this subject, after forbidding picnics, excursions, fairs, &c., on Sunday and holidays, said:

"'Remember thou keep holy the Sabbath Day,' is God's own command. * * We must not only rest from all unnecessary, servile work, but we must hear mass and spend the day—or, at least, a good part of it—in the service of God and religious duties. * * Ours is not, as we have said, a Jewish or a Puritanical Sabbath, nor do we measure its obligatory observance by a sectarian standard or any American or national idea: yet we would be sorry to see the respect in which our separated brethren hold the Lord's Day weakened or discredited. God grant that we may never see the Sunday profaned here in our own country as we have seen it in other lands."

Bishop Keane, of Richmond, Virginia, at a meeting called by his authority, after a powerful address against the selling of liquor on Sunday, submitted a series of resolutions for adoption, and a pledge for signature, setting forth the sacred obligation of keeping holy the Lord's Day, recognizing the selling and drinking of liquors on that day as violations of the commandment of God, and the precept of the Church, &c. Cardinal McCloskey, in 1882, said:

"We wholly denounce and absolutely forbid excursions or picnics on Sundays, or after dark, all moonlight excursions and all Sunday picnics, and we exhort our good people who love their church to abstain from any participation in such scandalous, unhallowed and disgraceful practices, and to use all their influence to suppress them."

The following is an extract from a New York paper when Straskoch attempted Sunday operas there:

"Cardinal McCloskey was reported in the *Herald* to have said: 'You may say that I am opposed to what is generally regarded as Sunday evening concerts, and that, while not very Puritanical or domineering, I oppose the sensational amusement, which advertises itself under the name of sacred concerts, but which is nothing else than the ordinary week day show,' &c."

Dr. McGlynn, at that time a prominent Roman Catholic clergyman, and, I believe, he has since returned to the fold of the Church which he had temporarily left, is reported to have said:

"In France, Sunday is more of a tiresome holiday than a rest. This disregard for the Sabbath acts unfavourably on religion. The Sabbath I have always regarded as a great social conservator in this country. The regard in which Sunday has been held by the English-speaking nations, has had much to do with their keen sense of decorum and efficient organization. * * * The Sunday rest should be a set-off to the weekly work, and Sunday night quiet, to the boisterousness and enjoyment of the week nights."

The Catholic Lay Congress, in Baltimore, also passed strong resolutions in favour of Sunday observance and against the Sunday liquor traffic. A letter was read from Cardinal Gibbons on the 4th December, 1888, before the United States Senate Committee on Education and Labour, with reference to this question. It was written in reply to an enquiry from the Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts, who is a prominent advocate of Sunday observance in the United States. The letter is as follows:—

"Cardinal's Residence, 408 N. Charles Street,
"Baltimore, 4th December, 1888.

"My Dear Sir.—I have to acknowledge your esteemed favour of the 1st instant, in reference to the proposed passage of a law by Congress against Sunday work in the Government mail and military services, &c. I am most happy to add my name to those of the millions of others who are contending against the violation of the Christian Sabbath by unnecessary labour, and who are endeavouring to promote its decent and proper observance by legitimate legislation. As the late Plenary Council of Baltimore has declared, the due observance of the Lord's Day contributes immeasurably to the restriction of vice and immorality, and to the promotion of peace, religion and social order, and cannot fail to draw upon the nation the blessing and protection of an over-ruling Providence. If benevolence to the beasts of burden directed one day's rest in every week under the old law, surely humanity to man ought to dictate the same measure of rest under the new law.

"Your obedient servant in Christ.

"James Card. Gibbons,
"Archbishop of Baltimore.

"Rev. W. F. Craft."

Now, Sir, these quotations from Catholic authorities, in my estimation, are highly satisfactory, and I think they bear out my contention that a Bill of the character of the one now before the House, is necessary. To review, we have the declaration of His Holiness with regard to this matter; we have the declaration of the two most eminent prelates of Quebec, Cardinal Taschereau and Archbishop Fabre; we have the declaration of Cardinal McCloskey, of New York, and of Cardinal Gibbons, of Baltimore; we have the declaration of the Catholic Plenary Council assembled at Baltimore, and we have declarations made by eminent Catholic Bishops in the various parts of the United States. Surely, with these quotations—and I might easily make them much more numerous—we may assume that the Catholic Church is arrayed upon the side of Sabbath reform, and the granting to man of his legitimate Sunday rest.

I shall turn next to the position of the Protestant Church upon this question. I shall assume that that Church occupies a position favourable to Sunday rest, and shall not make as voluminous quotations as I have done in the case of the Catholic Church. I will first quote some observations made by the Rev. DeWitt Talmage with regard to the Sabbath in Paris:

"The Champs Elysées, one great mass, one great mob of pleasure seekers: balloons flying, parrots chattering, foot balls rolling, Punch and Judy shows in scores of places, each with a shouting audience; hand organs and cymbals, and all styles of racket, musical and unmusical. And then, as the day passed on toward night, I stood and saw the excursionists come home, fagged-out men, women and

children, a great gulf stream of fatigue, and irritability, and wretchedness. A drunken Fourth of July, instead of a Christian Sunday. If you have ever been in Brussels or in Paris on the Sabbath day, it requires no great persuasion on my part to get you to pray morning, noon and night that such a Sabbath may never come to this country."

When before the Congressional Committee on Education and Labour, which was considering the question of the Sunday Rest Bill, Rev. Dr. Strong made use of the following language:—

"The continental Sabbath can hardly be called a day of rest. The time not devoted to business is, by the multitude, given up to amusements. But many amusements can no more take the place of the Sabbath rest than of night rest. Reaction may be afforded by a change of activities, but the intense living, the headlong rush of this generation, stands in peculiar need of repose, the rest which come only from quiet. As a matter of fact, a holiday Sabbath is commonly followed by a jaded Monday. Among the lower classes of operatives in France, Germany, and even in England, the effects of Sabbath dissipation very commonly make Monday an idle day. European manufacturers say that American workmen earn more than European by being able to work on Mondays. Among us, wherever the continental Sabbath has prevailed, Monday is the poorest work-day in the week, showing that Sunday amusements have served to exhaust rather than recuperate."

Rev. George Elliott before the same committee, speaking of Sunday laws, made use of the following language:—

"It has already been remarked that Sunday legislation is in some sort a part of the common law of the Anglo-Saxon peoples. It antedates what is known as statute law by great distances. It is in the old constitution or judicial codes which are back of the time of Edward the Confessor. The code of Alfred the Great begins with the ten commandments and repeatedly enacts penalties for violating the first day of the week or the Lord's Day. In the codes of Athelstane and Edgar the Peaceable, and away back even in the old days of the Saxons, when England was divided between West Saxony and Kent, there were Sunday laws. It is a part of the very constitution of all the English-speaking peoples, a part of their laws, an immemorial custom. Sunday is a non-legal day, as has already been observed by the recognition of even the constitution of the United States.

That is all I will trouble the House with in the direction of quotations from clerical authorities. I have given the position of the Catholic Church on the question by quotations from His Holiness, and their prelates; I have shown the position of the Protestant Church on the question, and I now wish to quote a few legal opinions. Chief Justice Field, when a member of the Supreme Court of California, gave this opinion, which was afterwards adopted by that court:

"The Sabbath laws are not so much for those who can choose their time for rest, as for the protection of labour against capital, for the defence of labour's natural right to a weekly rest day. The Lord's Day is also the people's day."

When on the Supreme Court bench of the United States, Justice Field gave this decision on a question relating to Sunday law. He said:

"Laws setting aside Sunday as a day of rest are upheld, not from any right of the Government to legislate for the promotion of religious observances, but from its right to protect all persons from the physical and moral debasement which comes from uninterrupted labour. Such laws have always been deemed beneficent and merciful laws, especially to the poor and dependent, to the labourers in our factories and workshops, and in the heated rooms of our cities; and their validity has been sustained by the highest courts of the state."

On another occasion, Mr. Justice Field remarked:

"There are very few points on which so many statesmen, scientists and philosophers are agreed as on the necessity and value of the weekly rest day."

I will trouble the House with only one more legal opinion bearing on the question, and that is one given by Judge Allan G. Thurman, of the Supreme Court of Ohio, in which he said:

"All agree that to the well-being of society periods of rest are absolutely necessary. To be productive of the required advantage these periods must occur at stated intervals, so that the mass of which the community is composed may enjoy a respite from labour at the same time. They may be established by common consent, or, as is conceded, the legislative power of the State may without impropriety interfere to fix the time of their stated return, and enforce obedience to the direction. When this happens someone must be selected, and it has been said the round of the week presents none which, being preferred might not be regarded as favouring some one of the numerous sects into which mankind are divided. In a Christian community, where a very large majority of the people celebrate the first day of the week as their chosen period of rest from labour, it is not surprising that that day should have received the legislative sanction, and, as it is also devoted to religious services, we are prepared to estimate the reason why the statute should speak of it as the Lord's Day, and denominate the infraction of its legalized rest as profanation. Yet this does not change the character of the enactment. It is still essentially but a civil regulation."

So much for the opinion of jurists in the United States. With regard to England it is unnecessary to say that the Parliament of the British Empire has the power, and has exercised it, to pass Sunday rest laws. Such laws are on the Statute-book of England, and have been from time immemorial. I propose next to cite the opinions of a few gentlemen, who are neither ministers nor members of the legal profession, to give the House a little lay opinion. First, I will refer to an opinion expressed by the celebrated Henry George, who is not a religious man, I believe. Mr. George gives expression to this sentiment:

"I believe that the institution of the Sabbath is one of the greatest benefits that the human race ever had. I believe in the strict enforcement of the law that prevents servile labour being carried on on the seventh day."

I will next give the opinion of Chief P. M. Arthur, of the Association of Locomotive Engineers. He said:

"I am in favour of any movement looking to the abolishment of all Sunday labour other than works of mercy and necessity. It has been repeatedly demonstrated beyond a question or doubt, that all Sunday traffic upon railways can be dispensed with without any detriment or injury to the interests of the railway companies. Had I the authority I would not allow a wheel to be turned between twelve o'clock Saturday night and twelve o'clock Sunday night."

Mr. T. V. Powderly, chief of the Knights of Labour, made use of the following language:—

"I believe in Sunday rest. So do the Knights of Labour."

We have the opinions expressed by public men of the past and public men of the present. Blackstone says: "A corruption of morals usually follow a profanation of the Sabbath." De Tocqueville: "Despotism may govern without faith, but liberty cannot." Mirabeau: "God is as necessary as liberty to the French people." La Place: "I have lived long enough to know what at one time I did not believe, that no society can be upheld in happiness and honour without the sentiments of religion." The great American historian, George Bancroft, says: "Certainly our great united commonwealth is the child of Christianity, and it may, with truth, be asserted that modern civilization springs into life with our religion, and faith in its principles is the life-boat on which humanity has, at divers times, escaped the most threatening perils." Franklin says: "What are laws without morals, and whence shall

we get morals except from religion?" Washington: "Reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle." Daniel Webster: "The longer I live the more highly do I esteem the importance of the proper observance of the Christian Sabbath, and the more grateful do I feel towards those who impress its importance on the community." Wm. H. Seward, Secretary of State under Lincoln, in an address at the Sabbath Convention at Rochester, in 1842, said: "Every day's observation and experience confirm the opinion that the ordinances which require the observance of one day in seven, and the Christian faith which hallows it, are our chief security for all civil and religious liberty, for temporal blessings and spiritual hopes." When Sir John Sinclair wrote an essay against what he considered a Puritanical observance of the Sabbath in Scotland, his friend, Adam Smith, though an apologist for Hume, said: "Your book, Sir John, is very ably composed, but the Sabbath, as a political institution, is of inestimable value independently of its claims to Divine authority." Sabbath observance has been advocated by such men as Gladstone, D'Israeli, Shaftesbury, Argyle, Bright, Lincoln, Garfield and thousands of others. The action of the British Government in late years has been such as to show unmistakably the desire of the ruling classes in England to honour and observe the Sabbath.

I now proceed to point out that the observance of the Sabbath has been petitioned for, and the movement in favour of securing its observance, endorsed by various labour organizations. Chief P. M. Arthur, of the Brotherhood of Engineers, in a letter of 24th November, 1888:

"I am in favour of any movement looking to the abolishment of all Sunday labour other than works of mercy and necessity. It has been repeatedly demonstrated beyond a question or doubt that all Sunday traffic upon railways can be dispensed with without any detriment or injury to the interest of the railway companies. Had I the authority, I would not allow a wheel to be turned between twelve o'clock Saturday night and twelve o'clock Sunday night."

The Brotherhood of Railway Brakemen and Locomotive Firemen, at a union meeting held at Bloomington, Ill., 24th July, 1889, passed a series of resolutions as follows:—

"Whereas the Sabbath was ordained for man: and whereas all history shows the best state of society and the highest and best civilization when the hours of the Sabbath were devoted to rest and relief from labour: therefore, be it resolved that we, as railway employés, ask of the general public to forego Sunday travel on railways and the demanding or requiring managers of railways to run Sunday trains for freight traffic, to the end that we, who are willing to give six days and nights of our time to the faithful service of the public and to our employés, may have the hours of the Sabbath with our families at command for the great good and comfort to ourselves from being at home with our families, and for church, Sabbath school and other privileges the Sabbath is designed to bring to us.

Resolved, that we tender our sincere and hearty thanks to those presidents and managers of roads who have recently issued orders curtailing Sunday work, and we most respectfully ask all managers of roads to follow their example.

Resolved, that, as workingmen, we feel that we can do better service during the six days of the week when we are permitted the rest and recuperation the Sabbath was designed to give us.

Resolved, that we, as railway employés, pledge ourselves to be of the best possible service in our power to the several railways which employ us and to regard the interest of our employers when they show an interest in our best welfare by giving to us the best possible safety appliances and as much of Sunday rest as the exigencies of railway transportation will admit."

The American Federation of Labour at St. Louis, in 1888, addressed this communication to the Committee on Education and Labour of the United States Senate, having under consideration the Sunday Rest Bill:

"St. Louis, Mo., 15th Dec., 1888.

"To the Committee on Education and Labour of the United States of America:—

"The American Federation of Labour at its session today, adopted the following:

"Resolved.—That the American Federation of Labour is in hearty sympathy with any legitimate movement inaugurated by the American Sabbath Union, the object of which is to lessen the burden of those who toil."

The Knights of Labour at their International Convention in 1888 passed a resolution approving of the Sunday Rest movement, as well as the Locomotive Engineers, whose resolution I have read. I have here a communication addressed by 450 locomotive engineers of the New York Central Railway to Mr. W. H. Vanderbilt, and although it is somewhat lengthy, I wish it to be incorporated in the report, because it covers very fully the ground, and it presents the case of these poor men in the most effective manner. The communication to Mr. Vanderbilt is as follows:—

"We have borne this grievance patiently, hoping every succeeding year that it would decrease. We were willing to submit to any reasonable privation, mental or physical, to assist the officers of your company to achieve a financial triumph; but, after a long and weary service, we do not see any signs of relief, and we are forced to come to you with our trouble and most respectfully ask you to relieve us from Sunday labour, as far as it is in your power to do so. Our objections to Sunday labour are: 1st. This never-ending labour ruins our health and prematurely makes us feel worn out like old men, and we are sensible of our inability to perform our duty as well, when we work to an excess. 2nd. That the customs of all civilized countries, as well as all laws, human and divine, recognize Sunday as a day of rest and recuperation; and, notwithstanding intervals of rest might be arranged for us on other days than Sunday, we feel that by so doing we would be forced to exclude ourselves from all church, family and social privileges that other citizens enjoy. 3rd. Nearly all of the undersigned have children that they desire to have educated in everything that will tend to make them good men and women, and we cannot help but see that our example in ignoring the Sabbath day has a very demoralizing effect upon them. 4th. Because we believe the best interests of the company we serve, as well as ourselves, will be promoted thereby, and because we believe locomotive engineers should occupy as high social and religious positions as men in any other callings. We know the question will be considered: How can this Sunday work be avoided, with the immense and constantly increasing traffic? We have watched this matter for the past twenty years. We have seen it grow from its infancy until it has arrived at its now gigantic proportions, from one train on the Sabbath until we now have about thirty each way: and we do not hesitate in saying, that we can do as much work in six days, with the seventh for rest, as is now done. It is a fact observable by all connected with the immediate running of freight trains, that on Monday freight is comparatively light; Tuesday, it strengthens a little, and keeps increasing until Saturday; and Sundays are the heaviest of the week.

"The objection may be offered, that if your lines stop the receiving points from other roads will be blocked up. In reply, we would most respectfully suggest, that when the main lines do not run, tributaries would only be too glad to follow the good example. The question might also arise, if traffic is suspended twenty-four hours, will not the company lose one-seventh of its profits? In answer, we will pledge our experience, health and strength, that at the end of the year our employers will not lose one cent, but, on the contrary, will be the gainers financially. Our reasons are these: At present, the duties of your locomotive engineers are incessant, day after day, night succeeding night, Sunday and all, rain or shine, with all the fearful inclemencies of a rigorous winter to contend with. The great strain of both mental and physical faculties constantly employed has a tend-

ency, in time, to impair the requisites so necessary to make a good engineer. Troubled in mind, jaded and worn out in body, the engineer cannot give his duties the attention they should have in order to best advance his employer's interests. We venture to say, not on this broad continent, in any branch of business or traffic, can be found any class in the same position as railway men. They are severed from associations that all hold most dear, debarred from the opportunity of worship, that tribute man owes to his God, witnessing all those pleasures accorded to others, which are the only oasis in the deserts of this life, and with no prospects of relief. We ask you to aid us. Give us the Sabbath for rest after our week of laborious duties, and we pledge you that, with a system invigorated by a season of repose, by a brain eased and cleared by hours of relaxation, we can go to work with more energy, more mental and physical force, and can and will accomplish more work and do it better, if possible, in six days, than we can now do in seven. We can give you ten days in six if you require it, if we can only look forward to a certain period of rest. In conclusion, we hope and trust that, in conjunction with other gentlemen of the trunk lines leading to the seaboard, you will be able to accomplish something that will ameliorate our condition."

Unfortunately, Sir, these locomotive engineers did not secure the boon they asked, and Sunday labour is just as prevalent now as it was then. Nothing can remedy this evil in that country except general legislation; and when that legislation is provided by the American Congress, then we can follow in their steps. It is said in objection to this Bill that its provisions ought to be matters of municipal and police regulation—that they should belong to, and be acted upon by, the various provinces. Well, Sir, the provinces have not the power to deal with railway traffic, with postmen, with letter carriers, with the Mounted Police, with the canals, with the publication and distribution of papers. These are powers which this House must exercise, if they are to be used at all. Now, the provisions of the Bill, from sections one to six inclusive, might, I suppose, be enacted by the provinces. The first section provides against labour on the Lord's Day. The second provides against the sale or purchase of goods, and the pursuit of ordinary callings. The third provides against horse racing, foot racing, cock fighting, dog fighting and other games that might disturb the public peace. The fourth provides against frequenting inns and tippling there. The fifth provides against hunting, and the sixth against fishing. These, I will admit, are offences that might be dealt with by the provinces; and if the Bill reaches the Committee of the Whole, and the House should choose to cut out those sections, I do not know that I would resist very strongly its opinion in that respect. But from the seventh section on, the Bill refers to offences which this House only can deal with. The seventh section is as follows:—

"Whoever shall on the Lord's Day, either as proprietor, publisher or manager, engage in the printing, publication and delivery of a newspaper, journal or periodical, and whoever shall on the Lord's Day engage in the sale, distribution or circulation of any newspaper, journal or periodical published on that day, shall be deemed to be guilty of a misdemeanour."

Now, Sir, with regard to the Sunday newspaper, fortunately we have not that great demoralizer in Canada yet. Not many years ago the first Sunday newspaper was published in the United States, and a more demoralizing agency cannot be conceived. Its publication involves manufacture, trade, transportation, Sunday secularization and general demoralization. For the Sunday newspaper we see called into existence special Sunday trains; we have steamers transporting it, and we have the thoughts of the public directed into the ordinary rut of week-day concerns, week-day pursuits and week-day reading. It is said that the Monday edition of a paper may involve more Sunday labour than the Sunday edition. I deny that. On the contrary, the Sunday edition involves a hundred times more Sunday labour than the Monday edition. It is not necessary to have Sunday labour for the Monday edition at all; the editors and compositors may go home on Saturday night and return to their work on Sunday night at 12 o'clock, after which there is ample time to bring out the paper. But the Sunday paper is the most prolific and dangerous source of the demoralization and secularization of the ideas of the people that can exist in the country. Its existence in the United States is greatly to be deprecated and deplored.

The next section of the Bill has reference to the closing of the canals. The canals, of course, are Government works, and if the Government permits the operation of the canals on the Lord's Day, the Government itself is guilty of Sunday desecration, and outrages the feelings of the Christian community in this country. The Bill, it is true, makes provision that after the 1st of November in each year, the canals may by Order in Council be kept open. This might partake of the character of a work of necessity, to enable vessels to reach their destination before the closing of the canals and lakes by ice. Section 9 relates to the post office:

"No post office in Canada shall be open for the delivery of letters or the transaction of business, other than the reception of mails, on the Lord's Day."

Now, the example of London, the greatest commercial city in the world, is sufficient to show us that it is not necessary to have the post offices open on the Lord's Day. The excuse often offered for it is that it is necessary to send letters to dying friends. The telegraph, however, is the fast mail of this age, and if it is necessary to apprize persons of the death of a friend, it is not necessary to use the mail at all, because the telegraph, in nine cases out of ten, will reach them sooner. We have protests in various countries against the opening of the mails on the Lord's Day, and although there is little to complain of in Canada in that respect at present, I think the provision of the Bill on the subject is one that will commend itself to the Christian sentiment of the country.

The tenth section relates to railway traffic. If this section of the Bill should meet with criticism at all, it is likely to be charged on the part of those favourable to Sunday rest, that it is too liberal and permits too large an amount of traffic on the railways. It is as follows:—

"Any railway corporation, superintendent, traffic manager, or person or persons by virtue of whose authority and command railway cars or trains shall on the Lord's Day be loaded at any railway station in Canada, or despatched from such station when loaded, or permitted to continue a journey (except in the case of perishable goods) with Canadian local freight,—or any person or persons as aforesaid who shall direct local passenger trains to be run on the Lord's Day (except one mail train each way, and one milk train on each road, and such special trains as are necessary for the purpose of conveying medical aid and means of relief in cases of accident, or to persons injured or afflicted with sickness, or of conveying persons to visit dying relations, or for the purpose of conveying the means for extinguishing fire to places requiring such assistance, or for other acts of necessity and mercy), or shall direct empty cars to be moved from station to station within the territory of Canada,—shall be deemed to be guilty of a misdemeanour: but two through passenger trains each way, with their necessary connections, shall be

permitted on any trunk line of Canada when American through passenger train connections render such trains necessary:

"2. At such time as the laws of the United States shall make corresponding provision, no through freight in transit from one point on the frontier of the United States to some other point on the said frontier, shall be allowed to pass over Canadian roads on the Lord's Day, except live stock and perishable goods."

It may be claimed that it is unnecessary to permit a mail train, or a milk train, or the transportation of perishable goods—and with regard to the latter, the refrigerator renders it unnecessary to move that class of freight on the Lord's Day. Perhaps it is unnecessary to have milk or mail trains on the Sunday, but it was felt our transportation interests in this country are very important, and that this is a question in a measure beyond our reach. It would be impossible, without doing great injustice to our railways, to make any provision which would compel them to adopt a different policy from that pursued by the trunk lines of the United States with which they connect. Take the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, they would be placed at great disadvantage in their competition with the American lines, if they were prevented making the necessary connections on the Lord's Day, and prevented carrying on that day the through freight, which they must bring to its destination without interruption. The second sub-section of the clause provides:

"At such times as the laws of the United States shall make corresponding provision, no through freight in transit from one point on the frontier of the United States to some other point on the said frontier, shall be allowed to pass over Canadian roads on the Lord's Day, except live stock and perishable goods."

So that, with regard to the transportation of through freight, the Bill places us in this position: that as soon as the United States, if they do adopt a Sunday Observance Bill, prohibit their through freight traffic on the Lord's Day, a similar provision will be enforced in this country. The provision in this Bill is contingent on the Americans adopting a similar one, and will not go into operation until they do so, because otherwise we would place our railways at a great disadvantage in their competition with American lines for passenger traffic and freight traffic. With regard to railway traffic, I suppose our railway managers have no desire to transgress in this particular. Mr. Seargeant, at present the general manager of the Grand Trunk Railway, in a letter last year, took a position with regard to this matter which was very satisfactory to those who favour Sunday rest reform, and the letter of Mr. VanHorne was also of a satisfactory character. As I intimanted a few moments ago, the transgressions on the part of the railway companies of the ordinance of Sabbath rest are in a sense involuntary. They are compelled to permit these transgressions in consequence of the necessity resting upon them through their American connections. The necessity for railway traffic on the Sunday is not admitted by the advocates of this Bill in the United States, and is not admitted here. Celebrated railway authorities there assert that it does not exist. Colonel Diven, who was for many years—seventeen years, I think—the general traffic manager of the New York and Erie Railway, said, in his evidence before the United States Senate Committee, with reference to this matter:

"There is no valid excuse for railroad traffic on Sunday, either for mail, passengers, or freight. Why should not

traffic on our railroads rest with all the other business activities? None of the other great interests are paralyzed by resting one day in seven, nor would any follow the suspension of the railroad traffic. Is the transmission of mails a necessity? The best and most successful business men I have ever known never open their letters on Sunday. If there ever was a necessity for the Sunday mail traffic, it ceased with the telegram. If ever there was a necessity for moving perishable articles on Sunday, it has been removed by the refrigerator car. My article in the *Christian Union* was intended as a challenge to railroad managers to justify their management. When that challenge is accepted I believe it can be successfully met by men of practical experience."

Thirty-one railway managers, in response to circulars or letters issued by the Sunday-rest promoters, gave it as their opinion that Sunday railway traffic was totally unnecessary, that it might, with every advantage to the public and without detriment or loss to the corporations, be entirely suspended.

The eleventh and last section of this Bill makes provision against Sunday excursions by steamboat or railway. Many excuses and reasons are assigned in justification of these excursions. It is said that it is necessary for the poor toiler in the cities to see God in nature, and that he requires to go into the country on the Sabbath. Well, we have very few cities so large that the toiler cannot get out into the country on foot, and a walk of two or three miles will bring him into the heart of green fields and to the enjoyment of the purest air.

Mr. AMYOT. He will be in the dust.

Mr. CHARLTON. He will be in the dust with cinders as well on a railway train. The fact is the demand for excursions is a selfish demand, because it forces the necessity of performing labour on a certain class of men, engineers, brakemen, and other employés, in order to enable people to go on these excursions. These excursions are demoralizing. They do not afford rest, because those who participate in them come back at night fagged, worn out, and in a physical condition which renders it necessary for them to seek that repose on a Monday which they should have had on the Sunday devoted to the excursion. The Catholic sugar planters of Louisiana, in 1886, were obliged to petition to the Legislature of Louisiana to secure the passage of a Sunday Rest Bill. The evil of Sunday excursions on the part of their employers was so great that on an average they could only work four days in the week. They came back with a sulphurous Monday and blue Tuesday as a rule after a Sabbath desecrated by drink and excess. Investigations have proved that the labourer who remains quietly at home on the Lord's Day and attends Divine service and Sunday school, comes to his work on Monday morning refreshed for the week, while the man who goes on an excursion comes back, in nine cases out of ten, if not in a state of drunkenness, at all events, tired and unfit for labour the following day. The association to secure Sunday rest in the United States addressed a great number of circulars to employers of labour asking them the condition of their employés who went out on Sunday excursions as compared with that of those who remained at home and were Sabbath observers, and the reply invariably was that those who spent the Sabbath on excursions were not at hand on the Monday morning as a rule but required a blue Monday and a black Tuesday to get over the excitement of their Sunday revelry, whereas those who had spent the Sunday quietly at home with their families were

on hand ready to begin work the Monday morning on time and with renewed vigour. With regard to excesses in connection with Sunday excursions I will give one extract from an address by Rev. Wilber F. Crafts:

"As a matter of fact, whatever may be said of 'Sunday excursions *per se*,' the real Sunday excursion is bad and leads to worse and worst. Refinement as well as religion taboos them. In California, where they have grown to ripeness and beyond, even the Sunday newspapers join in a general protest that has compelled some railroads to suspend them as nuisances. Think of a hoodlum picnic from San Francisco, after having terrorized a beautiful suburb all day, returning on Sunday night on a train with the lights turned out. That, as one has said, is the 'respectable Sunday excursion gone to seed.'"

That is said to be the tendency of the Sunday excursion. In nine cases out of ten these excursions are not productive of any good, and they are often attended by free liquor and free amusements, and they are always attended by weariness at the end of the day. There are two classes who oppose legislation of the character we have under consideration to-day.

One class opposes this legislation because they are averse to anything in the way of religious ordinances, those are the anarchist, the infidel, the brawler and the drinker. Another class opposes this legislation from religious scruples, and they include the Seventh Day Baptists, the Adventists and the Jews, who do not believe in the observance of the first day of the week. In Canada, probably, these do not exceed 2 per cent. of the population—perhaps not more than 1 per cent. We cannot change the day of rest from the first to the seventh day in order to suit 2 per cent. of the population, but we might meet this difficulty in this way: Certainly these people have religious scruples, and their scruples have a right to consideration, and it would be wrong to trample on anyone's religious scruples. Section 1572 of the General Statutes of Connecticut provides that:

"No person who conscientiously believes that the seventh day of the week ought to be observed as the Sabbath, and actually refrains from secular work and labour on that day shall be liable to prosecution for performing secular business and labour on the Sabbath, provided he disturbs no other person while attending public worship."

Some provision of that kind might be adopted, and that would provide for this assumed right and would meet the difficulty felt by Seventh Day Baptists, Adventists and Jews. The truth is that we cannot have two Sabbaths. We cannot have two days of rest, and it is useless to talk about it. We cannot provide that Saturday and the first day of the week shall both be observed as Sabbaths, and if we have to make any other provision than for one day, that provision which I have quoted from the law of Connecticut might be adopted. Men are often guilty of too great literalness. In regard to the Sabbath being observed on the first day of the week, that is a matter which, in my opinion, has no significance as to a day being chosen as the day of rest. If we adopted any day of the week, it might answer the same end. It might not answer religious views or religious scruples, but for the people in general one day of the week for a day of rest would do as well as any other. I think there is too much literalness with our friends the Adventists and the Seventh Day Baptists. If we were to start from any particular meridian, and were not to change our reckoning at the 180 degrees of longitude, we would find that we were keeping the Sabbath on a different day of the week. If a vessel sailed to the west and went around the globe without changing the reckoning on the 180 degrees she would arrive at her destination keeping Monday for Sunday; while if sailing in the opposite direction without the necessary adjustment of the calendar the vessel would reach her starting point with Saturday usurping the place of Sunday. In one case, in the Island of Samoa, the missionaries found that they were observing Saturday as the Sabbath, because they had not corrected their calendar when they went to that country; and I think our friends the Seventh Day Baptists and the Adventists might take a lesson from that fact.

I have already detained the House rather long, and this is rather like a sermon. Unregenerate man is not very fond of this kind of pabulum. I am sorry that this is not very interesting, but I think that, in conclusion, I may safely affirm, if my premises are correct, my conclusion is also correct; and that is, firstly, that a weekly day of rest is a natural need and a natural right of man. The celebrated Humboldt says that it is scientifically true that a weekly day of rest is a natural law and a natural right of man. My next proposition is that the day of rest must be the same for all. It would not do to have hod-carriers, merchants, lawyers and firemen select Saturday for their day of rest, while bricklayers, plasterers, judges and engineers observed Sunday, and other classes might observe Monday or Tuesday. That would derange the whole structure of labour. You must have one day selected as the day of rest. The next proposition I make is, that the common rest day must be protected by law. It is not an efficient rest day unless the law protects the right of the labourers to rest on that day. Many labourers cannot exercise their own choice on that day unless they are protected by law. They may be required to labour on every day of the week, and, if they refuse to do so, they are liable to lose their living and to lose their situation. Therefore, this God-given right must be secured to them by law as it is given to them by every right, human and divine. As to the law securing this rest day to the labourer, my fourth and last proposition is that two exceptions should be made. One refers to works of necessity, and the other to works of mercy. I, therefore, say that the rest day is a natural right and a needed right of man: the rest day must necessarily be one throughout the land, it must be secured to all men by law, and the only qualification is, that works of necessity and works of mercy, shall be exempted from the operation of this law.

When this Bill was discussed some five or six years ago, my hon. friend the Secretary of State, and the right hon. gentleman who then led the House, took the position that the Bill was *ultra vires*, that the provisions of the Bill properly belonged to the Local Legislatures. That was the Bill in reference to Sunday excursions. I suppose it is in the power of this House to declare what is a misdemeanour, and it is in the power of this House to punish a misdemeanour in such a way as its discretion may dictate, whether by fine or imprisonment. This Bill declares every offence in the Bill to be a misdemeanour. As I have said, the first six sections of this Bill relate to offences that possibly might be considered as more properly

coming within the jurisdiction of the Local Legislatures, but the seventh and the following sections to the eleventh inclusive, relate to offences clearly within the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada, and not within the jurisdiction of the Local Legislatures. Consequently, I hold that the Bill is constitutional, that there is not an offence dealt with in this Bill that is not an offence which this Parliament may deal with under the assumption that it is a misdemeanour, and that all offences from the sixth clause, are offences that this Parliament must deal with and that the Legislatures of the provinces cannot deal with. For instance, they cannot deal with our canals, they cannot deal with post offices, they cannot deal with our railway traffic—these are offences that we must deal with.

Sir, the considerations and conclusions that, in my opinion, commend this Bill to the favourable consideration of this House, and to the favourable consideration of the people of Canada, are, first of all, and perhaps the most important of all, that a rest day has been provided by Divine law, and that the Sabbath is of Divine ordinance. It is a civil ordinance as well, but it is primarily a Divine ordinance, a blessing conferred by God upon man. The next consideration that will commend the Bill to the favour of the House, is that its provisions are calculated to promote the good of the people. It is evident that there is a vast difference between English institutions and the institutions of continental nations: it is clear that the observation of the Sabbath in the English commonwealths has had a salutary influence upon public life. It is impossible to over-estimate the value to the people of this country, and the value to the people of other English-speaking commonwealths, of the blessings that have resulted from the observation of the first day of the week as a day of rest, as a day of Christian observance. The next thing that, in my opinion, commends this Bill to the favourable consideration of the House, is the fact that it emancipates labour from the exactions of the employer, it strikes off the shackles from the bond slave, it may be, who is a labourer, who has no other means of asserting his right to the day of rest than the means provided for him by the enactment of a law to protect him. The next point, in my estimation, in which this Bill commends itself to our favourable consideration, is that it promotes not only the interest of the labourer, but it promotes the interest of the employer. It is in the interest of the employer to have on Monday a sober, alert, clean, respectable, efficient labourer, prepared to take hold of his work, in place of a labourer who has been, perhaps, spending a dissolute Sabbath, who is unfitted to labour upon Monday and often unfitted upon Tuesday. It is in the interest of the employer to have an honest, God-fearing labourer, instead of a hoodlum. The operations of this Bill, so far as it affects the interests of the employer, will be salutary; it promotes his interest in every respect as well as the interest of the employé, for the interests of both are mutual in this regard. The last reason for which this Bill deserves our favourable consideration is that it is a blessing even to those who curse the Bill, it is a blessing to those who oppose it. There is not a class in the community, there is not a person in the country, that is not really to be benefited by a Sunday Rest Bill, a Bill which will secure to him the right to rest: a Bill, the tendency of which will be to direct his thoughts out of the ordinary rut of week-day life and week-day pursuits, to something higher: and the operation of the Bill in every respect, looking at it from whatever point you may, criticize it in whatever way you please—the operation of the Bill under the consideration of the House, will be salutary and beneficient to the whole country and to every interest, to every class, and to every individual, within the limits of this broad Dominion.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Before the House takes action upon this Bill, I will say a few words upon the subject. This is the second time, I think, that the hon. member has spoken in support of a measure of this kind, for I think the Bill which he introduced last year, but which he did not press to a conclusion, was of a very similar character. The propositions which the hon. gentleman advanced with such strong argument and illustration, are propositions on which, I think, there can be no difference of opinion in this House: and the conclusions at which he seems to have arrived in his argument, are not conclusions which any one, I think, would be disposed to combat. Still, I am very doubtful if many of the provisions of the Bill are sustained as the result of his argument. For example, I suppose, there can be no difference of opinion in this House as to the fact that a day of rest has been ordained by divine law, there can be no second opinion in this House that the good of the state requires that a day of rest should be fully observed. There can be no difference of opinion at all as to the proposition that the law should enforce the observance of that day of rest. But, in discussing the features of this Bill, we have to deal with the fact that, granted it is the subject of divine law, granted the day of rest beneficial to the state, granted that law is necessary to its observance in every province in the Dominion, Acts have been passed, and in almost every municipality of Canada enactments have been passed, almost as strict as the provisions of this Bill. It is a subject of which the Provincial Legislatures have fully possessed themselves, and it is, no doubt, within the competence of the Provincial Legislatures, and within their practice, to say how far the enactments on this subject are sufficiently severe or how much the severity should be increased from time to time. I think that the hon. gentleman was almost fully conscious of that fact when he intimated that the first half dozen clauses of the Bill might, perhaps, on examination be found to be unnecessary, and he discussed at greater length some of the other provisions of the Bill, which he thought were not within provincial jurisdiction. The first point, however, I wish to make before discussing those clauses which are within our jurisdiction—possibly all of them are, but when I say within our jurisdiction, I mean not only within our competence—but within our competence only—the first point to be considered before going to that class of subjects, is the state of the provincial laws upon this subject, whether it is necessary for us to deal with this subject by the criminal law, or whether it is not better to leave it as it is now, a subject of provincial and municipal regulation. It is my own belief that it is better to leave it as it is now. We have laws of very considerable strictness and severity in regard to this subject, as I have stated, in every province;

some of them, perhaps, not so strict as others, and the Provincial Legislatures are, for all purposes, better able to judge how far the provisions of the Sunday Rest Bill should be relaxed, in view of peculiar or local circumstances. I propose, therefore, and in this I have been given to understand the hon. gentleman will not differ from me, that the opinion of the House shall not be tested at this stage, on this Bill, by any division, but that the House will agree to refer the Bill, after its second reading, to a select committee, principally with a view to the consideration of this point. When the hon. gentleman came to consider some of the provisions of the Bill which he thought were outside of the province of the Local Legislatures, it seemed to me he was mistaken in some particulars, for example, in supposing that the subject of publishing newspapers could not be dealt with by Provincial Legislatures as well as any other active employment. I think it will be observed in this connection that as regards some of those provisions, they are far more severe than are necessary. For example, section 6 of the Bill provides that:

"Whoever shall on the Lord's Day go out fishing, or shall take, kill or destroy any fish, or use any gun, fishing-rod, net or other appliance for that purpose, shall be deemed to be guilty of a misdemeanour."

It provides that there shall be no fishing between twelve o'clock Saturday night and twelve o'clock Sunday night, notwithstanding it may be necessary for the actual sustenance of life: for the hon. gentleman has only made in his Bill a reservation in favour of the Indians, but there are many poor persons living in the country who need to engage in the pursuit of game and the taking of fish as well as do the Indians. It prohibits the catching in a net of any fish on Sunday, notwithstanding that the net may have been set on a week day, and that it may be exceedingly injurious to the party who owns it to remove it for the purpose of Sabbath observance. So when we come to the question of printing or publishing a newspaper on Sunday, the hon. gentleman's Bill, if I am correctly informed, would practically stop the publication of a Monday newspaper, inasmuch as the greater portion of the work done on the Monday paper requires to be performed before twelve o'clock on Sunday night in order to get the newspaper to press on Monday morning. I will now say a few words with respect to the provisions of the Bill which seem to affect the public interest, and the hon. gentleman directed our attention to them as indicating the necessity of legislation here as distinguished from provincial legislation. The provisions of sections 8, 9 and 10, require very careful consideration indeed. I think we shall have to oppose on principle the adoption of these provisions, although it may be desirable that the committee shall carefully consider how far the public interests are involved in sections of that character, irrespective of any attitude the Government may eventually take on that question. As to the provisions which refer, for example, to the absolute closing of the canals and the operating of the railways, I will speak only in a general way. The hon. gentleman has recognized in his Bill and in his speech the necessity of operating passenger trains, milk trains and several classes of trains of that kind for ublic convenience and for the convenience of the ordinary trade of the country. I am informed it is equally necessary that, within certain hours at least, vessels should be allowed to pass through the canals, to prevent the absolute stoppage of the canal trade between Saturday night and Sunday morning to the great detriment of those engaged in shipping and the great detriment of those whose cargoes are *en route*. As regards the railways, the Bill contains provisions which are entirely anomalous, I think. The hon. gentleman's proposal is that the carriage of all local Canadian freight shall be stopped on Sunday, but a railway may carry American freight, so that one train or one car which is on its way on Saturday night must be stopped and the freight divided: the American freight can go forward to its destination, but the Canadian freight must take its day of rest until Monday morning. The hon. gentleman has made that distinction intentionally, because he calls attention to the fact, and the Bill recognizes the fact that a different arrangement may be made when Congress shall pass a law of equal severity with this Bill upon this subject. But I do not see why that distinction should exist until that time arrives. A railway company is not allowed by this Bill to carry Canadian freight to the American border line, but it can receive American freight at the border line and carry it all over Canada. I do not see why that should be so: but much more do I fail to see why, after the freight comes into Canada, a railway should be limited to carrying American and not Canadian freight. The hon. gentleman will find, and the committee of investigation will find, that this will be a most serious and most inconvenient arrangement as regards trade and commerce. However, without detaining the House on the present occasion, I merely rise to indicate some considerations which I think ought to be very carefully taken into account before the Bill is adopted. If the House will concur in the proposal I have made, that in view of the general concensus of opinion in favour of the propositions which the hon. gentleman has advanced and on which his Bill is based, this Bill may fairly be read the second time, then, instead of referring it to the committee of the whole House, I will move that it be referred to a select committee to make an enquiry on the subjects I have mentioned: first, as to the effect of the present provincial and municipal enactments, with a view to ascertain whether those are not sufficient, and whether the matter should not be left in the hands in which it is now; and second, with a view to considering the public interests involved in regard to those provisions which, if adopted at all, must be adopted by this Parliament.

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

After Recess.

Mr. CHARLTON. I beg to concur in the wish expressed by the Minister of Justice that this Bill pass its second reading now, and be referred to a Select Committee of the House.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee; said Committee to be composed as follows:—Messrs. Chapleau, Kirkpatrick, Charlton, Weldon, Mills (Bothwell), Coats-

worth. Davies (P.E.I.), Gillies, Beausoleil, Mara and Christie.

Motion agreed to.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

Mr. EDGAR moved the second reading of Bill (No. 4) to amend the Electoral Franchise Act. He said: The Bill which I propose should be read a second time is a short amendment to the Electoral Franchise Act. It involves the principle of residential franchise or, to a certain extent, the principle of "one man one vote." I am aware, Sir, that this Parliament, and the Parliament which preceded it, is committed to the principle of a uniform Dominion franchise, and although I am one of those who do not believe that to be a correct principle, still I propose by this amendment not to interfere with it. At any rate every one who advocates a uniform Dominion franchise will admit that the present franchise law is not perfect and is susceptible of improvement, and if we are to have a uniform franchise I think we should try to have it uniformly good. Now to secure a franchise that will only give one vote to one man, I can see that double legislative action should be taken, and that we would require to amend not only the franchise, but also the Dominion Elections Act. While by amending the Franchise Act, as I propose to do, we may prevent owners and tenants who seek to be placed upon the electoral list from becoming voters unless they are electors in the electoral division, we cannot prevent these same electors from voting if even they are at the time of voting non-residents of the electoral division, without changing the oath of voters at the polls as it now stands in the Dominion Elections Act. However, I only propose in this Bill to deal with the first part of the programme. The alteration which I propose is only necessary as far as regards owners and tenants, because already "residence" is a prerequisite of being placed upon the voters' list in most cases under the Act. Occupants, of course must be residents of the electoral division, income voters, farmers' sons, owners' sons, fishermen who have a special franchise under the Act, as well as annuitants, are all required to be residents of the electoral division before they are entitled to be placed on the voters' list. You will see therefore that Parliament has gone very far, indeed, towards recognizing the principle of residence in an electoral division as a prerequisite of conferring the franchise upon the electors. I propose to extend this principle of the Act simply to owners and tenants, in addition to its present application. Now, what objections can be urged against that proposition. I suppose I will be met with the old story that property would not be sufficiently or properly represented in Parliament if we only gave one vote to one man, irrespective of his property qualification. But, Sir, Parliament has already ignored the principle of property representation to a very large extent. In the first place, any member who sits in this House to-day requires no property qualification, and so long as he is elected by the qualified voters of the country he cannot be displaced because he has not a few thousands dollars worth of real estate. Therefore, in this House, where the result of all the voting is shown in the election of representatives, we do not recognize the right of property to representation. We have also ignored this principle as far as the electors are concerned when we have allowed to be placed upon the voters' lists the wage-earners, the income voters, the farm labourers and the mechanics. These farm labourers, for instance, who earn eight or ten dollars per month and their board, are entitled to vote now, and surely there is no recognition of the rights of the property qualification in that. The principle of the present Franchise Act in giving to the labourer on a farm, to the mechanic in a factory, or to the porter in a warehouse, the same vote that the proprietor of the farm, or the factory, or the owner of the warehouse has, is absolutely to drop the distinction as far as the franchise is concerned between the man who owns property and the man who does not own property. Then, another step this Parliament has taken has done away largely with the representation of property in this House. When in the old days the elections were held on a number of different dates, spread over several weeks, a man who owned property in several ridings was able without very great difficulty to put in his vote in each of those ridings by attending at the different polling places on different days; but now, under the system of simultaneous polling, a property owner who has votes in remote parts of the country is disfranchised by distance in time or space as to most of his votes, and to that extent we have ceased to recognize property as a qualification for the electors. Then, take the case of a man who may have all his real estate investment in one polling division. He may have one or two hundred thousand dollars' worth; and yet he has only one vote: while another man who may be possessed of only $1,000 worth of real estate may, if it is judiciously distributed among adjoining ridings, have five or more votes upon it. I could give plenty of instances of that kind. In my own case, I do not happen to have much property, but I live in one riding, I have an office in another, and I have a little lot in another: so that I have three votes in the city of Toronto, in addition to which I have some votes on property scattered about in the County of York. There are scores of men in Toronto who have very much more property than I have, but it being concentrated in one riding they have only one vote, whereas if I attended to voting on election day I would be able to record five or six votes. Now, I do not think that is fair. There is no doubt that property will always have its full weight, its proper and legitimate weight, in returning members to this House. If a man owns large property, and has tenants and treats them well, or has a large number of employés and treats them well, he will have all the legitimate influence that he should have in sending members to this House. But, Sir, when you come down to the principle of the thing, I do not think it is property which is, or ought to be, represented in Parliament. It is the brains, and the flesh, and the blood, and the opinions of men, and not the clods of earth, or the trees, or the hills, or the fields, or the piles of brick and mortar, that ought to be represented in this House. Now, Sir, there are some distinct evils, I think, arising from the law as it stands at present allowing non-residents to be placed on the voters' list. I think all the members of this House will readily acknowledge that a large non-resident vote makes a general election a very much more expensive matter to the country than it otherwise would be. If persons have votes in a number of different con-

stituencies, and try to get them in, they must travel and either pay their own expenses or have them paid by somebody else, or else get passes from some railway company; and I am very sure that none of the members on either side of this House are anxious to owe their seats to the favours of the railway companies. The present system offers the temptation for the creation of faggot votes, and in close ridings the result is often affected by such fraudulent votes. There is an admitted evil, and the doing away of that evil is not an experiment in Canada. The last two elections held in the Province of Ontario have been held under a law providing for a resident franchise. When that law was introduced into the province, there were no objections made to it, that I have been able to discover, by the Conservative Opposition in the Ontario Legislature, nor have I heard of any complaint that they have made as to its practical working. I think they are very generally satisfied with it. And, Sir, I do not see why we should not try that very safe experiment in this House. I think it is right in principle. To leave the law as it stands, with a large non-resident vote on the electoral list, is undesirable in the interest of the country, and in the interest of parliamentary candidates, and I hope that this Bill will receive someproper support and consideration from this House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I doubt very much that it is, Mr. Speaker, the pleasure of the House that the Bill be read a second time; but in case it should be, I want to say a word on the other side. There is one feature of the Bill as to which I perceive my hon. friend has apparently considered that a very serious grievance exists in this country. He is evidently impressed with an article which a member read the other evening, stating that, in a campaign not very remote now, upwards of 2,000 persons owing allegiance to our Sovereign, but living in a foreign country, were transported to this country to cast their votes, and shouted acclaim to the leader of a great party in this country when they came across the line. The Bill of my hon. friend seems designed to meet what he, as well as some of our friends on this side, evidently conceive to have been a great evil, namely, that persons who have gone to reside in a foreign country could, in a moment of political crisis and excitement, be transported by one of these vicious railways to which he has referred, free of charge to this country, to the extent of thousands at a time, and shout political cries to the disturbance of the residents in this country as they pass over the border. Now, in opposing the second reading of the Bill, I do not mean to say that I do not, to some extent, sympathize with the feeling of my hon. friend that that is an evil which requires a remedy: but I mean to say that my hon. friend from Brockville (Mr. Wood) has a Bill before the House which deals with that subject alone, and does not complicate it with other questions; and I, therefore, propose not to vote for this Bill, but to wait until the Bill of my hon. friend from Brockville comes up, and give my vote for that. If the hon. gentleman who has this Bill in charge will read the Bill of the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood), he will find that it meets the great difficulty he has in view. It prevents these persons who are non-residents in this country and who have no stake in any electoral district in this country being brought over the lines free of charge by a railway company to disturb our elections. But the reason why I would rather vote for the Bill of my hon. friend from Brockville than for the present one is that the present Bill is complicated by questions relating to the basis of the franchise itself. Now, I do not propose this evening to detain the House by any argument on the question of property qualifications or on any questions of political economy. To these my hon. friend has barely alluded, because he, like myself, understands that this question is fully appreciated by the House, and has been continually discussed for the last six years, and that property forms one of the bases of the franchise established by the present law. If the Bill which was introduced by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron), the other day, had passed this House and we had repealed the Franchise Act entirely, there would have been no necessity to discuss the propriety of the principle of "one man and one vote" as regards some of the provinces—at least the principal province, perhaps, in Canada, because in that province that principle is recognized, although in certain portions of it I understand the operation of the principle is singularly prejudiced. But, Sir, the hon. member who has introduced the Bill has declared that the present franchise law ignores property qualification, and the argument he advanced in support of this contention is that members of this House do not require to possess a property qualification in order to be elected here. I submit that is not a sound argument. The Franchise Act recognizes the property qualification in the voter, and that property, which is possessed by the voter, may be represented in this House by a man who has no property qualification. The hon. gentleman further says that the Franchise Act ignores property qualification, because there are some persons admitted to the franchise who have no property whatever. That is true, but it only proves that the Franchise Act is not entirely based on property qualification. Nevertheless, in the cases in which that qualification is the basis of the franchise, the principle which the Franchise Act would keep in view is that, inasmuch as certain classes of voters get their qualifications to vote in respect of their property, it is but fair that the possession of that qualification in more constituencies than one should confer the right to cast a vote in more constituencies than one, in order that that property, to use a popular phrase, may be represented. The hon. gentleman who moves the Bill tells us that property ought not to be represented, that it is only brains which should be represented here. With great respect to the hon. gentleman, and without going into abstruse arguments on the question, that is hardly a fair way to put it. When we say that property is to be represented, we mean that thrift is to be represented. We mean that the rights are to be represented here which are to be affected by the legislation here, and the qualification which the voter enjoys, therefore, in Toronto and Hamilton gives him the vote in both places. The hon. gentleman has told us again that the principle of simultaneous voting has to a large extent impaired the effect of the representation of property in more constituencies than one. In saying that, the hon. gentleman has only shown

us that the evils he complains of are very slight indeed, and that under the principle of simultaneous voting it is practically a matter of difficulty for a man to vote in more places than one, during a general election at least. That, however, does not derogate from the principle of the Franchise Act: it does not derogate from the right which that Act recognizes to have that property represented by the two representatives who are returned from the constituencies in which it is placed. I think that the additional argument advanced by the hon. gentleman, namely, that by a judicious distribution of property in more than one electoral district a person may thus acquire a vote in each, whereas by a concentration of property in one electoral district the voter loses the right of voting more than once, is hardly a sound, or even a plausible argument against the principle of the present law. It may be true that by an ingenious distribution of the property qualification a vote in more ridings than one may be obtained, but I doubt very much indeed that, for the mere privilege of casting a vote in more than one riding, the hon. gentleman who has the Bill in charge would be willing to distribute his property in various constituencies. When we find that this has been done in bad faith and for the mere purpose of controlling the franchise, let us have the proof, and let us apply the remedy; but if it be, as it is now—and no pretension is made to the contrary—that property is acquired without respect to the franchise, and that franchise is had as a reward of thrift, and that the individual who has acquired that qualification in more than one constituency, has acquired it without regard to the franchise, his right is not to be taken away simply because it might, under possible circumstances, lead to an abuse. Under these circumstances, and as the Bill is totally at variance with the principle of the Act which has been affirmed again and again, and no later in this Parliament than about a fortnight ago, I conclude by moving in amendment that the Bill be not now read the second time but be read a second time this day six months.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not at all understand that this House precluded itself from proposing any amendment to the existing election law by the vote it gave on the Bill of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron). The question in issue in that Bill was whether we should adopt the franchises of the various provinces as the franchise of the Dominion, or whether we should continue to act under the Dominion Franchise Act. The hon. Minister, in moving the six months' hoist to that Bill, did not for one moment suggest that we had reached the condition of ideal perfectability with regard to our legislation upon this subject. He did not pretend to argue that the measure now upon the Statute-book was so perfect or so complete in itself that it was incapable of improvement, but the hon. gentleman informs us, in the speech he has just addressed to the House in opposition to the Bill proposed by my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Edgar), that that is the case, that this Bill is altogether unnecessary, that it ought not to have been proposed, that it ought to be opposed in this House, because the Bill proposed by my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Cameron) a few evenings ago, was rejected by the House. I do not understand that that is the position at all. There were two radically different principles presented to the House as between the Dominion Act—an Act proclaiming uniformity on the subject of the franchise—and the measure which the hon. member for Huron proposed. Now, what is proposed by the present Bill is simply an amendment of the law as it now stands. There is no attempt to change the sphere of legislation. What my hon. friend proposes is that this House shall amend the existing law, and he points out that a very large number of persons who are now entitled to vote and do vote, do so after they have ceased to be residents of this country, and have ceased to be British subjects. The hon. the Minister of Justice tells us that this feature of the law, which he admits is objectionable and ought to be amended, will be met by a Bill proposed by the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood). I aver that it will not be met by that Bill. What are the provisions of the Bill of the hon. member for Brockville? Simply that persons who have become citizens of another country and subjects of another sovereignty shall not be voters in this country. But supposing an income voter who was qualified under the income franchise provisions goes to the United States, but still has not become a subject or citizen of the United States, he may have resided there for three years, he may have expressed his intention to become a citizen of the United States, but, not having resided there for five years, and not having become a citizen of the United States, he may take the oath under the Bill proposed by the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) and may come back here and vote. I know, and everyone who resides in a border county knows, that we have a fluctuating population. We have many young men who are seeking their fortunes across the border whose names stand on the voters' list, and not having become citizens of the United States, many of them not having announced their intention to become citizens of the United States, or not having made up their minds one way or the other, nevertheless they are entitled to vote here under the law proposed by the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood). I object to that. What is the important fact to bear in mind in regard to this subject. Whether you require property as a qualification or not, this principle is recognized, and it is one that will be accepted on all hands, that a man in order to vote ought to be a member of the body politic on behalf of which he casts a vote. Upon what ground do you admit, as all the colonists of Great Britain do, and as the United States contend for, the right of self-expatriation? It is that, when a man separates himself from the country to which he owes allegiance and becomes the citizen of another country, he becomes a member of another society, and has no claim to vote or to interfere with the country from which he has separated himself. That is what we ask here, and the Minister of Justice will see that he has not met this condition of things. This Bill does that. The Minister of Justice does not say I object to recognizing the principle of "one man one vote," but I will confine the right to vote to those who continue to be residents of the country. There might be some argument in that, that a man who removes from one county to another in Canada should still have a vote in the county in which he is registered, but what can be said in favour of the man who is a resident of the country

over the border and has no property whatever left behind him upon which he is qualified? Take the case of a man who is a tenant. He stands upon the voters' list as a tenant, but he has left, and his tenancy has expired. He may be brought back and he may vote as long as his name is on the voters' list, and I have known of persons whose names have stood on the voters' list as long as this law has been on the Statute-book though they left the country six months after it was passed. I think that is objectionable, and though you may not meet that by declaring that a man shall have but one vote, and that that shall be given only in the place where he resides, you may provide that a man may have his name transferred from one electoral district to another, if he has changed his residence, but he ought to vote where he resides, and ought to have only one vote. Upon what ground has one man more than one vote? The Minister of Justice says: We recognize property in the electoral franchise. Is that the rule to be adopted? Then a man with $10,000 worth of property should have ten votes to one for a man who has $1,000 worth of property. That is recognized in banking institutions, and, if my hon. friend the Minister of Justice were a member of a monetary institution, he would insist upon that being carried out; but, as people capable of thinking and reflecting, we believe that property is a mere incident to our intellectual power and our moral qualities, and these are the chief things which concern the Government of the country, and which we regard as an evidence of qualification. The Minister of Justice says that the man who has his property divided in several counties ought to have a larger number of votes than a man who has the same amount of property in one county. Upon what ground? You can easily pack votes that way. You find men purchasing small properties and renting small houses in different constituencies for the very purpose of voting in other constituencies than that in which they reside. I say that a man who has more property and more intelligence than his neighbours will derive more influence than his neighbours from his property and his intelligence. His character, his ability to think, his social position and a score of other things give him what the Minister of Justice proposes to give him by additional votes which he does not require. But, if a man ought to have a vote in every county in which he has property, you ought not to have simultaneous elections, because in that way you interfere with the exercise of his right. In many instances, he cannot vote in more than one county on the same day, while his property may be in other counties which he cannot reach on the day of election. Thus you ought to have an election extending over as many days as there are constituencies in the country, so that he may be able to cast his vote in every constituency in which he has property. Well, that may be an absurd thing, but it logically flows from the contention of the Minister of Justice, and it is the only contention upon which this provision of the law, as it now stands, can be supported or upheld. I submit that the law is defective in this particular. It is objectionable, and it is objectionable for the reason that we are constantly legislating against corrupt practices, and there is nothing in this country that contributes so much to corrupt practices as the fact that men who reside out of the constituency, and out of the country, may be brought in for the purpose of casting their votes. Why, Sir, if the contention of the Minister of Justice was well founded, if these men who have no stake in the country, and no interest in the country, and who have gone abroad for the purpose of living somewhere else, because their names happen to be upon the voters' list, can rightfully be brought back or come back for the purpose of voting, I think that right would be well sacrificed for the purpose of obtaining purity in the elections, and to enable us to conduct our elections without the enormous expense which they sometimes entail in this country. Why, Sir, we hear of large numbers of parties being brought into the country. Do they come at their own expense? In some instances they may, but in the majority of instances, probably, they do not. They have come at the expense of some individual parties, or some friend who is residing out of the county, or some powerful railway corporation which is interested in the success of one party rather than another for the purpose of promoting its own special interest. I say that the existence of this right to vote in more than one constituency, is a serious evil. It leads to corruption, it leads to additional expense in the elections, and in the case of many innocent parties, it leads to the filing of petitions, to vexatious proceedings and to election contests, none of which would exist if this provision of the law were stricken out, and if such a measure as that proposed by my hon. friend were put upon the Statute-book. I trust that this House will not rest merely upon the partial amendments proposed by either of the Bills now before the House, but that it will proceed to procure cheapness in the elections, purity in the elections, perfect fairness in the elections, by adopting the principle contained in the Bill now before us, giving to one man one vote, and that whatever additional authority or influence he may exercise in the elections, shall be due to his own merit, to his ability and his social influence, not to the possession of a vote in some other constituency than the one in which he resides.

Mr. WATSON. Coming from a province that has a great number of non-residents on the list I feel that I would not be doing my duty unless I gave my reasons for supporting the Bill now before the House. I believe, and have always believed, in the principle of "one man one vote." I believe that under our system of raising a revenue it is the principle that should prevail. Very often a man who is not possessed of any real estate at all, probably contributes more to the revenue of the country than a man who is worth $10,000; consequently he has a right to the same franchise. I support the Bill for other reasons. I believe that we would have much purer elections if this Bill became law. The present system leads to personation and perjury, and this is carried on more or less in every contest. Under the present system non-residents are not personally known, no one knows whether they are the proper persons to vote under the names that are on the list, and, consequently, personation is practised to an enormous extent in some elections. I know that in my own county during the last contest a large number of votes were personated. It is impossible to detect them, unless you have some person there who knows them, and who is prepared

to prevent them from personating. They simply swear in their vote and leave. Even men who are known, and whom you would not expect to vote in different counties, have personated men high in position. I know in my own county during the last election an hon. gentleman who has a seat in the Senate of Canada, Senator Sutherland, came to my town and personated a vote, and swore in his vote, notwithstanding the fact that the property on which he voted was described on the list. He was sworn by my opponent's scrutineer, and he took the oath and voted, notwithstanding that the property qualification was on the list, a property which he never owned, a property which belonged to Mr. John Sutherland, a resident farmer, who has owned the property for the last twelve years. Now, it is estimated that in my county alone over 250 outside votes were polled, men who were brought into that county to vote, and a large number of them were supposed to be personated votes. In the city of Winnipeg it was estimated that over 400 outside votes were brought in, and these were cast for the hon. gentleman who has now a seat in this House. How many of these men were entitled to vote, it is hard to say. Special trains were run through my county: two special trains were carrying voters for my opponent, and not one elector who was known to be favourable to myself was allowed to ride on that train. Over 250 voters were brought into the county in this way. I will relate just one instance to show how this personation is carried on. An elector presented himself to the outside scrutineer, who asked his name. He looked at the list and said his name was James Cox Aikens. The scrutineer said: "You had better take the next name. That is the name of the ex-Governor of Manitoba, and he is not here to-day." The individual took the next name and voted, and this instance shows what manner of things are carried on under the present law. I thoroughly approve of this Bill. I believe it will lead to purer elections. I do not think that outsiders or railway corporations who can afford to bring in parties, should have the power to do so. We were told, the other night, in a debate, that over 2,000 residents of a foreign country were brought into the Province of Quebec and voted, because their names were on the list. I thought that statement, coming from a Minister of the Crown, was a reflection on the policy of the Government. In that case, it appears that over 2,000 electors who were entitled to be placed on the list, at the last revision, had left our country and gone to reside in a foreign country. That seemed to be a poor argument to use, coming from the source it did. In the interest of the country, and in the interest of honest elections, I hope that this Bill will become law.

Mr. TUPPER. I would like to draw attention to the argument that has been addressed to the House by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). It seems to me that hon. gentleman has not carefully read the provisions of the Bill now under consideration, since he addressed himself largely to the principle of "one man one vote." This Bill goes much further than that; this Bill is a much more drastic amendment to the franchise law than any proposition of that kind, because it can destroy a man with any vote, though he be a Canadian citizen holding property, having interests at stake in this country; it can destroy his influence and rob him of his franchise altogether. I may point out to the hon. gentleman that the proposed qualifications are based not upon "residence or domicile," but "residence and domicile." The Bill says that an elector must be resident and domiciled within the electoral district. So that if, for reasons that so often arise in a country like ours, with its enormous extent of territory and various industries and large districts over which business may be carried on, an elector having great interest, in any particular district for a season perhaps, or for temporary reasons removes his residence from the district in which his capital is invested, and in order to promote his business goes to another part of the Dominion, then by the provisions of this Bill he is deprived of the right of assisting in the control of the political interests of the country and of recording his vote at an election. If hon. gentlemen who are promoting this Bill have in view the principle they have stated, the language of the Bill is sadly astray. It does not assert the principle of "one man one vote," and that is the subject to which the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat gave his exclusive attention. I merely rose to point out that fact, because in both of the sections there is the extraordinary proposition laid down, in support of which I have not heard an argument advanced, and that is, that it is expedient that a man in order to secure his vote at an election must keep his residence always and entirely within one electoral district in the Dominion. The proposition needs only to be stated, the clause of the Bill needs only to be read, to carry an answer at once to the mind of any reflecting man. I have heard no argument in support of the language of the Bill that a man in order to vote at any election must be resident and domiciled within the district in which he claims to be registered. The other remark of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) seems a little at variance with the confident declaration he made a short time ago. The hon. gentleman said that within a few weeks he expected to be on this side of the House, and he is welcome, as the Minister of Justice suggests, whenever he comes. But I should like to point out to him that this seems a little at variance with his statement that the Franchise Act had been established by the vote a few nights ago, and a majority of the House having refused to repeal the Act the hon. gentleman, forgetting altogether the exuberant spirit in which he was then, now says we must bend our energies to the improvement of the measure. And so we should; but I am quite certain this is not a step in the right direction, and I claim that the hon. gentleman himself, since he is not converted to the principle expressly involved in this Bill, is not in a frame of mind that should lead him to support the motion for the second reading.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Like every good legislator, the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), having first attempted to repeal an objectionable Act and found the majority in favour of its retention, bends his energies to the improvement of the Bill. No one can find fault with him for so doing; and that is the answer to the criticism which the Minister of Marine has just offered. With respect to the other point just referred to, I call attention to the fact that the hon. gentleman's speech was

delivered at the wrong time. The hon. gentleman has not attacked the principle of the Bill; he has simply spent a few moments in offering a few verbal criticisms on the language used. The question as to whether the words "residence" or "domicile" should remain in the Bill is one to be settled in Committee, and at present we are simply discussing the principle of the Bill and not its details. When we go into Committee, the hon. gentleman can then present his arguments, and strike out any words to which he takes objection. If he thinks the principle of the Bill is correct, he should vote for the second reading, and try to amend it in Committee. The main point now to decide, and it is involved in the amendment of the Minister of Justice, is whether the principle involved in the Bill, of "one man one vote," should be adopted, or whether a man should have a vote in every electoral district where he happens to have property. I am not going to repeat the arguments which have already been well presented, and which are in a nutshell. The hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Edgar) has shown that whereas he happens to have three or four pieces of property very near each other, but in three different electoral districts, he has three votes, his neighbour who has ten times the property has only one vote. Logically the proposition is indefensible, and I do not think those acquainted with the practical working of the system as it now exists can defend it against the principle sought to be introduced. This is a fair, honest and square measure. Every man in the community capable of bearing arms and liable to be called on to assist in the defence of the country, being of full age and not being an idiot or under the ban of the law for having committed some crime, should have a vote, and if he has a vote he should have one vote and one vote only. I accede fully to the proposition that property always has had, and will continue to have, its legitimate and fair influence, and we should not add to that legitimate and fair influence an unfair and illegitimate influence by doubling or trebling the property holder's vote.

Mr. COCKBURN. I rise merely to direct attention to a statement made by the hon. gentleman who moved the second reading of this Bill. He stated that the election law of Ontario gave almost universal satisfaction, that two elections had been conducted under that law and they proved its most satisfactory character. The hon. gentleman is himself a resident of the fair city of Toronto, he is a large property holder there, and he must be aware that it is there at most a two-thirds franchise and in many cases a one-third franchise. The hon. gentleman and the hon. member from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) have now taken to their hearts the principle of "one man one vote," but when the local elections come around they are content to find a law enacted under which two-thirds of a vote are given to the free and independent electors, or even only one-third, and how these hon. gentlemen can consistently occupy this position passes my comprehension.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Are you talking about the parish vote?

Mr. COCKBURN. No; but I am talking about the law enacted by the Ontario Legislature, through the misguided action of the friends of the hon. gentlemen opposite. I should like my hon. friend (Mr. Edgar), if it is in his power, to endeavour to amend that Act, so as to do justice to the voters in the city in which he resides. As regards the remarks made by the hon. gentleman for Queen's (Mr. Davies), that we must deal at present with the principle of the Bill and not with the language, I always understood we were to deal with the words of a Bill and interpret those words, and this suggestion to change and mix matters in any such fashion is another illustration of the manner in which principles may be handled by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Before the question is voted upon by the House I simply desire to offer one or two observations on the remarks of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). The hon. gentleman is mistaken, I submit, when he says the Bill I have introduced, and which stands on the Order paper for second reading, does not meet the objection of the member for Bothwell. I would not have referred to that Bill in this debate had not previous speakers done so. But now I deem it necessary that the House should know the extent to which the Bill I have introduced goes in this regard. The Bill I have introduced aims at preventing any person who has become a citizen of a foreign country from returning to this country and exercising the right of franchise. It only aims at disfranchising non-resident voters who are in that category. The hon. gentleman very truly observes that in the United States a man may declare his intention of becoming a citizen before the expiration of the allotted time during which he can become a citizen of that country. I may say to him and to the House that the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson) has anticipated that objection and proposes to offer an amendment to this Bill when it comes before the House. That amendment will, I think, meet the objection urged by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) in reply to the remarks of the hon. Minister of Justice. Now, with regard to the principle of the measure under discussion: We cannot close our eyes to the fact that the principle of property qualification is after all the principle upon which the franchise is based.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I say that it is the principle upon which the franchise is based. Any extensions of the franchise in other directions have been based upon considerations in the interest of farmers' sons and young men who have a certain stake in this country, and whose right to vote is surrounded by safeguards which place the franchise in that regard entirely independent of, and different from, what is known as manhood suffrage. The principle of property qualification naturally has been brought into this discussion and a comparison has been made by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Edgar), between the working of the Dominion Franchise Act and the Ontario Franchise Act. I would draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to what is a very serious evil in the working of the Ontario Franchise Act. That evil is, that it requires residence up to the time of voting to enable a person to vote under that Act. What is the result of this? The result is that thousands are disqualified under the working of the Ontario election law. Why are they so disqualified? Because before the day of voting comes around they have left their

particular electoral districts, perhaps only a very short time before polling day, and hence they are wholly disqualified and cannot vote at all. Under the Dominion Franchise Act such a thing cannot take place, and the only objection that has been raised against it, is that it is a great expense, and a great inconvenience, and a serious trouble, and loss of time to the candidates in bringing outside voters in. I submit, Sir, that that does not in any sense affect the principle, and ought not to affect the principle, upon which the Dominion franchise is based, be it for good or evil, namely, the principle of property qualification. I only rose to make these observations, in order to repeat to the House that the remarks of the Minister of Justice with regard to the effect of the Bill I have introduced are strictly true, and the House will see when it is in committee on that Bill, that it will have that effect, and that if it is defective in any word it can be amended so as to produce the effect required.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The objections which have been urged to the second reading of this Bill by hon. gentlemen opposite have only served to show to the House how weak any opposition to it may be considered to be. The objection taken by the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn), is a weighty one, like this: You propose an amendment to the law of the Dominion, you think it could be amended; very well, but I think before you try your hand at amending that you had better try to amend the Act of the Ontario Legislature; a Legislature be it remembered in which the members of this House have no seat or no voice and nothing whatever to say in the matter. We would make great progress indeed in that direction. Then we have the very strong objections urged by the Minister of Marine that because there is a word in the Bill that does not exactly suit him, or that he thinks might not fully explain the object that the mover of the Bill has, although it has been clearly explained by the mover of the Bill and those who have followed him what the principle of the Bill is, and although the hon. gentleman knows what it is, yet because there is a word in the Bill that he thinks does not clearly express that idea, he holds it as a fatal objection to the measure. I would ask the hon. gentleman to apply that rule to any Bill introduced by the Government, even to the most carefully considered Bill introduced by the Minister of Justice, with all his ability, and if the Bill was to be rejected on the second reading and thrown out simply because there was one word or some words, or one idea, in the Bill that did not harmonize with his views, what legislation would we have? Why, take the Franchise Act of the Dominion, which we propose to amend in this direction. Does the hon. gentleman not know that when the Bill was introduced in 1885, and when its principle was affirmed by the House, it was considered for three months in committee, and when it came out of committee the person who proposed it would scarcely know it. Yet, the hon. gentleman takes exception to this Bill because there is a certain word in it objectionable to him, and he says that it should not pass its second reading. The hon. the Minister of Justice, who, I am bound to say, will make out a case, if a case can be made out, did not seem to consider this a fatal objection to the Bill. It is true that the Minister of Justice, in common with the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood), said that we did recognize property as the basis of suffrage: but, as a matter of fact, it is not the basis, and if the argument of the Minister of Justice holds good, that a man by holding property in different ridings has a perfect right to be entitled to cast a vote in each riding, he might argue, perhaps, that these gentlemen had the same right in common with other citizens of acquiring property in different electoral divisions, and that then no injustice is done. The Minister of Justice will not fail to observe that if he uses an argument of that kind, in the using of such an argument he is doing an injustice to some classes of people, that he is making class distinctions and giving certain undue powers to certain classes in this community, because the hon. gentleman must know that there are many whose means will not enable them to acquire property in different counties. Will the Minister of Justice, and will hon. gentlemen opposite, take the view that because a man is not possessed of worldly means enough to acquire a property qualification in different counties, that he is less a true born Canadian, and less entitled to vote in making the laws of this country than the others? There is where the question comes in. The vital part of the present franchise law is to create class distinctions and to give an undue advantage to one man over that possessed by another in the community. I would ask the Minister of Justice if one man possessing property qualifications in several counties is entitled to cast several votes, would he say that a wage-earner, for instance, who earns twice three hundred dollars a year should have two votes? Suppose a man should happen to earn three hundred dollars in one constituency in six months, and to earn three hundred dollars more in another constituency during the remainder of the year, would the Minister of Justice give him two votes? No: the present franchise law does not say that. The objection taken to this Bill of my hon. friend from Ontario (Mr. Edgar) is just a perpetuation of the old Tory doctrine that some men and some classes in this community shall have more weight and more influence than others; disregarding the fact that in this country, where the revenues are raised by customs and by excise, that the workingman, the mechanic and the artizan, owing to our system of taxation, is contributing as much to the revenues of this country as the man who may have property scattered through half a dozen different counties. Is it to be said that an honest, hard-working and tax-paying citizen of Canada, who may not have property scattered over different counties, is not to have the same rights as a more wealthy citizen of the country? The principle of the present franchise law in this respect is not right, and the principle of the Bill which is now proposed by my hon. friend from Ontario is, that in Canada those who are entitled to vote are those who have their stake in this country, who live in the country, who have to obey its laws, and pay its taxes, shall have a right to vote, other things being equal, and shall have as much power and influence in determining the election of a member of this House as any other person, save and except that legitimate influence referred to by the hon.

member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) which some men may have by reason of their study or superior knowledge of political affairs. That is the principle of this Bill: and in voting it down hon. gentlemen who do so vote against that principle, and declare that one man is entitled to more privileges and more rights under the franchise established by this Parliament than another. I believe in the principle of the Bill, and I propose to support it. If the hon. Minister of Justice has asked that the debate be adjourned until to-morrow or next week, or even for two or three weeks, in order that he might examine the Bill more closely, so as to make up his mind as to its merits, I would have been agreeable to granting him the time; but when he moves that the Bill be read this day six months, I fear that the House will not be then in session and I shall have to vote against his motion.

Mr. DENISON. The hon. member who spoke last referred to the two-thirds vote which exists in Toronto, and to the remarks of the member for Centre Toronto, and the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) suggested that we should have the same franchise for this Parliament as exists in the Province of Ontario. It is very well for him to suggest this change when he is in the cold shades of Opposition and can do nothing, whereas in Toronto, where his party are in power and have a chance to do something for the people, they only give us a two-thirds vote.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Two votes out of three.

Mr. DENISON. No; we have only two-thirds of a vote in Toronto, while other parts of the country have a full vote. The hon. member for West Ontario remarks that we ought not to have the trees and the ground represented; but, as the hon. member who spoke a moment ago said, what is the meaning of a vote? It means that those people who own the country, who have an interest in the country, should have a voice in the government of the country. It is not right that a man who comes here with his carpet bag, and who can go away in a moment, should have the same voting power as a man who is the owner of the soil. The people who own the country are the people who should rule and govern the country. I do not think it would be in the interest of Canada to allow anybody who can pack up his bag and leave the country at a moment's notice to have the same voice as we have. The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), speaking of military duty, says they all have to serve their country; but we must not forget that those people who have no stake in the country, who can pack up their bag and go away at a moment's notice, are not in very much danger of doing military duty. The moment there is any work to be done, they might get out of the country. I shall not say any more; but I will vote for the six months' hoist.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It is well known, Mr. Speaker, that under the present law a great deal of difficulty arises from the outside vote. The hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) is making provision to prevent the outside vote from coming in. The members of the Government, I understand, made provision at the last election to bring them in. There seems to be a difficulty existing in the party; they are not in harmony on this question. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison) wants to include the people who stay at home; the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) provides for that in his Bill, and then the hon. member for West Toronto will not support that Bill. It seems very difficult to please hon. gentlemen opposite. I believe that it was announced some time ago with a considerable flourish of trumpets that a great scheme was on foot to bring back from the United States many good Canadian citizens who went and settled there. I understand that a good deal of money was spent, and that officers are now employed and paid very high salaries with the view of bringing them back; and when we are endeavouring to bring them back by spending public money, we find the hon. member for Brockville introducing a Bill into Parliament to prevent them again becoming citizens and voting here.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). No, no.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. member for West Ontario provides in his Bill that our people shall stay at home, and if we had a liberal policy we would keep our people in this country instead of having them settle in the States as they have been doing for years past. This policy of annexation pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite is one to be deprecated and condemned, and it is not to be wondered at that the hon. member for West Ontario should be endeavouring to prevent an evil that is sapping the foundations of the prosperity of the country. Every good Canadian and loyal man should deplore this condition of things and endeavour to remove it. Now, if we had the principle admitted of "one man one vote," it would be more in accord with the eternal principles of justice and right. Hon. gentlemen opposite have an idea that it is not the man that should vote, but that it is the soil: the man who has to cultivate and develop the country is to be debarred from voting, while the man who has accumulated a little soil, or treasure, is to have the cumulative vote. The principle of "one man one vote" is the principle adopted in the Province of Ontario, and the same principle is now being strongly advocated in England, and I would like to see our friends in the Government, who profess to have some love and devotion for England, strive in some degree to follow the example set there in this respect. When this principle is being taken up by leading statesmen in England, where property has had so many charms for the people hitherto, it is time that the Parliament of one of England's greatest dependencies should take up the question and imitate the example which will, no doubt, be set in England in a short time, by enacting here the principle of "one man one vote," and giving the world to understand that all men here are free and equal, that they all stand on the same footing, that one man is as good as another in this country if he behaves himself, that it is not the quantity of land he possesses that gives him the right to vote. Property after all is not a qualification to a voter. I think the day is not far distant when the Act that we have now will pass away, and when the other principle which is more in keeping with the principles of justice and right shall prevail. We have seen the evils of the present system. One admission has resulted from this discussion, and that is the admission of hon. gentlemen on the other side that there has been a large exodus of Canadians from Canada to the United States, whom they are now taking means to prevent coming back.

The hon. Minister of Justice has declared that a large number of these people came in to vote at the last elections. Well, Sir, they had been on the lists when the lists were first made out and had never been struck off, and the Minister says they were brought back to vote against the interests of the people of this country. And now we find the Government taking steps to prevent any of them coming in unless they will promise to vote for the Government candidates. It is all right when they come in to vote for the Government candidate, but it is all wrong when they do not. We do not go in on that principle. We are not holding for that principle. We are holding for the principle which the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) has laid down, that a man must reside in the country in order to have a vote. I do not see why hon. gentlemen opposite should object to that. Their policy is different. When these people come back from the United States the hon. member for Brockville meets them with his Bill and says, you cannot vote here and become citizens, because you have resided a short time in the United States.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The Bill does not say anything of the kind.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think it was the hon. the Minister of Public Works, or if not, the hon. the Secretary of State—or probably it was the joint ability of both—to whom we are indebted for this great repatriation scheme, by which these people who had gone to the United States were to be brought back to Canada and made good citizens of. The House took a good deal of interest in that scheme. We were desirous of that result, but we are amazed to-day that the Government should put up a member of their party to prevent these people, when they do come back, from becoming citizens and exercising the franchise. It has been very well said to-night that one man may have $10,000 worth of property in one constituency and another may have $450 worth scattered over three constituencies, and the latter will have three votes while the former will have only one. When hon. gentlemen opposite take property as a basis, they are not logical in that provision. I hope the hon. the Minister of Justice will consider this matter a little, and if he will, he will alter his mind.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. During the next six months.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think if he will consider it before six months, he will withdraw his amendment, because, certainly, with the ability he has, he must see that it is part of the duty of his department to see that justice is done. You would almost imagine that from the title of his department, he will see that it is not just that one man with $450 worth of property distributed over three constituencies should have three votes, while another with $10,000 worth in one constituency has only one vote. I would ask the hon. Minister to get the officers of his department to consider that question; and if he does, I think he will withdraw his amendment.

Mr. DAVIN. In the Irish Parliament which met in Dublin, there was a man known to history by the name of Sir Boyle Roche, who declared that we should not do anything for posterity because he did not see that posterity had done anything for us. I think we, in this Canadian Parliament, may rejoice that in my hon. friend we have a man who may go down arm in arm the pathway of history with that famous individual, for he has appealed to the Minister of Justice and to the party now in power, and in fact to this whole Parliament, speaking of some measure which is to be introduced in the British Parliament in the future, near or far, to imitate the example likely to be set by the British Parliament in a very short time. I am inclined to quote William Shakespeare and say: "O my prophetic soul, my uncle." To imitate an example that is to be given us in the near future, the features of which we cannot understand or have any idea of, will certainly require all the genius that belongs to the Treasury benches, reinforced however much it may be by whatever little talent there may be in the House. My hon. friend the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) dealt with the principle of this Bill from the point of view of logic. Now, a great English statesman has said that nothing can be so foolish, nothing can be so impracticable, as to try to apply a rigid logical rule to political affairs.

Mr. LANDERKIN. How does the green-grocery policy suit you?

Mr. DAVIN. It would suit you well, but it would not suit me at all. You can imagine no political measure in which logical flaws cannot be found. If property is the basis of our franchise, as the hon. member from Brockville (Mr. Wood) very properly states, then it is perfectly right that men possessing property should be able to vote on that property. You can of course stand up like a young student in a college debating society, and say how anomalous it is that a man with ten thousand dollars worth of property in one district should have only one vote, while a man with two thousand dollars worth here and one thousand dollars worth in another district has two votes. But with property as the basis of our franchise, we may as well ask how utterly anomalous it is that a millionaire should have but one vote and a man with a house worth but three hundred dollars, his next door neighbour, has also one vote. You cannot exclude, Sir, from the practical affairs of life such anomalies as that. With reference to the criticism of my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies), of the remarks of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I consider that nothing could be more germane to the discussion or even to the principle of this Bill than the remarks he criticized. Remember, Sir, we are dealing with a very small Bill. The body of the Bill is in the very words criticized by the hon. Minister of Marine, and the principle must be wrapped up in the very words that constitute the operative part of the Bill; and surely it was a most proper criticism for the hon. Minister to point out that you had put a chain, so to speak, around the ankle of each man, when you require him, in order that he may have the right to vote, to have not only his domicile, but also that he shall be a resident in the district where he votes. And, as you have the term "resident" used, as well as "domicile," you must attach a meaning to each, according to the ordinary rules of interpretation, and, therefore, it was a most proper criticism to point out, that, according to the principle of this Bill, a man would be chained to the district. Now, I will take some trouble from the mind of my hon. friend in regard to the Bill of my hon. friend from Brock-

ville (Mr. Wood). My hon. friend from Brockville does not wish to prevent anyone who desires to repatriate himself from doing so, but anyone who has become resident in a foreign country and who has foresworn his allegiance to Her Majesty, is to be forbidden from coming across the line and voting, and it is clear that, if he has gone across the line and has sworn allegiance to the Stars and Stripes, though he has property in this country, he should not be allowed to vote. There is the greatest possible difference between the two cases. My hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson) declared that it was a Tory principle, that it made distinctions, that it put some men in higher positions than others. Well, Sir, if it be a Tory principle, it is a principle that has obtained up to the present minute in the most successful constitutional country in the world; it has obtained in the country, which, according to the words of John Bright, is the august mother of free nations. My hon. friend is a great Liberal. I do not know whether he can be called a Radical or not, but he can hardly be placed in a higher niche in the temple of liberty than Mr. Bright, and I know that Mr. Bright was strongly opposed to anything that looked to the principle of departing from basing suffrage on property, because he knew that, while that base remains, the state has a double bond, it has not only the bond of the individual interest in the affairs of the country but also the bond of the acquirements of the elector's sweat and thrift. It has this double bond for the performance of his duties as a citizen. The base upon which we have acted is the base of property. My friend the member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) I think rather misapprehended the scope of the Bill. He argued that a man who possessed no property whatever may be as good a citizen as a man who possesses property. He might contribute as much to the revenue if he has an income, and there is a provision made for that already, so that a man who has contributed to the revenue and has an income is not excluded from the franchise. I admit that you cannot make an arrangement in which you cannot pick holes, and yet from the illogicality of the situation there may be advantages which it would be a mistake, from a statesmanlike point of view, to give up. As to what my hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn), and my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Denison) said, I think it was a fair criticism to point out, when Liberals here were talking as they were, that they were only allowed two-thirds of a vote in Toronto. My hon. friend near me said that the eternal right and fitness of things required this. He probably meant the unalterable rule of right and the eternal fitness of things. If he had used that Platonic phrase, it would have so pleasantly recalled my early studies that he might possibly have drawn me into his carrol. I shall vote with the Government on this Bill.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think now that the hon. gentleman has become an antique, he ought to be taken into the Cabinet.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before the vote is taken on the motion of the hon. Minister of Justice, I wish to pass a few remarks on the two Bills now under consideration. I declare from the first that I am entirely in accord with the promoter of the first Bill. I believe a man should have only one vote. I must say that I am altogether favourable to this Bill, because I represent a county crossed by the Intercolonial Railway, which is an electoral machine in election times, by which its employés are enabled to vote as many as three times on the same day, when most of them are barely qualified to vote once. But, before discussing this Bill, I will observe that one thing always strikes me, whenever the debate falls on this question of electoral franchise. You never hear the hon. members on the other side of the House meet our arguments with arguments; but they turn on the provincial laws. They never fail to assail the laws of the Local Legislatures and to say that these Legislatures have passed bad laws. Thus, the other day, the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins) made a long speech—an eloquent speech, I must say—in the course of which he declared that he was opposing the Bill then under consideration, because Hon. Mr. Mercier had passed a bad law. This evening what answer do we get to our arguments in favour of the Bill now before the House? We hear the hon. members from Toronto say Hon. Mr. Mowat passed a bad electoral law, therefore we are opposed to this Bill. I believe it is paying a bad compliment to their friends in the Local Legislatures, and this condemnation of the local legislation is a poor excuse for approving that promoted by the Federal Government. I was saying a moment ago that I am in favour of the principle that a man should vote but once, and in favour of the present Bill on the ground that in the counties below Quebec which are crossed by the Intercolonial Railway, the employés are enabled to cast three votes. They first vote in Lévis, where some of them reside; then they vote at Fraserville where they get their pay; and then again at Ste. Flavie, because they sometimes sleep there during the week. There is not a member in this House who can gainsay this fact, and no one knows it better than the hon. Minister of Militia, who represents the County of Rimouski, for in one of the small parishes of that county, where only eighteen voters are on the list, more than a hundred votes were given at the last election by means of certificates from the returning officer given to employés of the Intercolonial. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is extremely dangerous. Moreover, on voting day the Intercolonial is used as an electoral machine. A train is put under steam at Point Lévis at nine o'clock in the morning, the employés having voted, the train is despatched at the country's expense, and the friends of the Government—for our friends are not allowed to board this train to which only those who bear the Conservative stamp are admitted—go to vote at Rivière du Loup, and in the afternoon reach Rimouski in time to cast their votes there. And all this is done at the expense of the country. These people give votes that they are not qualified to give, and often vote as many as three times without any qualification at all. Well, Mr. Speaker, would it be but for the sole purpose of preventing such an injustice, I would vote for the Bill now under consideration. As to the other one, that of the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood), I cannot favour it, for it often happens that people go to the United States for a few months without the intention of staying. They get naturalized in order to find themselves on equal footing with the Americans. I know that a

large number of persons of my county only go to spend the summer in the United States. They go to Michigan where they are employed as shipbuilders; they work at loading ships, and if they are not naturalized they cannot belong to the ship labourers' societies and cannot get work. They take out naturalization papers with the only object of being on the same footing as the Americans in obtaining work. They only spend the summer there and come back in the fall to spend the winter in Canada. Consequently, if the hon. member's Bill was to become law, these people would be deprived of their vote, although they only go to the United States for a few months to earn their living, the policy of the present Government making it impossible for them to maintain themselves and their families. Now, there is another reason why the Bill of the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) should be adopted. The Government has held that they were passing their Franchise Act for the sake of uniformity. They held that the qualification should be the same in all the provinces. Well, if the qualification must be the same, the voters should also be on the same footing; whatever be their social standing, whatever their wealth, whatever the amount of property they hold, they should all have but one vote. For all these reasons, and especially on account of the practice which I have mentioned as obtaining in the counties below Quebec which are crossed by the Intercolonial Railway, I will vote for the Bill of the hon. member for West Ontario.

Mr. SPROULE. We find the operations of the Ontario law to be this: Before the last amendment giving manhood sufferage, and even then we find that many men who had property in the country, who were assessed upon property in the country, but were not resident in the place where their property was, were not allowed to vote. That is an injustice which no man should suffer, because it leaves the man in such a position that he has not the same interest in the country that he otherwise would have. That is especially the case in the towns in the Province of Ontario. But, how would that be if it were extended to the Dominion franchise? As to what was said by the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) that the member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) had introduced a Bill to prevent Canadians from coming back to this country while we were spending millions to bring them back, I do not think he can have read the Bill so carelessly as to imagine that to be the fact. It seems to me to be the very reverse. It seems to me that that Bill asks Canadians not to take the oath of allegiance there as long as they have a stake in this country. Many Canadians retain a stake in this country by holding their property when they go abroad, and the Bill of the hon. member for Brockville will induce them to retain their interest in this country and not to take the oath of allegiance in the United States. If it had not been for the Bill which the members of the Opposition are trying to amend in this way, they would have suffered in the last election, and I am surprised at their present action, when I heard it stated in this House that 2,000 Canadians came across the line in the Province of Quebec, and an hon. gentleman said last night that he believed every man of them voted for the Reform party. Where would these men have been if the Bill of the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Edgar) had been the law at that time? There would be no need for them to come here under that Bill, because, though they might still have a property interest in the country, they could have no say in the Government of the country as expressed by a vote. I think it is very important, as long as men have property in the country, that they should feel that they have a vote in the country, and there is no way better to give them an interest than to allow them to remain subjects of Her Majesty the Queen. Then, again it is said that the Dominion franchise is a restrictive franchise, and that we want manhood suffrage as they have it in Ontario. It is a fact that cannot be denied that, notwithstanding the very defective list, the last Dominion franchise list, that was said to be over two years old, there were more votes on that list in some constituencies, than were on the list of the Liberal Franchise of Mr. Mowat, which recognizes manhood suffrage, yet they are said to have a property qualification. It is true we have a property qualification, so small that every man who is an industrious man, and has his health, can have a vote under this franchise law. I think it is a very good one, and is better than the proposed Bill, which would give one man one vote, but would prevent many men having any vote at all if they did not happen to reside in the constituency where their property is located. I think we have a very much better system at present; therefore we should refrain from amending it. I believe the law will in a short time be acknowledged as good by almost every intelligent man in the country, when he comes to think of it on sober second thought, and freed from all political feeling under which he may now be labouring. I believe that the present principle is a much more healthy one than the principle of the proposed amendment. It is exactly in harmony with the system that has been found to be most effective, and I most strongly incline to the opinion that before many years the provincial law in the Province of Ontario will be amended. I think we should retain what we have got, because we find it to work well: we should retain it for the reason that it gives men an interest in coming back to vote, as long as they have property in the country, and prevents them from becoming citizens of a foreign power. It still gives men an interest in the country; they can use their franchise on behalf of the member who represents the locality where their property is; it gives them an interest in the country where they can vote in, perhaps, some one locality, because they may have properties scattered over the different parts of the country. Therefore, they have a larger interest in the country than men who are only wage-earners. The present law has been proved to be a good one in its working, and I think we should be very slow to amend it; therefore, I, for one, will vote for the six months' hoist.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I have just heard the remarks made by my hon. friend for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) on the subject now before the House. My hon. friend complains of the manner in which the electoral rights are exercised in the counties which are crossed by the Intercolonial Railway. I believe that my hon. friend would do better to oversee the lists than to com-

plain of the present law. As to the right which is claimed by certain electors—a right which is certainly not recognized by the present law, and according to which they would be qualified to vote on the ground of taking their meals or sleeping at a given place—such a right does not exist. Such electors have to own real estate at that place or draw a qualifying income. And if they have neither of these qualifications, my hon. friend has no excuse for allowing hostile electors so unqualified to be put on the voters' lists in his county. Mr. Speaker, I have always been, until to-day, opposed to the Franchise Act adopted by the Federal Parliament in 1885. Now I have thought proper to modify my opinion in this respect, for, since 1885, the circumstances have changed.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) And principles also.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) Twice since 1885 the people have ratified the policy of the Government, and, consequently, I have felt that I should bow to the wishes of the majority. I have just heard my hon. friend the member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) saying that my principles also have changed. I hope that when I have expressed my views on the subject, he will admit that I have not changed my principles, but that it is his new allies who have forced me to alter my views. In 1885, no Provincial Legislature had yet attempted any aggression against the Federal power. Since 1885, on the contrary, Local Legislatures have been seen to draw proscription lists against the employés of the Federal Government and deprive them of their vote. In order that such a thing might come to pass, the destinies of the provinces had to be in the hands of would-be Liberal Governments. Since 1885, events have taken place in different provinces which go to show the necessity of having in the future an electoral franchise for this Parliament. Indeed, in several provinces, owing to the spirit animating a majority of the population, there would no longer be any guarantee that the minorities should preserve their electoral rights, if the Federal Parliament were to decide that in the future provincial lists and provincial franchises are to obtain. We have of late been treated to a much-to-be-regretted spectacle, and that by a would-be Liberal Government, the Manitoba Government, which has thought it proper to violate the constitution of the province in order to abolish the Separate Schools and the French language in that Province. Now, Mr. Speaker, let, some day, this majority, regardless as it is of the rights of minorities, indulge the caprice of deciding that the French element be an obstacle to the progress of the Province of Manitoba, and pass such a tyrannical law as has been adopted in some of the States of the American Union, enacting that, in order to be an elector of the Legislature of Manitoba, it be necessary to know how to read and speak English. What should become, then, of the French minority, or of other minorities not acquainted with that language, in the Province of Manitoba, or in the North-West Territories, in the Province of Ontario or elsewhere, if the majority should pass such an iniquitous law? Mr. Speaker, a majority which has already violated the constitution of the province, to abolish the Separate Schools and the French language, could certainly pass such a law, which would be despotic, it is true, but, nevertheless, within the bounds of the constitution. Therefore, for the protection of the minorities, be they French or English, in the different provinces of confederation, it is important that this Parliament should have the control of the Federal franchise; and if my views on this matter have been modified, it is due to the arbitrary doings of the Legislature of the Province of Quebec, of that of the Province of Manitoba, and of other Provincial Legislatures of the Dominion. I have heard my hon. friend the member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) complain with bitterness that every time the question of electoral franchise is discussed in this House, some one takes the liberty of criticising the franchise law of the Province of Quebec. It seems to me to be perfectly logical for members of this House to discuss a local law, when this Parliament is asked to say that in the future its franchise will be that which is determined by that local law. My hon. friend has, therefore, no ground to ask that we shall not discuss the local franchise laws. They necessarily have to be discussed, so that we may see whether they are good or bad, before adopting them as the basis of the federal franchise. Mr. Speaker, I have hardly heard, I must say, any argument capable of establishing that we ought to adopt the Bill presented by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar). One essential thing is not to be lost sight of in this debate; that is, that the principle underlying the present franchise law is to be respected. This principle is, that to be an elector one must own real estate or have an income from real estate or otherwise. This principle being the foundation of this law, it is impossible to deviate from it, for its violation would be an attempt against the basis itself of the law. If it is absolutely intended that the franchise should extend to everybody, or, in other words, that universal suffrage shall be established, then I understand that a certain number of my colleagues in this House, favourable to that sort of franchise, should be in favour of any amendment violating the principle of land qualification as a basis of franchise for the Dominion of Canada. But, Mr. Speaker, I warn the members representing rural constituencies to be very careful, for, in violating this principle, they forego a powerful safeguard of the electors, whom their mission is to represent and defend in this House. For, the very large majority, the almost totality of the electors of the rural districts want to preserve a franchise based upon real estate qualification. Besides, I think it the best principle, one which should be upheld in a new country like ours. It has been held that this principle establishes inequalities—that it is a Tory principle. Well, Mr. Speaker, I see nothing uniform, neither on earth nor in heaven, from what I am told. And if the Creator were to be judged of from what he has done on earth or in heaven, the Creator himself should be regarded as a Tory, having, as He has, created men in conditions unequal. It is ridiculous, absolutely ridiculous, to find fault with the Government and with the principle of a franchise based upon real estate, because this principle will not give equal rights to all men. No more than in anything else, is it possible to give equal rights to all in electoral matters. Even with universal suffrage there is no perfect equality; for, there are men of great intellect, like my hon. friend from Montmagny, and like the hon. member for Bellechasse,

and there are others in their constituencies who are their inferiors in intelligence and capacities of all sorts. You should give the latter a vote altogether insignificant and one much more extensive to all electors as well favoured as my hon. friends already mentioned. But, Mr. Speaker, I repeat it, the franchise based upon real estate should be respected, for it is the franchise of the great mass of the Canadian nation; and if the laws are to be made for the majorities, none are better made than that which recognizes property qualification as the basis of the franchise. In our country, the mass of the population, I would say nine-tenths of the citizens, own real estate. Those of the electors who do not own any are tenants. As to the people who are neither real estate owners nor tenants, I hold that the majority of them are not in a condition to exercise properly the right of suffrage. We are often shown the example of European countries. We are told they are very advanced in matters of legislation; but if I judge from the state of society to be found there, I cannot conclude that the franchise they have given to the masses has done much to elevate character or develop civic or moral virtues. If we compare our laws with those made by the turbulent and wicked citizens who constitute a danger for the European societies, we must admit that the laws which in our country regulate the right of taking part in public affairs, are not inferior—whatever may be the opinions of certain Liberals in this House—to those in existence among the European nations. I do not propose to go any further, Mr. Speaker. I think I have pointed out the danger there would be in the adoption of the Bill of the hon. member for West Ontario. Only, I will say that, having modified my views on the franchise, after having been forced to do so by the illiberal legislation of the Liberal Government in the provinces, I intend to give in the future my full co-operation to any Government—may it belong to either of the parties in this House—which will offer any reasonable measure calculated to render the franchise law less expensive and more efficient in its application. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I must thank the hon. members of this House for the attention that they have kindly given me.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) I wish to offer a few words of answer to the remarks just made by the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont). I was very well pleased to hear him explain why he had shifted from the position he had held for a few years in relation to this question of franchise. The House surely remembers that since 1885, that is, since the day the Franchise Act was introduced in this House, the hon. member for Bagot has always thought himself bound to vote against the principle embodied in the law so proposed by the Conservative party. The hon. member thought proper this evening to give us his reasons for the vote he gave the other day on the Bill for the repeal of that law. I think he would have done better had he then explained his course, instead of waiting and serving us to-day a speech which, under the circumstances, I regard as altogether untimely. For, Mr. Speaker, we are not discussing now the merits of the Franchise Act. We are not discussing now the principle of the franchise law. We are not discussing either what has been done in the Local Legislatures. What we are now at is the discussion as to whether we should adopt the principle embodied in the Bill introduced by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), the principle of one man one vote. I, therefore, consider the remarks delivered this evening by the hon. member for Bagot as altogether out of place. However, Mr. Speaker, I shall take the liberty of answering them in a few words. The reason offered by the hon. member from Bagot for changing his principles in relation to the franchise law, is that the Provincial Legislatures have altered the election law in the Provinces of Quebec and Manitoba. But, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member remembers surely that, in 1885, the principle involved was whether the franchise in force in the provinces such as established by the Provincial Legislatures, or that proposed by the Federal Government, should be adopted. Consequently, the moment my hon. friend was declaring in favour of the principle hat the regulation of the franchise was to be left in the hands of the Provincial Legislatures, he was accepting all the consequences of that principle. He was submitting himself to whatever measures the Provincial Legislatures would ultimately enact on the matter. I, therefore, consider that the reasons given by the hon. member for his change of front are not at all logical. But, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Bagot chiefly opposes the Bill now under consideration, on the ground that we are wanting the universal suffrage. Well, now, are we not virtually having universal suffrage? Is not universal suffrage to be found in principle in the Franchise Act? By the Act of 1885, have not almost all the interested ones a right to be put on the electoral list? What is going to be the effect of the Bill of the hon. member for West Ontario? It would afford one of the most efficient means of putting a stop to the unbridled corruption which is practised to-day. Under the present law, a large number of persons, under the pretence of bringing voters from a distance, are paid fares and disbursements, and all this involves a large outlay of money, for which there would be no occasion should the Bill introduced become law. With this law, all electors, or almost all, would be in the electoral district. They would be easily reached, no expenses would be entailed in bringing them, and one of the features of corruption would disappear from our political life. This is, Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons for which I am in favour of the principle of the measure submitted to us, and I shall be happy to vote for the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, for my part, I own that I am beginning to be somewhat tired of constantly hearing accusations against a Government which has none of its members here to defend it. I am beginning to be tired of all those attacks against a law, no enacting clause of which is even mentioned. I am beginning to be tired of hearing insinuations based upon suppositions against the franchise law of the Province of Quebec. I defy any member of this House to justly find fault with a single word of that law, which is essentially based on principles of justice and of real progress from both material and moral standpoints. Let my hon. friend search this law; what will he find? A clause, proposed by one of his warm personal friends, which prescribes that no salaried servant of the Provincial or Federal Government, shall have a vote. I hold that this is just. When

a man becomes the servant of a Government, he must mingle no more with the struggles of politics. He must withdraw from the field and become the servant of the public and not of a party; he must not expose himself, nor his family, to the risk of his being turned out of office on the morrow of a change of Government. But apart from this clause, which he does not like, what does he find to blame in this law? Does he object, for instance, to the teachers being given a vote? Will he find in this a principle contrary to liberty and progress in the country? The Government of Quebec has enacted a law as conservative in its principles and as liberal in its effects as it was possible to do. My hon. friend may examine the Statute-book, chapters 4, 5 and 6, 52 Victoria; he may search one by one all the sections; and he will see that this law is essentially favourable to public enlightenment, to representation based on the rights of property and intelligence. My hon. friend holds now that, in 1885, the Government had a right to violate the principle which he himself then defended—I then expressed no sentiment upon this matter—the principle of franchise resting with the provinces, that is, of leaving to the provinces the task of determining who shall represent them in the Federal Parliament. He now holds that the Government had the right to violate this principle; that it had the right of entrusting the preparation of the voters' lists to salaried officers, who think themselves in duty bound to make bad lists at the expense of the country, because they are the servants of the ruling power. He holds that the Government was right in doing so: and he takes this position in order to condemn an election law calculated to put an end to an odious reign of corruption. Mr. Speaker, when the result of elections in several constituences is changed by adding to the voters' lists fictitious electors that have been given qualification with public money, and who are carried from one constituency to another with public money, such practices are not calculated to raise a Government in the public estimation. This is what has been done. Let any one say what he pleases, but I state here, from personal knowledge, that the Intercolonial Railway, as my hon. friend from Montmagny so well put it, has been a vehicle of electoral corruption, and has falsified the expression of public opinion—and it is in the name of the rights of property that such a thing is condoned; and it is axle greasers and car sweepers that are taken to thus represent property. They are given qualification in three or four counties, and they are carried from one to the other with public money to slavishly vote for the party in power. Let my hon. friend study the local law which he attacks, and when he shall have passed to the Opposition he will better understand the evils of the present system. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I, as much as any one, believe that the Government should be very particular in the choice of the electors, of those who shall choose the members of Parliament. For my part, I am opposed to the principle of universal suffrage, because no nation in this world can be found composed entirely of intelligent and honest people, and there must necessarily be something to distinguish between those who deserve being electors and those who do not. This distinction is primarily to be found in property. Those who acquire or who preserve a property offer thereby a guarantee. This distinction is again to be found in the income which a man earns by his work. It ought also to be found in education, and I would favour a law by which a man, as Garcia Moreno had in the Republic of the Equator, should be required to know how to read and write before being a voter. I would like that wealth, property and income should not be the only qualification for a voter: I would also like a qualification based upon intelligence, upon the knowledge, theoretical and practical, which a man has had the industry and courage to acquire. The Quebec provincial law provides for all that. It has, nevertheless, as well as the Dominion law, made a great mistake—it has extended the franchise to the sons of farmers, on account of the father's wealth or property. It is very fine, on the face of it, to give a vote to a farmer's son: but go into the family, and look around. You will find the father of one mind and the sons of another. You introduce dissention in the families.—You destroy the father's rights and authority. And yet, the family is the basis of society. For my part, I regret this innovation. No doubt, a Government which goes before the people, and says to thousands of farmers' sons, "We have qualified you to vote," holds a fine trump. But if you consider the principles which must hold when you want to form a prosperous, peaceful and happy society, you must be careful not to destroy fraternal authority. However, all parties have united in this matter, and it would be useless now to find fault. What, then, is there to be found in the Quebec law which should turn one from the principles he defended in 1885? What, then, is there that has changed?

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) The Manitoba law.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) The Manitoba law, of which the hon. member spoke, is not passed yet. However, since my hon. friend wants to speak of Manitoba, I will follow him on that ground. If a Manitoba law should come to pass infringing on the rights of the French, as my hon. friend just supposed, we would then appeal to a Government which, I hope, would be mindful of those rights, and such a law would be disallowed. I am casting no blame in this upon the present Administration. The law in question is not yet passed.

Mr. LARIVIÈRE. (Translation.) I will point out to my hon. friend, that we have universal suffrage in Manitoba, since the Liberal Government is in power.

Mr. AMYOT (Translation.) It is possible that universal suffrage may exist in Manitoba. I am not discussing that now. But, if that law is bad, why has not my hon. friend asked his friends, to whom he is so devoted, to disallow that law? If the Province of Manitoba ever passes a law abolishing the French language, in the matter of franchise, Providence, I trust, will give us a Government regardful enough of our rights to disallow such a law. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that the present Bill should have given rise to so much discussion. What does it aim at? It proposes that when time comes for choosing the men to be entrusted with the government of this country, each elector shall have but one vote. Let us take, for instance, a gentleman's son, with much more money than intellect, and who qualifies himself in ten counties around Montreal. He can vote ten times. Another man by the side of him, who has passed his life in study, who knows politics, who is honourable and competent in every respect, if he has spent his time in

intellectual pursuits instead of bending his mind to money-making, shall have but one vote. It is in the name of property qualification that redress for such abuses is opposed. I say that the principle of property qualification is not involved in the proposed Bill. This Bill does not alter the franchise. It only proposes that a man shall vote once in a general election, and I believe that such a principle is correct. The reason given in favour of this Bill by my hon. friend who had the floor before me (Mr. Brodeur), is a complete proof of the soundness of this principle. What do we see in a general election, on one side as well as on the other? Forty or fifty thousand voters are absent. How much does that cost the friends of the Government and those of the Opposition? Money has to be spent to have these voters brought. Friends of the Government spend lavishly. Those of the Opposition have less money, but they also have to pay. Candidates ruin themselves, and when they reach Parliament, jobbery is rampant. The public chest is raided to reimburse the party. I appeal to the patriotic sentiments, to the sense of justice of my hon. friends on the right, and I ask them if they, who have the power in hand, should not take the initiative in measures calculated to put an end to this painful necessity, which leads members to join bands of plunderers in attacks on the public chest, because they have been obliged to go to ruinous expenses to get elected. Well, this Bill proposes a means of doing away with this dire source of corruption. When a man shall have to be a resident of a constituency in order to have a vote there, you will not be forced any more to spend a hundred, two hundred and even three hundred dollars to fetch voters from abroad. It will have a tendency to purify the political atmosphere. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I do not see why this Bill should be made a party affair. In a question of purity in elections, every one is equally interested. Let the Bill come from one side or the other, it should make no difference, provided an election system be found in which the francnise be truly the application of a right resting on the dictates of reason and of equal justice for all.

Mr. EDGAR. With every desire to give full weight to the arguments of hon. gentlemen who have opposed this Bill, I must say that I do not think very much light has been thrown upon the subject by their speeches since the six months' hoist was moved by the Minister of Justice. I also think it must have struck the House that the Minister of Justice, in his remarks, did not use his accustomed breadth of argument and skill in marshalling facts, when he set out to argue against this measure. However, we have had a few lively speeches. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), in his own light and airy fashion, undertook to amuse the House at the expense of the member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), and he accused him of imitating an English example which had never taken place. Well, now, I think the member for Assiniboia was altogether wrong in his facts, and the member for South Grey was quite right, because in bringing forward this principle that we advocate on the second reading of this Bill, we are following the example of the great leader of the Liberal party in England, who has laid down one man one vote as the principle of the Liberal party there. The hon. member quoted Mr. Bright as a great authority against this principle. I defy him to produce, now or hereafter, any statement or argument of Mr. Bright against the principle of this Bill. That there may be no doubt whatever about the position of Mr. Gladstone, whom I, for one, and every Liberal in this House, I am sure, are proud to follow, I will quote what Mr. Gladstone said on this subject no longer ago than the 23rd October last, when he made a speech at West Calder, in Scotland.

"I trust that we of the Liberal party are ready, when we get rid of this majority that terms itself unionist, to go on a little further, and by the abolition of their faggot, and plurality of votes to lay down the principle and give effect to the principle of what is called succinctly one man one vote."

So I think that the hon. member for Assiniboia took a wrong premise for his argument and his wit on that occasion. Now the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison) came to the rescue of his colleague from the Centre (Mr. Cockburn), and undertook to explain that in some mysterious way the electors of the city of Toronto in elections for the Provincial Legislature had been disfranchised. Well, now, whatever objections have been made to the experiment of minority representation which has been introduced in the city of Toronto, certainly no objection can be made on the ground that it disfranchises parties there. The hon. member for Centre Toronto knows full well that in elections for the Ontario Legislature, every single voter in that city can vote for two candidates. If a man has only one vote in the whole city he can cast his vote for two candidates; therefore, the citizens of Toronto cannot complain of not having votes enough at their disposal. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman assigned a task to me which I must modestly decline; he suggested that I should introduce a clause in my Bill, or introduce legislation here, to set the representation of the city of Toronto right, according to his view. I must leave that to the distinguished genius of my hon. friend from Centre Toronto, because I cannot at present see how, by legislation in this Chamber, we can set the legislation of the Ontario House right. The hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) stated that our franchise is based on property qualification. Now, I am satisfied that on reflection and research he would take that statement back, because it is not based on property qualification. Besides, a dozen instances which have been given to-night, by myself and others, in which it is not based upon property qualification; it does violence to the principle of property qualification in distinct terms. Take the case of income; take the case of a wage-earner, earning $300 a year, half of it, or more than half of it, may be wages taken in the shape of board. He has a vote that is not based on property qualification, not based upon an educational or intelligence test, either. If we look at this Franchise Act there are in all eight different classes of franchise, and out of these eight, six are based on a residential qualification, so it would be much more fair to say that our franchise law was based on a residential qualification rather than property qualification. That is the principle which I propose to adapt to the only two other qualifications that are not based on residential qualifications. The Minister of Marine made a remarkable discovery about my little Bill. He seemed to come to the conclusion, as far as I can make out, and he was followed in that by the hon. member for Assini-

bois (Mr. Davin), that there is something in the Bill which would deprive a man of his vote, if he changed his residence before an election, if he did not continue his domicile in the county where his name appeared on the list. There is no such proposal or suggestion in the Bill. The word "domicile" is introduced in order that residence may be more clearly defined. There is no better test of residence than to say it shall be the domicile. "Residence" is a looser or larger term, and by requiring "domicile" to be connected with "residence," it defines it in a proper and safe way. From the arguments of some hon. gentlemen one would suppose that the Dominion Franchise Act does not say anything about "domicile" in connection with residence. It does so very distinctly. Take the case of a farmer's son. He must be a resident within the electoral district, and he must also be with his father one year. If that is not "domicile," I do not know what is. If the father is dead, he must not only be resident but he must be domiciled with his mother. So it is in the case of an owner's son. The Ontario Act, with which fault has never been found in that particular, requires that residence and domicile shall go together. I have heard of a case in the city of Toronto where the residence that is required for an income voter under the Dominion Act was claimed to be a man's office. A gentleman living out of the city was assessed for income in the city, and he was prepared to take the oath of residence. Although he was a lawyer and should have have known better, he did take the oath that he was a resident, and voted on income, swearing that he resided in Toronto, whereas he lived out of the city and only had a city office. I am sure he acted wrongly, unintentionally, of course, in taking the oath. I think I am right in saying that the courts have otherwise interpreted "residence;" and in order to make it clear, it is a proper and wise provision to couple domicile with residence, so that there may be no misunderstanding. If we are to have a vote on this motion to-night, as I hope we shall, I hope it will not be taken with a misunderstanding of the meaning, scope or object of this proposed legislation. It is not proposed to give universal suffrage, it is not proposed even to enlarge the franchise, it is only proposed to place a proper limitation on the franchise in the interests, I think, of the whole community.

House divided on amendment (Sir John Thompson) six months' hoist:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Adams,
Baker,
Barnard,
Bergeron,
Bergin,
Bowell,
Burnham,
Burns,
Cameron (Inverness),
Carignan,
Carpenter,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Chapleau,
Cleveland,
Coatsworth,
Cochrane,
Cockburn,
Corbould,
Corby,
Costigan,
Curran,
Daly,
Daoust,
Davin,
Davis,
Denison,
Desaulniers,
Desjardins (Hochelaga),
Desjardins (L'Islet),
Dickey,
Dugas,
Dupont,
Dyer,
Earle,
Fairbairn,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),
Ferguson (Renfrew),
Foster,
Fréchette,
Gillies,
Girouard,
Gordon,
Haggart,
Hazen,
Henderson,
Hodgins,
Hutchins,
Ingram,
Ives,
Jamieson,
Kaulbach,
Kenny,
Kirkpatrick,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
LaRivière,
Léger,
Lippé,
Macdonald (King's),
Macdonell (Algoma),
Macdowall,
Mackintosh,
McAllister,
McCarthy,
McDonald (Victoria),
McDougald (Pictou),
McDougall (Cape Breton),
McGreevy,
McKay,
McLean,
McLennan,
McNeill,
Madill,
Mara,
Marshall,
Masson,
Miller,
Mills (Annapolis),
Monerieff,
Monet,
Montague,
Patterson (Colchester),
Pelletier,
Pope,
Putnam,
Reid,
Robillard,
Roome,
Ross (Dundas),
Ross (Lisgar),
Ryckman,
Savard,
Skinner,
Smith (Sir Donald),
Sproule,
Stairs,
Stevenson,
Temple,
Thompson (Sir John),
Tisdale,
Tupper,
Tyrwhitt,
Vaillancourt,
Wallace,
Weldon,
White (Cardwell),
White (Shelburne),
Wilmot,
Wood (Brockville),
Wood (Westmoreland).—169.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allan,
Allison,
Amyot,
Armstrong,
Bain,
Beausoleil,
Béchard,
Beith,
Bernier,
Borden,
Bourassa,
Bowers,
Bowman,
Brodeur,
Brown (Chateauguay),
Brown (Monck),
Cameron (Huron),
Campbell,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),
Casey,
Charlton,
Choquette,
Christie,
Colter,
Davidson,
Davies,
Dawson,
Delisle,
Devlin,
Edgar,
Featherston,
Flint,
Forbes,
Fraser,
Frémont,
Gauthier,
Geoffrion,
German,
Gibson,
Gillmor,
Godbout,
Grieve,
Guay,
Hargraft,
Harwood,
Innes,
King,
Landerkin,
Langelier,
Laurier,
Lavergne,
Leduc,
Legris,
Lister,
Macdonald (Huron),
McGregor,
McMillan,
McMullen,
Mignault,
Mills (Bothwell),
Mousseau,
Murray,
Paterson (Brant),
Perry,
Rider,
Rinfret,
Rowand,
Sanborn,
Scriver,
Semple,
Somerville,
Spohn,
Sutherland,
Traux,
Watson,
Welsh,
Yeo.—77.

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Mr. Taylor,	Mr. Trow.
Mr. O'Brien,	Mr. Barron.
Mr. Dewdney,	Mr. Mulock,
Mr. Prior,	Mr. Hyman,
Sir John A. Macdonald,	Mr. Mackenzie.

Amendment agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

Mr. FOSTER presented a message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows :—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1891, and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," he recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 4th June, 1891.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 5th June, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PETITION OF WILLIAM PUGSLEY.

Mr. DAVIN moved that the petition of William Pugsley, praying that leave be given to present the petition of the promoters of the Regina and South-Western Railway, be now read and referred to the Committee on Standing Orders.

Motion agreed to.

QUEBEC HARBOUR CONTRACTS—REPORT OF COMMITTEE.

Mr. GIROUARD presented the first report of the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is it the intention to make any motion with reference to the appearance of the witness, Michael Connolly, who is mentioned in the report?

Mr. GIROUARD, I presume a motion of that kind cannot be made until the papers are printed for the use of all the members; consequently the motion cannot be made before next Monday.

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS—REPORT OF COMMITTEE.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. With respect to the report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, presented to-day, no doubt its adoption should be moved and action taken on it by the House. I thought, however, and I consulted the sub-committee on that point, that it might be better to move it on Monday, and in the meantime the report presented to-day, containing as it does a synopsis of the evidence and proceedings of the Committee on this part of the enquiry, should be printed in the Votes and Proceedings in order that, by the time the witness was summoned to the bar, the members of the House would have before them all the evidence and all the facts. I hope, therefore, the House will consider I will be prepared to move on the subject on Monday, and that hon. members will take this as a notice.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman, of course, will understand, that I did not suggest that any positive action should be taken by the House in regard to this report. I merely suggested it was advisable that the witness who had been reported by the sub-committee as in contempt, should be ordered to be in attendance at the bar of the House, so that, if necessary, he could be examined. I did not suggest that any action should be taken. That course could be taken without interfering with any subsequent action to be initiated with respect to the witness.

Mr. EDGAR. Unnecessary delay will take place unless action is speedily taken. The witness is supposed to be in attendance before the Committee, and, if the House proposes to take any action, it is desirable it should be taken on Monday.

Mr. LAURIER. It seems to me that this point will present itself to the Minister of Justice.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no objection, and I will attend to the matter during the day.

PAIRING OF MEMBERS.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I rise to a question of privilege, and desire to refer to some observations made by the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) during my absence. The hon. gentleman made the following statement :—

"Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the House to a personal matter. After the vote the other day on motion to adjourn the debate in connection with the motion of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), the member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) got up and said that I had been paired with another gentleman. I stated then, and I repeat to-day, that I had distinctly declined to be paired with anyone before I left Ottawa. I have enquired about the matter since, and I find that I was not paired for that vote, but that I was paired previous to it without my consent and knowledge. I regret that the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) is not now in his seat. I will not say any more on the question to-day, but I will not let the matter rest here. The hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has had further information on the matter since he spoke, and if he does not take back the insinuation thrown out against me I will not accept any pair in future so long as he is head whip of the Conservative party. I want to be respected, and I presume that when the head ministerial whip knows the facts he will make them known to the House, but I will not tolerate being charged by any whip with breaking what I consider to be my word of honour. I was not paired for the vote in question. I did not know that I was paired for any vote at all, and if I had known I would have said distinctly that I declined to be paired. There are some remarks of the member for South Leeds which I wish to be struck out of the Official Debates, and I will refer to the matter further when the hon. gentleman is in his seat."

All I can say in regard to the matter is this: I had on my desk that evening when the vote was being taken, as I have to-day, a list of the pairs as they stand recorded in the pair book in the whips' room. I have a list placed on my desk every day, and I have one to-day. The night that vote was taken I had such a list. On that list were the names of the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) and the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne) as having been paired with the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Dyer) and the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Pelletier). After the vote was taken I asked to have the.

names read, to be certain that the names of those hon. gentlemen had been called Having heard them, and before the vote was declared, I rose, as it was my duty as head whip to do, and made this statement:

"I notice by the pair book that the hon. member for Maskinongé (Mr. Legris) has paired with the hon. member for St. Maurice (Mr. Desaulniers): the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne) has paired with the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Dyer); and the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) has paired with the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Pelletier)."

To that the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne) said:

"That is not correct as far as I am concerned."

The hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) said:

"I refuse to pair with anyone."

Then I said:

"I will read the pair book."

And in the meantime I had sent out for the pair book, and it was on my desk. But the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) interfered, and said: "Is this in order?" When you, Mr. Speaker, ruled it was out of order; and there the matter dropped. The hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier), in his statement, said: "I have received further information since." I enquired from the clerk of the whips, and he wrote me a letter to this effect:

"WHIPS' ROOM,
"June 5th, 1891.

"DEAR MR. TAYLOR,—The pairs between Messrs. Dyer and Lavergne, and Pelletier and Langelier, were dictated to me by Messrs. Fréchette (Megantic) and Brodeur (Rouville), and were entered by me in their presence on Friday afternoon last as follows: From 4 p.m. Friday, 29th May, 1891, until 8 p.m. Monday, 1st June, 1891.

"Both pairs read the same, and were made and entered at the same time.

"Yours sincerely,
"D. W. CAMERON."

Here is the pair book, and the entry reads as follows:—

"Mr. Dyer pairs with Mr. Lavergne, from 4 p.m. Friday, May 29, until 8 p.m. June 1. Pair 66. Mr. Pelletier, Ministerial, pairs with Mr. Lavergne, Opposition, from 4 p.m. Friday, May 29, until 8 p.m. June 1."

These pairs are so recorded. I made no statement except those recorded in *Hansard*, and I simply drew attention to the fact that those names were entered in the pair book, so I have nothing to retract. But I have learned this since, in conversation with Mr. Fréchette, the whip on this side, and Mr. Brodeur, the whip on the other side, that they had agreed to the pairs, and that they both went into the room and so had them recorded. My opinion is this, and, I think, I am borne out by the facts, that the whip of the Opposition did not notify the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier), or the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne), that he had paired them, and they, consequently, voted. But I drew attention, as it was my duty to do, to the fact that they were paired, and my hon. friend, Mr. Fréchette, said the pair was made until 8 p.m. Monday. So far as I am concerned, I have nothing to do with it, as I was not present, further than the entries in the pair book, the statement I made was based on the entries in that book. I do not think either hon. member had been advised by their whip that they had been paired. These are the statements I have obtained from the clerk, and from Mr. Fréchette.

Mr. BRODEUR. I desire to say a few words in reply to the hon. gentleman. On Friday afternoon the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Fréchette) came to ask me to get a pair for the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Pelletier) and the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Dyer). On the advice of my friends I had these members paired with the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) and the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne) for the day only, and I had these names entered, not in a book, but on a list which was affixed in the Government whips' room. Then, when these names were written on the list, I went away, and I saw on Tuesday that these names had been entered in a book. I saw that this book must be signed by the whips on either side, but I could not see either the signature of the Opposition or of the Ministerial whips to it. I did not see any book at the time the pairs were made, and the only thing I did see was a list attached to the wall in the whips' room, and on that list the pairs were mentioned as for Friday afternoon. I, therefore, do not understand how these hon. gentlemen could be paired for Monday. More than that, I met the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) on Monday morning, and I was so much under the impression that the hon. member was not paired after three o'clock in the afternoon of Monday that I did not say a single word to him about it. I was convinced at the time, as I am convinced now, that these hon. gentlemen were paired only for Friday, and the pairs were entered in my presence, not in a book but on a list attached to the wall. I learned only after this that there was a book for entering the names. I did not know that the person in the whips' room was clerk of the whips, because I asked the supposed clerk to make a list for me and he said that he was only the clerk of the Government whips and had nothing to do with the Liberal whips. That is the way we are treated in this House.

Mr. LANGELIER. I trust that this discussion will bring about some reform in the manner of recording the pairs. I see in the *Hansard* for the 1st June, after the vote on the motion of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), that my name is mentioned among a number of pairs. My name appears as having voted and also amongst the pairs, and it is very important that we should know upon whose authority that entry has been made in the Official Debates. It is a very serious affair that such entries can be made in the official record of the House without our being able to know by whose authority the entry has been made. Was it done by the authority of the chairman of the Debates Committee, or on whose authority was the entry made? I see that the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins), who is chairman of the Debates Committee, says that he never gave such authority, and I want to know on whose authority this was done. Mention has been made of a book for pairs, but the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Brodeur), who is one of our whips, has told me, as he has repeated to the House, that since this occurred he for the first time heard there was such a book, and he never before was called upon to sign the book or to see it. If it is the secretary for the hon. member for South Leeds

(Mr. Taylor) who keeps that book, we have no control over it and we would be completely at the mercy of that gentleman. I do not know him and I have nothing to say against him, but I maintain that, in this House, both parties should be on the same footing. The Liberal whips should be respected and treated as the whips on the other side are, and if not there should be no whips at all and each member should steer his own course without any reference to the whips. Our whips are not allowed to have a room of their own, they are not allowed to have a secretary; the secretary who is called the secretary of the whips says he has nothing to do with our whips, and, as I am informed by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Brodeur), he refused to do anything for him, as he said he was the private secretary of the head ministerial whip. If the record in the *Hansard* is made on the information supplied by that gentleman, I decline to be bound by it, and I call the special attention of the chairman of the Debates Committee to the fact that entries are made in the Official Debates which are not correct, and without any warrant for making such entries. It is a very serious matter if we are exposed to entries being made on the official record which are not correct, but which will go down to posterity as being correct. It is a serious reflection on me to see my name printed in the official record, which will go down to posterity, as having paired and voted at the same time. That is not correct, and it never would have been entered in the official record, if there had been some one to supervise the proceedings. It should be now erased. I insist that in future no entry should be made in the Official Debates except on the authority of the committee, and we shall be able then to have recourse against the committee, if anything wrong is done. This entry is an unwarranted reflection on my character, because it is admitted now that it is not correct. The hon. member for South Leeds said the other day, when the vote was taken:

"I notice by the pair book that the hon. member for Maskinongé (Mr. Legris) has paired with the hon. member for St. Maurice (Mr. Desaulniers); the hon member for Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne) has paired with the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Dyer); and the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) has paired with the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Pelletier)."

The hon. gentleman admits now that I was not paired.

Mr. TAYLOR. I did not make any such admission, and I think I am prepared to prove now by one of the members who was present with the hon. member, Mr. Fréchette, that the pairs were made.

Mr. LANGELIER. The hon. member stated that I had nothing to do with it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think your whip made the mistake that he did not inform you.

Mr. LANGELIER. The statement was that I had paired when I never had paired.

Mr. TAYLOR. I said that I noticed by the pair book that you had.

Mr. LANGELIER. I say that the pair book proves nothing at all. The pair book is the statement of the hon. member and he is contradicted by the statement of another hon. member whose word is as worthy of belief as his.

Mr. TAYLOR. There was a misunderstanding about it.

Mr. LANGELIER. There can be no misunderstanding, for I never paired, and I know nothing about it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I may say that I have nothing at all to do with the printing of names in the *Hansard*. It has been always the rule that the pairs in existence at the time the vote was taken should be sent to the press, and, I presume, also to the *Hansard*, but I know nothing of the printing of the pairs in the *Hansard*, nor do I know by what authority they go there. I will say as I stated before, that I think the responsibility for this misunderstanding rests with the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Brodeur).

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course the hon. gentleman will see that this is merely a matter of opinion.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend from Megantic (Mr. Fréchette) and the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Brodeur) are the parties responsible, and my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. Dyer) corroborates the statement of the hon. member for Megantic to me that they had paired until eight o'clock.

Mr. DELISLE. I am not in any way interested in this debate, but I must state to the House that, after having heard the remarks made by the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), and the remarks made by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Brodeur), I thought proper to accompany the hon. member for Rouville to the whips' room; and there it was stated before me by the keeper of the book that he had received the list signed by both the Conservative and the Opposition whips, but that those sheets were lost, and that he had taken upon himself to enter them upon the book. At the same time he stated that he never cared about the signature of the whips, because, when some sheets of that kind came to him he entered them in the books as if the pairs were made for the whole day without caring about the hours when the members should be here. I state that, because I was a witness of it, and I think the House should take some steps to avoid such disagreeable things in the future.

Mr. DYER. It may, perhaps, be as well that I should make a personal explanation of what I know of this matter. On the evening of Friday last the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Fréchette), knowing that I desired to obtain a pair, came to me and intimated that the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Brodeur) had told him that one of their men desired a pair. I met the two gentlemen on Friday night, when they said that they had arranged a pair for me with the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne) until six o'clock on Monday of this week. I said that six o'clock would not do me, and I wanted it arranged until twelve o'clock. They said, very well, and left me. To my surprise I found later on that the arrangement was not kept, and the hon. member for Megantic told me on Tuesday that the hon. member for Rouville had told him after leaving me that he could only make the arrangement till eight o'clock in the evening of Monday. I had not the pleasure of meeting the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska at all.

Mr. TROW. I regret exceedingly that this misunderstanding has taken place. I know nothing of it, and had no connection with it myself. As a rule, I have had the responsibility of all the pairs

up to this session for many years, and we have worked harmoniously together: prior to this session we have scarcely had any mistakes. I know no more honourable men in this House, or in this Dominion, than the hon. gentlemen who are accused of having voted while they were paired. I am satisfied that they were entirely innocent of the knowledge that they were paired, or they would have been the last to vote under such circumstances. I presume some little mistake must have taken place with the clerk, in entering the time, as to whether it was three o'clock or eight o'clock. I have a book of pairs, and I also have an office—a very indifferent and uncomfortable one. I do not think I have been in it for an hour this session, for I am afraid it would cause my death in a short time. However, I have no complaints to make of the Government's treatment of me in that respect, although they have removed me from time to time. However, we keep our separate books, and the head whip of each party signs every pair that is entered in the books. In regard to members being placed in the false position of having voted and being paired on the same question, I can hardly understand why that should take place, because members who pair, as a rule, are anxious that the public should see that they have not shirked the vote, and, therefore, they leave their names with me, or with the Conservative whip, so that they will be published: and the first opportunity, we give to the reporters the names of those who paired, and they find their way to the press. It is evident that there has been a pure misunderstanding in this instance, and no intentional wrong.

Mr. DESJARDINS (Hochelaga). I want to answer a question put by the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier). He asks on whose authority the pairs are published in the Debates. I told him it was not on the authority of the Debates Committee. It has been done at the desire of the whips, and it was a custom in the last Parliament. The hon. member will find in each volume of the Debates a list of the pairs on the principal votes during the session, and it has been understood that a list of the pairs would be sent to the reporters. There has been no order made on the subject by the Debates Committee.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. As considerable unpleasantness has resulted from the present misunderstanding, I think it should be arranged to avoid a similar occurrence in the future. This could be done very simply by arranging that every pair should be entered in the books of both whips and signed by the senior whips. If that simple precaution were observed, there would be no unpleasantness.

Mr. LAURIER. It appears to me that, in justice to my hon. friend from Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne), and the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier), they should not appear to have both paired and voted at the same time, and the entry in the Debates should be erased. Of course there is a misunderstanding somewhere. I do not wish to accuse anybody of doing anything wrong; but I think orders should be given to have this entry rectified.

Mr. BOWELL. Of course, if that is done, this whole discussion should be left out, and everything with reference to it.

QUEBEC HARBOUR CONTRACTS.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved:

That Michael Connolly, the witness named in the first report of the Select Committee on Privileges and Elections, be ordered to attend at the Bar of this House on Monday next, at three o'clock in the afternoon.

Motion agreed to.

CATTLE QUARANTINE REGULATIONS.

Mr. BOWELL. The quarantine regulations governing the importation of cattle from the United States as well as from England have not been removed, nor can they be, under the understanding which now exists between the Imperial Government and Canada.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is there any danger with reference to the importation of dead meat?

Mr. BOWELL. There never has been any regulation covering the importation of dead meat, in the way of restriction.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. MURRAY. I find in the Toronto *Empire* of yesterday an article reflecting on my conduct as a member of this House, and I desire to make a little explanation in order to put myself right. With the consent of the House I will read the article:

"The presumption these days of some of the Grit members is as offensive as it is unwarranted, but nothing that has yet transpired has in any way equalled the intolerable arrogance to-day of no less a personage than Mr. Thomas Murray, ex-member of the Ontario Legislature, ex-sheriff of Renfrew, and now M.P. for Pontiac, by grace of two Conservatives having run and allowed a Grit to slip in between them. Everybody knows that the members' rooms in the House are absolutely private. The Conservatives have their room, and they would no more dream of going into No. 6, the Grit room, than they would of entering Hon. Mr. Laurier's bedroom at the hotel during his absence. Yet, Mr. Murray—no green young member, but an old parliamentarian—this afternoon walked into the Conservative room——"

Mr. LANDERKIN. That was terrible.

—"accompanied by a secretary, coolly took possession of a table, and, with a nerve that was about an equal mixture of ignorance and impudence, proceeded to dispose of his correspondence. An attendant was called and Mr. Murray was requested to retire. He did so."

I must confess I was not aware that there are distinctive apartments for both parties in this House, and I did innocently walk into this room, which, I now understand, is reserved for the Conservative members of this House, accompanied by one of my constituents, a young man, who came to me to apply for a situation. Hon. gentlemen may laugh, but such are the facts. This young man was out of employment, and as I employ a great many men in my different branch stores, he applied for a situation in one of them. I was anxious to know what kind of a hand he wrote, and asked him into this room in order that he might give me a sample of his handwriting. Whilst he was writing the letter, some gentleman—I do not know who he was—who was in attendance, came to me and said, "Why, this is the Conservative room." I said, "Is that so, I was not aware of it:" and I immediately left. I saw about half a dozen members in the room with whom I was not acquainted, with the exception of one gentleman. I think the hon. member for Hamilton, whom I met

passing out, and to whom I said that I was not aware this was the Conservative room reserved exclusively for Conservative members. To my surprise, I find the reporter of the *Empire* has stigmatized my innocent action as somewhat very offensive. I may have offended some gentlemen in the room at the time, but, if I did so, it was unintentional. Judging by the Conservatives generally with whom I am acquainted, I do not think that many of them are so thin-skinned as to find fault with my going into their room on that particular occasion. I have been told that many Conservatives frequently come into room No. 6, which is set apart for the Liberals. For my part, I have only been in No. 6 once since I came to the House, and I do trust that when our friends come into power and we have the use of this very convenient room——

Mr. SPEAKER I think the hon. gentleman has proceeded far enough.

Mr. MURRAY. During my experience in the Ontario Legislature, we had no such rules. Here I am in a different atmosphere, but I do not know that there is any necessity for me to say anything further. Perhaps I have said too much, but I wish to impress on the House that I had no intention to infringe on the rights of the Conservative members; I would be very sorry to do so; and I think the attack made on me by the gentleman who writes for the *Empire* is utterly unwarranted.

MANITOBA SCHOOL ACT.

Mr. DEVLIN. I asked the other day the Minister of the Interior for information regarding the papers connected with the Manitoba School Act, and he said there would be no objection to bringing them down. When may we expect to have them?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have no recollection of having given such a reply, as none of the documents are in my department. I will find out where they are, and, no doubt, means will be taken to have them brought down.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Some of them are certainly in my department and will be ready in a few days. When the hon. gentleman spoke on the subject I thought, perhaps, there were some in the Department of the Interior, to which he has referred.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 99) respecting the settlement of accounts between the Dominion of Canada and the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, and between the said provinces (from the Senate).—(Sir John Thompson.)

Bill (No. 100) for the settlement of certain accounts between the Governments of Canada and Ontario respecting Indian lands (from the Senate).—(Sir John Thompson.)

Bill (No. 101) further to amend the Act respecting trade marks and industrial designs (from the Senate).—(Sir John Thompson.)

SUPPLY—THE HIGH COMMISSIONER.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster, That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply, and the motion of Mr. Laurier in amendment thereto.

Mr. CHARLTON. The debate upon the question under the consideration of the House has occupied a considerable length of time, and I do not propose to detain the House for very many minutes on this occasion. I wish briefly to review some of the points made by my hon. friend, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the last night this question was under discussion. The hon. gentleman took the position that the motion was made by my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, without being based on any evidence, or without his procuring any evidence, to justify him in making the motion. The charges made against the High Commissioner of Canada in Great Britain by the leader of the Opposition, are, that he engaged in an election contest in Canada while occupying his position in England, that he traduced and vilified the character, not only of individuals, but of a political party in this country, and that he made an attack in England and in Canada upon a private corporation. It was hardly necessary, until the denial had been made by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, that evidence should be laid before this House bearing out the charge made by the leader of the Opposition, as the facts are notorious. The Minister of Marine tells us that this matter should be dealt with by a special committee. The evidence is before the country, and is before the House, and can be easily obtained. There is no necessity for a special committee. The great Court of Inquisition of the Dominion is called upon to deal with the question which has been laid before the House of Commons of Canada.

I did sympathize with the hon. gentleman in the warm defence he made of the High Commissioner, who is a near relative of his. I thought it was natural that he should warmly defend his father, and it is not a very pleasant task to have to follow him in his defence of the High Commissioner. He tells us that, when the High Commissioner was in Canada on the occasion before the last election, he was received with the greatest degree of politeness by all members on this side of the House, with one notable exception, that of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). It is very true that Sir Charles Tupper was received with politeness on this side of the House, and we will always treat Sir Charles Tupper with politeness, but at that time we supposed that he was advocating a cause which would entitle him to the respect of the Liberal party. He had recently been in Washington, and, as it was expressed, he had not made an offer of unrestricted reciprocity but had made an unrestricted offer of reciprocity, and we thought that possibly he might be a means of obtaining that great boon which the Liberal party of this country desire for Canada. Therefore we looked upon him without any feeling of enmity, and we thought that he might induce his own party to take a sensible view of the case, and to obtain that which Canada languishes for to-day—free intercourse with the nation to the south of us. But it seems that the attention which we paid to him, under the impression that he could rise superior to party trammels, was not well grounded, and our politeness was, in a sense, thrown away, if it was

bestowed upon him as an indication of our opinion that, with his high qualities and his desire for the interests of this country, he would be able to obtain what was desired. Then, the hon. gentleman tells us of the supreme qualities of his father, and, from his remarks, it would appear that he is so lifted up above the rank and file of ordinary politicians, that we were only animated by envy, malignity and animosity against him, and that it is because we envy him his lofty position and the possession of transcendent abilities, that we try to bring him down by moving this resolution. Naturally, the hon. gentleman will feel proud of his father, and will defend him with fervour, but he is wrong in asserting that the feeling on this side is caused by envy, malignity and uncharitableness against him.

Then the hon. gentleman says that Sir Charles Tupper has never imputed treasonable motives to any large portion of the Canadian people. That is what Sir Charles Tupper did. He stated that he had come to Canada to expose the desire for annexation on the part of a large number of Canadians. In Toronto and Windsor, he accused my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Laurier), and all the leaders of the Liberal party, with being guilty of treasonable intentions, and with being engaged in a conspiracy with American statesmen and entertaining the purpose of handing Canada over to the United States. He called it "treason unveiled."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have to say that that was an accusation absolutely false, that he had no cause for making it, or evidence to warrant him in making such an accusation. I say that, as a public man, apart from his occupying a diplomatic position, he had no right to make that charge. When he came to Canada and hurled that charge against all the leaders of the Liberal party, and accused them of treason against their country, he acted in a manner inconsistent with the requirements that rested upon him as a gentleman, let alone the requirements that rested upon him as High Commissioner of Canada, acting in a diplomatic position in England.

Then, Sir, my hon. friend the Minister of Marine has made a charge with reference to the management of the political organ of the Liberal party in this country. He charged that Mr. Farrer had been engaged as chief editor of the *Globe* newspaper, and that, upon exposure of various letters and pamphlets written by him, he was deposed from that position, and another gentleman was put in his place as chief editor of that paper. Now, that charge is entirely without foundation. Mr. Farrer was never chief editor of the *Globe*. The chief editor of the *Globe* newspaper is Mr. J. S. Willison. Mr. Willison succeeded Mr. John Cameron, who was for many years manager of that paper, and Mr. Farrer was simply engaged as an editorial writer upon the *Globe*. At the time that Mr. Farrer's pamphlet was published, I believe he was in the employ of the *Mail*. Mr. Farrer has been for many years in the employ of the opposite party. He edited the *Mail* when it was a Government organ, he edited the Government organ in Winnipeg, and the greater part of his editorial service in Canada has been upon the Government press, a press upholding hon. gentlemen opposite. I suppose that when an editorial writer is engaged for a newspaper, it is not customary to enquire what his religion is, or what his political views are; he is engaged because he is supposed to have the qualifications that render him available, and make him a valuable servant for the position he has to fill. Mr. Farrer is admittedly the best newspaper writer in British America. Whatever may be his private opinions, he serves admirably as writer of the leaders upon the *Globe*. The *Globe* had no cause to ask what his private views are. No doubt he served just as admirably my friends on the opposite side, when his views were exactly the same as they are to-day, and, were he writing on the Opposition side now, his views on any question would never be thought of or called into question at all.

Then, we are told by my hon. friend that the fact that Edward Farrer had enunciated annexation sentiments is a proof that the newspaper for which he writes articles is an annexation journal. Well, I remember when annexation sentiments were not held in such disesteem by my hon. friends opposite. There was an annexation manifesto published in 1849, and there is to-day, in the Cabinet of this Government, a gentleman who signed that annexation manifesto, and it is rumoured that he is to be called upon to act as Premier of this Dominion. Sir, there never has been a day since that annexation manifesto was issued, that there has not been one or more gentlemen who signed it in the Tory Government. They will take them, and keep them, and use them. They have no feeling against annexationists. They have more annexationists in their party than there are in the Liberal party of this country. If you find men expressing annexation sentiments in Canada, in two cases out of three they are Tories; and were the Liberal party to come into power, the hon. gentlemen opposite would not hesitate to change their attitude at any moment, and advocate annexation to the United States if they thought they could thereby attain power again.

Mr. BOWELL. If they did, they would be sure to have you as an advocate.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not think they would. I do not advocate sentiments of that kind.

Then we are told by hon. gentlemen that the Liberals were in search of a policy, and they adopted the policy of Erastus Wiman, of New York, the policy of commercial union. Well, it happens, Mr. Speaker, that the policy of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States was advocated by certain Liberals a great many years ago. There was a United States Treasury Report issued in 1869, by Mr. J. L. Larned, which brought this question prominently before the people of Canada and the United States. I remember having advocated unrestricted reciprocity before entering public life. I remember having referred that question to a convention in my riding, more than ten years ago, and asking my supporters what their views were upon it, and I received their authority, by a unanimous vote, to stand up in favour of unrestricted reciprocity. That question was referred to the leader of the Liberal party more than five years ago. The question has been under consideration, and it was adopted by the Liberal party, not because Erastus Wiman had advocated it, but it was adopted after full and careful consideration, a consideration that lasted for years before a

decision was arrived at. Mr. Wiman, in advocating the policy of commercial union, was simply acting upon his own lines, while the Liberal party has been acting upon another line. Mr. Wiman advocated commercial union, the Liberal party advocates unrestricted reciprocity. The two things are different.

An hon. MEMBER. What is the difference?

Mr. CHARLTON. In the case of unrestricted reciprocity, we make an arrangement with the United States by which all the productions of each country are admitted into the other country free of duty, but whenever articles are imported into either country from any other country, either country has the right to impose such duties upon them as it pleases. We have control of our tariff against all the world except the United States, and we have control of our tariff against any importation from the United States that come from any other country, and the Americans have the same control over their tariff. So that we simply provide for the free admission into each country of the productions of the other country. That is what unrestricted reciprocity means, and it is quite a different thing that our friends mean when they talk of commercial union.

Then we are told that Erastus Wiman is an admitted traitor. Who admits it? And what bearing has the matter upon the case if it were admitted? He happens to agree, perhaps, with me upon some points, upon other points he does not agree with me. He moves in his own orbit. But I wish to see fair-play shown Erastus Wiman. He has been living in the United States many years. He has accumulated a fortune there, but he never has become an American citizen. Erastus Wiman cannot hold real estate in any State where aliens are debarred from doing so to-day, and he cannot hold vessel property in the United States. He is a British subject, and he refuses to become an American citizen, and I think, Mr. Speaker, that that fact rather indicates that Mr. Wiman is neither an avowed traitor, nor an actual traitor. He prides himself on his British citizenship, he is a British subject to-day, and he takes that course which, in his own estimation, is the proper course to secure for Canada the prosperity that he desires to see it enjoy. I have heard, Mr. Speaker, and you have heard, Mr. Wiman publicly thanked in this House of Commons by Sir Charles Tupper himself for the great services that he has rendered to Canada. Erastus Wiman has time and again apprised this Government of critical events when this Government were called upon to act, and might have acted too late, but for the friend who could give them information in time; and he has on every occasion shown his disposition and shown his desire to benefit Canada by doing whatever he could for it, in any way that lay in his power.

Then my hon. friend spoke of the definition of commercial union given by Mr. Hitt. What have we to do with that in discussing the policy of the Liberal party? We do not go to Mr. Hitt to get a definition of our policy. We do not accept his definition, we define it for ourselves. We know what our policy is, we know the ground upon which we stand, and we do not ask for an exposition of that matter from Washington.

Why this feeling of animosity for the United States, that is professed by our friends on the opposite side? I know one of the most eminent lights in the ministry of Ontario who used to preach in Ottawa. He was extreme in his opposition to the United States and his denunciation of annexation tendencies, and he accepted the first call he could get and went to Detroit—I refer to Rev. Mr. Carson. He changed his religion and became a Presbyterian at the same time that he annexed himself to the United States, for he was a Methodist before he left us. And then we know that the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) preached in the States. He preached in Buffalo, I believe, and I dare say he rendered good service there and was acceptable to the American people, and I do not want him to come now and throw any slurs or discredit upon those people who were so kind to him at that time.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I did not advocate Sunday Observance Bills, and tell profane stories on that day.

Mr. CHARLTON. Well, I am sure he did not advocate Sunday Observance Bills, at all events. He may have done something more inconsistent with his professions, I am not sure as to that.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we have the assertion made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that Mr. Blake's letter abandons the Liberal position, and throws discredit upon the Liberal party, that Mr. Blake has left the Liberal party, and that he characterizes unrestricted reciprocity as treasonable. Mr. Blake, in his letter, refers to the access we have to the English market, to the fact that that market is open to us, not because Great Britain wishes to benefit us, but because she opens her market to all the world. He shows that this market is of great advantage, but an advantage of small moment when compared with free access to the American market. He then proceeds to speculate as to the results of the McKinley Bill, and arrives at the conclusion that some of the American duties will be reduced, and he goes on to say:

"Having regard to this expectation (reduction of duties in the United States), unrestricted free trade with the United States, secured for a long term of years, would (even though accompanied by higher duties against the rest of the world than I, for one, admire) give us in practice the great blessing of a measure of free trade much larger than we now enjoy or can otherwise obtain; it would greatly advance our most material interests and help our natural, our largest, most essential, and most promising industries. It would create an influx of population and capital and promote a rapid development of forces and materials now almost unused; in three words, it would give us men, money, and markets."

These are Mr. Blake's sentiments with respect to unrestricted free trade. How can you take those words and assert that Mr. Blake has gone back on the Liberal party, when he asserts that unrestricted free trade would be a vast advantage to this country? It cannot be done. Mr. Blake recognizes that free trade, as between Canada and the United States, is certain to be productive of great blessings.

We had an allusion made—and as it was a personal allusion, I feel bound to refer to it—by the Minister of Marine to a certain letter that appeared, or a portion of it, in the *Empire*, with a statement, quite characteristic of the journalistic mendacity of that organ, that the letter was of recent date. It was an easy matter, as they had stolen the letter, to give a date; but a date was not given. That letter was nearly two years old. In it I expressed the opinion that the prospects of the Liberal party were not as good under a French Canadian as they would be under a Protestant

leader. It was a mere opinion upon the question of strength, popularity and availability. I will now say that the Hon. Wilfred Laurier, as the leader of the Liberal party, is, I believe, the very best man we could, at the present time, place in that position. He is a man whose character, affability, talents, kindness of disposition and thorough liberalism make him acceptable to the Liberals in this Dominion, and I take occasion publicly to say that I follow Mr. Laurier as the leader of the Liberal party of Canada. So much for this allusion. Hon. gentlemen who approve of the theft of correspondence, who approve of a sneak thief taking a private and confidential letter and carrying it to a newspaper which publishes it, and thereby becomes a confederate of the sneak thief, and all who approve of such transactions and can make capital out of this matter in their own little disreputable way, are welcome to do so.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will now tell us what he knows about machine politicians ?

Mr. CHARLTON. I will say to the specimen of a machine politician who has asked me the question, that I will answer him. The hon. gentleman alluded to, I believe, stands as high morally and is as honest a politician as any man on the other side.

The Minister of Marine next quoted from the *Globe* of 1880 to show that it was opposed to reciprocity, because at that time an editorial appeared in opposition to commercial union, or Customs union. The founder, owner, and master spirit of the *Globe* was the man who negotiated the draft Brown reciprocity treaty, which made a long step towards unrestricted reciprocity, and which proposed to place on the list of free articles a large number of American manufactures ; and there has not appeared in the *Globe* since the preparation of that draft treaty any articles that have in any degree militated against the policy of unrestricted reciprocity now advocated by the Reform party.

Then we have an attack made by the Minister of Marine against the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). It seems that my hon. friend was in Boston, and attended a public dinner there, and some enthusiastic American, who was very highly pleased with his oratorical power and was struck with the evidence of his statesmanlike qualities, said he would make a magnificent specimen of a United States Senator, that he would make a good Senator from Ontario. That was a complimentary statement made by an American. It was not a sentiment expressed by my hon. friend. It was not a sentiment expressed by any Canadian Liberal. We cannot be accountable for what is said by Americans in Boston, and we do not propose to be. He might have said he would make a good angel in Heaven.

Mr. BOWELL. You would have granted him absolution.

Mr. CHARLTON. I could not have vouched for the truth of the assertion had it been made. We have had reference made to the speech of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) delivered on that occasion. My hon. friend wished to impress the Americans with the advantages that would result to them from unrestricted reciprocity. That is a great trouble with which we have to contend. Americans say that our arrangements are all very well, but what advantages are they going to get out of it ? The difficulty is to convince them that unrestricted reciprocity with Canada will not give us all the advantages, and my hon. friend was seeking to remove that impression, and to pave the way for a public sentiment in favour of that measure which is essential to our prosperity. So my hon. friend said that the policy of unrestricted free trade would open to them commercial access to half the continent, and that it would be equivalent to them, in a commercial sense, to a new tier of northern states. It would be exactly equivalent to that. It would add to the area in which the Americans could trade with perfect freedom the whole Dominion of Canada, and it would add to the area with which we could deal a country containing 65,000,000 of people. So my hon. friend, in the course of his Boston speech, was acting with diplomatic skill in attempting to create a public sentiment in the United States favourable to that measure which we desire to obtain, when we secure a Government which understands our wants sufficiently well to make an honest attempt to obtain it.

Then we had a statement made with respect to an opinion expressed by Senator Hoar, of the United States Senate, who is chairman of the committee charged with the investigation into commercial relations with Canada. Mr. Hoar expressed the opinion that "annexation sentiments are making headway in Canada, and the number of annexationists is increasing." I think Mr. Hoar is correct. I have no doubt of it.

Some hon. MEMBERS, No, no.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes. I think if he went through the country on the great lines of travel and communication, he would find that every fifth Tory he met would express an opinion in favour of the United States. The whole Conservative party is honey-combed with that heresy of annexation to the United States, and they are like the woman who cries out about her chastity. They talk about treason, loyalty and annexation, and then attempt to cast a stigma on others than those to whom it properly belongs. The Minister of Marine told the House that he could give proof after proof from the United States newspapers and the utterances of American public men to show that they consider the Liberals of Canada their allies. The hon. Minister of Customs bows his assent. The public men of the United States of both parties, both Republican and Democratic, look upon the Liberal party of Canada as the progressive party, as the true Liberal party, as the party with whom they could make arrangements mutually advantageous, and they are justified in looking on that party in this light because the Liberal party in Canada is the progressive party in this country. If this country ever expects to obtain from the United States trade relations mutually advantageous, trade relations that will give us the great boon of a free access to the markets of the continent, I venture to say that that boon will be obtained by the Liberal party of Canada. The gentlemen who sit on the Government benches ; these reactionists, these men who foster antipathy and animosity between these two countries, these men who appeal to passion and to prejudice, these men who cast insults upon the people of the United States—these are not the men who can go to Washington to open negotiations or to secure that great boon for Canada. They have barred

the door against their proposals at Washington, and they continue to do so every time they assert that a broad-minded, liberal man in Canada is an annexationist, forsooth, because he desires to live on friendly terms with the great nation to the south of us.

It has been charged that my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Laurier), had been guilty of indecent haste in making this motion, but, in my opinion, he acted at the proper time. The time to make this motion was when Parliament assembled, and if Sir Charles Tupper is guilty of that which is charged against him, the sooner he is arraigned by resolution before the House of Commons the better. I deny, Sir, that the charges made by the leader of the Opposition were made with indecent haste. I may, perhaps, be permitted to refer to a few articles from the London *Times*, which will bear out the charges made against Sir Charles Tupper. I would have gone into this matter more fully, but the hour is late, and I shall not trespass on the time of the House more than a few minutes longer. When Sir Charles Tupper returned to England, he was interviewed by a reporter of the London *Times*, on the 15th day of April, and a report of a portion of his interview is as follows:—

"In the course of an interview yesterday afternoon with Sir Charles Tupper, High Commissioner for Canada in this country, who arrived in Liverpool yesterday from New York, that gentleman, referring to the recent election in Canada, said: 'The Dominion has been agitated for the past three or four years by leaders of politics of the Separatists, led by Mr. Wiman, at public banquets and meetings; and when the general election came there was not time between the issue of the writs and the elections to disabuse the public mind of the fallacies that had been promulgated.'"

Now, Sir, was it the business of the High Commissioner for Canada, who is charged with caring for the interest of this whole Dominion, and who is the servant alike of Liberals and Conservatives—was it his business, when he arrived in London, to make a slanderous charge against one-half of the people of this country? Was he justified in asserting that the contest in which he had been engaged was a contest between the Separatist class, those who desire to separate from England, those who desire annexation to the United States on the one side, and the loyal class on the other. No, Sir; he had no justification for making that charge; it was a slander upon the people against whom the charge was made, and whether he had justification for making that charge or not, it was none of his business to prefer such a charge, considering the position he occupied as a public servant of the whole people. Then, Sir Charles Tupper proceeded to make a charge against the Grand Trunk Railway in the same interview. He said:

"In addition to this, the Grand Trunk Railway—a very powerful corporation, with its two termini in the United States, at Chicago and Portland, but holding great influence in Ontario and Quebec—threw itself, with unwarrantable vigour, into the combat, and exercised extreme coercion against the Government among its employés. The fact that the Government should have been able, under these adverse circumstances, to carry the country by larger majorities than four years ago, shows that there is, in the Dominion, a deep-seated loyalty to British institutions."

Now, Sir, this was a false charge, as the subsequent correspondence proves. It is proven that the Grand Trunk Railway Company did not exercise extreme coercion upon its employés. It is proven, if the assertion of their officers is worth anything, that they exercised no coercion, that employés were left to vote as they pleased; and Sir Charles Tupper, when he arrived in London, and when he made this slanderous and false charge against the Grand Trunk Railway had not only forgotten the duties of his position, but he was animated by that spleen and spite which actuated him when he could not use the Grand Trunk Railway as an instrument for carrying out the desires of the Conservative party. Sir Charles Tupper proceeds to say:

"The policy proposed by Sir John Macdonald, the Premier, was that of reciprocal trade in the natural products of the two countries, Canada and America, similar to the Treaty of 1854, with such modifications as could be agreed upon in the interests of both. The effect of such a policy would not be against England, as the articles exchanged between the two countries would not be to any extent, if at all such as are exported from England."

Here was a deliberate attempt to deceive English public opinion, a deliberate attempt to make the English people believe that the Government were moving in the direction, and could expect to obtain a treaty on the lines of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854. Sir Charles Tupper knew that this was absurd, he knew that it could not be done. Therefore, in that short interview he charged one great party with being disloyal and with being Separatists; he preferred a false charge against the Grand Trunk Railway, and he placed before the British public a false statement with regard to the state of public questions in Canada. I might quote at great length to show the reprehensible conduct of Sir Charles Tupper, but I will not detain the House by so showing. We have in the London *Times* correspondence between Sir Charles Tupper and Sir Henry Tyler; we have charges made by Sir Charles Tupper that the Grand Trunk Railway issued free passes on their line from Point Lévis; we have charges that the Grand Trunk Railway exercised coercion with regard to its employés; we have charges that the Grand Trunk Railway threw itself, might and main, body and soul, into the contest in favour of the Liberal party; and we have all these charges denied and disproved by Sir Henry Tyler and by Mr. Seargeant, General Manager of the Grand Trunk Railway. We have a statement made by Sir Charles Tupper that he bitterly regretted the day when he lent his influence to secure for the Grand Trunk Railway an entrance into Chicago, and that he bitterly regretted that he had ever used his influence for the benefit of that corporation. We have him assuming an attitude of hostility throughout to the Grand Trunk Railway, we have him making the charge that the Grand Trunk Railway management was extravagant, corrupt and dishonest; and when brought to book on that charge, he attempted to wriggle out of it by saying he meant that the management was extravagant, corrupt and dishonest some 35 years ago, and we have throughout the whole controversy a lamentable degree of duplicity shown by the hon. the High Commissioner. We have also Sir Charles Tupper's offer to go on the stump in England to meet Sir Henry Tyler and to show the British people that he was a scoundrel, and a bad railway manager, and did not deserve their confidence. Suppose the British ambassador at Paris should attack the financial standing of some French railway corporation and propose to go before the French people to show that the management of the corporation was a bad one, would that be tolerated for a moment? No, he would receive his walking papers to go home. I

assert that Sir Charles Tupper throughout this whole contest, in taking the course that he did, in accusing the Liberal party of dishonest, unpatriotic, treasonable motives, in making this attack on the Grand Trunk Railway simply because he could not use that railway for his purposes, I claim—without going fully into these quotations, which would take some time, and which I do not propose to inflict on the House—that Sir Charles Tupper has acted in a manner that renders him liable to, and makes him deserving of, the censure of this House; and so I shall support the motion presented by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. KENNY. During the past four years that I have had the honour of a seat in this House, I have noticed that on many occasions reference has been made to the tone, and dignity, and order, and decorum which have marked the proceedings of this Legislature, and we have prided ourselves on the fact that in this respect we stood only second to the Imperial Parliament at Westminster. From both sides of the House I have heard references to British procedure, British precedents and British customs; and those references to British forms and to British habits always fell pleasantly on my ears, because I know that the great mass of the people of Canada, be they Tory or be they Liberal, are loyal to the institutions of our country, and are proud to belong to the great British Empire of which we form so important a part. During the present session I have heard individual members of the Cabinet assailed by hon. gentlemen opposite for departing from what those hon. gentlemen considered to be British practice. I have heard the whole Cabinet assailed because proceedings which they advocated did not accord with those hon. gentlemen's ideas of British custom. Now, I submit that hon. gentlemen opposite, have been following, during the course of this debate, the excessively un-British practice of attacking a man behind his back. I consider that the resolution now under discussion in this House is not only un-British, but unmanly. What are the facts of the case? The hon. leader of the Opposition has moved a resolution condemning Sir Charles Tupper, the High Commissioner of Canada to England, because Sir Charles took part in the recent general election in this Dominion, because he made use of certain language, and because he made certain references to the chairman of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. Mr. Speaker, we must not forget that the High Commissioner of Canada is a man well known throughout this Dominion. He was prominent in bringing about the confederation of these British North American provinces, and he has always taken an active part in the public life of Canada. As to how he there acquitted himself hon. gentlemen may differ; but we do know that for twenty years he was a prominent member of this House, and that during most of that time he sat on the Treasury benches; and we all know, and it has been acknowledged by hon. gentlemen opposite, that the important duties pertaining to the office of High Commissioner have been discharged by Sir Charles Tupper in a manner creditable to the country and satisfactory to all who have had occasion to seek his services on the other side of the Atlantic. Hon. gentlemen opposite have cheerfully given their testimony to the satisfactory manner in which Sir Charles Tupper has performed the duties of High Commissioner; but the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who has just taken his seat, has intimated to us that this politeness which was extended to the High Commissioner, when he sat in Parliament in 1887, the eulogia which were passed upon him by the hon. gentlemen opposite, were only extended to him in the hope that the Opposition would be able to induce him to accept their views as regards the commercial relations between this country and the neighbouring republic. As to the High Commissioner's parliamentary career, I am not in a position to speak from any personal knowledge. I had the honour of meeting him here only during one session, that of 1887, when Sir Charles Tupper occupied the important position of Finance Minister, and I must say that during that session I never heard such language applied to him as political bulldozer, and many other equally euphonious and elegant expressions which have been applied to him during the course of this debate. My knowledge of the High Commissioner's parliamentary career has been derived very largely from what I have heard of him from hon. gentlemen who have been his contemporaries in this House, and who sat on both sides of the Chair. I have heard that the High Commissioner was sharp in attack, and quick in defence, and I think that hon. gentlemen opposite, some of them at least, carry, and must carry forever the marks and scars of their redoubtable political opponent. It would really seem as if his very presence in Canada had opened those wounds afresh, and that now nothing but the unprecedented course of censuring a man in his absence will satisfy—the personal hostility, the animosity and vindictiveness towards the High Commissioner which seems to actuate some of the members of this assembly. Now, Mr. Speaker, before we censure Sir Charles Tupper for taking part in the recent general elections, it is only fair and proper that we should enquire into the character of that appeal to the people of Canada. Sir Charles Tupper, as I have mentioned, took part in the great movement which resulted in the confederation of these British American Provinces; but I submit that in the election which took place in March last in this Dominion, issues were presented to the country, far transcending in importance the question of Confederation or any other question which has ever been agitated in Canada since the British flag was first hoisted on this Continent. For the first time in the history of Canada a measure was proposed which assailed the national life of the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. KENNY. I say yes. I say that in the question of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity, as I view it, and as it has been viewed by the majority of the people of Canada, I believe our very national existence was imperilled. For that statement, I have the authority of an hon. gentleman opposite who has ever taken a prominent part in the discussion of the question of unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union, whichever you may be pleased to call it. I find it reported in the public press of the country that the hon. member for South Oxford used at Ingersoll, in 1887, the following language:—

"There is no doubt whatever that before we can obtain such a measure of unrestricted reciprocity as the advocates of this policy desire, it will be necessary to discriminate against the manufacturers of other countries, against even those of Great Britain. There is no doubt whatever in my mind also, that we cannot overlook the risk that does undoubtedly arise, that increased commercial intercourse may strengthen the hands of those who desire to see our political system absorbed in theirs."

These are words of caution addressed to the people of Canada as far back as 1887, before any motion was ever made in the Parliament of Canada in favour of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity. And I think it is to be regretted that a gentleman of ability, occupying the position of prominence and influence which the hon. member for South Oxford undoubtedly does in this country, should have lent his assistance to a measure which, he recognizes himself, strengthens the hands of those who desire to see our political system absorbed in that of the neighbouring republic. That extract from the speech of Sir Richard Cartwright at Ingersoll in 1887, I think, very good authority for my statement that there is at least great peril to our institutions involved in this question of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat explained, in a moment of candor, what his view is of unrestricted reciprocity, and I was glad to hear it from such an avowed advocate of the greatest possible intercourse with the United States. He told us that, as he understood the measure and as it is understood, I fancy, by hon. gentlemen opposite, he contemplates that we shall have a common tariff with the United States as against the rest of the world.

Mr. CHARLTON. No, I did not contemplate that; I said the very opposite.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). That was your platform during the election.

Mr. CHARLTON. My statement was that there should be complete freedom of intercourse between the two countries in the articles produced by the labour of each, but that each country should impose such tariff as it pleased against the products of other countries. My proposition was to give each country complete control of its own tariff except as regards the products of each going into the other.

Mr. BOWELL. Is that continental free trade?

Mr. CHARLTON. No, that is unrestricted reciprocity.

Mr. BOWELL. Then you are not following your leaders.

Mr. CHARLTON. I was following the lines of the Liberal policy.

Mr. KENNY. Is that what the hon. gentleman means by continental free trade, that each country is to retain its Customs regulations and barriers, and that each shall have a separate tariff as against the rest of the world? The hon. member for North Norfolk tells us that we have nothing to do with Mr. Hitt's definition of unrestricted reciprocity, that it does not concern us what Mr. Hitt thought or said on the matter. I am astonished at the hon. gentleman repudiating Mr. Hitt, for this reason, that, since this session has commenced, the hon. the leader of the Opposition, in one of the early speeches he made in this House, recommended the members of this Legislature to enquire into the opinions of the Hon. Mr. Sherman and of Mr. Hitt. If, Sir, you will look to the pages of *Hansard*, you will find that the hon. the leader of the party opposite referred to Mr. Sherman and Mr. Hitt as exponents and advocates of unrestricted reciprocity. Not only is it not consistent on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, but it is not fair to Mr. Hitt that he should be so repudiated by his friends in this House, because any reference made in this Legislature to these gentlemen, occupying prominent and honourable positions in their own country, should be made with all courtesy. They are gentlemen occupying, the one in the Senate of the United States and the other in the House of Representatives, prominent positions, and they have been intimately associated with the advocates of commercial union in Canada and selected by them to represent their views in those assemblies. But I find that as late as 27th March, 1890, when the resolution in favour of unrestricted reciprocity had been introduced by the hon. member for South Oxford, that hon. gentleman said:

"You may see the reflection of the policy of the Opposition in this House, in the resolutions which were introduced by Mr. Hitt, the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Just read that resolution.

Mr. KENNY. Does the hon. member for South Oxford repudiate Mr. Hitt?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Read the resolution.

Mr. KENNY. I will deal with Mr. Hitt; the hon. gentleman need not be in such a hurry; nobody interrupted the hon. gentleman who preceded me. I certainly will comply with the hon. gentleman's request, and will give him the resolution of 1890 of Mr. Hitt, and his resolution of 1889, and I am not surprised that he does not repudiate that resolution, because, to my mind, it is the result of some of the pilgrimages of some of the hon. gentlemen opposite to the shrine of Wiman, and to Washington.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It is the Minister of Finance you are referring to now.

Mr. KENNY. I find that, in 1889, Mr. Hitt moved a resolution in the Congress of the United States. I hold in my hand a copy of the speech which Mr. Hitt delivered on that occasion. The pamphlet is headed "Commercial Union with Canada" and not "Unrestricted Reciprocity."

Mr. LANDERKIN. Was that before the Government pilgrimage down to Washington?

Mr. KENNY. During the course of the very interesting speech which the Hon. Mr. Hitt then delivered, and with which, no doubt, hon. gentlemen opposite are quite familiar, he advocated that we should pool our tariffs, on the basis of population. Now, I would like to know if hon. gentlemen opposite are in favour of that? He said also:

"Can there be any question that it would be in the interest of our people to have free admission to that market for the sake of the American market—to have the preference, in fact, in that market by the establishment of a tariff against importations from any other country."

Further on, Mr. Hitt says:

"I have faith that the capital and labour of the United States, 60,000,000 strong, can easily take care of themselves in the opening of the market with 5,000,000 of Canadians."

Again he says :

"Undoubtedly they (that is the Canadians), in being subjected to the same tariff with us——"

Is this the reflection of the views of hon. gentlemen opposite? Is it for this definition that we are referred to Mr. Sherman and Mr. Hitt? You will find that hardly two of those gentlemen opposite agree on the question of commercial union, and we are obliged to go across the border and see what their allies there mean by unrestricted reciprocity. As regards this question, Mr. Hitt says :

"Undoubtedly they, in being subjected to the same tariff with us, would in all fairness be consulted as to its provisions, but we, 60,000,000, would in all fairness have generally the prevailing voice in declaring what the rate should be."

I will ask the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) if that is the reflection of his views?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is not, and the hon. gentleman knows it perfectly.

Mr. KENNY. These extracts are from Mr. Hitt's speech of 1889. Hon. gentlemen will well remember that the question of commercial union suddenly became very unpopular in Canada. As soon as it was placed fairly and squarely before the people of Canada, they recognized that commercial union meant political union; and they recognized further, that the Americans with whom some prominent Canadians were associating in advocating commercial union, meant political union. Consequently the term "commercial union" was dropped. So these hon. gentlemen were obliged to change their tactics, or, if they did not change their tactics, they changed the name of their fad and called it unrestricted reciprocity, which was a distinction without a difference. Therefore it was that, after mutual arrangements which we can very well understand, Mr. Hitt's resolution of 1890—the one which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) tells us is the reflection of the policy of the Opposition—does not contain the words "commercial union," but it stipulates for the complete removal of all duties on trade between Canada and the United States. If I am wrong, I should be corrected at once. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has challenged me to read the resolution of Mr. Hitt. I have it not complete.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Read it.

Mr. KENNY. I have it not in full, and the hon. member who may have had something to do with the framing of it, should correct me if I am wrong, but I say it provides for the complete removal of all duties on trade between Canada and the United States.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Certainly.

Mr. KENNY. Will any intelligent man say that, if the removal of all duties on trade between the United States and Canada is aimed at by that resolution, it does not mean the same thing as commercial union? An hon. member has kindly placed in my hands Mr. Hitt's resolution, and the House will see whether I have correctly stated its purport. It reads as follows :—

"That, whenever it shall be duly certified to the President of the United States that the Government of the Dominion of Canada has declared a desire to establish commercial union with the United States—— "

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What date is that, pray? That is not the resolution of 1890, and, if the hon. gentleman has been so informed, he has been erroneously informed.

Mr. KENNY. I think the hon. member for South Oxford is correct, and we can have no better authority on Mr. Hitt's resolutions than the hon. gentleman himself. The resolution which has just been handed to me is the resolution of 1889, and the difference between this resolution and the one of 1890 is simply that the words "commercial union" are obliterated. It is a distinction without a difference. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has given us a definition of unrestricted reciprocity, or rather of what he imagines unrestricted reciprocity to mean. I have referred you to Mr. Hitt, whom the member for North Norfolk, very unfairly as I think, has repudiated, considering all the services Mr. Hitt has rendered to the hon. gentleman's party in the Congress of the United States; but the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was more grateful, and he told us last year that in the Hitt resolution we would find the reflection of the views of hon. gentlemen opposite. Is it any wonder, under those circumstances, that, when the hon. member for South Oxford travelled 500 or 600 miles to attend a dinner in Boston, the gentleman who presided on that occasion stated : "We have in Canada many in favour of our view, we have in Prince Edward Island Mr. Davies, we have in Quebec Mercier and Laurier, we have in Ontario Cartwright, who look to us, the people of the United States, for the sign by which they shall conquer." I think no men better deserved recognition at the hands of others than these gentlemen did at the hands of the merchants of Boston. I was most anxious to get from a gentleman as prominent in the Opposition ranks as the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), a definition of unrestricted reciprocity, because I remembered that, during the last election, when I endeavoured to find out for myself what unrestricted reciprocity meant, and when the matter had to be dealt with by the people of the Province of Nova Scotia and of all Canada, suddenly a great change came over the gentlemen who were advocating that measure and the press which placed their views before the public, and then these gentlemen announced in the Province of Nova Scotia that what they understood by commercial union was that we were to have an interchange of the productions of both countries, but each country was to retain its own separate tariff. That did not coincide with what Mr. Hitt stated. Mr. Hitt was not deceiving his own countrymen when he moved the resolutions for the removal of all the duties between the two countries. But when the people of Nova Scotia who, in common with the great majority of the people of Canada, are loyal to the institutions of this country and to their Queen, had to pronounce upon unrestricted reciprocity, the advocates of the fad in that Province were obliged, to use a vulgar expression, to take back water. The leader of the Opposition did us the honour of paying us a visit in Halifax. I think it was in the December preceding that election. I am glad to be able to say here that I think the hon. gentleman's visit was a pleasant one, that he was treated by all parties with the greatest possible courtesy. I know very

well that the Minister of Militia, with his usual kindness, placed the drill shed at the disposal of the hon. leader of the Opposition, and there a very successful meeting took place, and I should be very sorry, indeed, to say that it was not a successful meeting. Now, the hon. the leader of the Opposition will pardon me if I just, for one moment, divert from the discussion which is immediately before the House, to express my surprise that, after all we did to receive him courteously and kindly in the Maritime Provinces, he should have said, in Huntingdon, after the general election, that this Confederation, that this Parliament of Canada, would never be ruled by the tail of the Confederation.

Mr. LAURIER. Oh, I never said that.

Mr. KENNY. Well, I am very glad indeed to hear it. It was not like the hon. gentleman to use such language. But to come back to the definition of unrestricted reciprocity. I read in the New York *Tribune* of 12th February, 1891, the following :—

"The Halifax *Chronicle* makes statements which appear to need prompt correction. It argues in favour of unrestricted and absolute reciprocity between Canada and the United States, with each country at liberty to adopt such tariff as it may prefer, and represents this, and no more than this, as the deliberate purpose of one party in the Canadian contest. If this is the fact, one party of Canadians closely resembles the babe which cried for the moon, and got into a rage because the moon would not consent to be grasped. This nation has not the slightest notion of allowing Canada to open a back door as wide as it may please, while tariff enactments of the United States are closing the front doors against sundry importations at New York and Boston. If anybody is really silly enough to suppose that any such plan is entertained by Americans, he does not live in this country."

Now, I think that is a clear definition, from one of the highest authorities of the United States, of what the people of that country understand by unrestricted reciprocity, which is being so constantly pressed on Canada by hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has hardly done Mr. Erastus Wiman justice. He must admit that Mr. Wiman is the father of the fad, and when they adopted his fad, he very kindly adopted them and took them all under his wing. Mr. Wiman makes no concealment of what he means by commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity. He goes further, and tells the people of the United States—and when he tells the people of the United States it means that he tells the people of Canada, and that he tells the people of the mother country—that all this agitation means such a measure of trade and commercial intercourse as will ultimately result in the absorption of this country into the United States of America. That is what Mr. Wiman means, that is what Mr. Wiman intends, and he makes no secret of his intentions. But I have travelled off into this trade question, and this definition of commercial union, because I think we should know exactly what is meant by it before we attempt to censure Sir Charles Tupper for engaging in the last general elections and assuming a hostile attitude against commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that because Sir Charles Tupper occupies a semi-embassadorial position in England, therefore he is not warranted in taking part in a general election in the Dominion of Canada. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am ready to recognize that, to some extent, that doctrine is correct. If it were an ordinary party contest, I would not expect Sir Charles Tupper to take part in it, if it were a mere question of Grit and Tory, if it were a mere question of the "ins" and "outs," if it were a mere question of National Policy or Free Trade, then probably Sir Charles Tupper would not have appeared in Canada. But when the very existence of our nationality was assailed, it was the duty of every man, no matter what his position in this country may have been, to take part in such a contest as that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then let him resign his salary.

Mr. KENNY. It would be well for Canada if every man who has drawn a salary for services to Canada, had done as much for Canada as Sir Charles Tupper has. Is there any man in this House or out of it, that can point to one instance in this Legislature, or on any public platform in Canada, or anywhere else, where Sir Charles Tupper, hour after hour, abused his own country? Among all the accusations that have been levelled against Sir Charles Tupper, no one can point to a public utterance of his which is calculated to disparage his own country, either in the esteem of our own people or in that of strangers. Sir Charles Tupper has attended many public meetings on both sides of the Atlantic, he has attended public dinners on both sides of the Atlantic, but he has never so spoken as to have it said to him that the best way his views could be realized was for him to become a Senator of the United States of America. Now, Mr. Speaker, because Sir Charles Tupper happens to hold the position of High Commissioner, can it be said that he has thereby sacrificed his position as a Canadian citizen? Is not Canada as dear to him as ever it was? The hon. member for South Oxford told us, four years ago—I have quoted his words to you—that this agitation for commercial union imperilled our relations with the mother country, and meant, probably, the absorption of this country by the United States; and if, Sir Charles Tupper believed that statement of the hon. member for South Oxford, I say it was his bounden duty to come to Canada and take part in that election. Would it be any excuse to any ambassador, if his country was assailed, to say that his ambassadorial position would prevent him from taking part in the defence of his country? Nobody will admit such a doctrine as that. That point was very clearly placed before this House the other night by my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). Let me quote from another gentleman who differs very little in his view of the question of unrestricted reciprocity from the view taken of it by the High Commissioner. Will any one oppose question the honesty and sincerity of the hon. Edward Blake? Mr. Blake was for years, all his life, identified with the Liberal party in this country. For many years he was the leader of that party, and the eloquence of his voice has frequently wakened echoes in this Chamber, and it has been stated on many a platform throughout Canada that he sacrificed his health in the service of his party. And yet so strongly was Mr. Blake of the opinion that this policy of unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union, that the result of all these journeys to and fro to Washington, would act injuriously to Canada, that when his party placed this policy of unrestricted reciprocity before

the country as their platform, he retired from his party and told them he had no more to do with them. Mr. Blake, prompted by a strong sense of duty, felt it necessary to make that public severance, and we all know how strong are party ties, and how difficult it must have been for a gentleman occupying the position which Mr. Blake occupied to take that step; but it became a solemn duty, it was a question of country before party, and Mr. Blake took that very important and decided step, and retired from his party. If the question raised in March last was so serious, if the issue which was then before the people of Canada was so fraught with danger to the Dominion that Mr. Blake felt constrained to take that extreme step, I say that Sir Charles Tupper should not be blamed if he chose to take the same view of the question as Mr. Blake adopted. If hon. gentlemen will read Sir Charles Tupper's pre-election speeches and compare them with Mr. Blake's post-election letter, they will find that on the question of unrestricted reciprocity these two gentlemen largely agree. I contend, therefore, that if it were necessary for Mr. Blake to take that extreme step, Sir Charles Tupper was equally warranted in taking the part which he did in the general election recently held. But let us for a moment see who are the gentlemen whose sensitive nerves and delicate organisms have been affected by the utterances of the High Commissioner. He has been accused of applying the term "ruined gamesters" to a large number of the people of Canada. That is mere assertion. That is not true. It has not been proven, in fact it has been disproved, and, therefore, it falls to the ground. As I said, who are the people whose feelings have been wounded by the utterances of Sir Charles Tupper? There is the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron). I had the pleasure of being present the other afternoon when he addressed the House, and he had only just started in his speech, the flag had hardly fallen, before he called Sir Charles Tupper a political bulldozer. I do not think that an hon. gentleman who is so prompt and ready to indulge in such language as that should be so exceedingly sensitive as to what may be said by political opponents. Then there is the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I had not the pleasure of hearing that hon. gentleman's speech, and I read a very meagre report of it in a newspaper; but, in common parlance, I believe the hon. gentleman pitched heavily into the High Commissioner. I know there is no one better able to do it than the hon. member for South Oxford. The traditions of the House tell us that in times gone by the hon. member for South Oxford and the High Commissioner have had their tournaments here, and it is not for me to say who conquered; but I do not think it is on record, at least it has never been told to me, that the High Commissioner ever attacked the hon. member for South Oxford when that hon. gentleman's back was turned. I do not think that the High Commissioner can be charged with that offence; and, therefore, it is that one cannot help feeling regret that the hon. gentleman should make so fierce an onslaught on a political rival, on a succesful rival, who happens to be absent. The hon. member for South Oxford is the last man in this House who should find fault with any man in it or out of it for having made use of strong language. In the matter of abuse the hon. member's appetite is perfectly uncontrollable and insatiable, and when it comes to slander it is positively ferocious. He not only gobbles up an individual but he bolts a whole province. Why, in 1888 I think, or at all events during the last Parliament, the hon. gentleman stated across the floor of this House that the electorate of the Province of Nova Scotia had offered to sell themselves to Mr. Blake, but that he was too honest to buy them. Consider that that statement was made in the Parliament in Canada, that it is on record in *Hansard*, and stands there forever, for what it may be worth, recorded against my native province. Remember, also, that that was the utterance of a gentleman who has been long in public life, one of our trained parliamentarians. I characterized it at the time, and I repeat now, that it was an insulting and false statement. That the hon. member for South Oxford should feel a certain amount of chagrin and disappointment at the results of the election in 1887, and of the election in 1891, is only natural; but that he should permit himself, because he is so chagrined and annoyed, to indulge in abuse and slander of those who differ from him is really not doing even himself justice, and is most unfair and insulting to those whom he so attacks. I hold in my hand a document signed by Richard J. Cartwright. I really do not know of my personal knowledge, it is not for me to say, whether it was written by the hon. member for South Oxford or not. It bears date Toronto, March 7, 1891, and in contains the following sentences:—

"Our opponents' array, on the other hand, is most literally a thing of shreds and patches, made up of ragged remnants from half a dozen minor provinces, the great majority of whom do not even pretend to be actuated by any principle save that of securing a good slice of booty for themselves and the sections or constituencies they respectively represent."

I halt for a moment. That accusation is levelled at the representatives of the Maritime Provinces, at the representatives of Manitoba, of the Province of British Columbia and of the North-West Territories. With some of us that hon. gentleman has sat for four years, and as the result of that—I cannot call it intimacy—as the result of that parliamentary intercourse and communication, he declares that we are not "actuated by any principle save that of securing a good slice of booty for themselves and the sections and constituencies they respectively represent." The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) continued to say:

"And who know besides that popular feeling in those very provinces is strongly and distinctly in favour of our policy, though actual cash in hand or in the shape of railway subsidies has proved too much for the virtue of a majority of the voting population in many instances."

Thus writes the hon. gentleman. He appears to be amused. I do not envy him if he thinks this is an amusing production. Thus the hon. gentleman writes, not only of the people of the Maritime Provinces, of Manitoba, of British Columbia and of the North-West Territories, but of their representatives in this Assembly. Now, Sir, on behalf of those who have thus been insulted, and speaking more especially for my own province and for the constituency which I have the honour of representing here, I say that a more insulting, a more slanderous, a more calumnious, a more diabolically

false statement was never penned by the hand of man. Yet this is the hon. gentleman whose sensitive nerves are wounded because the hon. Sir Chas. Tupper applies the words "ruined gamesters" to Mr. Wiman, to Mr. Farrer and to Sir Henry Tyler. I considered it my duty to those whom I represent to take the very first opportunity which I possibly could to tell the writer of that document that a more false or malignant statement was never written. Sir Charles Tupper has been blamed for something he said as to the conduct of the Grand Trunk Railway officers. It must be borne in mind that a prominent official of the Grand Trunk Railway has stated that he was instrumental in carrying a large number of people back into Canada to vote against the present dominant party in order to bring about the annexation of this country to the United States. I contend, Mr. Speaker, I submit it in all fairness to this House, if it were not the duty of the Hon. Sir Charles Tupper, High Commissioner as he was in London, to tell the English shareholders of the Grand Trunk Railway Company that possibly, by the connivance of the chairman of that company, such a transaction had taken place. I do not think, Sir, that the people of Canada or the members of this House will be disposed to censure Sir Charles Tupper very severely, either for taking part in this election or for the particular language which he applied to Mr. Farrar or to Mr. Wiman; or for bringing before the shareholders of the Grand Trunk Railway the conduct of their officers during the recent election. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), during the course of the speech which he made in this debate, indulged in a little prophecy, and we all know that that is a very dangerous *rôle* to play. The hon. member for Bothwell spoke in a jocular manner—he is always fond of a joke—and when nobody else could substantiate the charge against Sir Charles Tupper, why the hon. member for Bothwell travelled a long way and brought to his aid a comic paper from the United States. But the hon. gentleman indulged in the *rôle* of prophet and he said that in a short time he would be on this side of the House. The hon. gentleman did not tell us whether he was coming alone or not. I assume, after the disclosures which were made during this debate, that the hon. gentleman occupies the position of the leader of the loyal Opposition in this House, because the hon. President Lane, who presided at the magnificent dinner at Boston, which the hon. member for South Oxford attended, had told us, to quote his own language, that Laurier in Quebec, and Davies in Prince Edward Island, and Cartwright in Ontario, do not look to the people of Canada for a policy; he says that these gentlemen look to the people of the United States for the sign by which they shall conquer. Consequently, we all know that the people of Canada want a leader who will look to them for the sign by which they shall conquer, and I have no doubt that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) feels that he is the coming man. This is no laughing matter, gentlemen; it is a very, very serious matter. Assuming that the hon. member for Bothwell is to occupy that position, I would, in all fairness and frankness, be disposed to give him a few words of advice. He does not know, when he comes out in that *rôle*, exactly what position we may take—we the independent members who sit on this side of the House. In common parlance, we may be disposed to give him a "lift," but he must first of all instruct his followers that they must not abuse absent men. If we fight our opponents we like to meet them face to face, we do not want to wait until they are one thousand or two thousand miles away, and until the Atlantic rolls between us. Again, I would advise the hon. gentleman to bring forward a straight Canadian policy: Canadian first, and Canadian last, and always Canadian. I would further advise the hon. gentleman when he says his prayers night and morning, as I am sure he does most regularly, to pray that he may not be led into temptation, that he may not be carried away by the charms of these free railway runs, and these free dinners, and probably these free drinks which have been indulged in by a few Canadian politicians: but that the hon. gentleman being, as we all know, a most virtuous man, should avoid that broad path which leads to Wimanism, and that at all events, if he should go travelling in foreign countries, he will not go anonymously, and that he will not be ashamed of signing his own name. I really do think, Mr. Speaker, that when the hon. member assumes the *rôle* of leader of the loyal Opposition in Canada, if he will abide by these instructions, a great future awaits him. Above all, let him look well to the people of Canada for his support and policy, and not to the people of the United States: for if he does not, I am afraid that he will remain where he is for a very, very, very long time. That he probably will remain there, Mr. Speaker,

"Till the world grows old,
And the sun grows cold,"

and the Grits and the stars have disappeared forever.

Mr. FRASER. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman, who in his beautiful speech—an oration I might call it—has lapsed into the future by turning prophet, will not think it indelicate on my part if I attempt to answer him in the peculiar way in which he seems to think a debate of this kind should be conducted, namely, by answering a charge directly made by simply bringing charges against others.

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

After Recess.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 96) respecting the Ottawa and Parry Sound Railway Company.—(Mr. Jamieson.)

PRIVATE BILLS—EXTENSION OF TIME.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved:

That as the time for the reception of reports of Committees on Private Bills will expire on Wednesday, the 10th inst., the same be extended till Tuesday, the 30th inst.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—THE HIGH COMMISSIONER.

Mr. FRASER. Before recess, I was about to say that, had not this debate assumed the peculiar phases it did, I would not have said anything upon the question. Had the mere denial of the hon. Minister of Justice of what was contained in the resolution been acceptable to hon. gentlemen opposite, I should have willingly abstained from speak-

ing, being content to leave that mere denial to go to the country with the evidence submitted, if this House did not decide the question of the correctness of the resolution moved. But when I saw this debate assuming such various phases, when I saw almost every conceivable attempt made to introduce matters which I submit ought not to be discussed under this resolution, when I saw that the faces of hon. gentlemen opposite were most cheerful when any attempt was made to move away from the contention of the hon. Minister of Justice, and to show that the statements attributed to Sir Charles Tupper were correct, and that in their force they affected every man on this side of the House; I saw at once, by the pleasure thus evinced by those hon. gentlemen, that they wished to stand by the remarks made by Sir Charles Tupper, and that their joy was complete if, while assuming as a matter of course that the great body of the electorate back of the Opposition were loyal, they could by any method fasten on the Opposition the stigma that Sir Charles Tupper attempted to put on the Liberal party of Canada. Nor does it seem that even that is sufficient for the hon. member who last addressed the House, the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), who began by the statement that such a resolution as this would not be introduced into the Parliament of England, and ended by showing the real purpose of his speech. He showed that at the bottom of his speech was the desire, not to answer the evidence adduced in this House in support of the resolution of the hon. leader of the Opposition, but to take advantage of the opportunity to have a fling at the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and to relieve himself of the animus that was shown not only by the words he used but much more, if possible, by his very appearance. I admit that such a resolution as this would not be possible in the English House of Commons, and why? Because no such occasion could arise. Let me deal for a moment with the remarks of the hon. member representing South Oxford. I am not going to enter into any defence of that hon. gentleman. I suppose that the hon. senior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) having for four years satisfied himself on every occasion in striking at the late member for Halifax, finds that his occupation is now gone, and he seeks what he considers higher game. His blade being somewhat rusted, he will burnish it again for the battle, and, passing over ordinary mortals on this side, will seek the hon. member for South Oxford and tilt with him for the next five years. Well, I will leave him to settle the matter with the hon. member for South Oxford himself, and I will only say, with regard to the hon. member for South Oxford's statements, that Sir Charles Tupper himself, and the hon. member for Halifax, and every Government candidate in the late election in Nova Scotia, laid the groundwork of that remark, and even of a stronger remark. What did Sir Charles Tupper himself say in speaking at Amherst?

"You find the Maritime Provinces, eastern and western —the smaller outlying provinces—the North-West and Manitoba, smaller than ourselves—you find these holding the balance of power, these smaller provinces in a position to claim the very highest and first consideration at the hands of their party for the noble manner in which they have sustained the institutions of our country."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FRASER. Hon. gentlemen opposite cheer to the echo. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that passing events and the opening up of the future will disclose the fact that these hon. gentlemen are ready to take the hint of Sir Charles Tupper and act accordingly. I have no doubt the vigorous cheer from the members from the Lower Provinces indicates at least to the Ministers who now sit before them what they may expect and what they do expect. Why, Sir, could it be more clearly stated that those provinces might expect to receive from the Government more than they had received in the past? and when we had to meet on every hustings in the Province of Nova Scotia first, last and always, when we read in the public press this question: Will you return a member to the Opposition and get nothing? —When we met this remark everywhere, from hustings to hustings: Do you want a railway? then do not vote for a member of the Opposition: you have been out in the cold these twelve years, and what did you get? take the hint from a member who supports the Government, and you will get something—when we met this suggestion everywhere, I submit that the foundation was laid by Sir Charles Tupper himself who is now on trial, and by those members from the lower provinces for a man in Ontario, or for that matter for a man anywhere else, to make the remark implying that we had descended so low. Let me say that that method of political warfare is below, not only the dignity of this Parliament, but the dignity of any man seeking a seat in this Parliament; and I submit that any man who descends to that level to discuss the question of the day, and who seeks to secure the support of the electorate on grounds so low, should be the last man to complain of such a remark in this House. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) said that he would be very glad to have the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), with the independent members, including members on the other side, form a new party. Is he beginning to think that Confederation is a failure? He said so once. Is he now thoroughly convinced that Confederation is a disappointment; and finding that the party he is following and the Government he is supporting are not independent, does he wish to form a new party? If the hon. gentleman wishes to find an independent, a Canadian party, he has not to travel far to find one. If I am not mistaken, the Canadian party is here now on this side—the only Canadian party—that party which seeks the best interests of Canada, which seek to make of Canada a prosperous country for the hardy sons of toil to live in. He will find that this side of the House is willing now, as always, to adopt the best methods of the mother country in order to make the conditions of life here as easy as possible for those who work for their bread. He will find here men ready to strike off the shackles and trammels imposed on our people by hon. gentlemen opposite, so that this country may become free as it ought to be. He will find on this side of the House the only Canadian party which has faith in our own people: the only party which does not fear competition, but is ready to stand up, man to man, in competition with our neighbours across the border in any labour or enterprise. He will find in the Liberal party men who do not need the support of combines, but depend on their own brains and energies, and are ready to make of Canada a country fit for independent men to live in; and if

the hon. gentleman desires to cast in his lot with an independent Canadian party, he will find on this side a congenial home. The hon. gentleman said that the speech of the hon. member for South Oxford was directed at Sir Charles Tupper, because Sir Charles Tupper was a successful political rival. I do not know that the High Commissioner is now a rival for political fame; but, perhaps, if the hon. gentleman had looked to the other side of this House, he would find that Sir Charles Tupper has dangerous rivals there, and that if there is any rivalry to the High Commissioner, now or heretofore, it comes from hon. gentlemen opposite. Then the hon. gentleman quoted a letter of the leader of the Opposition. Now, I submit it is a well-established principle, that if you quote a man's letter or take a man's evidence, you must take it as a whole: and if the hon. gentleman finds any comfort in the statement, denied by Mr. Blake afterwards, that the policy of unrestricted reciprocity leads to annexation, he can, on the other hand, find consolation in the assertion by that gentleman, in the same letter, declaring that the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite will lead to our absorption by the United States. I suppose in the one case Mr. Blake is as good a witness as in the other; and having given him the highest possible character, having spoken of him in a manner that would do credit to the most enthusiastic follower of that hon. gentleman, having spoken of him as a most reliable witness, the hon. gentleman must accept the authority as a whole and admit that Mr. Blake strikes at hon. gentlemen opposite just as much as he does at us. Speaking of the High Commissioner, the hon. gentleman also said that Sir Charles Tupper, in his breast, felt that Canada was as dear to him as ever. However that may be, there is scarcely a man, woman or child in Canada who does not believe that Sir Charles Tupper is as dear to Canada as ever he was. Whether or not the reasons for his loving this country are the same as those which render him dear to this country, I know not; but I know that, while I shall speak with the greatest possible respect of Sir Charles Tupper, who comes from the same province as I do, I would feel much better had I not, in this question, to speak on matters of fact, on which every man should speak. I do not forget the great services of Sir Charles Tupper to his country, but he only did his duty and was well paid for it. I do not forget that he is a distinguished statesman, but that is all the more reason why he should have remembered that his country's interests and the truth, in speaking of his fellow-citizens, ought to be dearer to him than a party triumph. And here let me say there has been much said on the opposite side about striking at Sir Charles Tupper behind his back. Well, we cannot have him here, and it is not our fault if he is not here; but I want hon. gentlemen opposite to remember that Sir Charles Tupper stabbed a large number of the people of Canada behind their back when they had no chance to reply. Let it not be forgotten that we have evidence before this House, evidence which I consider to be overwhelming and which I will treat of later, to show that Sir Charles Tupper forgot himself in speaking, if not of the majority, at least of the flower and chivalry of Canada. I think this House will admit that they would much prefer not having to speak or to vote on this matter. I submit that there are many hon. gentlemen opposite who believe Sir Charles Tupper made a mistake, who believe that astute statesman did forget himself as he never did before. He had assisted in winning the elections and the elections were won. Then was the time to be generous, then was the time to forget, even if he had thought that such a thing was possible, what his opponents had said or what he might consider they believed: but I do not think that even Sir Charles Tupper believed—and I know many hon. gentlemen opposite do not believe either—that the Opposition hold the views ascribed to them. We are told that we should not discuss this matter, that it is ungenerous on our part to discuss it. No, I submit it is not. The whole matter comes down to this: If the resolution of the leader of the Opposition be true, should we pass it? If the statements in that resolution be true, ought we to vote that Sir Charles Tupper be recalled? Now, if Sir Charles Tupper has said what he is charged in that resolution with having said, there is not an hon. gentleman opposite but will admit that he has slandered the people of Canada, and that he has slandered the Grand Trunk Railway Company. Let us see. Does the evidence agree with this? I said a moment ago that, had the defence been confined to that put forward by the hon. the Minister of Justice, I would not have felt called upon to say anything in this discussion. But this issue has raised the two pleas. The plea raised by the hon. Minister of Justice, cautious, good pleader as he is, is simply a denial. Other members file the plea of confession and avoidance. Can both the pleas stand together? It must not be forgotten that hon. gentlemen opposite, though they cheered to the echo the Minister of Justice when he rose, paid less attention to his argument when he sat down than they did when other hon. members taunted this side of the House with having been disloyal. I think they desired that that should be proved to be the case, and that they are hanging their political fortunes on that. Let me commend to the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) the desirability of avoiding fault finding and the use of harsh expressions. He may find it disagreeable to have harsh words used, and he should be sure that he, as an independent member, can refrain from falling into the same error. The Minister of Justice said that Sir Charles Tupper denied all that Sir Charles Tupper was stated to have said, and went on to say that the Liberals who were returned to this House at the recent election would not have come here if they had not avowed their loyalty to British institutions and their disavowal of the disloyal utterances which had been attributed to them. Well, I, for one, found very little occasion to avow my loyalty. Where we were known, we had no reason to say that we were loyal. The country knew from our actions that we were loyal, but it was only hon. gentlemen on the other side who had to proclaim their loyalty. There were three classes who were attempted to be caught by this loyalty cry. One class was those who were really loyal, the class who believe that the institutions of this country are the best in the world and who believe that there is something in men who say that their opponents are disloyal. The second class consists of those who were anxious to leave the Conservative party but were standing off and saying: We cannot leave that party because it is stated that the other

party is disloyal. The third class was the dapper gentlemen who appear on certain gala days, who dress in the uniform of Her Majesty, and are never heard except when they say they are willing to lay down their lives for their country when there is no battle to be fought. Many electors no doubt were caught by this cry in the last election, but the fact is that the Government returned here with a majority of less than 30 after having a majority, as they claimed, of over 50, and that shows that all this preaching of disloyalty and all attempts to bolster up their party by such a cry did not have the success they expected. The country took them on their merits in four weeks, and, if there had been four weeks more, those hon. gentlemen would not have been in their places to-day. Will they say that this country is so rankly disloyal, and that so large a number of Opposition members can be returned, and are those who elected them to be branded as disloyal? Whenever an election is run, there is always a crisis, according to these gentlemen. At one time it is stated that money will not come into the country unless they are kept in power. At another time, it is another cry. At each election, there is a crisis, and at each election Sir Charles Tupper must be sent for, as they cannot do without him. It is the highest possible compliment to Sir Charles Tupper. Were not the advisers of Her Majesty in this House sufficient to conduct the campaign? They had at their head, as we all admit, the ablest politician in Canada. They had the Minister of Finance, who could explains how little he had taken out of the pockets of the people to meet his large expenditure. They had the Minister of Public Works, whose works are as clear as daylight. They had the Minister of Justice, and I will take second place to no man in giving him the position he deserves. I thought, when he made that brilliant speech the other day which had so little in it, that he could hardly remember the time when he adorned the bench, and I was sure that, if I or anyone else attempted to make such a speech before him, with that inexorable logic which he possesses, he would have swept it away like cobwebs and would have shown that there was no reason in such argument. Then, there was the Minister of the Interior, whose great powers were so graphically described the other day by the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). Then, there was the Minister of War. Surely we disloyal men could be kept from carrying out our disloyalty when he, in his gay trappings, mounted on his prancing charger, having strictly prohibited the use of fire-crackers, could ride into his self-chosen Champs de Mars and say that the recalcitrant Liberals would have to pass over his body before they would obtain the object of their treason. Surely these and the other members of the Government were sufficient, but no: a moribund Government, with moribund lists, and a moribund policy, had to go out of the country and call in Sir Charles Tupper, to call in the great doctor, the magic doctor, to use his golden elixir as the lymph by which he would put life into the party and strengthen their sinews and bring them back again triumphant. I say, that is great praise for Sir Charles Tupper. No higher praise could be given to him. But, if that means that no election can be conducted at a great crisis without Sir Charles Tupper, I submit that the quicker Sir Charles Tupper joins the Government the better, or the quicker other men take their places the better still. I have only to say this much in reference to the Minister of Marine: I sympathize with him. No man could sympathize with him more than I did. He had to depend upon himself, and I could understand how all the instincts of his manly nature were roused in defence of his father, Sir Charles Tupper was sent for in order that the Government might get the advantage of his "skill, his influence and his eloquence;" and yet, when he was put on his trial, only the Minister of Justice, by a bare denial, could be found to stand up for him. But yesterday Sir Charles Tupper might have stood against the world—now, none so base as to do him reverence. Where were the Ministers who had profited by his golden elixir? Where were the Ministers who held their seats before he came here? Was this chivalrous? We heard a good deal from the other side, the party of gentlemen, about the methods that are carried on on this side. Was it chivalrous for the members of the Cabinet to leave him to his son, feeling as he did the delicacy of his position, who alone stood up among them all to speak for his father? I submit that that was not an exhibition that did credit to the Ministers, because, although he did not say so, they ought all to be ready, and nothing, except that they did not need to go to his rescue, nothing, except the fact that the Minister of Justice had said all that needed to be said, and that Sir Charles needed no defence at their hands, could place them in that position. And if that is the case, then it says very little for the hon. gentlemen opposite who followed him, and have to stand up for Sir Charles Tupper. Now, I say to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine, that he could be pardoned for many of his strong statements, stronger statements, at least, than were used on this side of the House, and I can very well understand how, chafing under the disadvantage, chafing under the wrong, he might be pardoned for saying what he did. What does he say? "No one would be returned from Nova Scotia who accepted unrestricted reciprocity." I can only speak for myself when I say that I accepted it, and my constituents accepted it; they accept it now, and will accept it as the best method of improving their condition. Then he says that we would not speak as we did of Sir Charles Tupper if he were here; I submit that was not a delicate touch on the part of the Minister of Marine. Unless I misjudge the character of the men on this side of the House, although we can be beaten, we can still stand up again. I can assure the Minister of Marine that that is not the kind of stuff we are made of. I would have him remember that valour resides not in one individual man, and it ought to be enough to say that Sir Charles, after writing all he did, and saying all he did, when offered a free share by a Grand Trunk Railway shareholder to attend a meeting of shareholders and prove his assertions, showed that discretion was the better part of valour, and did not accept the offer. Now, Sir, I submit that, under these circumstances, there need be no fear on this side, even were Sir Charles here. We will be glad when he comes here, and I can assure the Minister of Marine that for one, I, the least among all the members of the Opposition, shall not refrain from stating what I have to say in the presence, even, of Sir Charles Tupper,

should I conceive that Sir Charles Tupper was wrong. There is no one man who can so persuade this House by his power, by his eloquence, and by his ability, as to keep the members of the Opposition, or for that matter, the members on the other side, from saying what they want to say; and although the contest may be unequal, we shall strive, as best as we can, to enter the lists, and when defeated once, to enter them again for another fray. No one man has such power. He said that one of the merits of Sir Charles Tupper was that he carried Confederation. Well, that may be a merit. There may be men who differ on that point. I am not going to say one word now about that matter. I want to make a statement for myself, and I trust no man will think that what I say ought to detract from the proof, that so far as my interests are concerned, and the interests of the people of Canada, we are all Canadians, and are building up in this country a nationality of which we may be proud; and I want to say here, that if I could go back to 1867, and undo that history, for myself I would not do it. I want now and here to say that so far as we are concerned, the Liberal party, we are as willing to work out our destiny, and we have as nearly forgotten those old issues as the members of the Conservative party. I want the hon. gentleman to remember that Sir Charles Tupper was not in the company of the great men of that day. The Hon. Joseph Howe, the noblest Roman that ever we had in Nova Scotia, was against him; the late Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia, a man on whom the present Administration heaped the highest honours that were in the gift of the Crown, was against him; and no less a distinguished gentleman than the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron), genial, dignified, able and eloquent, also opposed Sir Charles Tupper. Now he supports him, and I blame him not; now he is his friend, and I blame him not. But I want the hon. gentleman to remember that in that fight in which he took no mean part, he opposed Sir Charles Tupper, and I have not heard his confession, either in public or in private, that he ever thought himself less worthy for having opposed Sir Charles Tupper in 1867. I can assure that hon. gentleman that while there are many in Nova Scotia to-day who regret the methods employed at that time, many who will die believing that they were wrong, the great mass of the people of Nova Scotia are willing to forget that wrong, and I may say that the great majority of the people of Nova Scotia do not wish, at this early stage in our history, to canonize the man who carried them into Confederation despite all the glorification he gets here. I myself have only to say that so far as that issue was concerned, the people of Nova Scotia fought him believing they were right, the facts will show in the future that the methods were wrong, and the sequel will show that Providence was kinder to the country than the men who attempted to make its history at that time. Now, I said a short time ago that the whole question amounts to this: Was there ground for this motion? Is there evidence? I am not going to say a word upon that evidence. That evidence is in, it goes to make up the record in this House, and if I may be allowed to give an opinion, it is now, as it was to me before, conclusive that Sir Chas. Tupper did at least, to speak very kindly of him, lose his head at that time. Now, let it never be forgotten that the distinctions drawn by hon. gentlemen opposite between the leaders of the Liberal party and the rank and file of the Liberal party will not stand. Did not the hon. gentleman think that when the leaders were assailed as disloyal, then every man that voted for the leaders was disloyal too? That they adopted what was said by their leaders as being true? Did it never strike hon. gentlemen opposite that when they stated the leaders were disloyal, and when the people who followed the Opposition showed unmistakably, the last time, their sympathy with them, their sympathy with all that they did in Parliament—did it never strike them that the Liberal electors must either be dishonest in voting for disloyal men, or they must be disloyal themselves? It was said by some hon. gentlemen opposite that they wanted the people of Canada to speak well of their country. I want to do that, too. I am not going to impute any disloyal motives to those on the opposite side of the House. But I will say this, that the man who states that another is a disloyal man, who attempts to brand a large number of his fellow-citizens as men seeking an alliance with a foreign state, when he knows it is not true, is a worse man and strikes a more severe blow at his country than if he spoke against its material wealth all his life. In the former case, in charging disloyalty, he is speaking against a man's character, speaking of men as disloyal to their country, as men who although living in the country have their hearts elsewhere and are annexationists. If the statement made by Sir Charles Tupper, that the leaders of the Liberal party were disloyal, is allowed to pass, and he is to be held up to respect and reverence when that statement is incorrect, then I submit he is dealing a deadlier blow, if it should have any effect in Canada, than all the articles of the Government's party declaring we decry our country. We do not decry our country. We wish to state the facts about our country. Hon. gentlemen opposite think they are the country. Those hon. gentlemen think that if we talk about them and their methods we are disloyal. It is the old story over again. Louis XVI lost his head. Were all the Frenchmen opposed to him disloyal? Yet in every action of the men there was that germ of truth that gives to France its present glory. Were the brave men who fought against tyranny in England honest and true, or were they disloyal? We must assume they were loyal men, because they showed they held the best interests of the kingdom at heart. If we are disloyal because we speak against extravagance in high places and honestly think we are acting in the best interests of the country, I accept the accusation—I am disloyal because I am disloyal to that which is wrong. Does it follow that, when a man is opposed to the wrong, he is disloyal? Do hon. gentlemen opposite contain all the loyalty of the country? Are we not doing that which we think right, in battling, as we do with all our hearts, against the policy which has been imported from across the border, the worn-out shreds of republican protection, and when we are fighting for free trade in the interests of the people because it is the principle that every Englishman believes in, which has given England her continued glory? Are we disloyal because we are opposed to this miserable trade policy of the United States, which has been introduced into Canada? That is the whole ques-

tion. By-and-bye no man can say to a Minister, or a follower of the Government, that any improper action has been taken, without receiving as a reply: You are disloyal. So well have they indoctrinated their followers with that view that the whole Civil Service of Canada believe, not that they are serving the people of the Dominion, but are serving the Government; they are the officers of the Government, the Government have everything to do with them. I said a moment ago that Sir Charles Tupper, at Amherst, laid the foundation for the remarks of my hon. friend the Minister. I was anticipating the event by a short time, I mean the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and my hon. friend had good ground for making that statement. Throughout Nova Scotia they well understand, and it did not need the remark of the Minister of Justice to make them act accordingly, that they are the officers of the Government, and they must, whenever an election is called, stand up and work for the Government. I am sure the Minister of Justice will not in his calmer moments say that Sir Charles Tupper, when he came to this country, took his fortunes in his hand. Must it be laid down as a principle that every officer of the public service, forsooth, is bound to take his fortune in his hand, to be a soldier of fortune, a political Major Dalgetty, to fight his fight and to prepare for the worst? Such a system would give the civil servant every opportunity not only of using his political influence but of using what he gets from the Government to keep him in power. Is that true British doctrine? I am not surprised at its introduction here, for it is an adjunct of the protective system of the United States, and we have imported this as the second part of American politics into this country, following as naturally in the wake of protection as night follows day. Hon. gentlemen opposite must also introduce the system of spoils and carry out the American doctrine that to the victors alone belong the spoils. I had vainly thought that in this new country we were going to build up a nationality which would engraft on itself that which was best from the old country; but hon. gentlemen opposite in their great loyalty have not gone to England for a pattern but have travelled across the border. Did it require that a member of the Government should rise in this House and lay down that doctrine? What will every office-holder in the Dominion think? He will now say, in view of the statement made by the Minister of Justice we are to so act, it is the correct method; we take our fortunes in our hands, we are asked to go into the fight with our fortunes and use all our power not to serve loyally and truly the interests of the people, but to keep ourselves in power, to fight the battles of the party, and to expect that when the smoke clears away we will be continued in office. Yet, I doubt not that these hon. gentlemen, should the same principle be applied when a change of Government takes place, be the first to whine under the lash. They would not wish that principle applied to them. If it were applied, they would find all the offices empty and new men going in. Would that be a good thing for this country? Soldiers of fortune, forsooth! The civil servants would be fighting the battles of the Government and theirs alone; no difference whatever interests are involved, no difference what wrong has been done, no difference if the country is being bled in the interests of the very power under which they hold office, they must stand by the Government, because the Government stands by them. I think the very statement of the case should lead any hon. gentleman on reflection to conclude it is wrong. Is the evidence in support of the resolution now before the House here? We have had a number of definitions of the office held by Sir Charles Tupper, given by the Minister of Justice and other hon. gentlemen, definitions, I admit, wide enough to cover the present case, definitions put out in advance to cover the next case. No two of these definitions agree; but the definition is wise enough to cover all the extravagance of Sir Charles Tupper and all the methods he adopted when last in Canada. If that evidence is complete; if that evidence is such as should lead to the recall of Sir Charles Tupper, I am sure the Government should recall him. In that case, I am sure, too, that Sir Charles would agree to it. I am satisfied that all he said during the election and after the election, if there is power in his words, must have done more harm to Canada than all the writing we have had in this country for the last 20 years. I am sure neither his skill nor his eloquence was used to the best advantage. It is said Sir Charles was sent for. I admit it, but surely it was to do the right thing and not act according to these methods. Hon. members no doubt noted how very carefully the First Minister spoke of Sir Charles Tupper some days ago in this House. The right hon. gentleman said nothing about Sir Charles' utterances. The Government assumed nothing, and the remarks so quietly and suggestively made by the Finance Minister when asked what the Government's intention was in regard to Sir Charles Tupper, was in the same strain, that the Government was giving the matter its attentive consideration. At that time and subsequently, unless the remark was a pleasantry, they were considering what should be done, and the conclusion they arrived at was that they should deny the whole charge, put us on the proof, and then say that the proof was not sufficient. It is said we of the Opposition are in favour of American institutions, that we are the party seeking to ally ourselves with the United States and that at this great crisis every man should have reason as he did to stand by Queen and country. I state here most positively that the only disloyal party in Canada are the Ministerialists. They are disloyal because their methods are American, they are disloyal because their conduct is American, they are disloyal because they are seeking to carry on a Government on the corrupt methods that obtain in that country, and they are disloyal because they have taken the worst features of Government in that country and applied them to this country. But are we the friends of the United States? No: we are not; and what authority is there for this? The papers laid upon the Table of this House yesterday in reference to the trade relations between Canada and the United States, state that Sir Charles Tupper showed conclusively to the satisfaction of Mr. Blaine, that the only party in Canada favourable to the United States was the party of which he is a member. He tried to show that the Liberal party of Canada always opposed every concession, and that his great difficulty was not alone to carry out methods by which we could have better trade relations with the United States; but in answering the Liberal party who are always finding fault with

him for every concession which he made in the direction of extended trade relations with the United States. Sir Charles Tupper showed conclusively that the party in Canada who are in favour of the greatest possible trade relations with the United States was the Conservative party, and that the Liberals were the enemies of any better treatment of the United States by Canada. Read the papers and you will see if Sir Charles Tupper does not say this. Now I am sure that whatever Sir Charles Tupper may be, his statements will be evidence coming from a witness who is opposed to us and must be accepted by gentlemen opposite. He has given the Liberals the best possible character, he has shown to Mr. Blaine conclusively that we want no relations with the United States and that the Conservatives do, and I submit that in the face of all that it was not well that the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) should speak about making pilgrimages. Pilgrimages forsooth, the last and most ridiculous pilgrimage comes from the side of hon. gentlemen opposite; pilgrimages so short in their duration that even the shrine could not be viewed; pilgrimages so short in their duration that even the smallest possible history of the saint could not be studied; pilgrimages so short that these brave men simply walked up the hill and down again; pilgrimages which we shall hear more about later on. The remark of the member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), in which he dared to say that the leader of the Opposition is forming the opinion and writing the resolutions of members across the border who are introducing this subject in the United States Senate and Congress, is an insult to the House. When he blunderingly took up last year's resolutions, and could not find this year's resolution in it, his answer was: Well, the men who write them over there can best find where they are. Is not that worse than the language of Sir Charles Tupper? And yet the hon. gentleman says he is an independent member; so are they all, all honourable men, every one of them. I submit that the evidence is conclusive against Sir Charles Tupper in this matter, and coming as I do from Nova Scotia let me say that I regret very much that Sir Charles Tupper should have said and done what he did. I would have much preferred that this statesman should have gone down to posterity with a brighter latter-day glory than he has at present, owing to his conduct at the last election. I submit that it would have been more in his own interest and in the interest of Canada, if, after having won the election, he should have been generous enough to have at least spoken a kindly word, that he should not have followed up his vituperation before the election by worse language after the election, and that he should not have attempted to throttle one of the greatest institutions in this country. We hear a great deal about loyalty from members on the other side of the House, but the men who shout loyalty are not the men who have it. The man who constantly speaks of his religious opinion is not the man who has very solid religious opinions, and loyalty, like that higher, and better, and nobler principle, lies in a man's heart and shows in a man's character, and not on a man's lips. The man who needs to be continually calling out that he is loyal, feels nothing of the first principle of loyalty which tries to improve a man's surroundings and to cause him to look upon his country as something he should serve, and not himself. There are men in this country whose hands are elbow deep in the public treasury, and yet we find them, like the thief running away with the bags of gold, when the populace shout "thief, thief"—they cry out that they are loyal. There are men in this country who are crying loyalty who are not as loyal than the gentlemen on this side of the House. I will not say that the gentlemen opposite are disloyal, but the fact that they are continually crying out that they are loyal is strong evidence to the contrary. During this great crisis the election was run upon that issue. All other issues were forgotten, the Government had no defence of their methods, they had nothing to say in favour of their conduct for the last five years, and so they fell to crying loyalty and trying to abuse their opponents. Loyalty of that kind is not the loyalty that will tend to the growth of Canada. The man who tries to make his home happy and prosperous, the man who wishes to lessen the difficulties of life, the man who wishes to get the freest possible relations with his neighbours, the man who wishes to make this country a cheap country to live in and to give us the most for our toil and labour, the man who adopts the principle which will lead us to sell our goods in the dearest market and to buy in the cheapest market is the only true loyal Canadian in this country of ours. By these methods and these only can the country be made prosperous. By these methods and these only can the condition of the poor be relieved, and by these methods only, pursued, as they are, by the Liberal party who have at heart the welfare of the people of this country, can prosperity be secured. It never can be secured by the methods pursued by the hon. gentlemen opposite who are shouting loyalty while they are impoverishing the country. That Sir Charles Tupper should have come to this country and should have stated that these men who are desirous of the best interests of their country, the men who had to fight their elections without the power of the Government at their back, the men who had to fight the methods resorted to by hon. gentlemen opposite—for Sir Charles Tupper to brand these men as disloyal, is, to say the least of it, one of the most infamous charges that was ever brought against a great party in Canada. I do not say a word about hon. gentlemen opposite and their loyalty. I leave that to themselves, but the least said about it the better. I will assume for the time being they are loyal, but loyal men are ready to believe that others are loyal and to accord to others the same right which they claim for themselves. Now, Sir, if it is disloyal for the Liberal party to seek better trade relations with the United States, what of the conduct of the Government, who, finding themselves in straits so desperate, that Sir Charles Tupper had to be sent for, had to borrow or steal a part of the Liberal policy, before they would dare to go to the country? What is to be thought of the men of the party opposite talking about discrimination, when they themselves have made a discriminatory offer against Great Britain to the United States? Under the treaty of 1854, which they offered to the United States, thirty articles were included, which thirty articles were a discrimination against Great Britain. Are they ready now to put one single article upon the free list, except raw material; and if they are it is only a question of degree. If hon. gentlemen opposite are ready to put one single article that comes from Great Britain

into a treaty with the United States they are just as disloyal to Great Britain as if we had reciprocity in all articles. The London *Standard*, one of the greatest papers in England, published an article during the late election in reference to both the political parties in Canada, and the view of that journal was that the policy of both parties was only a question of degree, and where the loyalty question came in no man could understand. Let me say in conclusion that there is only one way of making people loyal, and if these gentlemen opposite are going to carry on the business of this country, if they think they are going to build up a United Canada by flinging lying charges against the members of the Opposition, they are very much mistaken. There are members of the Opposition in this House who, if the question of loyalty came to be discussed, could talk of loyalty as loudly as they. They could show that in their veins ran the blood of men who were ready, when the forefathers of their accusers were resting quietly at their homes, to take their lives in their hands and fight for their country. And these men who talk of disloyalty are maintaining a policy that is doing more to make men disloyal in this country than anything else. During the time the reciprocity treaty was in force, there could not be a more loyal people than the people of Nova Scotia. Prosperity was universal; and during that time—and I only mention it to show the result of people being well fed, well clothed, and well housed—there was a sentiment of loyalty throughout the province which could not have been exceeded. Every man was under arms. We had a militia law which compelled every man to bear arms for a certain number of days every year. So that a policy which will feed people and fill their homes with plenty, a policy which will make all their relations in life happy and prosperous, is a policy that will make them loyal. You make people disloyal when you cease to give them the objects of life. What makes the people of Ireland disloyal to-day? Is it not the action of the Government? Is it not the fact that they have not the necessaries of life? And I tell you that if this country were more prosperous, if it were enjoying the prosperity that it enjoyed under the old reciprocity treaty, there would not be a word of disloyalty. But go on making the conditions of life harder, go on depleting the country, go on driving our young men from the country, and you will sap the foundations of the loyalty of our people. I am going to vote for the resolution of the hon. leader of the Opposition. I am going to vote for it because I think the case is proved; because I think that Sir Charles Tupper uttered statements against our leaders which no follower ought to accept. I am going to vote for it because I think the best interests of this country require that the man who acts on behalf of Canada in England should be so free from politics as not to take any part whatever in them, and thus acting in the interest of our common country, will be removed from the temptation of saying and doing what he should not. Considering the case well proven, considering the evidence sufficient, and considering that Sir Charles Tupper has done that which he ought not to do in the best interests of the people of Canada, I am going to vote for the resolution of the hon. leader of the Opposition.

Mr. GILLIES. Mr. Speaker, when this resolution was moved, a few evenings ago, by the hon. leader of the Opposition, it was not my intention to offer any remarks on the question; but since that time, the discussion has taken such a wide range, and so many different phases of it have been presented, that I feel I would be doing violence to my own conscience if I did not, at this stage, offer a few observations. I feel that a great wrong has been attempted to be done to the Hon. Sir Charles Tupper. When we consider the prominent position that hon. gentleman has occupied in the Province from which I come, down by the sea, for the past forty years, I think it ill-becomes anyone from that province to hurl against him such epithets as we have heard in this debate, from some of the hon. gentlemen sitting on the left of the Speaker. If we consider the different positions the Hon. Sir Charles Tupper has filled in that province for the last forty years, we may well ask ourselves, how comes it that such a man as my hon. and extensive friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) can make the remarks he has just made? Sir Charles Tupper, it is in the recollection of many hon. gentlemen in this House, entered political life as long ago as 1854. Since then, he has been identified with every important question that has arisen, not only in his native province, but in this great confederacy of ours. In the great work of Confederation he was allied with such Liberals as the late Hon. Mr. Howe and the late Hon. Senator Brown, Liberals whose cheeks would burn with shame if they were here to-night and listened to the speeches of some of those who claim that political title. He was, I say, associated with prominent Liberals and Conservatives of honoured memory, men who have gone to receive their reward; he was associated with the right hon. Premier, who, and I utter it with heart-sore and profound sorrow, lies to-night on his death-bed; he was associated with those honoured men who made this nation of ours what it is to-day. I was surprised the other evening to hear the remarks made by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron). That hon. gentleman sat, I think in this assembly for some years with the Hon. Sir Charles Tupper, at whom he was hurling his vilest abuse; yet during all those years that hon. gentleman never dared to point his finger to one single wrong or wrongful act of Sir Charles Tupper's during his long political lifetime, but he chooses to vent his spleen against him only when he finds him 3,000 miles away. During that time we never heard any reference to Springhill, or any of these other conjured up and exploded charges that find their utterance when the object of them is far away. But, Mr. Speaker, when I look into *Hansard* and read the speeches of the hon. member for West Huron, I am not at all surprised at the attitude he assumed when discussing this question. What did he say the other evening? He said:

"Had the motion of my hon. friend gone further than it does, I would have voted for it; I would have voted to abolish the office and to abolish Sir Charles Tupper at the same time. I never could see the utility or necessity for this office."

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Hear, hear.

Mr. GILLIES. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear," but I think I can quote an authority at this very moment that is sufficient to convince even

him of the inaccuracy of his statement, and that will show him both the utility and necessity of this office. I will read an extract from an address of the cattle dealers of Montreal presented to Sir Charles Tupper at a public banquet on the 9th May, 1884, and what does it say :

"We have learned with deep regret that your public duties will prevent the acceptance of the banquet tendered you by the cattle exporters of Canada, a regret that is the greater because an opportunity would then have been afforded of demonstrating the appreciation in which your public services, and especially the signal services you have rendered the cattle trade, are held by us. * * *

"Your vigorous, prompt and judicious action last autumn when a cargo of Canadian cattle was condemned, ordered to be slaughtered, and an embargo about to be placed on the trade, saved this important branch of commerce from a blow that would have definitely checked its development and caused most serious losses to all engaged in it.

"We desire in the name of the cattle exporters of Canada to thank you for that service, and to express our conviction that but for the happy fortune of Canadians possessing so able a representative in England as yourself, their trade would have been temporarily ruined and dwarfed for a long time to come by the scheduling of this country.

"We trust that a similar occasion will not arise, but should it happen otherwise we know that in your presence in England we have the best safeguard against unjust, hasty or harsh action on the part of the British authorities towards the export cattle trade of Canada.

(Signed) "F. R. Lingham,
N. Kennedy,
H. J. Stephens & Co.;
Thomas Crawford,
J. & B. Coghlin,
G. B. Morgan,
Robert Craig & Sons.
A. W. Aikins & Co.,
Geo. D. Morse & Son,
Hugh Kelley,
Wm. Johnston,
Reid & Elliott,
Geo. H. Pope,
Geo. F. Frankland,
D. H. Craig,
Allan Crabtree,
Chas. M. Acer,
A. G. Goodfellow,
John Black,
John Dunn & Co.,
T. F. Johns,
W. Hearn,
T. Bonner & Sons,
D. MacIntosh,
A. Brown.

"Montreal, 7th May, 1884."

I confidently submit that any one of those names would be quite sufficient to meet any of the virulent statements of the hon. member from Huron against the High Commissioner. This document of itself shows the ability displayed by the High Commissioner ; it shows the high tribute paid him by one of the largest commercial institutions in this country. The signers of this document admit that were it not for the action of Sir Charles Tupper in London the cattle trade would be lost to this country—a trade that is estimated to amount this year to forty million dollars. That, I think, very fairly disposes of the allegations of the hon. member for Huron, and should enlighten him as to the necessity and utility of the office of High Commissioner of Canada. That hon. gentleman, in the course of the debate, said he would like the Government to point out "what Sir Charles Tupper had ever done in the interests of Canada?" I point to the address I have just read and say that is a sufficient answer. But this is not all. We could go on adducing other reasons, equally potent with the one I have given, to show the great services done by the High Commissioner at London, and this I propose doing a little further on in the course of my remarks. But the head and front of his offending is the fact that he took part in the last election. We are asked : Was he justified in coming out here at that particular juncture? In the first place, we know that Sir Charles Tupper came here, as the hon. the Premier has told us himself, at the First Minister's earnest request ; and the point has been well taken that it is at the heads of the members of the Cabinet the resolution should be hurled for the offence, if offence it is, and not at Sir Charles Tupper. Had that been done, I am quite sure that the Cabinet would be fully prepared to meet the charge. But, Mr. Speaker, Sir Charles Tupper, believing that the policy advocated by the leaders of the Opposition would be, in the highest degree, inimical to the interest of the Dominion, came over here and lent his valuable assistance to prevent the dire results to this country which would follow the adoption of that policy. Believing himself right, he entered into the contest with all his might. He believed that the doctrine propounded by Mr. Wiman would lead ultimately, perhaps immediately, to annexation. The great father of the fad on this continent, if it has any paternity at all, is Mr. Erastus Wiman. What does that gentleman say? I quote from the Boston *Herald* of the 22nd January, in which is contained a full account of a large meeting held at Thorndike in Boston, on the 21st January last, at which were present Mr. Erastus Wiman and Mr. W. H. H. Murray to discuss the question of unrestricted reciprocity. The leading men of Boston were present, and the meeting was presided over by Mr. Lane, President of the Merchants Association. Mr. Wiman there gave full scope to his views, as held by him ; and as they are held by him, so are they held by the advocates of unrestricted reciprocity in this Dominion. He said :

"In opposition to the Tory party which now controls the Government is the Liberal party, which has adopted a policy of entire conciliation towards the United States. The Liberal party believe that an unrestricted reciprocity between the two countries is possible, to the vast advantage of both, and they have adopted it as the chief plank in their platform. This policy, if adopted and put in force by a Liberal Government would settle almost every existing difficulty between the two countries."

He went on further to say :

"Now the question between the Tory party and the Liberal party is to be decided within a very short time, and is to be made the issue at the ensuing election."

Then Mr. Murray, his co-worker in the cause, said :

"I believe the time is soon coming when the Liberal party in Canada, which has always wished us well—the party, in whose members there is no antagonism to joining us—will represent the country and then overtures can be made and they will be received—I mean overtures for union. And by union I mean not unity merely in trade but political unity."

Now, what does that mean? I wish the House to mark well his words. He says: Let the Liberal party get into power and we will have political unity ; we will have the unity of the two peoples. That is annexation. Sir Charles Tupper, fearing such a calamity, flung himself into the midst of the fight. He came, he saw, and, of course, he conquered. It has been well said that the former leader of the Liberal party in this country, Mr. Blake, than whom I believe no more able or true-hearted man ever sat within these walls, and I venture to say a more eloquent voice has not for many years been heard pleading before the British bar within its extensive realm, said, as long ago as four years, that such a policy as unre-

stricted reciprocity was an impossibility, that it was beyond the domain of practical politics. But, the House will pardon me if I read an extract from Mr. Blake's celebrated speech at Malvern in January, 1887. He says:

"No man, I care not how convinced an advocate of absolute free trade for Canada he may be, no man, I believe, can suggest a practicable plan whereby our great revenue needs can be met otherwise than by the continued imposition of very high duties on goods similar to those we make, or can make, within our bounds, or on the raw materials. I invite the most ardent free trader in public life to present a plausible solution of this problem; and I contend that he is bound to do so before he talks of free trade as practicable in Canada."

Yet we have men like the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron), who boasts of being a Liberal, what he really is not, and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who hurls epithets against his opponents that I would expect to hear from people in lower walks of life than he is supposed or professes to be, saying that it is possible. Mr. Blake goes on and makes his meaning clear:

"I have not believed it soluble in my day, and any chance of its solubility, if chance there were, has been destroyed by the vast increase of our yearly charge and by the other conditions which have been created. The thing is removed from the domain of practical politics."

That was Mr. Blake's opinion four years ago, and his recent utterances on that point are fresh in our memory, and are not consoling to the hon. gentlemen of the Opposition. The tributes paid to Sir Charles Tupper by the leaders of the Opposition are, and should be, sufficient to estop them from discussing, or should have estopped them from introducing, this resolution. What does the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), say about Sir Charles Tupper in a speech which will be found on page 105 of the first volume of the *Hansard* of 1888? I am sure he was an unwilling witness, but he says:

"He is very useful here, and I am bound to say that though I differ from him *in toto coelo* as to his policy, I think he is much the best Minister of Finance I have come across in my time, on that side of the House for a long period of years."

When we remember that there were such men as the late Sir John Rose, the late Sir Francis Hincks, and other men of great ability, filling that responsible position during the period alluded to, and when we find the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) saying that Sir Charles Tupper, against whom he has been hurling his accusations, was the best Finance Minister he had come across, he paid a great tribute to the ability of that hon. gentleman, and is consequently convicted by his own utterance. Here is another unwilling witness: the hon. member for South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) said the same evening:

"I fully agree in the tribute which has been paid to the ability of the Finance Minister by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I also fully and frankly accept his statement that the work of the office of High Commissioner was never more efficiently performed than during the year that has passed."

There is a double tribute paid to the hon. gentleman they are now endeavouring to traduce. In one paragraph a tribute is paid to his efficiency as High Commissioner, and in the other part the highest possible tribute is paid to his ability as Finance Minister. That is not all. Hon. gentlemen will remember the Hon. Peter Mitchell, who, it will be conceded, was no very great friend of Sir Charles Tupper, particularly during the last years he was in this House, and at the time he made the speech from which I quote. What does he say?

"When the hon. gentleman was appointed High Commissioner everybody was pleased. The country had confidence in his abilities, and I think his career on the other side of the Atlantic showed that a High Commissioner, who has some skill and some knowledge of the interests of the country, was of great service. I recollect that on one occasion, when Canada was threatened with being scheduled against the importation of cattle into Great Britain, the hon. gentleman took the matter up, went down to Liverpool, went into the cattle yards, took off his coat, and with that scientific and practical knowledge he possesses, convinced the British Government Commissioners that it was unnecessary to schedule the cattle of Canada."

Those are the words of the Hon. Peter Mitchell, and I think they meet the query of the member for South Huron when he asks: "I would like the Government to point out to this House what Sir Charles Tupper has ever done in the general interests of Canada?" But that is not all. Hon. gentlemen will remember that Hon. Mr. Jones represented the County of Halifax, and I do not think anyone will accuse him of having been a very warm friend of Sir Charles Tupper, but he said in this House of Sir Charler Tupper:

"I think the ground my hon. friend (Mr. Mitchell) took with reference to the services of the High Commissioner in London might entitle that gentlemen to our high approbation."

Now, I hold that the evidence of those four unwilling witnesses, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), the hon. member for South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong), the Hon. Mr. Mitchell and the Hon. Mr. Jones, all bearing high testimony to the efficacy of the service rendered by Sir Charles Tupper as High Commissioner in London and as Finance Minister in this House, should be abundantly ample even to convince the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) of the error of his ways. But I have not yet done with producing evidence showing the popularity and ability of Sir Charles Tupper in his position as High Commissioner, and the confidence reposed in his official and executive abilities by all parties. I have here an address presented to Sir Charles Tupper on the 10th September, 1885, by the Agriculture and Arts Association of the Province of Ontario, and signed by George Moore, president, and Henry Wade, secretary, both of whom, I understand, are good and ardent Grits. Now the best kind of testimony are the admissions of a party when those admissions are against himself. This address is as follows:—

"We have learned with pleasure of your appointment as Executive Commissioner for Canada for the Colonial and Indian Exhibition to be held in London next year, and also of the naming of yourself in connection with H. R. H. the Prince of Wales, as a member of the Royal Commission, and we feel assured that under your able direction such a display of the natural products, manufactures, arts and industries of the Dominion will be made as will worthily represent its progress, its wealth and its possibilities, and maintain its proud position as the premier colony of the Empire."

This testimony is given by a party politically hostile to Sir Charles Tupper and I assume, therefore, there is no gainsaying its truth. Now, Sir Charles Tupper, besides being High Commissioner in London, acted as the chief executive commissioner of the Colonial and Indian Exhibition, in 1886, and I hold in my hand an address presented to him at the close of that exhibition by the

exhibitors and others, which clearly shows the eminent services rendered the country on that great occasion by Sir Charles Tupper. An address was read on their behalf by the Marquis of Lorne, and was so high in his praise that I beg leave to read a portion of it to the House. It is addressed to Sir Charles Tupper, and reads:

"We, the exhibitors, agents and others, connected with the Canadian section of the Colonial and Indian Exhibition, cannot permit you to leave London without conveying to you a formal expression of our appreciation of the work you have done in the interests of Canada at this exhibition. We, who are on the spot, and have been brought into personal contact with you, can the better appreciate the magnitude of the labour imposed upon you, at the exhibition, in addition to your official duties as High Commissioner of Canada. The earnest and ungrudging spirit you have displayed in attending to the interests of the exhibitors, and watching the advantages to be gained by our country, has raised you greatly in our esteem. When the exhibition was first proposed, you visited Canada, and roused an interest in it in every province, and many producers and manufacturers who did not foresee, as you did, the results of this effort, have now to thank you for opening to them the opportunity of introducing their goods to the markets of this vast Empire. As for the prospective results of the exhibition, never before were the products of our fields, forests, mines and waters, and of our manufacturing skill, and last, though not less important, the character of our educational system, so conspicuously and advantageously placed before the world; and we have already abounding indications that this exhibition will mark a new era for Canada, in her commercial relations with the outside world. The distinguished part you have taken in the attainment of this result is too well known to our countrymen to need emphasis here, and we trust your mission home may be entirely successful."

Now, I respectfully submit that is another answer for the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron), and I think it ought to silence him in the future when he is disposed to ask what good thing any man could point to as resulting from the mission of Sir Charles Tupper to London. Here is an extract from a London correspondent of the Toronto *Mail*, also speaking of the services of Sir Charles Tupper:

"It is only by being in the exhibition daily that one can form an idea of Sir Charles Tupper's unflagging devotion to his country's interests, now so largely at stake, or rather I should say so triumphantly assured. Canada is his one thought, and how to place her before the eyes of the world his only care. Of his ability it is needless for any Canadian journal to speak. But the tireless zeal, the earnest devotion and anxiety with which that ability has been applied to the assurance of Canada's success in this great gathering of her kindred nations, none but a constant eye-witness can know."

I think this is cumulative and convincing testimony of the great services rendered by Sir Charles Tupper to this Dominion. We all know the good that resulted from the Colonial and Indian Exhibition. Our trade with the mother country became vastly extended thereby, and the success of the Canadian section of that exhibition was entirely and admittedly due to the untiring efforts of Sir Charles Tupper. Now, I would like briefly to refer to one portion of the speech made by the hon. gentleman who preceded me (Mr. Fraser). He says that the Liberals never talk about their loyalty, that the shouting is all done on the other side. Well, this is the first time I heard an expression of that kind used. I do not think, indeed, that that assertion will find any response nor corroboration throughout this country. I would ask who, among the members of this House, talk more loudly and more frequently of his loyalty than the leader of the Opposition? Whether at a college dinner, at a political meeting in a remote district of the country, or on the floor of this House, that hon. gentleman avails himself of every possible occasion to drive down our throats, as it were, the belief that he is excessively loyal. I believe he is, I hope he is. I believe the statement that he is because he makes it. Holding the opinion of that hon. gentleman that I do, I feel convinced that of the statements made by his followers many, in this debate, are not approved of by that hon. gentleman. I do think that he is too scholarly and too refined in his feelings to approve of the unrepresentative conduct, without using a harsher and more applicable term, exhibited on the part of some of his supporters who have taken part in this debate. We find members like the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), himself coming from the Maritime Provinces, applying the words "blackguard" and "blackguardism" to such an honoured and honourable gentleman as Sir Charles Tupper, and if the hon. member for Queen's can use such language, it is no wonder that other Maritime members hang down their heads in shame. Let me remind the House that the subject of this debate was the theme of the very last speech made by the right hon. Premier who now lies nigh pulseless, and who said in that voice that we shall never hear again, and upon which our memory will ever love to linger, that Sir Charles Tupper came to this country at his express request, and that he was prepared to accept the full responsibility of his actions. With this it is co-incidental that the late D'Arcy McGee's last speech a few minutes before his life was taken was an eloquent and triumphant defence of Sir Charles Tupper. Sir, I believe that no matter how many members may come from Nova Scotia in future years, no matter of what ability they may be, or of what political stripe, I feel convinced that for many a day and many a year the equal of Sir Charles Tupper from that province will not be seen in this House, and his peer for all time to come among the chosen men of this wide Dominion will be difficult to find.

Mr. LANGELIER. I do not intend to go over the ground so well covered by the members who have spoken on this side. I think it will be difficult for some hon. gentlemen opposite to vote against the motion now before the House. I may mention in particular the Secretary of State (Mr. Chapleau) and the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives). Only three years ago the question of the conduct to be followed by officers of this House, came up here. Three unfortunate translators were complained of by the Secretary of State and by the member for Sherbrooke, for having interfered in the elections. They had understood that they were at liberty to act as ordinary citizens outside of the session, but because they had interfered in the elections of the hon. member for Sherbrooke and the hon. Secretary of State, those hon. gentlemen lodged a complaint against the translators and they were dismissed. Their dismissal by the Speaker was not only approved of by the members on the other side of the House, but it was very strongly insisted upon by those two hon. gentlemen. I need not go over the details of the charges made against Sir Charles Tupper. I think they have been proved to the satisfaction of every unprejudiced man in this country. I think there can be no doubt, after this discussion, that Sir Charles Tupper, being an officer of this Dominion, being

a paid servant, not of one party alone, but of both parties, and being very highly paid by the two parties to work for this country, has left his duties in London to come to this country to support one of the parties. But Sir Charles Tupper has not contented himself with that. Many quotations have been made from the speeches he delivered during the election. I may add something as to what he did in Quebec. We had the advantage of a visit from the High Commissioner. On 26th February last, he addressed a large meeting at Tara Hall, Quebec, in my own division. It was intended to promote the candidature of my adversary. It was an extraordinary meeting, for there was electoral bribery, not small bribery, but bribery of the highest kind, such bribery as can be called high bribery by the High Commissioner of Canada. Three enterprises have been desired by the people of Quebec for a great number of years. One is the release of debentures of $1,000,000 due by the North Shore Railway to the Dominion Government. Sir Charles Tupper promised the release of those debentures. It appears from the statement made, the other day by the Minister of Public Works in answer to a question put by me, that in order to make his promise more distinct a telegram sent by the Premier to Sir Charles Tupper was garbled by him, for it would not have suited his purpose to have read it in its entirety. Another public enterprise in which the people of Quebec have been taking a very great interest during the last four or five years is the construction of a bridge opposite the city. Sir Charles Tupper called the citizens to elect a ministerial candidate and get the bridge. He said they might consider the bridge an accomplished fact—and he said so although it would cost four million dollars. The third enterprise in which the people of Quebec are interested is the establishment of a line of mail steamers from that port. Again Sir Charles Tupper promised they would get the line, and the steamers were to have the size and speed of the *Teutonic*. Sir Charles Tupper did not content himself with these statements. He had to speak of his opponents, and he traduced them and their leaders. I will quote from the Quebec *Chronicle*, the leading Conservative paper of the city, the remarks he made :

"He publicly charged that Cartwright, Farrer and Erastus Wiman sought to subvert the Canadian people from their allegiance to Great Britain. He spoke of Mr. Laurier's high attainments"—

He did not dare to do what he did at Amherst because it would not be safe, for no one would have taken the responsibility for his protection if he had said one word of a disparaging character against the leader of the Opposition, because if there is anyone there for whom all the citizens of Quebec of both political parties have respect and admiration it is the leader of the Opposition. Sir Charles Tupper had proof of that feeling during the meeting, for whenever he made a charge against the Opposition, there were cheers for Mr. Laurier. The report continues :

"He spoke of Mr. Laurier's high attainments, but he said he was a weak tool in the hands of designing men."

These are the words of a man who is paid $12,000 a year as salary to represent both parties of this country, and it is paid just as much by the people represented by members on the Opposition benches as by those represented by hon. gentlemen opposite. But he said something worse. It has been proved that he attacked the Grand Trunk Railway. He has acted the part of a traitor to this country. If there is one objection I have to the resolution it is that it does not go far enough. It reproaches Sir Charles Tupper in his capacity of High Commissioner for having interfered during the late elections, and with having attacked the Grand Trunk Railway ; but, I repeat, he did something infinitely worse. What would he said of an ambassador of Great Britain who, in a foreign country, traduced one of the portions of the kingdom and tried to ruin the credit of that portion ? That is what Sir Charles Tupper has been doing. The proof of it is to be found in this morning's *Citizen*, in the words used by the High Commissioner against the Province of Quebec. When the position of High Commissioner was created, it was stated that his principal usefulness would be in promoting the credit of the country and assisting in loans that would from time to time be made in England. What has Sir Charles Tupper done ? It is known, and he knows it better than anyone else, that at the last session of the Legislature of Quebec a law was passed authorizing a loan of $10,000,000. It was known that Mr. Mercier, the Premier of the province, and his colleague, the Treasurer of the province, were about to visit Europe to raise this loan for the consolidation of the provincial debt. Sir Charles Tupper should have done his best to help them so as to earn his salary, it was his bounden duty to help them to float the provincial loan and strengthen the credit of the province. But, instead of doing so, he used his best efforts to render the loan a failure. I quote the words he used, as they appear in the *Citizen* :

"Mercier, by his wild extravagance and determination to hold on to power, has spent the last dollar in the treasury. He is wandering about from bank to bank now, borrowing money at 6 per cent. interest to carry on his Government from day to day, and passed an Act of repudiation, the most dishonourable and injurious ever passed in a British province, and in fact the only instance of its kind in the British Empire. He has destroyed the credit of Quebec. His efforts on behalf of Mr. Laurier are well understood, and are the last throw of a ruined gamester."

I must say at once that a portion of that statement is a complete falsehood. It is not true there was an Act passed by the Legislature of Quebec repudiating its liabilities. Mr. Mercier is very strong and very popular in Quebec, but neither Mr. Mercier nor any other strong man could induce the Legislature or any portion of the Legislature to pass such a dishonourable Act as an Act of repudiation of its debts. It is not true that any such Act was ever passed. Even if that were true, it would not be becoming of the High Commissioner representing this country to run down the credit of Quebec. I say again it is untrue ; there never was any such Act passed by the Legislature of Quebec. We have the proofs before us that Sir Charles Tupper has acted the part of a traitor to his country, or a traitor to the Province of Quebec at least. He has struck Quebec a deadly blow with the financial institutions in England ; he has done his very best to prevent the loan which is to be floated from being a success, and he has injured the credit of the province as much as he had power to do. This being the case, I cannot understand how any member from the Province of Quebec, having the slighest respect for his province can do otherwise than vote for the resolution proposed by the leader of the Opposition. The only regret I have is, and I

repeat it again, that the motion does not go far enough. I think the motion should condemn Sir Charles as a traitor to the Dominion of Canada and especially to the Province of Quebec.

Mr. TISDALE. At this late hour of the night, and particularly as I understand that members upon both sides of the House are desirous for a division as they are anxious to get away, I shall not trouble the House with any remarks upon this question. I did intend to trespass on the indulgence of the House for a short time but I shall forego it under these circumstances. I shall simply confine myself to a statement in regard to one of the matters discussed in this motion. I desire to say that in the riding which I represent, and also in the adjacent riding which returned a Government supporter, the Grand Trunk Railway or their officials did not in any way interfere with the elections, and the large majority of their employés voted for me and for the other hon. gentleman in an adjacent riding who was also a Government supporter.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Mr. Speaker, I consider this speech of the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) one of the strongest contributions we have had in this debate. The hon. gentleman has shown those who have attempted to make out that Sir Charles Tupper had not vilified and traduced the management of the Grand Trunk Railway road that to his own certain knowledge they are wrong. He has borne testimony that in his riding where the Grand Trunk Railway has a considerable power, to his own knowledge there was no effort made on their part in order to induce or compel their employés to vote in one direction or the other. It is a very strong testimony coming from that side of the House, and it will relieve us from the burden of referring at a great length again to the proofs which have been placed before the House by gentlemen who have preceded me in this debate. The question has wandered somewhat, and a discussion has been had to-night by hon. gentlemen opposite in a direction that seems to me would be more appropriate when we engage in the Budget debate. The proposition we are discussing to-night is the resolution that is offered by the leader of the Opposition, which is as follows :—

"The conduct and language of Sir Charles Tupper, High Commissioner of Canada in England, in interfering in the recent elections and in imputing treasonable and disloyal motives to a large proportion of the people of this Dominion, and also in assailing and vilifying the managers of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and in reflecting upon the position of the said company, is a breach of the duties of the office which he fills, and is calculated to destroy the efficiency of the said office, and to injure the credit of the Dominion, besides damaging a very important corporation whose shareholders have invested large sums of money in the work of extending and promoting the railway system of Canada."

You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that by the resolution we are called on to say that the language and conduct of Sir Charles Tupper in interfering with the election is a breach of the high office which he filled; that when he imputed treasonable and disloyal motives to a large portion of the people of this Dominion, and that when he attacked and vilified the managers of the Grand Trunk Railway, he was also guilty of a breach of the duties of his office. Now, it might be well, perhaps, just at the outset, to consider for a moment the position that Sir Charles Tupper occupies in this country. There has been somewhat of a difference of opinion upon that on the part of gentlemen who have spoken. Some viewed him as a civil servant: true, they said he was high in the Civil Service. Others viewed him in the light of an ambassador, but the Minister of Justice, if I understood him aright, does not take the ground that Sir Charles Tupper occupies a position similar to that of an ambassador. The hon. Minister viewed him as one who is simply an agent of the Government and who was at liberty to take part in party conflicts and election strifes, knowing at the same time if he did so he was taking his official life in his hands, as one of the minor officers in one of the departments would do, and that if the party he lent his aid to was not successful he would then resign his office. I think it is well, just at this point, that we should have the view of the office of High Commissioner and what is due to it, which has been expressed by the hon. gentleman who fills that position. I think that would be useful now, and I am happy to say that I am in a position to give to the House, from the lips of the High Commissioner himself, the light in which he regards that office, and the manner in which he believes the duties should be fulfilled. When Sir Charles Tupper reached Canada, summoned as we were told by the Government to lend them the benefit of his counsel, advice and eloquence, he was interviewed by a reporter of the *Daily Citizen* of Ottawa, and the *Citizen* states:

"Sir Charles received a representative of the *Citizen*, and with his customary courtesy consented to be interviewed. Entering at once upon the subject of his visit to Canada at this juncture, which he did with the utmost candour, Sir Charles said: I was most reluctant to return to this country to take sides in a party struggle. I have always held that the Canadian High Commissioner in England should not identify himself with the fortunes of any party, but should be truly representative of the whole people of Canada, and during my tenure of the office I have endeavoured to act, not as the representative of a party Government, but as a representative of the Canadian people. True, an ambassador even acts for the Government of the day. But Lord Lyons was twelve years an ambassador to France, although the Governments in England rose and fell during that period. Of course the representative of a country would feel it incumbent on him to resign his office in case the policy of the Government for whom he acted was such as, in his judgment, was injurious to the interests of the people. Otherwise, as in the case I have instanced, he would be justified in continuing in office independent of political changes at home. These are the views I hold of the position of the Canadian High Commissioner in London, and under ordinary circumstances and in the regular course of events I should never have consented to depart from this view of my duties."

These are his words: this is his view of what was due to the dignity of the position, and then he goes on to state that there were exceptional circumstances under which alone he found himself able to depart from that line of conduct. He says:

"But the circumstances just now are entirely exceptional. In the first place, we have arrived at a most important crisis in the history of Canada, when our industries and the interests of the people of Canada at large are seriously menaced by the fiscal policy of the United States as embodied in that measure generally known as the McKinley Bill, and it becomes necessary for the Government and the people of this country to put forth every effort to find new channels of trade and to devise means to meet the effects that this restricted measure threatened to bring about."

We find that Sir Charles considered it was his duty to come out here to aid the Government in finding new channels of trade, but I am not aware that he devoted himself to that object. I believe the Minister of Finance attempted to do a little in that line but with very poor success as far as I have

heard since. Any effort that was made subsequent to Sir Charles Tupper's visit in order to open up avenues of trade, was not to open new avenues of trade which had been closed through the McKinley tariff, but to go to Washington almost on bended knees, to beg the United States to give us access to their markets as they had done before. In this interview to which I referred Sir Charles Tupper then speaks of Mr. Wiman and said that Mr. Wiman he considered was acting in such a manner and had been giving utterance to such statements that he felt it imperative upon him that he should lend his aid in the contest. The testimony given by Sir Charles Tupper as to what was due to the office of High Commissioner I have read to the House from his own lips: and, Sir, when he left his position and when he took part in politics—he, the paid representative of the Canadian people—he who himself declares his duty to be that of the representative of the whole Canadian people—when he ceased to act in that capacity and came to this country, and not only took part in political strife, but attributed, as the resolution says, treasonable motives to a large portion of the people in this country, I fail to see how any hon. gentleman, jealous for the honour of his country, jealous for its standing in the eyes of the world, can say nay to a resolution that declares that such conduct was a breach of the duties of the high office which he holds? Sir, it has not been attempted. One of the most notable things in this debate has been that the Ministry who invited this gentleman to come to this country have failed to rise in their places and attempt to justify Sir Charles' conduct. The hon. Minister of Justice, than whom there is no one on the other side of the House more able to make a defence, if defence can be made, must himself have felt, as everyone who listened to his utterances was struck with, the weakness that his case possessed. His only defence was a broad denial of the statements made in the amendment submitted by the leader of the Opposition, and to demand the proof. The proof was forthcoming, has been given to this House, and is recorded in the pages of what will be the history of this country: and after that was furnished, and after the excuse that was framed by the ingenious mind of the hon. Minister of Justice had been cast aside, where was there another Minister to rise in his place, and, with a chivalry that any man ought to be possessed of, defend this High Commissioner, whom some of their supporters on the back seats are inclined to charge us with want of chivalry for attacking in his absence? Sir, they assumed the responsibility of asking him out here. Let me remind them that they did not assume, and have not assumed, though pressed time and again in this House to do so, the responsibility of his utterances and his subsequent writings. When the question was pressed on the hon. Minister of Finance on more occasions than one, whether the Ministry endorsed the utterances and writings of their High Commissioner, he sat mute and dumb, until, when pressed and repressed, he stated that, if he could not get on with his estimates till an answer was given, he would answer; and what was his answer? The attitude of the Government in reference to that matter is one of attentive consideration. So that we find those hon. gentlemen opposite, whose bounden duty it is to defend the High Commissioner, fail to rise to do so. Yes; there was one other besides the hon. Minister of Justice, one who himself admitted that it was a difficult task, who felt that the task should not be left to him, who felt that if these men had been true to the High Commissioner they would each and every one of them be ready at once to rise in his defence for what he had said and written—in other words, be prepared to do by their utterances what they evidently are afraid to do, but what I suppose they will be prepared to do by their vote, giving it silently when the opportunity arises. Well, let us examine the question a little, whether it is an unfair thing that this motion should be introduced in the absence of Sir Charles Tupper. Has the House of Commons in England, I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, never taken cognizance of any colonial governors? Has their conduct and administration never been brought under review in the House of Commons in their absence? If a civil servant in a minor position is guilty of misconduct, is it not discussed in this House? When the hon. member for Ottawa County brought up the case of one civil servant appearing on a platform in his county, he told us that the civil servant had at any rate this defence to make for himself, that, whether true or false, whether real or feigned, he had handed in his resignation to the Government and was no longer a civil servant. But, Sir, the head of our Civil Service does not seem to have that delicacy: he thought it not inconsistent, while holding that position, while deriving the emoluments connected therewith, to come over and take part in an electoral contest in this country; and, Sir, if he be not present here to defend himself, are the Opposition to blame for that? Did the Opposition prevent that hon. gentleman doing what he ought to have done, resign his position as High Commissioner and stand as a candidate for the representation of one of the constituencies of this Dominion and enter this House, and in the presence of the elected representatives of this people and of the Liberals among them, be man enough to utter the charges which he dare not make before their faces, but which he makes behind their backs on public platforms, and also writes to the public press? Why is he not here? It would be the proper thing for him to be here; but though he is not here, he has his defenders here, in whom he has as much confidence as he has in himself; and although his defender attempted a somewhat difficult task, yet I should judge that the High Commissioner would feel that his case was safe in his hands. In this same interview in the *Daily Citizen* which was had with the High Commissioner, the reporter, who seemed to take for granted that it was only a likely thing to expect that Sir Charles Tupper, having returned to this country to engage in the election, had handed in his resignation as High Commissioner and was about to enter the Cabinet, to give to it that strength that he had done before, asked him this question:

"'What are your plans, Sir Charles? Will you enter the Cabinet?'

"'I have no idea of entering the Government; I am proud to say that my name and family are sufficiently represented in the Government without my trying to create anything like a family compact.'

"Then evidently alluding to the eminent young ter, who has already achieved distinction in the statesmanship which has made his father famous, Sir Charles, with a ring of paternal and surely pardonable pride in his tones, continued: 'I have no hesitation in saying that, taking into consideration our respective ages, he is not

only a younger but a better man. Nova Scotia is now represented in the Cabinet by two men, with whom, there is every evidence to conclude, she has, and justly so, a right to be satisfied."

Well, Sir, I will not attempt to deny that; but I will say that Sir Charles himself there says that there is one in the Cabinet who he considers is possessed of equal ability with himself. That one has spoken in his defence, and I am not desirous at all to detract anything from Sir Charles estimate of the abilities of that young man, for I can understand that it is a pardonable pride in a father to have a son of whose talents he need not to ashamed. The only two members of the Cabinet who have spoken are the Minister of Justice (Sir John Thompson) and the Minister of Marine (Mr. Tupper), in the latter of whom the House will admit Sir Charles Tupper has a successor, well fitted by his abilities to have a seat in the Cabinet. What has been the defence offered by these gentlemen? The Minister of Justice made no defence; he only said: You have made a motion without producing the proof. The other Minister followed for a time the same line, and then attempted to prove that what Sir Charles Tupper had said was not what the resolution imputes to him, but something entirely different. Let us examine now whether it is true that Sir Charles Tupper did impute treasonable motives to a large portion of the people. I think I have established, out of his own mouth, that it was a breach of the duties of his office to engage as a partisan in the elections of this country. Let us examine now whether he is guilty of the charge of having imputed treasonable motives to a large portion of the people. Surely if it was a breach of the duties of his high office to enter into party politics at all, that offence must be magnified manifold if, during the heat of the contest—nay, worse, if after the heat of that contest, and in cold blood—he is found attributing treasonable and disloyal motives to a large portion of the people of this country, whose paid servant he is. We have had the facts given to the House before, but just let me refer to them again. In the Amherst *Gazette*, the organ of the High Commissioner himself, appears a report of his speech delivered after the elections. That report was quoted by the hon. the member for South Oxford and by others; and I looked at the paper myself to see whether there was any qualifying context which would alter the meaning of the language attributed to Sir Charles. I found the quotation was exactly correct, and that it stands in a sentence by itself—that there is nothing to qualify it, and that the meaning cannot be at all doubted. Sir Charles Tupper said:

"There are two great parties in Canada, one loyal to its own and the mother country, the other ready to hand over our country to aliens and to turn its back on Great Britain."

That is the statement Sir Charles Tupper made at Amherst—made deliberately after the election was over and the excitement had subsided. Yet we are told there is no proof. When the Minister of Marine attempted to answer the charge, what line did he take? Why, Sir, after saying that we had taken scraps of newspapers out of their connection, he, in the same breath, proceeded to read portions of an article penned by the High Commissioner, long after the election was over, when he found he had got himself into a position he could not maintain, when he found he had to take back what he had said, and that his utterances were not believed. It was then he was kind enough to say, in the *Review* in May, that the great bulk of the Liberal party, under the leadership of Mr. Blake, were loyal, that it was just a few of the leaders who were disloyal. And the Minister of Marine gives us that statement made in May as a contradiction of this direct statement made about the 7th of March. All that the Minister of Marine succeeded in showing was that Sir Charles Tupper had made diametrically opposite statements in the course of a month, and we are bound to the alternative that one of them must be absolutely false, since each directly contradicts the other. That is all he accomplished: and since no apology or retraction has been made by the High Commissioner, we are justified in bringing him to account for having imputed treasonable and disloyal motives to a large portion of the people of this country. Which party did he mean was loyal to this country and which party disloyal? Hon. gentlemen opposite will claim that their party, at any rate, is loyal. I claim for the Liberal party that if Sir Charles Tupper's reference to a disloyal party refers to the Liberal party, it is absolutely and utterly false. My language is not too strong. Hon. gentlemen opposite bandy about the terms "traitor," and "treason," and "veiled treason," and "disloyalty," as if they were light charges to hurl against people. Do they not know that the charge of treason is one of the most serious charges that can be levelled against public men: yet after using it freely they hold it is very wrong for anyone to rise and denounce it as being false. But Sir Charles said more. He said:

"On the other hand, nothing had so raised Canada in the view of English capitalists as the Canadian Pacific Railway; for every one who invested gets his return. The Grand Trunk Railway, also, since the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway has been ruining its own shareholders by its vain attempts to try to obstruct that line and going into wild purchases of other lines to embarrass it. Now you find Laurier, Wiman, Farrer and the Grand Trunk Railway Company, these craven creatures who have been representing us as a people whose life could be crushed out by the United States, leading and abetting a party who turns its back on England."

Yet the Minister of Marine, in his attempt to defend the High Commissioner, said: Oh, he did not allude to the Liberals of Canada, but only to a few men, only to Messrs. Wiman and Farrer. Why, as the hon. member for Guysborough said, he attributed treason and disloyalty to the leader of the Liberal party; and does he suppose that the Liberal party will not resent that charge when they know it to be false? The last gentleman who spoke on the Government side, a supporter of Sir Charles Tupper, a man who owes probably his seat in this House to the influence exercised by the High Commissioner, when he declared that the leader of the Liberal party is a loyal man, gave the lie to the High Commissioner who declared him to be a disloyal man. And yet, there is not one of these men who are prepared to vote, if they are prepared to vote, that the language of Sir Charles Tupper was right, who dare rise in his place and charge upon the leader of the Opposition disloyalty, as was done. What a scene it is in the House of Commons of Canada, that a number of men should be prepared, if prepared they are, to justify a charge or an accusation of disloyalty made by a paid servant of the country against the leader of one great pary, and yet they are too craven to rise in the House and say that the charge is true.

Others may say that Mr. Laurier, who leads the Liberal party, is a craven creature and a disloyal man, and yet they will vote and will say that it is right for a paid servant of the people to stigmatize the loved leader of the Liberal party as a craven creature, associated with traitors in an attempt to subvert the institutions of the country and to turn Canada over to aliens. Can they escape from that position? Does the reading of that specify the leader alone? What is that leader doing? He is leading a party which adheres to him, and that party is stigmatized with being of the same views as he, and we ask for nothing else. If he is asserted to be guilty of anything disloyal to the country, it reflects on those who follow him and aid him. If hon. gentlemen will not rise and take the responsibility, in a manly way to that hon. gentleman's face, of the statements which their paid servant made publicly behind his back, let them be manly enough to say that that man said what was untrue, and what they know to be untrue, as one of their own members has stated. I do not know that I need go further. The proof is before you. It is a matter perfectly notorious that that has been the course of Sir Charles Tupper during the last election campaign; and not only so, but since the campaign has been over, we find him vilifying the leaders of the Reform party, and all the attempted defence that has been made has not been pertinent to the question. All the talk about Mr. Wiman or others has nothing to do with the question. The Liberal party and the leader of the Liberal party, who are proud to follow their leader, have had imputed to them disloyal motives. We have heard from the member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier), that the High Commissioner, the paid servant of the Canadian people, in taking part in that campaign, attempted to bribe constituencies by offers of public works. What do we find him doing after this public speech to which I have referred? We find him giving an idea to the people of the North-West and Manitoba that now is their opportunity to press their claims on the consideration of the Government. That has been already alluded to, but I will refer to it again. He says:

"To-day we see the parties in Ontario and Quebec nearly balanced, and the other provinces not only holding the balance of power, but in a position to claim the first consideration, from the noble manner in which they had supported the Government."

What does he mean by that language? What do hon. gentlemen opposite understand by it? What do hon. members supporting the Government from the Maritime Provinces understand by that? I heard them laugh when, in a debate on the Estimates which I must not mention, the member for North York (Mr. Mulock) referred to that, and they implied that he did say in so many words that they were to press for these public works unless the interest of the country required them. Let us see. What does he mean by this further sentence in the same speech?

"Another fortnight would have considerably increased our majority in Ontario, but, after his 36 years experience, he preferred a majority of 40 to one of 80."

What for? With frankness he tells us, and this will give us the cue to what he meant when he told the smaller provinces that now they had the power in their hands. The reason was this:

"The Government has not so many people to provide for with the lesser number."

That will explain to the hon. gentlemen opposite, who seem to be in doubt what he meant as to the smaller provinces having the balance of power. What does he mean, for it seems difficult to get an hon. gentleman opposite to understand these speeches—what does he mean by its being better to have a majority of 40 than one of 80? He says:

"He dared say Mr. Dickey would tell us he occasionally gets a hint from some person that he wants a certain piece of work done by the Government."

I think that explains the whole position. Mr. Dickey can tell us whether he has ever had such hints or not. Practically he says: Support the Government, press your claims: Mr. Dickey, I guess, has had hints that certain people would like a certain work done, now is your time, press the power you have and take the advantage. Here is the High Commissioner, not only attributing disloyal and treasonable motives to one of the great parties in this country, but also endeavouring to corrupt the constituencies of this country, and yet those hon. gentlemen are inclined to shield him. Then there was my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), who did not take the same line as the Minister of Justice. He had read the newspapers, he did not ask to be informed, but he was prepared to look upon this language of Sir Charles Tupper as figurative language, he contended that Sir Charles Tupper did not mean what he said. Well, it may be figurative language, but it looks very real indeed. The member for Assiniboia says that, even if he did commit an error, the services he has rendered to Canada ought to wipe that all out; and I was amused to read what he said about the services Sir Charles Tupper had rendered, for, according to the hon. gentleman, Sir Charles Tupper is not only the greatest man in Canada, but he is about equal to all the combined great men that Canada has ever produced. He says:

"My hon. friend complained of Sir Charles Tupper's enthusiasm over the Canadian Pacific Railway and the North-West. Sir, I doubt if I should be standing here to-day troubling the House if it were not for what Sir Charles Tupper has done for the North-West."

I will admit that Sir Charles Tupper, in bringing the hon. gentleman into the House, has conferred a signal favour upon the country.—

"There is no man in Canada, not even his illustrious leader, to whom the North-West is more indebted than to Sir Charles Tupper."

Then he goes on to say:

"Sir Charles Tupper built that railway in four years less than the specified time. He is a man of great energy, and that is a great railway, and has made Canada something in the eyes of the world. If the Minister of Justice claims that Sir Charles Tupper has rendered great services to Canada, the building of that railway is not the least he has done in the interest of Canada."

My hon. friend seems to be of the opinion that Sir Charles Tupper did the whole thing. We will give him credit for having brought the hon. gentleman here, but I demur to the statement that Sir Charles Tupper built the Canadian Pacific Railway. I thought, perhaps, some of the other members of the Government had something to say in it. I thought, perhaps, Parliament had something to say in it. I have been under the impression that there was some tens of millions of dollars of the Canadian people's money invested in that enterprise; and not till the hon. member for Assiniboia had pointed out how wrong this motion was against Sir

Charles Tupper, because had he completed this road, did I ever know the true facts of the case, that Sir Charles Tupper built it himself, and is entitled to the whole credit. But he has rendered good services, he tells us, in England. He says:

"But there was one small instance that occurred a few years ago for which we, in the North-West Territories, are grateful to him, and Canada should be grateful to him also—I allude to the time when our cattle were supposed to be suffering from pleuro-pneumonia. What did he do? He rolled up his sleeves. He is a dissector in more ways than one. He had the cattle killed, and it was shown they were not suffering from pleuro-pneumonia, and that one act was of more value than all the money that the Tuppers have ever received from Canada."

Well, what was "that one act"?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Killing the cow.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No, he didn't kill the cow, he had the cow killed by others. The one act he did was this: He rolled up his sleeves. So you can see, Mr. Speaker, that it is very wrong indeed for the leader of the Opposition to introduce a resolution of censure, granting that Sir Charles Tupper has been guilty of the grossest impropriety, granting he has been guilty of bearing false witness against one of the largest parties of this country, granting that he has endeavoured to corrupt the constituencies by offers of public moneys, whether they were entitled to them or not; he rolled up his sleeves and that is worth all the money the Tuppers ever received from this country. Well, now, I do not want to detract at all what the High Commissioner has done. I think he did good service on that occasion; but I ask: Did he do anything more than his duty? Did he do anything more than any other individual would have done?

Mr. DAVIN. It would not have occurred to most men.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If my hon. friend had gone into the business himself, it would have occurred to him. I suppose a veterinary surgeon would have been employed to kill the cow. Now, I wish not to detract from Sir Charles Tupper's service at all, but I say the man did nothing more than his duty. Should we, years after, have that pointed out to us as so meritorious an act that, forsooth, the Canadian Parliament should take no cognizance of his public acts and public utterances, even when these acts and these utterances are against the best interests of this country? No, Sir, we cannot understand the doctrine, we cannot accept the doctrine, and while the hon. member for Assiniboia may be pleased to offer that as a plea for mitigation of punishment, it is of very little value, and it seems to me that it cannot weigh in this question. The hon. gentleman himself cannot say that he was doing more than his duty. And if it was his duty before that, how will the member for Assiniboia say that he was in the line of his duty when he came over to Canada at the risk of neglecting the duties of that office, when there might at any time be a similar complaint made against our cattle? And if I am not mistaken that same circumstance was repeated, perhaps not while he was here, but scarcely had he got home before it happened; and I think he was not at that port at the time, though I speak under correction. Well, that is the best defence that could be made. I may say to the hon. member for Assiniboia that I have heard friends around me say that he had made the best defence of the High Commissioner that had yet been made. Now, my hon. friend is of a broader mind than Sir Charles Tupper. Sir Charles Tupper, as I read before the hon. gentleman came in, charges upon the leader and charges upon the party to which I belong, in plain, unmistakable language, that we are a party ready to hand over the country to aliens. The member for Assiniboia has a broader mind than that; still he thinks there was danger in our course, for he says:

"I believe that most of the Reform party, in fact I believe all the Reform party, as far as I know its members, are loyal; that is to say they are subjectively loyal. But objectively, if I may make that germane distinction, they are disloyal—they mean to be loyal. You can easily understand a man getting on a railroad that will lead to disloyalty and annexation, and yet deceive himself that every sleeper that he travels over was a loyal one, and on every rail there was the hall-mark of devotion to the Empire; nevertheless the rails would lead him to a disloyal goal. That is the position our friends occupy."

Now, you see the hon. member for Assiniboia, he too, if I may be allowed the expression, gives the lie to the utterance of the High Commissioner, because the High Commissioner charged upon us that we were ready to hand over the country, prepared to do it, and that we were in danger, by our course, of letting such a thing occur, unknown to us, unperceived by us and contrary to our wills. The High Commissioner said we were ready to hand it over. Now, the hon. member for Assiniboia says that is not true. I think that you are in danger, that your course might lead in that direction. What danger did the hon. member for Assiniboia see in the course of the Liberal party in desiring freer trade relations with the people to the south of us? Why should it end in annexation? Why should there be any danger in that course? Why does he warn us against taking the first step on that road that he says might lead us there? Does he always follow in that line? I think not. I think that he would scarcely do it. My hon. friend, I suppose, is opposed to polygamy; I know I am. Would he decline to take the first step towards matrimony, which is a right and proper thing in itself, because he might be induced or led into polygamy? Freer trade relations with the United States means in no way a yielding up of our national independence, in no case means a transference of our allegiance, in no case means the taking down of one flag and the substitution of another. But the hon. gentleman would forbid us to take the first step towards securing freer trade relations with those people, because of an imaginary evil that he conjures up in his brain. It is not worthy of the hon. gentleman to take that position and say that he fears that might be the result, and he has not confidence enough in himself, he has not enough skill, to enjoy freer trade relations with the people of the United States without handing over his country to that country, and bringing about that which Sir Charles Tupper says our conduct is not only in danger of doing, but which we are as a party ready and prepared to do. And now, Sir, with reference to the second charge, with reference to the Grand Trunk Railway, I need not allude to it at length. Hon. members know what Sir Charles Tupper has said, how he has vilified the manager of the road, how he has entered into a controversy with its president, how he has declared its whole course a wrong and improper one, how he has endeavoured to depreciate the value of its stock. All those points are

matters of record, and I need not trouble hon. members with them again. The resolution sets out that Sir Charles Tupper is guilty of a breach of the high duties of his office, and, therefore, merits the condemnation of this House. The resolution further states that his course is calculated to injure the credit of the Dominion. I take it that that is a self-evident proposition. I say to hon. gentlemen opposite that if they are prepared to vote down the resolution, there are two alternatives they can take. They can either believe that the credit of Canada has not been injured by Sir Charles Tupper, or they can believe that Sir Charles Tupper told the truth. I leave it to them to choose which horn of the dilemma they will take. If Sir Charles Tupper told the truth—and I should have added to that statement—if the people of England believe he told the truth, then the credit of Canada must be impaired. It is impossible for a man occupying the position of High Commissioner for Canada at the Court of St. James to declare as he has done, and as the English people know he has done, that the leaders of one of the great political parties in this country, and that party which is lead by them, are a disloyal party, which are ready to hand over their country to the people of the United States. If that statement is believed by the people of England, Canadian credit must be injured greatly. I was glad to hear the Minister of Finance and an hon. gentleman who spoke on the other side say that they believe Canadian credit stood as well as ever it did. I am thankful for that; but no thanks are due to the High Commissioner. Let us see the position in which we are placed. If our credit is high in England to-day, notwithstanding the utterances and writings of the High Commissioner, we are forced to this conclusion: that Canada has a representative at the Court of St. James as High Commissioner whose word is scorned, despised and disbelieved, and that is a position which is unworthy of this young nation of Canada. If his word is believed in regard to the Grand Trunk Railway, then he has damaged and impaired the credit of that company. Viewed in what light you will, I must say that the course of the High Commissioner has been one not worthy of commendation at the hands of this House, but his course has been such as must lead this House to declare that in the framing of this resolution, it has not been couched in any language too strong, but the statements contained therein are true, have been absolutely proved, and if proved, this House should manifest its opinion of the conduct of the High Commissioner by according it their support.

Mr. SKINNER. In debating this question for a few moments I will review some of the arguments put forward this evening. As I understand the position taken by hon. members supporting the resolution, they present it in a threefold form: first, that Sir Charles Tupper should not have taken any part in this controversy; second, that if he did so, he should not have used the expressions towards the Liberal party he did use; and, third, he should not have made any reference to the Grand Trunk. All the arguments of the hon. gentlemen opposite come under these heads. As to Sir Charles Tupper's right to come here and take part in an election campaign, the matter has been so thoroughly argued out that I need not address the House at any length to prove that proposition. Sir Charles Tupper holds the position he does in England, not only representing as it is said the whole people, but he must and does represent the Government of the day, and he must more particularly represent the Government of the day than any diplomatic officer of any Government represents his Government, and in that particular the High Commissioner's office does not correspond to the position of an ambassador. Could it be supposed for a moment that were a change in the Government to occur, and hon. gentlemen opposite to succeed to power, Sir Charles Tupper would be continued as the representative of Canada in London? He would not. No matter what his talents may be, no matter what his influence, no matter what acquaintance he may have as to the means of extending the influence of this country in Great Britain, hon. gentlemen opposite would not continue him in that position, because they would want a gentleman there who would be a custodian of their political secrets and their mode of conducting the business of the country. The two parties in this country are as wide apart as the politic poles can place them with respect to the policy to be pursued. Hon. gentlemen opposite, without enlarging on their policy, have one set of views. I need not say whether they are right or wrong, but they are entirely different to the views held on this side of the House. The party in power at any particular time require a representative as High Commissioner who will be their agent, who will carry out their ideas and carry out their policy to the people to whom he is sent. If the High Commissioner holds that position, this will be one of his duties, to represent that policy anywhere and everywhere, as he believes to be necessary. A diplomatist, when he goes abroad, represents only the ideas that the country want him to present with respect to the particular country to which he is accredited. He is an agent of an entirely different character. But Sir Charles Tupper, the High Commissioner, takes from Canada to Great Britain what are the opinions of this Government at home, and therefore he is in a position to talk politics there, and if he talks them there he has a right to talk them here. And along the line of argument it is his duty whenever he pleases to exercise it either there or here, to talk politics and act politically to the same extent as one of the Ministers of the Crown would do here, or if the Minister were in Great Britain. I say further, that if there ever was a time when the High Commissioner, and every man who believes as the Conservative party believes, should come forward and speak and act, it was during the recent election. Hon. gentlemen opposite say we accuse them of being disloyal, and of being traitors. They know as well as you and I know that we do not accuse them of being disloyal and of being traitors in the sense of accusing enemies of being such. What we say is that if their policy is carried out to its logical results it would become disloyalty and it would finally take this country away from the allegiance it now owes. Now, what did Sir Charles Tupper do after having gone through these elections? Gentlemen opposite allege that after the elections were over he charged them and their leaders with disloyalty in the ordinary sense. Read his speeches, read the text as well as the context that refers to this, and you will find that all the charges of disloyalty and everything of this character in

the speeches were based on the principle that the Liberal policy leads to the disruption of the Empire, and that, therefore, they must, of necessity, be disloyal. I would ask gentlemen opposite if they cannot agree with us that their policy if carried out would lead to this result: Was the policy pursued by the Liberal party one that was calculated to cement the bonds that bind us to the mother country? Were they not above board in the proposition, so far as mentioning it was concerned, that they would not only have free trade with the United States, but that they would also have a discriminating tariff against Great Britain? Do they not know that nearly every public man in Congress who spoke upon this question, and every leading newspaper of the United States which wrote upon this question, declared that if free trade between the two countries were adopted, Canada must place the same tariff around our country that they did around themselves? Did not this result form the other proposition as logical as one thing can come from another, namely, that if we had to maintain the same tariff as the United States, the United States would control our tariff, because they were the larger, the more populous, and the greater trading country? If the policy of the Liberal party were carried out the consequence is that we were not only to have a discriminating tariff against Great Britain, but we were also to have a tariff that would be dictated to us and be controlled by a foreign country. Is it in the nature of things that Canada, under these circumstances, could remain a British dependency, or a British Dominion, in connection with the Empire? No; it must be driven away from the Empire, and eventually it would come to one of two things: either Canada must become independent, or it must become part of the United States; and if the policy of the Liberal party leads to that, then it leads to dismemberment of the Empire, and if it lead to dismemberment, it leads to disloyalty, and if it leads to disloyalty it leads to a traitorous course being pursued by the gentlemen on the other side, although they might not have intended it to have been traitorous or disloyal.

An hon. MEMBER. What is that but disloyalty?

Mr. SKINNER. Not in the sense of wilful treason. A party in any country may have a policy that may lead to a certain course of events, and they may know that it leads to that course of events, but they may not care so much whether it does or not. The hon. gentleman who interrupted me just now is a strong free trader; and the gentleman who spoke in the early part of the evening (Mr. Fraser) said that no matter what the consequences were we must buy in the cheapest and sell in the dearest market. That was his argument. Now, what is the result of all that teaching? It is trade first and loyalty afterwards, and if you are going to pursue that course you are following along a line of proceeding that would finally lead us into disloyalty and dismemberment and break up this great national combination. What we on this side of the House said during the election and what Sir Charles Tupper emphasized was, that instead of discriminating against Great Britain we are ready to have all reasonable free trade with the United States; and if we are to look for more extended markets we will look to the markets of Great Britain itself, and if Great Britain is ready to make a discrimination against the world in favour of us we will fall in with her, and at all events stand by the Empire, whether we are going to be more successful or less successful. I believe that the one great principle is the union of this great Empire first and then success afterwards. Gentlemen on the other side of the House reverse that proposition. They say: Give us trade first and then let the Union or the connection of the Empire take care of itself. I contend that if the views and policy of hon. gentlemen opposite are carried into effect they will lead to disruption of the Empire, and to that extent we say they are disloyal. It is no use for them to spread the idea throughout the country that the Conservative party intended to charge them with disloyalty in the rough and ugly sense they are putting it. We know they are citizens of Canada; we think their political opinions are wrong; we think their political course can lead but to one end, and if that is to be disruption of the Empire, then it is disloyalty, and that is the whole sum and substance of the story. When Sir Charles Tupper spoke at Amherst he made that as plain as it could be. When he charged that the party opposite was ready, as the hon. gentleman said who last spoke, to deliver the country over to aliens, what did he mean? He meant that for the purpose of having free trade they would be willing, if the necessity called for it, to be annexed even to the United States. I know, and the people of the country know, that it was a part of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite during the last campaign to have free trade no matter what it cost the country. Take the speech delivered by the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Cartwright) at Boston. While it might have been made for pleasantry, yet it meant that the city of Boston must become the great sea emporium for the trade of this country. What did that mean to all the Maritime Provinces, who have been true to this Union and who have been true to the connection of the mother country? It meant the transfer of the trade that we have been labouring for, the trade that the Maritime Provinces as well as western Canada has been willing to be taxed for; it meant that this trade was to be transferred to Boston and New York. Why, Sir, we showed to our people, and the country recognized it, that inasmuch as New York has monopolized nearly all the import trade of the Atlantic, by the natural course of events it would also draw the ocean import trade from the Maritime Provinces. If that was to be the result, would not that be disloyal to all our interests, and that was what was meant to be charged. So far as saying that the people of England would understand by what Sir Charles Tupper said that half the people of this country were traitors in the ordinary sense, and thereby that it would damage the country, hon. gentlemen know that Sir Charles Tupper did not mean anything of the kind. When the hon. gentleman who last spoke said that he is glad to know that after all these things have been said our financial integrity still remained intact, let me ask him why has our financial credit continued to be good? It is good because the policy of gentlemen on the other side of the House has not been successful. If they had succeeded in the elections you would have found that the credit of this country would have received a shock which it would not have

recovered from for a great length of time. Therefore, when hon. gentlemen opposite make charges against Sir Charles Tupper they do it in a Pickwickian sense; they know that they do not mean what they say when they write out such formidable resolutions as that which we have to-night. When the hon. member for Queen's said the other night that Sir Charles Tupper had blackguarded, vilified and abused the people of Canada, he knew that he had done nothing of the kind. Sir Charles Tupper simply pointed out what he thought would be the logical results of the political course these hon gentlemen had taken. Everybody understood what he meant and said, and it did not detract from his statesmanship or add anything to his name for abuse, but it showed that as representing the great party with which he was connected he had the bravery to stand up—because he must have known that his words would be repeated, not only all over Canada, but in the old country and in the United States as well—and declare that he believed the policy of the party to which he was opposed would lead to a disloyal result. Now, a moment with reference to what Sir Charles Tupper said with regard to the Grand Trunk Railway. I will pass by the question whether the Grand Trunk Railway was indebted to the Government or to the people of Canada or not for favours that had been shown to it. But it must be remembered that our country was passing through a terrible crisis; it must be remembered that even if we on this side of the House were wrong, yet we believed that the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite was going to ruin this country; we believed that if they succeeded, annexation and dismemberment would come. So, assuming for the sake of argument that we were mistaken, Sir Charles Tupper, in representing our ideas and speaking and acting for this party found, in his efforts to save the country from such a condition of things, that the Grand Trunk Railway Company was not only exercising what might be said to be its political rights, that is to say, of allowing its officers and men to vote as they pleased, but was exercising its influence against the Government in the elections. And what more came out on that point? Did not Mr. Read, as agent of the Grand Trunk Railway, express the true inwardness of the case when he said that he did what he did, that he caused so many men to be brought from the United States to vote in the constituencies along the border, because he was an annexationist and wanted annexation to triumph in the country? Was not that disloyal? And in so expressing himself he not only indicated his own feeling, but he gave an index as to all that was done and said. Every lawyer in this House knows that when a case is on trial in court it is impossible to prove everything, but if a certain evidence is opened up the jury can from it plainly draw an inference of the facts. So, from the gleams of evidence furnished us as to what the Grand Trunk Company were doing in this election was it not easy to draw the inference that that company were in favour of our country at all events becoming connected with the United States in such a way that we would lose control of our tariff and have a discriminating tariff against Great Britain, and that they did not care a bit whether this country remained true to Great Britain or not; all they wanted was the trade at any price at which they could get it. That having been proved, it became very clear that the Grand Trunk Company were not loyal to Canada and Great Britain, and had not before their eyes, in the action they took in the election, the integrity of this Empire and loyalty to this country at all. Well, after all this was done, Sir Charles Tupper came to speak about it, as I think I have proved he had a right to do; and when he spoke the words he did, were they not words of truth? Had he not evidence to back him: and did not every intelligent person in this community, whose mind was not blinded by prejudice feel that what he said about the Grand Trunk Railway was the absolute truth and nothing else? Therefore I say that on the evidence before the country, what Sir Charles Tupper said he was justified in saying. The hon. gentleman who last spoke intimated that Sir Charles Tupper would lose all his influence in England because of what he said with reference to the Grand Trunk Railway and on this question generally. If you examine the record of Sir Charles Tupper since the elections you will see that he has not lost one whit of his influence in that country. He is representing this Government, and he is representing ideas that prevail on this side of the House as fairly and fully and capably as he ever did; and he is as well received in Great Britain, and has as much influence there, or more influence, than he ever had before. Some hon. gentlemen opposite who read extracts from certain British newspapers to show that Sir Charles Tupper did this or that wrong thing, have to go to a class of newspapers that do not care one farthing for the integrity of this Empire. Further, it will be seen from expressions in that portion of the press in Great Britain that is true to the British idea that what Sir Charles said is approved of there. Our friends on the other side seem to imagine that they can make the idea of loyalty discreditable in this country. They talk occasionally as if to speak of loyalty were to speak of something that was a mere fad. I think it will be a bad day for Canada and the Empire when loyalty is to be laughed at. Therefore, I say, go to the press in Great Britain that aims to keep this Empire together, and you will find that the action taken by Canada in this last election and the arguments used by Sir Charles Tupper and others have met a ready and hearty response in that great country. Therefore, I believe that Sir Charles Tupper is as valuable a representative there as he ever was. Just one remark with reference to the ridicule which the hon. gentleman who last spoke endeavoured to throw on what Sir Charles Tupper is doing there. Canada stands to-day much higher than she did ten years ago. To-day these provinces which were disjointed colonies a few years ago, are respected and known throughout the whole world. Sir Charles Tupper, by his speeches, and his influence, and labours, and by the exercise of his great abilities as our High Commissioner, has done more for us than any man who has ever represented this country abroad in any position. Therefore, instead of a resolution being brought in for the purpose of casting any slur on Sir Charles Tupper, I believe that not only has the Conservative party a right to be proud of his great talents which he has brought to bear on this question and of the manner in which he has guided this country along the high road of progress, but that the whole people of Canada, Liberals and Conservatives alike, owe him a debt of gratitude.

Mr. FLINT. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken is one of the most eminent authorities in this House on the subject of annexation to the United States. He is an old and experienced politician, who has made a long, and careful, and critical study of all the bearings of this question, and has placed upon record his deliberate conclusion that the Conservative party of this country is the party most responsible for any annexation sentiment that may exist in the Dominion and the party whose policy has led directly in that direction. I will quote the language of the hon. gentleman, delivered on the 4th March, 1867, in Berryman's Hall, St. John. He said:

"When the Conservative press and speakers raise the cry of disloyalty against the Liberals they raise a standard of lies."

That old familiar cry, which was first hurled in this country, during the struggle for responsible government, against those who were trying to bring something like decent organization and the principle of progress into our affairs—that old cry of treason and disloyalty which was as familiar to our forefathers at is it to us to-day; that cry which was raised against our forefathers when they undertook to remove the disabilities under which we were labouring; that cry which was raised against the Howes, the Lafontaines, the Baldwins and the George Browns, and all those who, in our political history, have attempted to bring about political reform—that cry is still made to do duty against us to-day. In 1887, that cry was hurled against the Liberal party in Canada; and we find that the hon. gentleman, then a member of the Liberal party, gave it as his deliberate conclusion, after twenty-five years' study of the principles and policy of the Conservative party, that when they raised the cry of disloyalty against the Liberals they were raising a standard of lies. I have never yet heard that the hon. gentleman has recanted that opinion before any audience in the province from which he comes. He also placed upon record his deliberate opinion upon another occasion. In the Union Hall, on the 9th February in the same year, this eminent apologist for the policy of the Conservative party, of which he is now a member, gave expression to a similar opinion. I will quote the hon. gentleman's language when speaking to an audience in St. John, in the Union Hall, on the 9th February, 1887. He then said:

"Why, gentlemen, the greatest annexationist power in Canada, during the past twenty years, has been the Conservative party."

I agree with the hon. gentleman. His opinion, I may add, is but the endorsation of that of another great man in this country, a gentleman who, it is no discredit to the hon. member to say, occupies a higher standing than he in the minds of the people—a gentleman who has been eulogized during this debate by members on the Treasury benches, who has been quoted frequently with approval by other hon. gentlemen opposite, and who has been alluded to in terms of praise by Sir Charles Tupper himself. And here I may remark, with reference to the views of hon. gentlemen opposite regarding the great men of the Liberal party, that while they lavish on these men unstinted abuse, so long as they take an active part in politics, no sooner have they retired from the political arena than they become highly honourable, distinguished, and worthy of all commendation. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman to whom I have alluded, Mr. Blake, stated, as his deliberate conclusion, that the policy, the history, and the tendency of the Conservative party was directly towards annexation, and that the evils by which we are surrounded to-day, and which prevent that full development we should enjoy, have been caused by the shackles put upon trade and by the financial difficulties with which the Conservative party, for the last twelve years, has saddled this country. There, Sir, we have the opinion of the great Mr. Blake, as well as of the hon. gentleman, that the policy of the Conservative party has been the greatest annexationist power in the country for the last twenty years. I could not help being amused at the line of argument taken by the hon. gentleman. It was taken in imitation of my esteemed friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), who desired this House to entertain the opinion that all these charges of the High Commissioner against the Liberal party and its leaders of treason and disloyalty were to be taken in a Parliamentary or a Pickwickian sense; that they had no meaning, and that the most they could imply was a tendency to disloyalty, some four or five removes from direct disloyalty, as the hon. gentleman described it. It was, in fact, only treason or disloyalty at four or five removes. But is it not within the cognizance of every member of this House, is it not on record in every speech, address and article of the High Commissioner that he has accused the Liberal party and the Grand Trunk Railway of being concerned in a plot and a conspiracy? That is something very different from a mere political tendency. In almost every utterance, written or spoken by the High Commissioner, he invariably speaks in a most sneering manner of the United States as an alien people, and alludes to those gentlemen of the United States, whose names had been mixed up in this connection, as being agents of that country to undermine the loyalty of the people of these provinces. Although the evidence laid before this House by hon. gentlemen who preceded me has been overwhelming to prove conclusively that the High Commissioner has traduced and vilified a large proportion of the people of this Dominion composing the Liberal party, by charging them with being disloyal and engaged in a plot to break up our institutions and hand us over, bound hand and foot, to the people of the United States, and although no attempt has been made to contradict that array of evidence, I would ask you, Sir, to consider what shadow of evidence there is that should lead us to believe that the Liberal leaders have been engaged in any such plot or conspiracy or have given utterance to any expressions of disloyalty. We have had the Minister of Marine stand here, and in a very able and interesting manner, retail the articles, and letters, and speeches of the High Commissioner on various occasions, and he undertook to show, not that the High Commissioner had not made these charges, but that the charges were true, that the plot existed, that the conspiracy was formed; but I call the attention of the hon. gentlemen on the other side to the fact that there is not one line or syllable under the hand of any leader of the Liberal party to afford the slightest support to any such proposition. We have letters from Mr. Wiman; but what is Mr. Wiman to the Liberal party? We have letters from Mr.

Hitt; but who is Mr. Hitt? Will hon. gentlemen say that letters passing between gentlemen who have no connection whatever with the Liberal party should be held to bind the Liberal party? The propositions are absurd, and would not be listened to for a moment in any trial in a court of law. The question before the House is whether the High Commissioner has degraded the office which he accepted and filled, and should fill to the credit of this country, and with a view to the interests of this country in the mother country. In a recent debate I quoted some of the English journals in relation to this subject. Now, I will quote the opinion of a gentleman whose word ought to be taken as a fair and impartial estimate of the position the High Commissioner placed himself in by his attacks upon the Grand Trunk Railway Company. In his speech at Amherst Sir Charles Tupper made a virulent attack upon the president of that corporation, and referred to the directors of that company and the leaders of the Liberal party as craven creatures, who were prepared to use their influence to carry this country into annexation. An attempt was made to create an outcry in England against the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and a great deal of comfort and encouragement was given to certain hon. gentlemen on this side of the Atlantic because it was found that some members of the Grand Trunk Railway Company were prepared to vote against the re-election of Sir Henry Tyler's directors. It gave great comfort to the Conservatives, because they thought it would show that the action of Sir Henry Tyler was considered to be inimical to British interests. They were also gratified because a delay was had in the election of the directors. The leader of the opposition among the shareholders of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, was a Mr. Baker, who criticized the action of the directors who were in accord with Sir Henry Tyler, and sought to bring about the election of other directors. I am about to give the opinion of Mr. Baker, who was the main opponent to Sir Henry Tyler and his directorate. I will quote from the official report in the *Railway News* of 18th April last:

"Mr. Baker said he regretted that a gentleman holding the high position of High Commissioner for Canada should have so far forgotten the interests of his country and the need for maintaining friendly relations between capitalists on this side and the colonists on the other as to make attacks on the company."

This is not the opinion of an opponent of Sir Charles Tupper or of a man who is backing up Sir Henry Tyler and his management of the Grand Trunk Railway, but it is the opinion of a leading financier and a leading critic of the present management of the Grand Trunk Railway; and his deliberate opinion is that the High Commissioner, in his attacks upon the Grand Trunk Railway Company, had forgotten the interests of his country. Further Mr. Baker says:

"The interests of the Grand Trunk Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Government were, as far as the people of Canada were concerned, of an entirely different character."

Having said so much in regard to what he called "this regrettable incident," he went on to criticize the management of the company. I call the attention of the House to a statement made by Mr. Seargeant, the gentleman who was attacked by Sir Charles Tupper, very recently, to his superiors in London, and I will call the attention of the House to the very remarkable observations which Mr. Seargeant, a man of reputation and character, makes in regard to some of the features of this case, and I would like some of the gentlemen on the other side to give us some comments upon this and some expression of opinion in regard to Mr. Seargeant's statements. Sir Henry Tyler, in a letter to the London *Times*, dated 23rd May, 1891, says:

"Mr. Seargeant informs us, in reference to these attacks (these are the attacks on the Grand Trunk Railway Company by Sir Charles Tupper): 'We have offers of assistance from members of the Tory party, and there certainly is no feeling against us. I get nothing but sympathy. I have not heard any one person defend Sir Charles.'"

He gets nothing but sympathy in the private letters of the Tory party to him; but where does he get any sympathy from the leaders of the Tory party in this House, or the members of the Government in this House, when the character of the management and the men at the head of affairs of the Grand Trunk Railway Company are so bitterly attacked? I will not attempt to enlarge at this late hour upon the subject of loyalty, but I do desire to say, in reply to an observation made by the hon. the Minister of Marine, that there are no more loyal people in the Dominion of Canada to British institutions, to the British Crown, to our form of Government, and to the interests of the people of Nova Scotia and of the Dominion of Canada, than the Liberals of the Province of Nova Scotia; and, although many of these Liberals have been secessionists, or have been called secessionists, although they have voted in favour of a repeal of the Union, I say the reason for the dissatisfaction that existed in the Province of Nova Scotia, the reason that that sore remains unhealed to this day, and will always remain unhealed until every man who was in public life in Nova Scotia in 1866 is laid under the sod, is principally the extraordinary and unwarrantable conduct of the man who is under impeachment to-day. If the people of Nova Scotia had been allowed a free choice as British citizens, as to whether they should enter into this Union or not, after the scheme was laid before them, I have many reasons for believing that they might have accepted some scheme. But I ask any member here, from Ontario or from Quebec, what those great provinces would have done if such a dastardly outrage had been attempted on them as was perpetrated by the Legislature of Nova Scotia in handing over the whole country without asking by your leave or with your leave. Was not that a blow at the ambition, the rights and the feeling of the people, a blow at their British traditions?

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). That is exactly what they did. They did not appeal to the people at all.

Mr. FLINT. The mistake, the political blunder, the crime of the High Commissioner at that time, has borne bitter fruit from that day to this, in the feeling of dissatisfaction and of discontent which has prevailed throughout the province almost from that time until the present, the feeling that they were outraged in their dearest rights by having their constitution swept away against their consent. I will quote an extract from a speech delivered upon the occasion of the passage of those resolutions by an eminent man, since deceased,

whose words, I believe, will be received with respect in this House. Speaking in the debate in the Nova Scotia Legislature, the result of which was the passage of the Confederation resolutions, he said:

"Sir, round me sit the men to whom the constituencies of Nova Scotia entrusted her constitutional rights—her interest and welfare—to whom she for four years bared her neck—is there—can there be one among us who will help to fasten upon her neck this chain prepared by the delegates? No; let us rather keep sacred that trust—let us rather go back to the people, and learn of them at the polls their wishes on this great question, lest, in after years, they have just reason to execrate our memories—lest they pray heaven to strike palsied every hand that fastened a rivet of that chain."

These words are the words of the Hon. Mr. McLellan, Governor of Nova Scotia, who is much lamented. These are words of as true and patriotic a son of Nova Scotia as then stood in the Legislature, and he expressed the feelings of the people of Nova Scotia. The objection was not so much to the Union as to the outrage upon the feelings and national pride of the people by the manner in which the Union was carried. But they had to endure the taunts of disloyalty and treason from the hour they rose up and endeavoured to resist that pressure, just as the Liberal party here to-day have to endure the taunts of disloyalty. The reason they objected to the Union, some of them, was that they believed they had a more close connection with England under their own constitution, and yet their most patriotic feelings were outraged by being taunted with treason and disloyalty on that account. And so it has been with almost every political reform advocated by the members of the Liberal party, from the earliest days of the constitutional history of this country down to the present time. At every election there is said to be an awful crisis, as the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) has said, which calls the High Commissioner from his post in London and gives him some excuse for coming back to engage in an election. He has a perfect right to do so as an individual, provided he resigns the emoluments of his office, and takes the responsibilities which every other public man takes on those occasions. Now, I will call attention to the change which took place in the language of the High Commissioner after he had returned to England. At first he claimed to have plunged into this terrific struggle to save his beloved country from the calamities that would befall her by her absorption into the American Union. He then denied that there was any annexation sentiment in the country worthy of consideration. The hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Gillies) was kind enough to compare the action of the High Commissioner to that, I believe, of the Roman hero who leaped his horse into the ditch in order to save his beloved city at a great crisis; and he proceeded, after this indication of his opinion of the overwhelming character of the crisis the country had passed through, to eulogize at great length the hero of his song, the present High Commissioner for Canada. As he was proceeding with his eulogy I could not help thinking how disadvantageous it might be to him should any members on this side take the trouble to answer them in a manner in which they could be answered if one chose to descend to personal vituperation. There is a notion that when a prisoner pleads his character as a defence in a charge of crime, it is a strong indication that he has no other defence to make, that the evidence is against him, and as a last resort he pleads that his character is good. But in reply his character may be shown up. So the character and eminent service of the High Commissioner are placed before us as a mitigation, as an answer to the serious political crime with which he has been charged by the resolution before the House. I am not going either to belittle the praise heaped upon the High Commissioner, or to rake up from the distant past charges that could be raked up and levelled at the head of the High Commissioner. But I desire to place on record as my deliberate opinion, in opposition to that of the member for Richmond, that although the High Commissioner has done some service to some interests in this country by his great energy, yet it is the deliberate opinion of a large majority, of the Liberal party of this country at all events, that the influence of the High Commissioner upon Canadian politics has been distinctly detrimental and degrading to the best public interests of this country. Throughout this very discussion that has taken place with Sir Henry Tyler before the people of the mother country, where public men are held most strictly to the truth of their statements, do we not find that the High Commissioner is distinctly charged with a series of deliberate falsehoods and misrepresentations, and that he has failed in every one of his communications to withdraw himself from the painful and embarrassing position in which these charges have placed him? Is this a proper position for the High Commissioner for Canada to assume before the people of England, where he is pilloried in the press of that country as a falsifier of facts, as one who states that which is not true, and which is not susceptible of proof? I would call attention to some of these statements made in the columns of the London *Times*, as well as some of the comments that have been made upon them by papers of great influence in the other country. I disagree entirely with the statement made by the hon. member for St. John, that the papers which attack the High Commissioner are papers of no influence or position. There are no financial journals in England the editorial expressions of which are more deeply weighed by men whose financial interests are dependent upon public opinion, than the *Economist* and the *Railway News*. I would say that in the editorial columns of these papers before the full discussion developed, I find a distinct support of the position assumed by the Conservative party in this country, until it was exposed by the able and trenchant letters of Sir Henry Tyler. The first charge the High Commissioner makes against the Grand Trunk Railway Company, after the general charge that the Liberal party have entered into this mythical conspiracy which has no existence except in the diseased brain of that gentleman himself, is that the Grand Trunk Railway Company had issued a circular to its employés commanding them to support the Opposition to the Government of this country. This they denied, and no proof whatever of the charge has been offered. Another statement made by the High Commissioner is that Mr. Seargeant, the manager of the Grand Trunk in Montreal, had issued a manifesto, and he desired this to be recalled. The manifesto turns out to be a myth, and the whole of his argument falls completely to the ground. He also stated that the interview in which this matter was brought forward

was sought by the Manager of the Grand Trunk, that that gentleman was placed in the position of asking an interview with the High Commissioner with a view to securing his influence and support by an offer of support from the Grand Trunk Company. But it transpired that the interview was sought by the High Commissioner himself from the Manager of the Grand Trunk through a mutual friend, and an interview was thus brought about. It is very much like the position assumed by the High Commissioner in another matter, which will probably be brought before the House in a few weeks, in which the Government stated that the interview was sought by the representatives of the United States Government, and we find this distinctly denied by the Premier of that Government, and practically admitted by the High Commissioner himself. Statement after statement of the High Commissioner in this correspondence have been completely disproved. Among others was the statement that the Government of the country had offered the presidency of the Canadian Pacific Railway to Sir Henry Tyler if he would undertake the construction of that road. Judging by the opinions of English journals in regard to the High Commissioner, it appears, if those opinions are the opinions of impartial men in the old country, the interests of Canada must have suffered. I find the *Railway News* of 4th April, a paper which had taken some stock in the allegations of the High Commissioner in regard to the disloyalty of a large number of the people of this country, assumed, and almost to the present hour assumes, that this country had a narrow escape at the recent election from being carried bodily into the American Union. It is very painful to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to read the calm utterances of the British journals on this subject, and to find that the whole public mind of the mother country has been poisoned by the vilifications and by the falsehoods of the High Commissioner. I do not wish to use strong language, but as regards these statements I desire in my place, and on my responsibility as a member of this House, to brand all assaults on the loyalty of the Liberals as false. I say the man who, professing to have the interests of this country at heart, would—after the disclaimer made, and the proof offered in the House and before the people—repeat the falsehood, is baser than he who invented the falsehood in the first place. The *Railway News* of 4th April, says:

"As our readers are aware Sir Charles Tupper has in some election speeches indulged in very vituperative observations respecting the Grand Trunk, charging that its extravagance, corruption and jobbery had inflicted a serious blow on the reputation of Canada."

Hon. gentlemen will remember that Sir Charles Tupper, in his phillipic, stated, among other things, that the corruption, extravagance and jobbery of the management of the Grand Trunk had inflicted a serious blow to Canadian interests and on the shareholders of the company. When Sir Henry Tyler, like a true-hearted gentleman that he is, anxious for his reputation in the financial world, and as manager of a great corporation, demanded a scintilla of proof of such outrageous statements, how did the High Commissioner meet him? He told Sir Henry Tyler that he alluded to the original construction of the road forty years ago. Is that a worthy and dignified position for the High Commissioner of Canada to take in a controversy, when he charged the manager of a great corporation with extravagance, corruption and jobbery. to crawl out of the hole by stating that he alluded to the transactions of men who had been dead for the last quarter of a century? The *Railway News* of 11th April says:

"Sir Charles denies that he went 'cap in hand' to the general manager of the Grand Trunk to ask him to withdraw a manifesto which he asserted had been issued to the employés of the Grand Trunk to vote against the Government at the recent election.

"It appears from the rejoinder of Sir Henry Tyler that the meeting was arranged by a trusty friend and supporter of the Government—Mr. Hector Cameron—who stated that 'Sir Charles would esteem it a favour if Mr. Seargeant would meet him.'

This leads me to notice, and I think the idea must have passed through the minds of many hon. gentlemen in reading this correspondence, the very superior air the High Commissioner for Canada assumed in the language he used to the Manager of the Grand Trunk, and in the whole of his dealings with that company. What authority had he to threaten the Grand Trunk, or to state what the Government would or would not do in regard to that company if it acted with the wishes of the Government or disregarded them? Has the Government placed in the hands of the High Commissioner the right to say that Government influence would be used or would not be used to extend the power, authority and influence of the Grand Trunk Railway? Has it come to this, that even if the Grand Trunk Railway saw fit, which we deny, and of which there is no evidence, to use its legitimate influence on one side or other of the political questions of the day, the Government have a right to say that it shall be prevented from extending and increasing its power and influence? Or do the Government hold out the promise to those corporations which will exercise their influence in favour of the Government that they may obtain increased power, patronage and influence throughout the country? I must say that circumstances connected with the late election would almost lead us to suppose that promises had been given in some quarters that increased power, patronage and influence would be placed at the disposal of those corporations which would give their power and influence to support the Government at the late elections. Continuing the *News* says:

"Because they would not vote as desired the Grand Trunk proprietors are denounced by the High Commissioner in England, who should represent no particular party, as 'craven creatures who had embraced the first opportunity to spring at the throat of the Government and endeavoured to choke it in the interests of an alien people.'"

The same paper in another article says:

"Sir Charles Tupper, however, thinks that his Government have a right to the support *en bloc* of the employés of the company, and that it is the duty of the officials to direct them in what manner they should exercise the privileges of the franchise. Because they would not vote as desired, the Grand Trunk proprietors are denounced by the Canadian High Commissioner in England, who should represent no particular party, as 'craven creatures who had embraced the first opportunity to spring at the throat of the Government and endeavoured to choke it in the interests of an alien people.' Mark the consequences! 'The Government would, he said, fail in their duty if they permitted this great corporation to obtain increased power, influence and importance in the country.' Fancy, if you can, a Minister of the Crown in this old-fashioned, but still free country, asserting that because the London and North Western Railway directors had refused to direct their employés to support his party at a political election,

the Government would neglect its duty if it permitted 'that great corporation to obtain increased power, influence and importance in the country.' * * *

"The hon. gentleman in his official position as High Commissioner of Canada will, of course, feel it his duty to take some opportunity of explaining to the representatives of 23,000 British shareholders the 'reason why' he felt himself justified in designating them as 'craven creatures' who had 'sprung at the throat' of his Government to choke it in 'the interests of an alien people.'"

The same paper of 18th April remarks:

"The interests of the meeting (of G.T.R. shareholders) on Tuesday, mainly centered, however, in the complete answer which, in fulfilment of the promise given in the official report, Sir Henry Tyler gave to the unfounded and insolent charges which Sir Charles Tupper made against the company and its management." * * * *

When a paper of this kind, having great weight and influence in the mother country, states that the charges of the High Commissioner were unfounded and insolent, can we imagine that his influence in London would be as efficient in the interest of this country as it would be if no such assertion was made by a journal of that character. I will pass over the details of the negotiations with Mr. Seargeant of the Grand Trunk Railway, and I will come to a matter which shows how delicate the interests of these shareholders in England are. It was expected that the letter of Sir Charles Tupper, together with his speech in Amherst, would have such an influence on the stock of the Grand Trunk Railway that at the annual meeting they would change the whole directorate, including the president, Sir Henry Tyler. At the first meeting the hour had passed before there was an opportunity of taking a poll of the shareholders, and the gentleman who I have quoted, Mr. Baker, moved that the poll be taken on the following Thursday. We are informed by the London *Economist* that this slight circumstance, and the fact that the directors were not at once re-elected, reduced the price of the Grand Trunk Railway shares in the London market from one to three per cent., representing a total loss to the shareholders of something like half a million pounds sterling. That proves that in transactions of this kind the British people are accustomed, in listening to the utterances of eminent public men occupying high positions, to accept them at their word, and taking Sir Charles Tupper at his word, his charges having been made known, the market fell at once, on account of the danger that the directorate of the company might be changed in consequence of a partial belief in the truth of these charges. A reference to the attack made by Sir Charles Tupper upon the credit of the Province of Quebec has been ably brought before the House by the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier). Was there ever in the annals of the whole history of Canada so outrageous a misuse of the public position of a man in a high place in the mother country as to decry the credit of a whole province? It was well known that the Premier of Quebec was at that very time preparing to negotiate a loan upon the European markets for a very large amount, in order to consolidate the debt of the Province of Quebec at a lower rate, so that a large amount of money paid in interest might be devoted to other public purposes; yet on the very eve of these delicate negotiations in the financial markets the High Commissioner for Canada launches the most untruthful and most damaging representations in regard to the credit of the Province of Quebec that have ever been made in the history of this country. He stated that the Premier of Quebec was borrowing money at an exorbitant rate of interest from day to day in the banks of his own city, to carry on his Government. He said that the Government had attempted to pass through the Legislature a measure repudiating the public debt of the Province of Quebec, and, as my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson) stated, had his statement been believed by the financiers of the leading capitals of the world, where the Premier of Quebec was about to float his loan, the credit of the Province of Quebec and the credit of the Dominion of Canada would have been to a large extent irretrievably ruined. But, Sir, the reputation of the High Commissioner must have preceded him. We know that his charges against the Liberal party met with no response in this country and nine-tenths of all his observations were received only with a sneer by the people of Canada. His reputation for strong language was too well known on this side of the Atlantic, where everything that he may state in his public and official capacity is discounted at from sixty to seventy-five per cent. But on the other side of the Atlantic we feared it might be different, but we now find that during his short career as High Commissioner for Canada he has been found out not only by the people of the mother country but by the people of the United States as well. If this Dominion desires to preserve its credit and integrity, if this Government desires to uphold the true principles of constitutional Government in this country, they will remove Sir Charles Tupper from the anomalous position which he holds. He is neither a member of the civil service, nor a member of the Cabinet, nor a representative of the people, but he seems to be above and beyond the Government, and above and beyond the people, an official vilifier as has been stated by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the "chartered calumniator" of the people of this country. I say that the Liberal party of this country, whether they succeed or fail in the result of the vote on this resolution have only done themselves justice by placing upon the record their strongest repudiation, not only of the utterances of the man but of the responsibility which the Government has assumed by retaining him in that position after the statements he has made before the people of Great Britain and before the people of this country as well as of his conduct in discharging the duties of his office.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, as no member from the Province of Quebec has, as yet, expressed any opinion on the important motion of the hon. leader of the Opposition now before the House, I will take the liberty of offering a few remarks. If they are to judge from the vigour with which the hon. members on the left side of the House attack the course taken by the High Commissioner at London during the last campaign, the public will conclude that the blows dealt to the Opposition by the High Commissioner during that campaign have greatly injured the popularity of the Liberal party. I am astonished, and the people will be astonished with me, at finding the Liberal party and its leader so thin-skinned when accusations of disloyalty are brought against them. I ought rather not to be astonished at all at the Opposition being so tender-skinned, indeed, four

consecutive defeats such as they have met with are enough to make sore the skin of any political men no matter to what party they may belong. The hon. leader of the Opposition complained with bitterness of the words uttered by Sir Charles Tupper about him and his party. But, Mr. Speaker, four years ago the hon. leader of the Opposition—I should say first that I have no mission for defending the loyalty of the Tory party; this party contains men quite able to do so—four years ago, I say, the hon. leader of the Opposition was himself accusing his opponents of disloyalty, and every one knows, the friends of the hon. leader of the Opposition know, that words from his mouth have a great importance, not only in this House and in this country, but also in the neighbouring country and in the mother country itself. Here are the words spoken about his opponents by the hon. leader of the Opposition. Referring on that occasion to the policy of protection adopted by the Conservative party, and to the loyalty of the Conservatives of Ontario, this is what he said—I am quoting from page 179 of the Debates of 1886, vol. I:

"And if we continue the story even down to the days since this Government has been in power, we find that when they introduced the National Policy, and it was objected that that policy was unfair and ungenerous to England, and that it might possibly endanger British connection, the cool Tory answer was: 'So much the worse for British connection.' Sir, this is Tory loyalty. Ready they are to-day to sacrifice British connection, if British connection stands between them and their selfishness; ready they are to sacrifice British connection if it stands between them and their enjoyment of power; ready they are to sacrifice British connection for mere sordid greed."

Could more direct and more insulting accusation be cast in this House against a great party representative of the country's majority? For the hon. member made slight difference between the Ontario Conservatives and those of his own province. But, Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader of the Opposition and his political friends seem to have in the matter of loyalty two weights and two measures, just as for the other political questions. This is not all. We have seen, during the last federal elections, the hon. leader of the Opposition only too willing to accept the help of public officers, of salaried Government officers.

Mr. DELISLE. (Translation.) What Government?

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) The Local Government. The officers of the Local Government are paid salaries from public funds just as much as is Sir Charles Tupper for his mission in England. Let us see, if you please, Mr. Speaker, what was done by a public officer during the last federal election. It was in the County of Kamouraska. The Government candidate was a Mr. Chapais, a young man of talent, and the Opposition candidate, who is now a member of this House for that county, had the energetic support of Hon. Mr. Gagnon, now sheriff of Quebec, who took an active part in the campaign, a violent part even, to secure the success of the candidate of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. And yet, when Hon. Mr. Gagnon was in the Legislative Assembly—if I had about me the Debates of Quebec, I could quote the words of this gentleman—he was holding then that a public officer must not mingle with politics, must not take part in election struggles. No, Mr. Speaker, it is a rare thing not to find the Liberal leaders and their friends in contradiction with themselves when they go to making such grand declarations of principles as are found in the resolution now before the House. One would think it is an unpardonable offence on the part of the Conservative party to denounce the conduct of the Grand Trunk Company, when we think, and when our public men think, that the company favours a policy contrary to the interest of this country and of the Empire. It is an offence for us. But if such is an offence for us, I will remark to the hon. leader of the Opposition, that his political ancestors must have been guilty of a mortal sin when they endeavoured to smother the Grand Trunk in its infancy. Mr. Speaker, the political ancestors of the hon. leader of the Opposition would not own him as one of their successors, if they could witness the policy which he follows to-day, so different is it from that followed by them when they were leading the Liberal party. The Opposition was violent, when at the outset of the company, the Conservative party was granting subsidies to the Grand Trunk, in order to ensure the success of that enterprise. It was the first railway being built in the country, and the Conservative Government wanted to ensure the success of the undertaking. Upon that success was to depend the future of railway enterprise in this country. Well, the Liberal party fought those subsidies which the Conservative party was granting the Grand Trunk Company to make sure its success. At that time the Liberal party learned the business of smotherers of public undertakings. Later on, when the company had acquired sufficient strength to do without public and governmental help, the Government of the Province of Quebec, as does the present Federal Government, thought it its duty to foster railway enterprise. What was the opposition which the new companies met with on the European markets when the question came of finding money necessary to secure the building of the new railways? They met with the opposition of this spoiled child of our country, the Grand Trunk Company, which burked the loans of the North Shore Railway Company and of the Northern Colonization Railway Company, when these enterprises were undertaken. The consequence was that, in order to secure the construction of these two first links of the great Pacific Railway, the Quebec Government was then forced to undertake it itself. At that time the Grand Trunk tried to smother these new-born companies, and in this they obtained the aid of the Liberal party, which had learned the business of smotherers of railway undertakings at the time it practised it on the Grand Trunk Company itself. To-day, Mr. Speaker, in the mind of the public men who compose the Conservative party, the Grand Trunk weds its interests to the political interests of the hon. leader of the Opposition in order to dominate the railway interest in the country, and to try even to dominate the very Government of the Dominion. Sir Charles Tupper, the High Commissioner at London, protested against such a course, against such a policy. I have just heard one of my hon. colleagues on the right state that the Grand Trunk had taken no hostile position in his constituency. That may be, but one thing is certain, this company has taken a very active part at the last elections in the district which I have the honour to represent. The Grand Trunk Company sent letters to each of its employés, to each of its officers, with instructions to vote for the candidates of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition.

But, Mr. Speaker, I do not complain of that in any way. If the Grand Trunk Company thought it was to its interest that the policy of the Opposition should prevail, I find no fault with its being hostile to me. It was its right to be so. But in the name of what right does the hon. leader of the Opposition want to arraign or impeach the High Commissioner because he does not agree with him, because he opposed the Grand Trunk Company, which does not share his political opinions. As I was saying before, the hon. leader of the Opposition has been sore by four consecutive defeats. Seeing the hon. leader of the Opposition at work, one would think that he is always changing his programme, modifying it constantly. One would think that at this late hour, at this stage of the session, the hon. leader of the Opposition felt that he had another little addition to make to it. All my hon. colleagues in this House know that the first programme of the hon. leader of the Opposition and of his friends was a revenue tariff. Then, if I am not mistaken, it was free trade; then again, commercial union; later on, unrestricted reciprocity, and lastly, continental reciprocity. Now, he has thought that by the heroic resolution before the House, he would put a little appendix to his programme, by asking the chief of the Conservative party, in order to ensure victory to his political friends and to himself, to fold his arms when his troops are going to the front, so that he may the more easily conquer. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Public Works has been asked at the beginning of this session, to be good enough to give up his portfolio on account of accusations formulated against him, accusations which have not yet been proven, and which, I hope, never will be. A little later on, the hon. leader of the Opposition comes down with a resolution which he submits to this House, and by which he would like to have it settled that another chief of the Conservative party, who dealt hard blows to the Liberal party during the last campaign, should not take part any more in elections, so that victory might be easier for him. It is Sir Charles Tupper whom he now wants to see out of the political field. I admit that if he does want victory to be easy, he does well to try and remove from the field the chiefs of the party which defeated his own four times in succession. Perhaps he might thus secure for himself success in a fifth campaign. But I doubt if the chiefs of the Conservative party will consent thus to drop out. So, Mr. Speaker, Sir Charles Tupper stands accused of the crime or of the offence which his traducers have themselves committed. Here is a party so lacking in liberality as to want to prevent the chiefs of the Conservative party from joining in the election campaigns. I am not, as my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition is, an authority on constitutional matters, but we have heard the hon. members from the right, who are constitutional authorities, state that Sir Charles Tupper had a right to take part in the last election, because he is not a civil servant in the ordinary sense of the word. Sir Charles Tupper is an agent in London, who is responsible for the policy of the Government, and it is certain that his duties shall cease as my hon. friend comes to power. I believe it will not be soon; but, nevertheless, his duties shall come to an end as soon as the leader of the Opposition passes to the other side of the House. Sir Charles Tupper is a political man, who occupies too large a place in his country to make it possible for the hon. leader of the Opposition and his friends to seriously contend that this citizen has no right to take part in elections. Not only should Sir Charles Tupper answer the summons he had received, but I sincerely believe that if he had not done so he would have degraded himself in the eyes of his party. Sir Charles has rendered immense services to his country; his name is to a certain extent identified, as well as those of his colleagues, with our public enterprises, and especially with the great Pacific Railway, the wonderfully rapid construction of which he has secured by favouring the company entrusted with the carrying out of that great work. Under the circumstances, as a member from the Province of Quebec, my hon. friend knows more than anyone else what our province owes to Sir Charles Tupper. He knows that when he was Minister of Railways, Sir Charles Tupper did not hesitate a moment to indemnify the Province of Quebec for the enormous expense it had incurred to build a part of the Pacific. His speeches in the House remain to show under what circumstances he came to the rescue of our province; and they show that he treated her loyally, as indeed she could expect to be treated by a man gifted as this man is. The services rendered by Sir Charles Tupper in England—it has been superabundantly proven, and it has been admitted even by the hon. members of the left—are so considerable that it is almost an act of ingratitude on the part of public men of this country to attempt to censure the conduct of this statesman. These services are such that the hon. members who usually support the policy of the hon. leader of the Opposition, will not consent, at least those from the Province of Quebec, to commit such an act of ingratitude. The Liberal members from the Province of Quebec, judging the question on its merits with the spirit of justice and independence which should govern us in all things, will refuse to give their support to the motion of the hon. leader of the Opposition. I have shown that on many occasions this hon. gentleman has himself formulated against his opponents the accusations which he contends have been uttered against his party by Sir Charles Tupper. These facts being known by his colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that they can hesitate to say that my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition preaches, while in the Opposition, a doctrine which he could not practice were he on the ministerial benches.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Laurier:

That all the words after the word "That" be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof:—The conduct and language of Sir Charles Tupper, High Commissioner of Canada in England, in interfering in the recent elections and in imputing treasonable and disloyal motives to a large proportion of the people of this Dominion, and also in assailing and vilifying the managers of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and in reflecting upon the position of the said company, is a breach of the duties of the office which he fills, and is calculated to destroy the efficiency of the said office, and to injure the credit of the Dominion, besides damaging a very important corporation whose shareholders have invested large sums of money in the work of extending and promoting the railway system of Canada.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Guay.
Allison,	Hargraft,
Armstrong,	Harwood,
Bain,	Innes,

Beausoleil,	Landerkin,
Béchard,	Langelier,
Beith,	Laurier,
Bernier.	Lavergne,
Borden,	Leduc,
Bourassa,	Legris,
Bowers,	Lister,
Bowman,	Macdonald (Huron),
Brodeur,	McGregor,
Brown (Chateauguay),	McMillan,
Brown (Monck),	Mignault,
Burdett,	Mills (Bothwell),
Cameron (Huron),	Monet.
Campbell,	Mousseau,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Murray,
Casey,	Paterson (Brant),
Choquette,	Perry,
Christie,	Préfontaine,
Colter,	Proulx,
Davidson,	Rider.
Davies,	Rinfret,
Dawson,	Rowand,
Delisle,	Sanborn,
Devlin.	Scriver,
Edwards,	Semple,
Fauvel,	Simard,
Flint,	Somerville,
Forbes,	Spohn,
Fraser,	Sutherland,
Gauthier,	Trow,
Geoffrion,	Truax.
German,	Vaillancourt,
Gib on.	Watson,
Gillmor,	Welsh,
Godbout,	Yeo.—79.
Grieve,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Adams,	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Baker,	LaRivière,
Barnard,	Léger,
Bergeron,	Lépine,
Bergin,	Lippé,
Bowell,	Macdonald (King's),
Burnham,	Macdonell (Algoma),
Burns,	Mackintosh,
Cameron (Inverness),	McAllister,
Carignan,	McCarthy,
Carpenter,	McDonald (Victoria),
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McDougald (Pictou),
Chapleau,	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Cleveland,	McGreevy,
Cochrane,	McKay,
Cockburn,	McLean,
Corbould,	McLennan,
Corby,	McLeod,
Costigan,	McNeill,
Curran,	Madill,
Daly,	Mara,
Daoust,	Masson,
Davin,	Miller,
Davis,	Mills (Annapolis),
Denison,	Moncrieff,
Desaulniers,	Montague,
Desjardins (L'Islet),	Patterson (Colchester),
Dickey,	Pope,
Dugas,	Putnam,
Dupont,	Reid,
Dyer,	Robillard,
Earle,	Roome,
Fairbairn,	Ross (Dundas),
Ferguson (Leeds and Gren.),	Ross (Lisgar).
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Sproule,
Foster,	Stairs,
Fréchette,	Tarte,
Gillies,	Taylor,
Girouard,	Temple,
Gordon,	Thompson (Sir John),
Haggart,	Tisdale,
Hazen,	Tupper,
Henderson,	Tyrwhitt,
Hodgins,	Wallace,
Hutchins,	Weldon,
Jamieson,	White (Cardwell),
Joncas,	White (Shelburne),
Kaulbach,	Wilmot,
Kenny,	Wood (Brockville),
Kirkpatrick,	Wood (Westmoreland).—100.

PAIRS:

Messieurs.

O'Brien,	Barron,
Skinner,	King.
Ives,	Frémont,
Desjardins (Hochelaga),	Amyot,
Curran.	Devlin.
Macdowall,	Charlton,
Coatsworth,	Featherston,
McKeen,	Livingston,
Macdonald (Sir John A.)	Mackenzie,
Dewdney,	Mulock.
Prior,	Hyman,
Ryckman,	McMullen,
Stevenson,	Edgar.

Amendment negatived, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Kingston Penitentiary..... $148,583.64

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I note a remark here with regard to the allowance to the Rev. J. S. Quinn: "Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Penitentiary Act." What is the meaning of that?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. By the statute relating to penitentiaries all new officers begin at a minimum and go gradually up to a maximum. The meaning of this note is that chaplains should be made an exception to that rule, inasmuch as their qualifications are the same when they enter the office as they are after a lapse of time in the office.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I note that the total receipts from the farm are put down at $153.40. Is that the total value of the produce of the farm?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No. It only represents the sales actually made; it does not represent the articles consumed.

Committee rose and reported resolution.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It was understood, I believe, that the hon. Minister of Finance would proceed on Tuesday with the Budget speech, but there are painful circumstances which I need not allude to further that will make that a very doubtful matter. I would like to know, however, what conclusion the Government have come to on that point.

Mr. FOSTER. It will depend entirely on the turn events take. If by any possibility no more unfortunate event occurs, I shall be prepared to go on with my Budget on Tuesday. But the House of course knows the condition of affairs at the present time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Ministers have no information, I suppose, to give us on that matter just now.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No. The last information I had was that Sir John Macdonald was very, very low.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1.30 a.m. (Saturday.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 8th June, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

DEATH OF SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Mr. SPEAKER. I desire to inform the House that, in view of the fact that the right hon. leader of this House died so late on Saturday night, it was impossible for me to communicate with hon. members earlier than the present, I thought it was only a fitting tribute to one who had occupied so prominent a position both in Parliament and in the councils of the country for so long a time, that we should exhibit some signs of mourning in this House to-day, and I took the responsibility of ordering that the symbols of mourning which are shown here to-day should be put up this morning. I venture to express the hope that hon. members on both sides, irrespective altogether of politics, will sustain me in the action I have taken.

Hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, having to announce to the House the sad event that has been known for two days now, I was afraid I could not trust to my memory, and I, therefore, thought it desirable to place in writing what I wished to say. Accordingly, I will now read the observations I desire to offer. Mr. Speaker, as the oldest Privy Councillor it falls to my lot to announce to the House that our dear old chief, the First Minister of Canada, is no more. After a painful illness of two weeks, death put an end to his earthly career on Saturday evening last. To tell you, Mr. Speaker, my feelings under the circumstances is more than I can do. I feel that by the death of Sir John A. Macdonald, Canada has lost its greatest statesman, a great patriot, a man of whom any country in the world would be justly proud. Her Gracious Majesty the Queen never had a more devoted and loyal subject than the grand old man, whose loss we all deplore and regret from the bottom of our hearts. For nearly fifty years he has directed the public affairs of this country. He was among the Fathers of Confederation the most prominent and distinguished. He put his whole soul into that great undertaking, knowing full well that the confederation of all the British North American Provinces would give to our people a country and institutions to be glorious of, and to the Empire not only a right arm, but a great and safe highway to her Indian and other possessions. He told me more than once how grateful he was to the people of Canada to have allowed him to have consolidated that great work. The fact is, his love for Canada was equal to that he had for his own mother country. Mr. Speaker, when the historians of Canada write the history of the last fifty years, they will have to write the life of Sir John A. Macdonald, and, in writing his life, they may not agree with all his public acts, but they cannot fail to say that he was a great man, a most distinguished statesman, and that his whole life was spent in the service of his country, dying in the midst of his official duty, not having had a day's rest before he passed to a better world. I need not express, Mr. Speaker, my own personal feelings. Having spent half of my life with him as his follower and as his friend, his departure is the same as if I lost half of my existence. I remember how devoted he was, not only to the old Province of Canada, but how chivalrous he showed himself to the Province of Quebec, and specially to my French Canadian countrymen. He had only a word to say, and instead of being at the head of a small band of seventeen Upper Canada members, he would have had all the representatives of his province behind him. But, as he told me several times, he preferred to be just to his French compatriots and allies, and the result was that when Confederation came, the Province of Quebec had confidence in him, and on his death-bed our great chief could see that his just policy has secured peace and happiness to all. Mr. Speaker, I would have wished to continue to speak of our dear departed friend, and spoken to you about his goodness of heart, the witness of which I have been so often, but I feel that I must stop; my heart is full of tears. I cannot proceed further. I move:

That, in the opinion of this House, the mortal remains of the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, G.C.B., should be publicly interred, and that this House will concur in giving to the ceremony a fitting degree of solemnity and importance.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I fully realize the emotion which chokes the hon. gentleman. His silence, under the circumstances, is far more eloquent than any human language could be. I fully appreciate the intensity of the grief which fills the souls of all those who were the friends and followers of Sir John Macdonald, at the loss of the great leader whose whole life has been so closely identified with their party; a party upon which he has thrown such brilliancy and lustre. We on this side of the House who were his opponents, who did not believe in his policy, nor in his methods of government; we take our full share of their grief—for the loss which they deplore to-day is far and away beyond and above the ordinary compass of party range. It is in every respect a great national loss, for he who is no more was, in many respects, Canada's most illustrious son, and in every sense Canada's foremost citizen and statesman. At the period of life to which Sir John Macdonald had arrived, death, whenever it comes, cannot be said to come unexpected. Some few months ago, during the turmoil of the late election, when the country was made aware that on a certain day the physical strength of the veteran Premier had not been equal to his courage, and that his intense labour for the time being had prostrated his singularly wiry frame, everybody, with the exception, perhaps, of his buoyant self, was painfully anxious lest perhaps the angel of death had touched him with his wing. When, a few days ago in the heat of an angry discussion the news spread in this House, that of a sudden his condition had become alarming, the surging waves of angry discussion were at once hushed, and every one, friend and foe, realized that this time for a certainty the angel of death had appeared and had crossed the threshold of his home. Thus we were not taken by surprise, and although we were prepared for the sad event, yet it is almost impossible to convince the unwilling mind, that it is true, that Sir John Macdonald is no more, that the chair which we now see vacant shall remain forever vacant; that the face so familiar in this Parliament for the last forty years shall be seen no more, and that the

voice so well known shall be heard no more, whether in solemn debate or in pleasant and mirthful tones. In fact, the place of Sir John Macdonald in this country was so large and so absorbing, that it is almost impossible to conceive that the political life of this country, the fate of this country, can continue without him. His loss overwhelms us. For my part, I say with all truth, his loss overwhelms me, and it also overwhelms this Parliament, as if indeed one of the institutions of the land had given way. Sir John Macdonald now belongs to the ages, and it can be said with certainty, that the career which has just been closed is one of the most remarkable careers of this century. It would be premature at this time to attempt to fix or anticipate what will be the final judgment of history upon him; but there were in his career and in his life, features so prominent and so conspicuous that already they shine with a glow which time cannot alter, which even now appear before the eye such as they will appear to the end in history. I think it can be asserted that for the supreme art of governing men, Sir John Macdonald was gifted as few men in any land or in any age were gifted; gifted with the most high of all qualities, qualities which would have made him famous wherever exercised and which would have shone all the more conspicuously the larger the theatre. The fact that he could congregate together elements the most heterogeneous and blend them into one compact party, and to the end of his life keep them steadily under his hand, is perhaps altogether unprecedented. The fact that during all those years he retained unimpaired not only the confidence, but the devotion—the ardent devotion and affection of his party, is evidence that beside those higher qualities of statesmanship to which we were the daily witnesses, he was also endowed with those inner, subtile, undefinable graces of soul which win and keep the hearts of men. As to his statesmanship, it is written in the history of Canada. It may be said without any exaggeration whatever, that the life of Sir John Macdonald, from the date he entered Parliament, is the history of Canada, for he was connected and associated with all the events, all the facts which brought Canada from the position Canada then occupied—the position of two small provinces, having nothing in common but a common allegiance, united by a bond of paper, and united by nothing else—to the present state of development which Canada has reached. Although my political views compel me to say that, in my judgment, his actions were not always the best that could have been taken in the interest of Canada, although my conscience compels me to say that of late he has imputed to his opponents motives as to which I must say in my heart he has misconceived, yet I am only too glad here to sink these differences, and to remember only the great services he has performed for our country—to remember that his actions always displayed great originality of views, unbounded fertility of resources, a high level of intellectual conceptions, and, above all, a far-reaching vision beyond the event of the day, and still higher, permeating the whole, a broad patriotism—a devotion to Canada's welfare, Canada's advancement, and Canada's glory. The life of a statesman is always an arduous one, and very often it is an ungrateful one. More often than otherwise his actions do not mature until he is in his grave. Not so, however, in the case of Sir John Macdonald. His career has been a singularly fortunate one. His reverses were few and of short duration. He was fond of power, and, in my judgment, if I may say so, that may be the turning point of the judgment of history. He was fond of power, and he never made any secret of it. Many times we have heard him avow it on the floor of this Parliament, and his ambition in this respect was gratified as, perhaps, no other man's ambition ever was. In my judgment, even the career of William Pitt can hardly compare with that of Sir John Macdonald in this respect; for although William Pitt, moving in a higher sphere, had to deal with problems greater than our problems, yet I doubt if in the intricate management of a party William Pitt had to contend with difficulties equal to those that Sir John Macdonald had to contend with. In his death, too, he seems to have been singularly happy. Twenty years ago I was told by one who at that time was a close personal and political friend of Sir John Macdonald, that in the intimacy of his domestic circle he was fond of repeating that his end would be as the end of Lord Chatham—that he would be carried away from the floor of Parliament to die. How true that vision into the future was we now know, for we saw him to the last, with enfeebled health and declining strength, struggling on the floor of Parliament until the hand of fate pinned him to his bed to die. And thus to die with his armour on was probably his ambition. Sir, death is the law—the supreme law. Although we see it every day in every form, although session after session we have seen it in this Parliament striking right and left without any discrimination as to age or station, yet the ever-recurring spectacle does not in any way remove the bitterness of the sting. Death always carries with it an incredible sense of pain; but the one thing sad in death is that which is involved in the word separation—separation from all we love in life. This is what makes death so poignant when it strikes a man of intellect in middle age. But when death is the natural termination of a full life, in which he who disappears has given the full measure of his capacity, has performed everything required from him, and more, the sadness of death is not for him who goes, but for those who loved him and remain. In this sense I am sure the Canadian people will extend unbounded sympathy to the friends of Sir John Macdonald—to his sorrowing children, and, above all, to the brave and noble woman, his companion in life and his chief helpmate. Thus, Mr. Speaker, one after another we see those who have been instrumental in bringing Canada to its present stage of development, removed from amongst us. To-day, we deplore the loss of him who, we all unite in saying, was the foremost Canadian of his time, and who filled the largest place in Canadian history. Only last week, was buried in the city of Montreal, another son of Canada, one who at one time had been a tower of strength to the Liberal party, one who will ever be remembered as one of the noblest, purest, and greatest characters that Canada has ever produced, Sir Antoine Aimé Dorion. Sir Antoine Aimé Dorion had not been in favour of Confederation. Not that he was opposed to the principle; but he believed that the Union of these provinces, at that day, was premature. When, however, Confederation had become a fact, he gave the best of his mind and heart to make it a success.

It may indeed happen, Sir, that when the Canadian people see the ranks thus gradually reduced and thinned of those upon whom they have been in the habit of relying for guidance, that a feeling of apprehension will creep into the heart lest, perhaps, the institutions of Canada may be imperilled. Before the grave of him who, above all, was the father of Confederation, let not grief be barren grief; but let grief be coupled with the resolution, the determination that the work in which Liberals and Conservatives, in which Brown and Macdonald united, shall not perish, but that though United Canada may be deprived of the services of her greatest men, still Canada shall and will live. I agree to the motion.

Mr. DAVIN. I think, Sir, it would be unbecoming, if I may venture to say so, that I should remain silent on this occasion, and that no expression should be given of the way the North-West feels at this supreme hour. For myself it would be hard not to express a sense of grief at such a time as this, because it so happens that for some years I was brought closely into contact with him whom we mourn at this time, and I was able to see into those features of his character which were probably of as much value to the world and as much the secret of his strength as the great abilities which struck the superficial observer. Mr. Speaker, the man whom we mourn here to-day was emphatically a great man. When I came to Canada first, his friends, misdoubting that they might have formed a provincial conception of Sir John Macdonald, used to come to me and ask how he would compare with the great men in England. I said he could stand up to the greatest of them, and when I knew him intimately and was brought closely in contact with him, I became more and more convinced that, far from doubting whether he could stand up to the greatest of them, few of them had the varied qualities, the extraordinarily varied and complex qualities, that are necessary to make a political leader such as was Sir John Macdonald. Ranging over the field of history, and recalling the names of the men who have reached those heights which it takes a lifetime to climb, it is hardly possible to find one who has possessed the diverse qualities of the great man who the other day was leading in this House. You may find great power of intellect, great powers of statesmanship, far-reaching views, great powers of oratory, but where will you find, conjoined with all these, that incomparable, that genial humour, that politeness which never fails, that delicate consideration for the feelings of others, that exquisite urbanity, that distinguished Sir John Macdonald—that ever and anon played, the light and shade of a rich and abounding nature—

"*Le bon sens ironique et la grâce qui rit.*"

Sir, the measure of his great abilities are the difficulties that he overcame. I remember, when I first visited these buildings, some twenty years ago, a gentleman then occupying one of the highest positions in the Government, said, to my surprise, when I admired the buildings: "But what an expense, what a waste of money." Now we find they are hardly equal to their needs; and the fact is, these very buildings emphasize the imperial cast of mind of the great man who is gone. I remember the first time I had a conversation with him, some seventeen or eighteen years ago, he drew a sketch of the British possessions confederated together, and then, in his own emphatic way, he said, "That is the time when I should like to lead." In truth, he was not only a Canadian, but an Imperial statesman, and the brightest gem in the British Crown was polished and set by his hand. Thrice in his great career he accomplished events such as give tone, and colour, and form to history, and affect the relative position of nations. I have read somewhere of a child who planted a tree, which ultimately shaded his old age, and with the dews of evening watered his grave. Sir John Macdonald is in that position, because he found Canada a petty province and he leaves it something like an empire. At this moment a nation more important than the nation over which Elizabeth ruled, weeps the loss of a statesman who built it up. As I have said, it does seem to me that the qualities most startling in that remarkable man were the kindness of heart and that alchemistical power which transmuted all that came near him into gold—which made of every foe that came within its influence either a friend or a devotee. And when we think of his loss, we mourn, not merely the statesman who directed the affairs of the country, but the friend; and not only do we that knew him thus mourn, but even those not personally acquainted with him, for he had that power, which only belongs to the highest genius, of making men who never saw him feel the extraordinary charm of his personality. We may build statues to him in these grounds, monuments will arise to him in Kingston, but the real, the grandest monument to Sir John Macdonald will be the love that Canada feels it her privilege to cherish for so great a personality. But even should we never erect a statue to his memory, humanity would keep his memory green, for he belonged to that rare group of men who enchain the memory of mankind. Sir, language was addressed to a great countryman of his, a great Scotchman—not a statesman, but belonging to another order of activity—which might well be applied to the great statesman we mourn:

"Dead heroes in marble from memory fade,
But warm hearts shall weep where thine ashes are laid,
And earth's proudest priesthoods like phantoms flit by,
But thou'rt of the priesthood that never can die."

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As hon. gentlemen may have learned by the papers to-day, the funeral of our departed friend will take place in this city on Wednesday, and in Kingston on Thursday. It will be Friday, therefore, before we get back, and, under these circumstances, I would move that when this House adjourns, it stands adjourned until Tuesday week, the 16th inst., at three o'clock.

Mr. LAURIER. I would have expected that before this motion was made, some gentlemen on the Treasury benches would be able to inform the House as to whether anybody had been summoned by His Excellency to carry on the Government of the day. I assume that he has done so, if British precedence is, as it ought, to be followed. Under such circumstances, I think the motion to adjourn should have been coupled with such a statement. If the hon. gentleman is ready to show that His Excellency has summoned some one to form a

Cabinet, I am ready at once to agree to an adjournment. I can well conceive that the new Cabinet would require some days to prepare for the hard labour they will have to do this session, and there would be no hesitation in granting an adjournment for a short time; but so long as no Cabinet has been formed, it seems to me that the proper way of conducting business is to have the House adjourn from day to day, except, of course, the day set apart for the funeral, in order that we may receive at once what communications may be made by His Excellency with regard to the formation of a Cabinet. The hon. gentleman is aware that this has invariably been the practice followed in England.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. When I mentioned to the hon. gentleman, before the House met, that I would make this motion, I knew the hon. gentleman would make the remarks he has made, and I do not find fault with him for doing so. I may say that we are not aware of any party having been sent for by the Governor General to form a new Administration, and, as I have just said, as this week will be taken up altogether with the funeral ceremonies, nothing can be done before next week. The hon. gentleman is aware that in this country the English precedents have not always been followed in matters of this kind; and, in any case, if His Excellency thinks proper to send for some one after the funeral to form an Administration, the party sent for would have but Saturday and Monday to carry out his instructions, and would not be able to communicate to the House before Tuesday, so that no time would be lost by consenting to an adjournment.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think that the course suggested by the hon. the Minister of Public Works is a very unusual one. The hon. member says that English precedent has not always been followed in this country. So far as I am aware, it has been very closely followed since the organization of this Confederation and before, and, if it was not followed, that has arisen from oversight or inadvertence rather than from any intention to depart from the precedents established in the mother country. At this moment His Excellency is without a Cabinet. The death of the Prime Minister has dissolved the Administration as advisers of His Excellency on matters of general policy. They retain, of course, their constitutional right to advise His Excellency individually as Privy Councillors. Under these circumstances, it seems to me that His Excellency, if he follows the English constitutional rule, will, without delay, notwithstanding the death of the Prime Minister, which the House deplores, send for some one to whom he will entrust the duty of forming an Administration I do not think that His Excellency can delay that until Saturday. No one can tell at what moment some emergency may arise when it will be necessary that His Excellency should have constitutional advisers enjoying the confidence of Parliament, and there would be as much propriety in his sending for some one to assume the responsibility of forming an Administration now as on Friday or Saturday. When Mr. Percival, who was Prime Minister of England, fell by the hand of an assassin in the House of Commons, steps were at once taken to form an Administration, and the House adjourned from day to day, only remaining in session so as to be in a position to advise the Crown, if it were necessary, with reference to its proceeding in constituting a Government; and it did actually intervene and carried through the House a resolution in which advice was tendered to the Crown upon that subject. And so we find that, on the fall of the Aberdeen Government, Her Majesty first sent for Lord Derby, who failed to form an Administration; then she sent for Lord John Russell, who also failed; and, after a fortnight had elapsed, Lord Palmerston succeeded in forming an Administration. During all that period after the defeat of the Government, nothing took place from the 15th January until the 16th February, but during that time there was only one day's adjournment. The House met every day for the purpose of watching the proceedings, and intervening as the Great Council of the Nation if it thought fit to do so. Looking at the precedents which we have before us, and at those which occurred in England under circumstances somewhat similar to those which now exist here, I think the course advised by the Minister might very well have been taken by him if he could at the same time have informed the House that His Excellency had sent for some one to form an Administration, but that information has not been given to the House, and, while we owe it to ourselves and to the late Prime Minister to pay all proper respect to his memory, we also owe it to the country that we shall not be derelict in discharging those duties which the law and the constitution and our public responsibility impose upon us.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think it would be a mistake for the House to exercise its judgment on the motion to adjourn for a week on the supposition that it is put forward on the ground of inconvenience to His Excellency, or with a view of desiring the re-formation of the Cabinet being deferred until the expiration of that time, or until the funeral arrangements have taken place. The motion is made with no such view, with no view that the re-formation of the Cabinet should be deferred. We are not, as the Minister of Public Works has announced, in a position to state that His Excellency has yet sought the advice of anyone in regard to the formation of his Cabinet, but we cannot assume that His Excellency will not do so at the convenient and proper time, at a time to suit the convenience of this Parliament; nor, by acceding to the motion to adjourn, will the House be acceding to the idea that the re-formation of the Cabinet should be deferred. I think the motion is made by the Minister of Public Works, on the ground on which I support it, that, in view of the funeral observances, this House should adjourn out of respect to the memory of him who was so recently its leader, until the funeral ceremony is over. The arrangements already made will take the rest of this week. The re-assembling of the House on Monday would be awkward, and we thought it would suit the convenience of hon. members to meet again on Tuesday at three o'clock. In the case of the death of distinguished members of Parliament, it is not unusual for the House to adjourn, in respect to their memory, and we cannot foresee any emergency, any crisis, any danger to the State, which would interfere with the adoption of the motion proposed by the Minister of Public Works. I think the House will refrain from tendering advice to His Excellency as

to the formation of a Cabinet, because it has full confidence that His Excellency will follow the precedents laid down and will do the best in the interests of the country in forming his Cabinet. I hope, therefore, that the House will accept the motion to adjourn on the ground that it is proper, that it is expedient, and that it is respectful to the memory of the late leader of the House that we should adjourn until after his burial has taken place.

Motion agreed to on division.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT.—CONTRACTS.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is an item on the Order paper which requires to be disposed of in order that the business of the House may be kept in proper shape. I, therefore, move :

That the Order of the House in regard to the attendance of Michael Connolly at the bar of the House this day be discharged, and that the said Michael Connolly be summoned to appear at the bar of this House on Tuesday, 16th June instant, at the hour of four o'clock in the afternoon.

Motion agreed to.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 4.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 16th June, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 102) respecting the Ontario and Qu' Appelle Land Company.—(Mr. Trow.)

Bill (No. 103) to further amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Barron.)

QUEBEC SKATING RINK.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Friday next, to consider the following resolution :—

That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to convey to the Quebec Skating Club certain Ordnance lands in the city of Quebec, subject to such provisions and conditions as the Governor in Council deems proper.

A NEW MINISTRY.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to read to the House a statement that has been entrusted to me by the Hon. Mr. Abbott, a member of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, as follows :—

Having obtained the requisite permission from His Excellency, I desire to make a statement of proceedings after the death of the late Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald. It was felt by His Excellency that the state of public affairs did not necessitate the formation of a new Cabinet until the grave had closed over the late Premier and the last honours had been paid him. On the morning following the funeral, His Excellency, exercising his constitutional right, applied to the Hon. Sir John Thompson for his advice with respect to the steps which should be taken for the formation of a new Government. Later, on the same day, by Sir John Thompson's advice, I was myself summoned by His Excellency, and, after consideration, I accepted, on the following day, the duty which His Excellency desired me to assume. I, therefore, communicated with my colleagues and requested their consent to remain in their respective offices, and with their assent submitted to His Excellency my recommendation that they should be continued in the positions, which His Excellency was pleased to approve, and he also sanctioned my assuming the departmental office of President of the Council. The vacancy caused by the lamented death of the late Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald has not been filled, and pending the appointment of a successor the affairs of the Department of Railways will be administered by a member of the Cabinet.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 14) with respect to certain matters affecting the Administration of Justice.

Motion agreed to : Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. BARRON. I draw the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that in some of the counties to which is attached jurisdiction such as it is now proposed to add to the county, the county court judge already, under the Ontario Government, does the work and receives salary from the Provincial Government. If this becomes law, I suppose it will not interfere with the jurisdiction, so far as it is claimed by the Local Government.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The jurisdiction is now exercised in various parts of the Dominion by the judge of the adjoining county, or another judge who may happen to be called in. He is not, I think, called in by the Provincial Government, although it is very likely the Provincial Government approves of the arrangement. He does not receive any salary, but doubts have arisen as to his having jurisdiction when so called in, and conflicting decisions have been rendered on that point; the First Minister of Ontario has requested that this legislation should be introduced. In fact, nearly all the provisions of the Bill are enacted to remove doubts which have arisen in Ontario, and in pursuance of an arrangement arrived at between the Attorney General of Ontario and myself.

On section 4,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I desire to amend this clause by inserting in the second line after the word "offices" the following words :—"either by the Governor General in Council, or, previous to the passing of the British North America Act, by other competent authority." I think the Committee will agree with me that the provisions of sections 1 and 4 should be made retroactive, to remove doubts which have arisen as to jurisdiction of judges who assumed the authority it is here intended they shall have. I, therefore, propose to insert in clause 1 the words : "shall be deemed always to have extended."

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice if, in conferring upon these county court judges this additional duty, by which they will be compelled to go into the additional territory that may be assigned to them by the Provincial Governments, he contemplates making any provision for increased remuneration? We have some very large districts, and additional

expense will be thrown on the judge in the shape of travelling expenses. If a judge is to perform his duty in two districts and save the appointment of another judge, some additional pay should be given him, or at least an allowance for travelling expenses. I have in my mind the position of a judge who has two districts under his care at present. It was only yesterday he told me that his travelling expenses to one district and return home cost him $45.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is not contemplated to insert anything in this Bill upon that subject. The Bill is not intended by any means to make provision for the case of a judgeship being left vacant and another judge being called on to perform permanently the duties in addition to his own, but it is intended merely to provide for an emergency. We should never call upon a judge of one county to exercise jurisdiction in another county permanently. Those duties are now exercised at the request of the provincial authorities or of a judge who may be ill; and it is intended also to apply to the case of a judge suddenly removed by death or other disability when there is business requiring immediate judicial attendance. When cases arise under section 3 for the calling in of any county court judge, we will have to consider whether provisions should not be made for paying him, inasmuch as he receives no salary if he is of the class mentioned in section 3. If such cases arise, it would be necessary to ask for an appropriation in that regard, but it is not proposed to make any such provision in the Bill. In fact, section 3 could only be enforced if the judge were willing to act without remuneration, or if he would trust to an appropriation being made by Parliament afterwards. The object of the Bill, as I have stated, is not to introduce any new system of administering the county court jurisdiction, but rather to remove doubts as to the class of cases in regard to which one judge, as a matter of courtesy or of necessity, is called upon to perform duties for another judge.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Section 2 compels the judge to act. It would be better to say that it shall be lawful for a judge to exercise the duties in such a case.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. The second section imposes the duty upon any judge to go to any district that the Lieutenant Governor in Council may decide. I do not think the Local Government pays the expenses in these cases, and there ought to be some restriction on their powers, or some provision made for these expenses. It is imposing a very onerous duty upon the judges.

Mr. BARRON. If any county court judge is asked by the Lieutenant Governor in Council to go to another district, his expenses are paid by the Local Government, in the same way as the county court judge in Victoria, who has been asked to take the Division Courts in the County of Haliburton, is paid by the Local Government.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The additional duty is imposed upon the county court judge of going to an adjoining or any other county, and no provision whatever is made for his remuneration, although he may be compelled to go. If the object of the Bill be what the Minister of Justice says it is, I do not see the necessity for the first part of section 2 at all. It would be sufficient to provide that the county court judge shall have power to hear cases in any other county, but, if it is left as it is, the county court judge ought not to be compelled to leave his own county and go to another without some provision being made for his remuneration. The fact that the Local Government makes some provision does not affect this matter at all. When the Lieutenant Governor in Council orders the judge to go to another county, the judge receives remuneration, but by this Bill the Federal Government takes power to compel a county court judge to go to another county, and I think that is unfair to the county court judges. It is true that in the western part of the Province of Ontario the county court judges have very little to do. In most of those counties there are two judges, the senior receiving $2,600 and the junior $2,200 each, including $200 for travelling expenses, although there is really work for only one judge, and the Government might very well call upon one of those judges to discharge duties elsewhere. But, in general, I think the point taken by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) is correct, and that, if the Government can call upon any judge to go from one end of the province to the other, they should not do so without providing for his remuneration.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would ask the Committee to remember what I have already stated, that this is not an attempt to introduce a new system of administering justice, but to provide for cases of emergency. Whenever a judge is called upon under section 2 to discharge a duty which is onerous to him, I think he may rely upon it that Parliament will do what is just in regard to his disbursements. Of course, it would be absurd to ask for any salary, because we have a right to his services during the whole year. I would ask my hon. friends opposite to remember that section 2 is simply a re-enactment of the legislation of the Province of Ontario in regard to this matter. Doubts have arisen as to the right of the Local Legislature to pass such legislation, and we have introduced that provision to set those doubts at rest. The Federal authority is not taking the power to itself to order a judge from one end of the province to another. We only take power to make an Order in Council of that kind when we are called upon by the Local Government to do so. The Provincial and the Federal authorities must, therefore, concur, and I think it is not unreasonable that this provision should be made. Under the rare cases that will arise under this enactment, no doubt a fair provision will be made by Parliament for travelling expenses, as it is made by the Local Governments when, for instance, a Queen's Counsel is called upon to hold a criminal court, and Parliament has been asked to give the same indemnity for expenses to the *ad hoc* judge as would be given to the judge appointed by the Federal authorities. No difficulty has ever occurred of the kind referred to, and whenever it does occur, I have no doubt it will be met by this Parliament.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). After the explanation of the Minister of Justice, I do not think there will be any difficulty in the matter. We are pretty sure that if judges are called upon to perform these duties, they will make application, either to this Parliament or to the Local Legislature, for remuneration, and no doubt they will get it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I must ask the Committee to leave the Bill in committee in order that I may draw up with some care a clause to meet the needs which have been developed in the discussion. I move that the Committee rise and report.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I believe there are cases still in litigation, and it would not be fair to take away their rights by Acts of Parliament. I hope the hon. gentleman will have regard to these cases.

Committee rose and reported progress.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT.—CONTRACTS.

The Order being read:

Michael Connolly, the witness named in the First Report of the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, to attend at the Bar of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms will please see that Mr. Connolly is in attendance.

The DEPUTY SERGEANT-AT-ARMS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Michael Connolly is in attendance.

Mr. SPEAKER. Admit the gentleman.

MICHAEL CONNOLLY came before the Bar.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. For convenience, I move that the report of the sub-committee and the exhibits annexed thereto, be read in the presence of the witness, in order that he may have full cognizance thereof, after which I propose to put a question to him.

Motion agreed to, and the Assistant Clerk read the report, as follows:—

The Select Standing Committee to whom was referred certain statements made in connection with the tenders and contracts respecting the Quebec Harbour Works, &c., with instructions to enquire fully into the said allegations, and especially, but without limiting the scope of such enquiry, to investigate all circumstances connected therewith, and the payments and other matters mentioned in the said statements, beg leave to present as their First Report, the following Report of the Sub-Committee, to which they have unanimously agreed, viz.:—

REPORT OF SUB-COMMITTEE.
HOUSE OF COMMONS, 5th June, 1891.

The Sub-Committee on Privileges and Elections have unanimously agreed to the annexed Draft Report on the reference to them in the case of Michael Connolly, a witness refusing to produce certain books required by the Committee; and they recommend it to the Committee for adoption as the Report to be submitted to the House.

D. GIROUARD, *Chairman.*
JNO. S. D. THOMPSON,
J. A. CHAPLEAU,
DAVID MILLS,
F. LANGELIER.

DRAFT REPORT SUBMITTED BY THE SUB-COMMITTEE.

The Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections have the honour to report that, in pursuance of the reference made to the Committee by the House on the eleventh day of May last, several witnesses have been in part examined, and a large number of documents have been produced.

One of the witnesses so examined in part was Michael Connolly, a member of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Company, mentioned in the reference. The said Michael Connolly's summons required him to produce a number of documents and books of account.

The witness having attended with documents and books of account containing entries relating to the matters under enquiry, and being under examination, was required to produce the books and place them under the control of the Committee.

This demand he distinctly refused to comply with. He was likewise required to hand certain of these books to a member of the Committee who expressed a desire to look at them in order to put certain questions to the witness relating to certain matters of account which were supposed to be entered therein. This was also refused by the witness.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

The proceedings of the Committee, and the testimony of the witness, will appear more in detail by the Exhibits hereto annexed, marked "A" and "B," being the minutes of the proceedings of the Committee, and the shorthand writer's notes on the evidence.

Alexander Ferguson, Esquire, Q.C., referred to in the exhibits, was counsel for the witness and for another member of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Company.

Your Committee, being of the opinion that the discharge of the duties of the Committee, imposed on them by the House, requires that the books should be placed under the control and in the possession of your Committee, and that the books be placed in the hands of members of your Committee for the purpose of interrogating the witnesses, report the refusal of Michael Connolly to obey the orders of your Committee in these particulars, and request the action of the House thereon.

All which is respectfully submitted.

D. GIROUARD,
Chairman.

WEDNESDAY, 3rd June, 1891.

The Committee met at 10.30 a.m.

PRESENT:

Messrs. Girouard, *Chairman*,

Adams,	German,
Amyot,	Girouard,
Baker,	Ives,
Beausoleil,	Kirkpatrick,
Burdett,	Langelier,
Cameron (Huron),	Laurier,
Chapleau,	Lavergne,
Coatsworth,	Lister,
Costigan,	McDonald (Victoria),
Curran,	McLeod,
Choquette,	Mills (Bothwell),
Daly,	Monereiff,
Davies,	Mulock,
Desaulniers,	Quimet,
Dickey,	Tarte,
Edgar,	Thompson (Sir John),
Flint,	Tupper,
Fraser,	Weldon.—36.

The minutes of the last meeting were read and confirmed

Mr. Michael Connolly was recalled, and, in answer to the Chairman, stated that the books and papers which he had been ordered to bring with him had arrived, and he now produced them.

Mr. Ferguson stated, on behalf of the Messrs. Connolly, that they wished it to be understood that these books and papers were not produced before the Committee in the ordinary sense of the term. There was a great deal in the books which had no relevancy whatever with the subject under investigation, and the Messrs. Connolly did not think that their private books should be thrown open to the public, as they would be more or less, were they produced in the ordinary way. They were quite prepared to submit them to an expert accountant appointed by the Committee, or to search the books themselves and give any information required by the Committee, but they could not give up possession of the books.

This not being considered satisfactory, it was moved by Mr. Edgar, that the books of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., now produced by the witness, Michael Connolly, be kept under the control of the Committee until further orders.—Motion agreed to.

Mr. Connolly submitted a list of the books and papers which he had with him; he then produced seven books and papers, which were filed and marked as exhibits as follows:

Exhibit X 2.—Specifications and contract for Esquimalt Graving Dock.

Exhibit Y 2.—Contract for closing and opening of Princess Louise Embankment.

Exhibit Z 2.—Contract for dredging Quebec Harbour Works.

Exhibit A 3.—Contract for Quay-wall and entrance for Wet Dock.

Exhibit B 3.—Contract for dredging Wet Basin, Quebec Harbour.

Exhibit C 3.—Contract for Lévis Graving Dock.

Exhibit D 3.—Trial balance sheet, British Columbia Graving Dock.

Witness being ordered to produce cash books in connection with the Lévis Graving Dock, declined to do so; stating at the same time that he was willing to do with them as he had already suggested.

The Clerk being ordered to lay the said cash books on the Table, the witness declared that he would not allow

any man to lay hands on the books, but he consented to have them marked and identified. And after some discussion the books were accordingly identified and marked as Exhibits P 3 to U 3.

The Committee then adjourned till to-morrow, Thursday, at 10.30 a.m.

THURSDAY, 4th June, 1891.

The Committee met at 10.30 a.m.

PRESENT:

Messrs. Girouard, *Chairman*,

Adams,	Fraser,
Amyot,	German,
Baker,	Girouard,
Barron,	Ives,
Beausoleil,	Kirkpatrick,
Burdett,	Langelier,
Cameron (*Huron*),	Laurier,
Chapleau,	Lavergne,
Coatsworth,	McDonald (*Victoria*),
Costigan,	Mills (*Bothwell*),
Choquette,	Monereiff,
Curran,	Mulock,
Daly,	Tarte,
Davies,	Thompson (Sir *John*),
Desaulniers,	Tupper,
Dickey,	Weldon,
Edgar,	Wood (*Brockville*).—35.
Flint,	

The minutes of the last meeting were read, amended, and confirmed as amended.

Mr. Ferguson stated, in regard to the books belonging to the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., that, after the adjournment of yesterday's sitting, they had been put in a box in the next room (No. 50) under lock and key, the key being in the possession of Mr. Connolly, that they were still there, and that they were at the disposal of the Committee in the same way that they were yesterday.

Mr. Michael Connolly, being recalled, was ordered to produce the cash books in connection with the Lévis Graving Dock contract.

Having brought the books, and being requested by a member of the Committee to hand them to him that he might have an opportunity of examining their contents, Mr. Connolly refused to allow the books to pass out of his possession.

On motion of Sir John Thompson, it was

Resolved, That a sub-committee be appointed to report to the House the facts which have transpired in relation to the books of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. from the minutes and stenographer's notes, and that such sub-committee consist of the Chairman, Messrs. Mills (*Bothwell*), Langelier, Chapleau, and the mover.

Mr. A. Gobeil, Deputy Minister of Public Works, was sworn and examined.

During his examination certain letters and papers were read and filed, and marked as Exhibits B 3 to Q 4, both inclusive.

The Committee then adjourned until to-morrow at 10.30 a. m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, Wednesday, 3rd June, 1891.

The Committee met at 10.30 a. m., Mr. Girouard in the chair.

Investigation into certain circumstances and statements made in connection with the tenders and contracts respecting the Quebec Harbour Works, &c., resumed.

Mr. MICHAEL CONNOLLY (recalled).

WITNESS.—I wish to state, Mr. Chairman, that all the books we have in our possession are here in the building and we are ready here to submit them to inspection, but I do not think we ought to have them open to the public. If there is any particular entry wanted I am ready to read it.

By Mr. Tarte:

Q. Will you produce on the table of this Committee all the books, contracts, vouchers, letters, receipts, cheques and other documents in your possession or under your control in connection with: first, the dredging of the harbour of Quebec since 1882: second, the cross-wall in connection with the same work: third, the dredging of the wet basin in the same harbour: fourth, the south wall or retaining wall in the same harbour: fifth, the graving dock at Lévis: sixth, the graving dock at Esquimalt, as ordered by a subpœna issued by this Committee upon the 20th May last, and again by a second summons dated the 26th May last, and again by an order given on the 29th May last to you?—A. Here is a list of the documents we have, and if there is anything here that this Committee—

By the Chairman:

Q. Is this a list of the documents asked for by Mr. Tarte?—A. I believe it is.

By Mr. Davies:

Q. Do you produce the documents asked for here?—A. Yes: I do.

By Mr. Tarte:

Q. Will you read the list you have produced?—A. Lévis Graving Dock—two cash books, two ledgers and two journals. Quebec Harbour Improvements—two cash books, one ledger and one journal. South Wall—ledger and journal. Esquimalt Dock—two ledgers, three journals and one cash book.

By Mr. Amyot:

Q. These books now belong to the Committee?—A. No; they do not belong to the Committee.

MR. FERGUSON.—The statement I have to make on behalf of Mr. Michael and Nicholas K. Connolly is that they are ready and willing to attend before this Committee and to exhibit the books from time to time for the purpose of showing any particular entries therein, as to which witnesses may be examined pertaining to the charges referred for investigation in this matter. We take the position that these books contain a large number of accounts and transactions in no way pertaining to the subject of investigation before this Committee. There are a large number of unsettled accounts by the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., for which Nicholas K. Connolly and Michael Connolly are alone liable, and they submit that they should not be called upon to submit these books for general exploratory inspection, but that they should be called upon to produce them and point out entries and accounts from time to time as they are required for the purposes of the Committee, and that they should not be given up for general inspection and general discovery. They should remain in their own custody. The point I make is that in the general meaning of the word *production* they are not produced. The witness is attending here under a subpœna *duces tecum*, but they are not produced in the ordinary sense in which documents would be produced in a suit. He is here as a witness producing them from time to time, the books remaining in his custody.

By Mr. Tarte:

Q. You have handed to this Committee a list of the books which we have now in our possession?—A. A list of the books I have here yet.

Q. But you have produced here a list of books?—A. Yes.

Q. Have you got any other papers, vouchers, receipts, cheques or notes belonging to you, or under your control, bearing on the works that are the subject of this enquiry?—A. All the papers I have are here. There is another list not enumerated in that list, but they are here. This is the list:—1. Trial balance-sheet, Esquimalt Graving Dock. 2. Contracts—(*a*) Graving Dock, Esquimalt: (*b*) Closing and opening of Louise Embankment: (*c*) Graving Dock, Point Lévis: (*d*) Contract for dredging Quebec Harbour: (*e*) Cross-wall: (*f*) Quebec Harbour dredging: (*g*) Letter H. F. Perley to Larkin, Connolly & Co., May 17, 1883.

Q. Is there a trial balance-sheet?—A. Yes.

Q. Will you produce it?—A. With pleasure. Here is the contract for the Esquimalt Graving Dock (marked X 2).

Q. You say you have brought the contracts here?—A. All the contracts enumerated in that list are here.

Q. What are they?—A. For closing of the opening in the Louise Embankment (marked Y 2): Contract for dredging the Quebec Harbour works (marked Z 2): Contract for the construction of the quay wall: an entrance for the wet dock, Quebec, between the Quebec Harbour Commissioners and Messrs. Larkin, Connolly & Co., dated Quebec, 6th June, 1883 (marked A 3): Contract for dredging and removing material from wet basin, Quebec Harbour Commissioners and Larkin, Connolly & Co., No. 3796 (marked B 3): graving dock contract, Point Lévis (marked C 3). This is a trial balance-sheet of the Esquimalt Graving Dock (marked D 3).

By Mr. Edgar:

Q. Is that the final one?—A. I cannot tell.

Q. Look at it?—A. It says: "Trial balance of Esquimalt Graving Dock up to date."

Q. What date?—A. I do not see any date on it.

By Mr. Tarte:

Q. In the list of the books I see "Lévis Graving Dock—two cash-books." Will you produce them?—A. They are all here, and I am ready to produce any item you want.

Q. Will you produce them?—A. I must decline to give them up.

Q. Will you please put those two books on the table of this Committee?—A. The books are on the table. I am willing to point out any particular item in the books and read it to the Committee, and willing to remain here from day to day and be examined on any item.

By the Chairman:

Q. You are ordered to lay those two books on the table and leave them under the control of the Committee?—A. I am quite willing to leave them on the table and open the books and read any portion that the Committee may desire, but to turn them over to the custody of the Committee I must decline.

By Mr. Davies:

Q. I ask you to produce those two books and have them identified?

(No answer.)

The CHAIRMAN.—Let the Clerk take the books.

WITNESS.—I decline to allow the Clerk to touch those books.

By the Chairman:

Q. You are ordered to lay on the table the above two cash books for the purpose of being marked and identified?—A. I am quite willing to do that, but I do not know exactly what that means. If it means turning the books over to the custody of the Committee, I must decline: but if it does not mean that, if it is intended for the purpose of investigation, I am quite willing to do that.

Q. Are you quite willing to lay the books on the table for the purpose of being marked and identified?—A. Yes.

Q. Give us those two cash books in order that a letter may be put on each of them?—A. I may state, if you will allow me, that we have made every effort since yesterday to ascertain the address of our bookkeeper. If possible, we will have him here. He can identify everything in these books. We have nothing to hide or conceal.

The following exhibits were filed:

LEVIS GRAVING DOCK.

Exhibit E 3.—Cash book.
Exhibit F 3.—Second cash book.
Exhibit G 3.—First ledger.
Exhibit H 3.—Second ledger.
Exhibit I 3.—First journal.
Exhibit J 3.—Second journal.

QUEBEC HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS.

Exhibit K 3.—Cash book.
Exhibit L 3.—Second cash boak.
Exhibit M 3.—First ledger.
Exhibit N 3.—Second ledger.

SOUTH WALL.

Exhibit O 3.—Ledger.
Exhibit P 3.—Journal.

ESQUIMALT DOCK.

Exhibit Q 3.—Cash book.
Exhibit R 3.—First journal.
Exhibit S 3.—Second journal.
Exhibit T 3.—Third journal.
Exhibit U 3.—Ledger.

The CHAIRMAN.—I understand, Mr. Ferguson, that you undertake to produce the books here to-morrow?

Mr. FERGUSON.—Yes.

Mr. MULOCK.—We do not want any undertaking.

Mr. FERGUSON.—Then I withdraw my undertaking.

By Mr. Tarte:

Q. Can you point out in any one of the books any entry for expense, for notes of $25,000 in 1885, I think?—A. I suppose I could. It would take me a good while to find it, though.

Q. Will you try—from 1883 to 1885?—A. What book is the entry in?

Q. The cross-wall.—A. What date?

Q. I cannot give you the date.—A. You see I will have to hunt through the whole book.

Q. You will hunt then?—A. What year was the entry you speak of?

Q. I did not make the entry myself. Did you make the entry about the notes?—A. I did not.

Q. Who did?—A. I think that all the entries in these books were made by Martin P. Connolly.

Q. Is it to your knowledge that some entry was made about $25,000 notes, given in 1883, in connection with the cross-wall?—A. I cannot say that there was.

Q. Did you ever see any entry in the books about these notes?—A. I never examined the books. My time was fully occupied on the works directing the operation of the men and that sort of thing.

Q. Then you are not in a position to say when that entry was made, if made?—A. No, Sir, I am not.

Q. You cannot point out to us the books, or the book, in which such entry should have been made or has been made?—A. No: all I can do is to bring the books here and hunt up any item you tell me, which, of course, I am quite willing to do.

Q. Can you tell us if to your knowledge any entry of about $22,000 in notes in 1884 was entered in the books?—A. These books? These books are the books of the Quebec Harbour Improvements.

Q. Have you the books in connection with the graving dock at Lévis?—A. I have.

Q. And the supplementary contracts?—A. I have them here.

Q. Are you in a position to point out to me in what book that entry of about $22,000 notes was made?—A. I am not.

Q. Did you make the entry yourself?—A. No.

Q. You never saw such an entry?—A. I never examined the books nor audited them.

By Mr. Davies:

Q. Did you see it?—A. I may have seen it or I may not. As I said before, my time was fully occupied.

Q. Did you see the entry or did you not?—A. I won't swear that I did or did not.

By Mr. Tarte:

Q. Did you ever see any of the cheque books of the firm?—A. Yes: I have seen many cheque books.

Q. Have you some of those cheque books left with you?—A. There are none of them here. I telegraphed to Quebec yesterday afternoon, when you gave an order for the books, and I think all the cheque books, letter books and vouchers will be here to-day.

Q. Are you prepared to hand over to this Committee the vouchers that are coming up to-day?—A. I am prepared to hand over or explain anything to the Committee that I am able to explain, but to give up possession of the books, I must decline, as I said before.

Q. I do not speak of the books, but the vouchers, receipts, papers or notes that you may have in your possession?—A. I have no objection to the vouchers, but the letter books must remain in our possession. I am willing to read any letters in those books.

Q. Will you answer in a positive manner that you have no objection to handing over letter books, cheque books, notes and receipts that you may have in your possession in connection with the cross-wall, dredging in Quebec, and the graving dock at Esquimalt and Lévis?—A. I have answered that. I am willing to turn over any vouchers we have, but letter books and account books we must consider in our possession, of course allowing the Committee the privilege of hearing any entry that they may wish, or having any letter read.

Q. You have stated a minute ago that you have no knowledge that an entry for $25,000 notes was made in 1883?—A. No; I did not say that. They may be there or they may not.

Q. You said, to your knowledge there was no such entry?—A. I said nothing of the kind. I said they may be there. If you ask me to read any item, I will.

Q. Can you point out to me where that entry is?—A. I cannot. I will have to look it up.

By Mr. Daly:

Q. Will you kindly turn up the expense account of the Quebec Harbour Improvements in May, 1883?—A. I cannot find it.

The Committee then adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, THURSDAY, 4th June, 1891.

The Committee met at 10.30 a.m., Mr. Girouard in the chair.

Investigation into certain circumstances and statements made in connection with the tenders and contracts respecting the Quebec Harbour Works, &c., resumed.

Mr. AMYOT.—What has become of the books, and are they in the possession of the Committee?

Mr. FERGUSON.—Yesterday the books were taken by the Messrs. Connolly into the other room and put in a box which they had there for that purpose and which they had brought from Quebec, and locked them up under lock and key, the key being in possession of Mr. Connolly, and they are there yet.

The CHAIRMAN.—Are the books now at the disposal of the Committee?

Mr. FERGUSON.—In the same way as yesterday. They will be produced here when called for as yesterday.

Mr. DAVIES.—Mr. Ferguson claims control and will not give them to the Committee.

Mr. FERGUSON.—Exactly.

Mr. EDGAR.—Are the books here for the Committee to examine?

Mr. FERGUSON.—No.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK.—Are they open for examination by any member of the Committee on any item connected with this enquiry?

Mr. FERGUSON.—Yes.

MICHAEL CONNOLLY recalled.

By the Chairman:

Q. Will you bring those two cash books, please?—A. Yes, Sir: here are the two cash books.

By Mr. Choquette:

Q. Let me see the two cash books. Will you hand those books to me that I may look into them?—A. No, Sir; I must decline to let the books pass out of my possession.

By Mr. Monerieff:

Q. I would ask Mr. Connolly, whether you would have any objection to let any member of the Committee look at any page of the book while you stand by and have possession of the book?—A. Not the slightest.

Q. You are perfectly willing that I should go there and turn over every page of the book?—A. No: not every page. I wish them to specify what particular page they want.

Q. Of every account belonging to this investigation?—A. Yes: every account from start to finish.

Q. At the same time keeping control of your books?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Kirkpatrick:

Q. Why didn't you allow Mr. Choquette to look at your book?—A. Because he did not specify the account.

By Mr. Daly:

Q. I would like to know if Mr. Connolly has any specific reason for not wishing to produce the books in the manner required by Mr. Choquette?—A. I have, Sir. There are a great many unsettled claims in those books and a great many other matters not pertaining to this enquiry, that I do not want other people to prowl through.

Q. Can you give us the names of those people?—A. There are a great many contractors here that I do not want to have see our books.

Q. And there may be friends of the contractors on the Committee?—A. Just so.

By Mr. Amyot:

Q. Would you kindly state the names of some parties who have claims against Larkin, Connolly & Co. in 1883?—A. I must decline to state that.

Q. Do you give the same answer to 1884, 1885, 1886 and following years?—A. I must decline to give the name of any of our creditors.

Q. Would you give us an idea of the amount of claims there are?—A. They are not the subject of enquiry before this Committee.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved that the following question be put to the witness:—

Are you willing to place in the custody of the Committee of this House on Privileges and Elections, or in the custody of the Clerk of this House, for the purpose of reference to the said Committee, the several books of account which you produced when you appeared as a witness on the 3rd day of June instant before the said Committee, for the purpose of enabling the said Committee to pursue the investigation of the charges which were referred to the Committee by the order of this House on the 11th day of May last, and in relation to which you have been in part examined before the Committee?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. DALY moved:

That Michael Connolly, now at the Bar of the House, be heard by Counsel.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the question must be put and answered, unless Counsel desires to be heard in opposition to the question being put.

Motion agreed to.

MR. FERGUSON, Q.C. *(Counsel).* I am instructed, on behalf of Mr. Michael Connolly, now at the Bar of the House, to read the following statement as his statement; showing the reasons why he declined to give up the custody and possession of the books which he was requested to do by the Committee on Privileges and Elections. The statement is as follows:—

"In obedience to the subpœna served upon me requiring me to bring with me certain books and papers, as follows, that is to say: All the books, contracts, vouchers, letters, receipts and other documents in my possession, belonging to me, or to the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., in connection with—1st, the dredging of the harbour of Quebec since 1882; 2nd, the cross-wall and lock in connection with the same harbour; 3rd, the Langevin memorial fund; 4th, the graving dock of Levis; 5th, the graving dock at Esquimalt; 6th, the dredging of the wet basin in the Quebec harbour; and 7th, the south wall or retaining wall in the same harbour, I appeared before the Committee of this Honourable House on Privileges and Elections on the 3rd and 4th of June instant with the books and papers called for. The books of account of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. that I brought with me in obedience to the subpœna, consisted of ledgers, journals and cash books, which contained some accounts and entries relating to the contract and public works referred to in the matters under investigation by the Committee, but they also contained a large number of accounts and entries which had no relation to or bearing upon said matters under enquiry. That these other accounts and entries related, amongst other things, to unsettled claims of the late firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. against other parties, to the indebtedness of the firm to other parties, to their dealings with sub-contractors and employés, to the cost of doing the work, and the books also contained much valuable information of a practical character as to the carrying on of such works acquired only by years of practical experience, and many other matters of a private character. That these books are, and have for some time past been the property of the firm of M. & N. K. Connolly, composed of myself and N. K. Connolly, who were members of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., and who acquired the interests of the other partners in that firm, and its assets, accounts and books. That I was not, nor was my partner, N. K. Connolly, one of the accused in respect of the charges under investigation before the Committee. That after being served with said subpœna, I was advised by Counsel that I must take the books to the Committee in obedience to the subpœna and submit to examination upon them as to any accounts or entries in them relating to the matters in question before the Committee, that I must also open them for inspection of these accounts and entries before the Committee and for the examination of any witness who could give evidence in regard to them, but that I would not be obliged to hand over the custody or possession of them or to have them examined indiscriminately by the Committee or by any one else. I was informed by Counsel that only to the extent mentioned would a court of justice, under the circumstances, enforce the production and discovery of the contents of the books, and that this honourable House, guided as it would be by the principles and rules adopted in respect of such matters in the courts of justice, would equally respect the private rights and interests of a witness under such circumstances, and would not require that I should part with the custody or control of the books or oblige me to submit them to the Committee for a

general inspection of their contents. That, acting upon his advice and in obedience to the subpœna, I brought the books before the Committee, and they were marked for identification by the clerk of the Committee, but I always retained custody of them. When asked by the members of the Committee to give up control of them and allow them to be generally inspected, I respectfully but firmly declined to do so on the grounds stated in the evidence and minutes of the proceedings of the Committee by myself and my Counsel, and which I have in this statement shortly put forward. That I, at the same time, submitted my willingness to attend with the books from time to time, whenever required, for the purpose of being examined upon them and having them inspected in regard to the accounts and entries relating to the matters in question, or so that they might be used on the examination of any other witnesses who could give evidence in regard to said accounts or entries, more especially Martin P. Connolly, the former book-keeper of the firm, who was in attendance on the Committee and ready to be examined. That it was further stated in my behalf to the sub-committee appointed to prepare a report on this matter, that I was willing to attend with the books before a sub-committee of three for inspection from time to time, whenever required by the sub-committee, in so far as they related to the charges under investigation, in my presence and that of my counsel, with liberty to Mr. Tarte and his counsel and an expert, first agreed upon by all parties, to examine those portions of the books which related to the charges before the Committee. If I were forced to give up the custody or control of the books and submit them for general inspection, I believe my partner and myself would be greatly prejudiced in our private interests by the accounts and entries above referred to, not in question herein, being exposed to inspection. In view of the above facts and of the statements made by my counsel and myself in this statement and before the Committee as to my reasons for not giving up the custody of the books, I most humbly and respectfully submit to this most honourable House that I have fully complied with the requirements of the subpœna served upon me, that I have produced and submitted said books for inspection and examination to the same extent and in the same manner as would be required of me in any court of justice under similar circumstances, and even to a further extent, and that I ought not to be required by this honourable House to give up the custody of them or to allow a general examination of them to be made by the Committee or any one else. I also most respectfully submit that I should be forthwith discharged from further attendance at the Bar of this honourable House."

I may add to this statement, Mr. Speaker, that if this Honourable House sees fit, notwithstanding the reasons the witness has assigned why he should not be called on to give up the custody of his books, to still order that he should give up the custody of his books to the Committee, he is prepared to bow with submission to the Order of this honourable House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved :

That the witness, Michael Connolly, do now withdraw.

Mr. LAURIER. Subject to the Order of the House?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Oh, yes. I presume that no other member of the House has any question to submit, and I propose to offer a resolution on the subject. I presume that the question has been answered by the paper which has just been read, and I propose to treat that as being the answer to the question propounded.

Motion agreed to, and witness withdrew.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, everything connected with this transaction has, I know, received the most careful attention of the large Committee that was ordered by the House to pursue the investigation; but it is necessary besides, now that it has assumed this important phase, that members of the House who are not members of the Committee should carefully consider the course which this House ought to pursue in regard to the transaction. Therefore, before offering a resolution to you, I propose to call the attention of the House briefly to the circumstances which now present themselves, and which seem to me to call for our action. The Committee having undertaken the duty, in accordance with the order of the House, to make this investigation, issued a summons to this witness to appear on a certain day and to bring with him certain books of account, in which it was believed there were entries relating to the transactions which formed the subject of the charges referred to the Committee. On page 219 of the Votes and Proceedings it will be seen what those books were. There were a set of books in relation to the Lévis graving dock, which included cash-books, ledgers and journals; a set of books relating to the Quebec harbour improvements; a set of books relating to the south wall, and a set of books relating to the Esquimalt graving dock. I am relieved from the necessity of showing the House that entries in these books may have been, and likely were, pertinent to the subject of the Committee's investigation, by the statement which has just been read to the House, in which it is stated :

"The books of account of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. that I brought with me, in obedience to the subpœna consisted of ledgers, journals and cash-books, which contained some accounts and entries relating to the contract and public works referred to in the matters under investigation by the Committee."

Therefore it is unnecessary for me to say to the House that these books are likely to contain entries bearing on the important enquiry the Committee is pursuing : the witness says they do contain those entries. The answer which the witness makes as his reason for not giving up the books, is briefly expressed in the passage following that which I have just read :—

"But they also contained a large number of accounts and entries which had no relation to or bearing upon said matters under enquiry."

This is the case with every set of account-books which a witness is ever called on to produce in any court of justice or in any kind of enquiry : and if the mere fact that the books called for contain entries not relating to the subject of enquiry, relieves the witness of any obligation to produce them or to submit them to an examination, then no witness would ever be obliged to submit books of accounts or to be examined with regard to them. The position, however, which the witness occupied when he came with these books of accounts, and when these books of accounts were identified, was the position in which a witness is placed in a court of

justice, producing them under a subpœna *duces tecum*. So far, I fully concur in the answer he has made, and to which his counsel has added supplementary remarks; but the position which he assumed, after producing the books and they were identified, was by no means, in my humble opinion, that which any witness would be allowed to assume in a court of justice. The position he took was this (I, of course, paraphrase his words): He said: "I am totally unacquainted with these books: I never made an entry in them, and have never examined them. I am willing to hold them in my hands and turn up any entry which the members of the Committee may specify." The House will see at once that no member of the Committee had had any access to these books or knew a single line in them; and the witness, who did not know what was in the books, because he had not examined them or made any entries in them, was to keep possession of them and turn up any entry he might be called on to refer to by persons who had never seen anything but the cover of the books. Of course that was quite equivalent to his refusing to produce the books at all. To show the House the analogy between the position the witness really occupied, although he was not conscious that he occupied it, if I may judge by his subsequent conduct, with that of a witness producing the books under a subpœna *duces tecum*, I may mention what actually transpired in the Committee after the refusal of the witness had been persisted in for some time. He was asked by a member of the Committee to turn up a certain page of a certain cash book and indicate a certain entry relating to a certain money transaction of which another witness had spoken. He said: "There is no entry there of any such sum of money." A member of the Committee said: "Hand your book to me that I may see for myself." That would be the right of any counsel in a court of justice. It might be that upon counsel seeing that page, he would find that the witness was not telling the truth, or he might find on the following page the very entry he was looking for, or he might find part of the entry under one date and part subsequently; but if the witness is to hold the books and allow no one to see them, he is complete master of the situation and may make any answer he chooses without fear of detection. Therefore I thought it was perfectly clear he was bound to pursue a different course. I thought he was bound to act as a witness in a court of justice, and that the members of the Committee were entitled to examine him as to the books, precisely as a counsel or a judge would examine him in a court of justice. I see he has taken the ground, in his answer, that he has complied with the law as fully as a witness would have been required to do in a court of justice. I think he has not complied with the law at all, and if these books are relevant to the enquiry, they are sealed books to us unless they can be investigated, as they would be in a court of justice. I hope the House will do the Committee the justice of believing in advance that the objectionable kind of examination to which the witness takes exception—examination into matters not necessarily involved in this inquiry—will not be gone into by the Committee. If the witness were brought before a court of justice and produced these books, the first duty of the court would be to see that no irrelevant impertinent enquiry into the books would be allowed; but the witness must not be allowed to decide that question for himself, because, in that case, he could close and seal from the eye of the tribunal any passages he did not wish to expose. The judge would take ample precaution against an impertinent scrutiny into transactions that did not relate to the subject of the enquiry, and I have no doubt whatever the Committee will also take means to avoid any such scrutiny. I admit that an enquiry of this kind, by means of a committee composed of upwards of forty persons, sitting in the capacity of judges, is a very awkward proceeding, indeed, and a very inconvenient one sometimes, when we have to decide nice questions of this kind; but it is by no means beyond the power of the Committee to arrive at a method of testing what part of the books ought to remain closed. It may be that the witness is right in supposing that the best way to do that is to have a small sub-committee to decide whether the passages of the books he does not wish to turn up are relevant or not to the enquiry; and it is true he made to the Committee an offer that if we should appoint a committee of three he would supply those books for our examination. It was impossible that we should make any bargain or contract with the witness. We felt the Committee were entitled to dispose of the matter when he had put the books in their custody and were confident they would dispose of it fairly. I, therefore, beg to move a resolution, which is virtually an order of the House for the production of these books to the clerk of the House, in order that they may be referred to the Committee. In view of the statement made by the counsel for the witness, that, notwithstanding the protest he has made, the books would be produced if the House so ordered, I think we will wait until we see whether the statement of the counsel was made in good faith, before ordering the prisoner into custody of the Serjeant-at-arms. I, therefore, beg to move:

That Michael Connolly having been summoned by the Committee on Privileges and Elections, to whom were referred the statements made to this House on the 11th of May last by J. Israel Tarte, Esq., the member representing the Electoral District of Montmorency in this House, with power to send for persons and papers, and having thereupon appeared before said Committee, with certain books of account which have been identified and marked by the Clerk of the said Committee, as indicated in the Report of the Committee to this House, and having refused to place the said books of account under the control of the Committee or to permit the Committee to examine them for the purpose of conducting the investigation which the Committee were ordered to conduct by the Order of the House on the 11th May last:

This House doth now Order that the said books of account be now produced by the said Michael Connolly and delivered to the Clerk of this House.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—TREATY PAPERS.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before you go into Supply, I would like to enquire of the Minister of Justice whether he has yet obtained the additional documents affecting the correspondence with Washington which were to have been produced in a day or two when we last separated?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Assent was given to the production of a further set of documents, and I will be able, I hope, to make a full statement on

the subject to the House to-morrow, indicating what the documents are which can be produced and the day on which they can be laid on the Table.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary. . . $90,511.50

Mr. MULOCK. I would ask the Minister of Justice whether it is at this penitentiary or at Dorchester that the manufacture of wooden-ware is carried on?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. At Dorchester.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe that the total sums received from the farm of this penitentiary is nominally $254. At what does the Minister of Justice estimate the total value of that farm? I think it covers about 200 acres, and I should think a considerable amount of produce of one kind and another ought to be received from it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I cannot answer the question at the moment, but I will answer it before the Committee rises.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the Minister would state what he is doing with these convicts. I see there are about 345 estimated for. What employment have you found for them in the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary; and, for that matter, I would be glad to know what conclusion the Minister has come to in regard to the troublesome question of the employment of convicts generally?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am in very much the same position in regard to that subject as I was last year, as a very large amount of work is being done in the way of construction, and in Kingston and St. Vincent de Paul gangs of men are employed in getting material, stone and other kinds of material, for carrying on the works which which have been in progress for two or three years past. The capacity of the prison, without the completion of the wing which has been under construction for two or three years, is about exhausted, and the greater part of the new construction is being done by the convicts. We have also a large number working upon the farm, but the farming and work of construction, occupying in the case of Kingston, I think, some 80 men, in addition to the ordinary duties of the penitentiary, are the only resources we have in regard to the employment of labour. In Dorchester, which was indicated by the question put a few minutes ago by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), we have some machinery at which men are employed in making what is called woodlen-ware—that is, buckets, tubs, pails, as well as brooms. A good deal of work in the way of construction has also been carried on at Dorchester on account of the building being new. We are not making any new work there, but the completion of the building has given us tolerably good employment for many hands. I may say that the question will come up almost immediately, if these works of construction are not carried on, as to what employment we shall give the convicts, and I have no hesitation in saying that, when we cannot get remunerative employment for them on the farm, in works of construction, and in the ordinary work of carrying on the routine of the prison, it will be necessary for us to have some kind of manufacturing industries, which, as I know, are considered objectionable, but which, nevertheless, we shall be compelled to resort to in order to find satisfactory employment for the convicts. In times past, we have been able to give them a good deal of employment in making clothing for public purposes, such as the North-West Mounted Police, and it is possible that the manufacture of clothing for bodies like that and for the penitentiaries themselves will continue to give employment to many. The labour question so far has not been very serious, but it is likely to be very much more so very soon, and probably within another year. Speaking of the work of construction and the necessity of continuing it for some little time yet, I am inclined to think that in Kingston, when we have concluded the work there, we shall have to undertake the erection of an asylum for insane criminals. Under the present system, insane criminals are sent to Kingston from all parts of the Dominion, and there we have not sufficient accommodation to give them the requisite exercise. The building is very commodious as far as the interior accommodation is concerned, but the provision for outdoor exercise is very limited. I think it will be necessary for me to ask Parliament before very long for an appropriation for an asylum for insane criminals, and that will give ample work for the employment for the surplus labour at Kingston, which, as hon. gentlemen know, is the largest pententiary we have.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the number of insane criminals?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. About thirty.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not know if it would be constitutional, but would it not be almost as easy, and perhaps better, to make an arrangement with the Local Government to have a large asylum there with a sufficient number of guards to take charge of the insane criminals instead of establishing a branch asylum for yourselves? I know there may be objections to that, but I think that, if the hon. gentleman starts a branch lunatic asylum of that kind, he will find that the cost will be enormous in proportion to the number of unfortunate lunatics who will have to be kept in confinement there.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It might be more economical to adopt that course, but I do not think it would comply with the plan upon which we send our criminal lunatics to the asylum. The cases are supposed to be studied under the care of alienists, who are skilled in the treatment of insane criminals, and I think it is desirable that that plan should be carried out as far as possible. No doubt if we were governed by motives of economy, it would be better to make arrangements with the provincial lunatic asylums, and change the law so that it could be done.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It was not solely for reasons of economy that I made that suggestion, but because that unfortunate class, in many respects, are likely to be better treated, I am inclined to think, by men who have made the treatment of lunatics their special care for many years. The Minister is aware that if he is going

to obtain the same skill as can be obtained in the larger asylums, it will be difficult, or very expensive, to say the least. However, if he is prepared to go to the cost required, and if the objections, which I admit may exist, to mingle the two authorities together, appear too strong, I have nothing more to say.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I notice the receipts from the farms connected with these penitentiaries range from $123 to $250. I suppose this does not include the whole value of the products of the farm, but only the cash receipts.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If the hon. gentleman will refer to page 70 of my report for the year ended 30th June last, he will see a statement of the proceeds of the farm at St. Vincent de Paul, and on the credit side of the account the value is put at $6,180.21. Under the item "customers," is put down $162.10. That is all that comes into the returns here. Page 20 contains the Kingston account, and the farm is declared to have yielded $6,669.50.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice there has been a large amount granted in the way of gratuities, over $7,300, on page B—110 of the Auditor General's Account. The Minister will notice there are no less than nine gratuities granted, making altogether $7,317. Why are those gratuities granted?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The circumstances under which they were granted were these: About a year ago there was reason to believe that a very extensive revolt had been planned at Kingston. Information reached the warden from several quarters that an extensive rising was to take place on a certain day, and means were taken effectually to prevent that rising. This circumstance led to a very thorough examination of the means of preventing anything of that kind, and it was found by the department that, partly from motives of economy, and partly from humane considerations as regards the officers themselves, quite a number of officers, some eight or nine, had passed the age when persons were allowed to remain on the staff by the regulations. An order was given immediately that the regulations should be complied with, and the officers retired on gratuity, and although the amount was a large one, we thought that it was absolutely necessary to incur it in order that we might feel that we had a staff of men fully able, not only to do the routine duties, but to meet any great emergency that might arise as in the case of a revolt, which would involve a risk of life as well as of property, and we decided that the staff of guards should be composed of able-bodied men.

Mr. McMULLEN. While the statement made by the Minister may be a very reasonable one from his standpoint, my opinion is that it is not wise to establish those precedents, because we are aware that when a precedent is established in the administration of one penitentiary, the officers in other penitentiaries will expect to be as liberally dealt with. This appears to me to be a very large amount. No doubt the Minister has thought proper to make the changes in order to secure more complete safety. At the same time, I think that when we pay officials a good round sum as salaries from year to year, the country has a perfect right to expect from them a full and efficient discharge of their duty; and when their retirement becomes a necessity in order to put more efficient men in their places, I do not think it is quite right, or in the interests of the country, that we should encourage demands of this kind, or make a precedent that may be possibly followed out by other Governments afterwards. It may be made the ground-work of granting gratuities to a very large extent. I was struck with the amount when I noticed it in the item on this page, and I thought it my duty to enquire into the reasons thereof.

Dorchester Penitentiary..... .....$43,454

Mr. MULOCK. I wish to call the attention of the department to a matter that I referred to on a former occasion. It is with regard to woollen-ware that I wish specially to speak, although I believe that convict labour there is also employed in the manufacture of other articles of general merchandise. Some few years ago the manufacturers of woollen-ware made representations to the Government with regard to the subject, and, as a result of those representations, the Government, instead of selling the output in the ordinary markets, endeavoured to meet the objection by distributing it among the manufacturers. I am free to admit the embarrassments of the question, and the manifest desire of the Minister of Justice on that occasion to endeavour to give satisfaction to the manufacturers. However, I happen to represent, probably, the largest manufactory of woollen-ware in Canada, and I have received a communication from them upon the subject, wherein they express their entire dissatisfaction with the present system, and they have requested me to raise my voice against it. Although the Government have endeavoured, as I mentioned, to consider to some extent the interests of those manufacturers, nevertheless my constituents inform me that the output of convict labour, even if it is sold at wholesale prices to the manufacturers, does, *pro tanto*, interfere with the employment of free labour. As this convict labour is so employed, even if the output is sold to wholesale men, nevertheless to that extent it displaces free labour, and the interest I refer to feels that very seriously. In the communication that I received upon the subject, and which I need not refer to more particularly, my correspondents state that not only they, but other manufacturers who joined with them in the memorial, have come to the same conclusion, and I desire now to know from the Minister of Justice whether he has considered the question so as to be able to give a satisfactory answer to the petition which I offered, namely, that there should be a discontinuance of the employment of convict labour in the manufacture of woollen-ware.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am not able to give what the hon. gentleman considers a satisfactory answer to that question. The facts are, that the present machinery was employed in the two penitentiaries which were amalgamated when Dorchester penitentiary was formed. In St. John and Halifax the same work was carried on, and to as great an extent as at present. I have not, therefore, increased the output of woollen-ware since the penitentiary was opened. But manufactories have grown up since, in different parts of the country, notwithstanding the penitentiary at Dorchester was putting out this quantity of woollen-ware. The manufacturers thought the wants of

the country or the profits of the enterprise would reward them for establishing manufactories of their own and competing with us, and having to some extent failed in achieving success in that regard, they desire us to be put down. We have the advantage of age, and the occupancy of a fixed portion of the market. In various parts of the country they objected to the prices at which we are accustomed to place our products on the market: but, on the matter being inquired into, I was able to convince them that we adhered to the ordinary trade prices, and were not, therefore, in any way taking advantage of the fact that we obtained our labour for nothing. On turning to page 87 of my report it will be seen that our output is only of the value of $2,250. This was at the time of the preparation of the last annual report.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice the amount is put down at $4,196.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That was by the collection of some arrears. When we made the arrangement to which the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) referred, we closed up the accounts with our agents in the Lower Provinces and collected the balances. In the warden's report he intimates that the value of the labour, exclusive of material, used in Dorchester penitentiary was on wooden-ware $2,250, and all the items were given. I made an arrangement, in order to prevent local inconvenience from these goods being placed on any particular market and thus destroying in any way the results of local enterprise, with persons selected by all the manufacturers of wooden-ware, of whom there are only five or six in the country. The arrangement I made was to place our whole output in the hands of Mr. Eddy, of Hull, who would distribute the articles, and thus meet the great objection the manufacturers had in view, namely, that of our goods being put on the market at fair trade prices, without taking advantage of our convict system to undersell the trade. That was sufficient for the time: I think it should be sufficient altogether, inasmuch as it removes the true grievance. But I am afraid the grievance now really is that we are engaged in manufacturing at all; and that is answered by the fact that we were engaged in doing so before these manufacturers commenced operations, and I suppose if any of their goods are unmarketable that is not attributable to us.

Mr. MULOCK. I am unable to accept the last reason assigned for the continuance of the industry. I think wherever convict labour comes into contact or competition with free labour, I do not care whether convict labour was in the field first or not, it should give way. The convict system may press heavily on the general public; but it would be a great inconvenience to place the maintenance of convicts on a special industry. It is an extraordinary proposition to advance, that because it happens that convict labour was, as is alleged, first in the field, therefore it should have the right to occupy the field. If that is a valid reason, why did the Minister yield, when he adopted a year ago the system of selling the penitentiary output to an agent of the manufacturers? The hon. gentleman certainly felt there was a good argument against the competition. Yet, if because the prison industry was first in the field, it has the right to exist fully and freely, the hon. gentleman conceded something he should not have conceded. So there appears to be nothing in this argument advanced by the Minister, and I think he will not seriously press it. The real defence of the system, and it is one in which I sympathize with him, is the difficulty of finding other employment. That is probably the reason of the maintenance of the system, and for the reasons I have already mentioned, I request in the name of my constituents, the discontinuance of this system: and, unless there is some assurance given to that effect, I may deem it necessary to bring the matter before the House before the close of the session in some more formal way.

Mr. SPROULE. Almost every year we have a discussion on this item in connection with convict labour. It appears to me very strange that it should be used as an argument against convict labour, because every hon. member will admit that it is utterly impossible for a convict to be engaged in labour of any kind without his labour being brought into competition with the other labour of the country. Even if he be employed in raising grain to feed fellow-convicts, he becomes a competitor of the farmer: and yet the farmer does not complain. If he is employed in any other line, his product comes into competition with that of free labour: but when the article is sold at market value, no one has reason to complain. It should be our object as far as possible to obtain as much as may be fairly obtained from these men who are undergoing punishment, without doing injustice to any class: and no injustice is done when the prison product is sold at the regular market price.

Mr. DEVLIN. Suppose a great many people were thrown out of employment by the fact that furniture was made in the penitentiary cheaper than in the ordinary factory, would not great injury result?

Mr. SPROULE. It was not sold cheaper.

Mr. DEVLIN. Mr. Eddy is acting as the Government agent.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He purchases wholesale.

Mr. DEVLIN. Probably he is allowed to buy the goods cheaper than he could make them. In fact he does buy the goods from the Government, and sells them at a lower figure than he otherwise could do.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We charge him the ordinary trade price, except that if he buys our whole output we give him a slight advantage, such as we would give to any wholesale dealer. I do not think he will continue much longer to be our agent: he complains loudly that we charge him too much.

Mr. DEVLIN. I trust he will soon discontinue to act as the Government agent, because he will then be obliged to manufacture, and consequently employment will be given to a great many people who are now out of employment and compelled to walk the streets.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The great objection seems to lie in the fact that most of our penitentiaries are allowed to produce goods, and that these are sold out of the penitentiary. There is a question behind that one, and it is: Is it right and proper that these men should be kept at work, and thus earn something to pay for their keep? I think so. They have made themselves a burden on society by their

crimes, and society has the right to compel them to do something for their support, to decide that they shall not be supported in idleness, and that hardworking people shall not be called upon to contribute all that is necessary for their maintenance, but that these convicts shall to a certain extent be compelled to contribute to their support. If hon. members assent to that proposition, I submit that no occupation can be named to which the same objection cannot be raised as has been raised on the present item. If it is decided to make them work at all, they must be compelled to work at whatever is most convenient and advantageous. If that is the correct view to take, it is the duty of the Government not to give way to these complaints. If you admit it to be a valid objection that their work is going to come into competition with the work of people outside, you must stop convict work altogether. That is not the right view, and I hope the Government will be firm in their position, and set the convicts to work at whatever employment is most convenient and can best be done by them, irrespective altogether of complaints from outside.

Manitoba Penitentiary..... ..$53,863.60

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe there has been a change made in the wardenship of this penitentiary. Will the Minister please state the reason he made the change, and who has been appointed in the place of the late warden?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Towards the close of last year the warden of Stony Mountain penitentiary was taken very ill: his life was despaired of, and although temporarily recovered, he is by no means fit for duty. During the spring, when it was quite apparent that he was no longer able to fill his office, he was superannuated, and the prison has been put in charge, for the present, of the Accountant of the Penitentiary Branch of the Department of Justice. Mr. Foster had a thorough knowledge of the penitentiary accounts: he is aware of the complaints which had been from time to time made as to the management of fiscal affairs at the penitentiary, and I thought it very advantageous that before making any permanent appointment to the wardenship, I should give the affairs of that institution thorough investigation at Mr. Foster's hands, and that matters there should be put on an entirely new basis before the new regime is entered upon.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Did the retiring allowance which the hon. gentleman gave to the late warden, include any number of extra years' service?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The allowance, which is about $1,200, is based on the years of actual service only, and does not include any extra computation of years.

Mr. WATSON. Is it the intention to retain Mr. Foster as warden of the penitentiary?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. At present he is only temporarily appointed, and I have not yet formed any opinion as to whether or not any other applicant ought to be appointed. I consider that Mr. Foster's acquaintance with the affairs of the penitentiary made it advisable that he should go there for a time.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to draw the attention of the Minister to a few items in connection with this penitentiary. At page B—113 of the Auditor General's Report, I notice there is a marked difference in the price of coal oil used, some being at 22½ cents and some at 30 cents per gallon. At page B—114 of the Auditor General's Report, I notice an item of $147 for travelling expenses of S. L. Bedson: $103.77 for lunch for the Governor General and party, and $194.21 for a lunch for the Queen's Printer.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Queen's Printer did not get a lunch. That is an amount paid to the Queen's Printer for printing in connection with the penitentiary.

Mr. McMULLEN. I beg your pardon: it looked as if it were charged for a lunch.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. With reference to the other item, the expenditure was authorized by me under these circumstances: The party referred to, comprising a considerable number of persons, during their travel in Manitoba and the North-West, visited the prison, and, as it is a long distance from any place of entertainment, I authorized the warden to give them a meal.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No doubt the Finance Minister took care that it was carried out on temperance principles.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Certainly. You will observe there is nothing in the account there for anything else. The warden of the penitentiary had permission to go to Europe on leave for three months. He was not, of course, paid his travelling expenses to Europe, but I agreed that while he was in Europe I would pay his travelling expenses in visiting any prison in which I thought any information was to be had in the line of his duties. I presume that if there is a difference in the price of coal oil, there is also a difference in the quality, and perhaps the better quality is supplied to the officers' quarters. We have had two or three contracts for supplying coal oil to that penitentiary, and we have had considerable difficulty about it. In the first place the oil was supplied from Winnipeg, but it was very bad and not according to sample, and we refused to take it and called for tenders from the oil districts in Ontario. I believe the cost of the oil is increased on account of the expense of transport to the penitentiary.

Mr. WATSON. Do you require all the coal oil used should be manufactured in Canada?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. As a matter of fact I believe it is Canadian oil, but there is no requirement, and the contract was let in the oil districts of Ontario.

Mr. WATSON. If we want good coal oil in Manitoba we have to get American oil, and it costs 5 cents a gallon more.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am glad to hear the statement made by the hon. Minister of Justice. I think it was full time that some change should be made with regard to the expenses of this institution. It has been the duty of members of this House during several sessions to refer to the extra expenses under Mr. Bedson's management. I think the Minister of Justice has done well in putting a man in charge, to ascertain as to how the expenses

of the Stony Mountain penitentiary could be cut down, for I think some investigation into the management of that penitentiary was badly needed and did not come too soon. I presume that the oil is American oil supplied by a Canadian manufacturer, as the amount charged is about the price of Canadian oil.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With respect to Mr. Bedson, I believe in some respects he was a good officer, and I rather think he did very fair service during the troubles in the North-West, but I would desire to know, in connection with this gentleman, whether the Minister of Justice obtained from him any satisfactory explanation with reference to his connection with certain matters brought before a committee of this House last session, as regards certain furs that were alleged before that committee to have got into his possession? I think, in parting with that gentleman, the Minister, who is fully cognizant of these facts, probably required some explanation and should have got some. I should like to know what that explanation was: whether Mr. Bedson was one of the parties who assisted in impounding the Bremner furs, or whether he cleared himself from all connection with that matter?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have nothing more than the statement of Mr. Bedson, that he received none of the Bremner furs whatever. He made that statement over and over again, and he has declared that in no way did he participate in that transaction.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think it is a matter of astonishment that this officer was kept in that position so long. I believe that if there was a dishonest officer in the service of the Government and the country, Mr. Bedson was that officer. I know that immediately before the retirement of Mr. Mackenzie's Administration, it was brought to the notice of the Government that this same officer had called upon certain parties in Manitoba and offered to give them contracts if they would pay him a commission of 10 per cent. upon them. Upon our going out of office I brought this statement to the attention of our successors, and it has always been a matter of astonishment to me that he should have been retained in his position so long afterwards.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I know that the hon. member for Bothwell makes these remarks in sincerity, but I am sorry he has thought it necessary to repeat them now, after Mr. Bedson has retired from the service and is in a position to excite sympathy rather than censure.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I believe them to be true.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I know the hon. member believes them, or he would not have made them. He speaks very strongly, notwithstanding that he does not usually speak so strongly of public officers. What the reason is, I have not been able to surmise, beyond the fact that Mr. Bedson's management of the financial affairs of the Manitoba penitentiary has not been successful; I have admitted that myself. I believe that in some respects he was a most exemplary officer. As regards discipline, and training his men to respect him, he had no equal in the service; and he has done good and efficient service to the country in other capacities as well. I have never had any reason to doubt his personal integrity, though I have not considered him a financial success. With regard to the letting of contracts and getting a commission on them, I may say that he had no letting of contracts at all. Ever since I have been in the department, the tenders have come to the department, and in every instance my hand has awarded the contract. I have heard it commonly stated, with regard to public officers, by disappointed tenderers or contractors, that they were offered the contract if they would share in the profits or give a commission; but the charge is generally ill-founded.

Mr. DALY. Coming from the Province of Manitoba, and being a personal friend of Colonel Bedson, I cannot allow the imputations cast upon him by the hon. member for Bothwell to pass without saying a few words. I think the attack made upon Colonel Bedson by the hon. gentleman is cowardly in the extreme. The hon. gentleman knows, from the statements made by the hon. Minister of Justice, that Colonel Bedson has retired from the superintendency of the penitentiary. I know the reason why the hon. member for Bothwell has such a feeling against him. It is a matter of long standing, and it seems to have rankled in his breast for years. He will remember going to the penitentiary years ago and being refused luncheon by Colonel Bedson.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is not true. I was not at the penitentiary 20 minutes, and never asked for or looked for luncheon. The statement is untrue.

Mr. DALY. I say the statement is true.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DALY. And when the hon. gentleman rises in this House and makes this imputation against a public officer whose conduct for integrity has been marked by the hon. Minister of Justice and by every other person who knows him, I can say myself, and other representatives from Manitoba will corroborate the statement, that there has not been a more honest officer in the service of the country than Colonel Bedson. I regret very much that owing to his illness, and the unfortunate condition in which it has left him, he is not able to continue to fill the office of superintendent of the penitentiary, and I am satisfied that the Government is losing one of the most efficient officers they have ever had in charge of any of our public institutions.

Mr. McMULLEN. I must resent some of the remarks the hon. gentleman has made. It has been the duty of this Committee for the last eight years to closely scrutinize and criticize the expenses of this penitentiary, and I think every man who has examined carefully the items of those expenses has come to the conclusion that Mr. Bedson has been playing a grab game in connection with that penitentiary for many years. The items prove it; his actions prove it; and the statement the hon. gentleman has made is not in accordance with the past experience of this House. The hon. gentleman may possibly have found Mr. Bedson a very genial, kind man in his way to him and those who associated with him there; but it is our duty as servants of the public to criticize the acts when they come before us. We have been compelled on all occasions to make a most searching investigation of the ex-

penses in connection with this penitentiary, and I must say that they show that Mr. Bedson has been a reckless officer, regardless of his own name or the credit of the institution.

Mr. ROSS (Lisgar). As the member for the district in which the penitentiary is situated, I think it my duty to say a few words regarding Mr. Bedson's career. I know intimately nearly every one who has tendered for contracts in connection with that penitentiary for many years past, and I have never heard any one of them charge Mr. Bedson with fraud, or impugn his actions in any way. With regard to his conduct of the penitentiary, everyone in the city of Winnipeg and throughout Manitoba has expressed but one opinion, that is, that he is one of the best disciplinarians we had in the country. In fact, I believe that in this respect he has no superior in Canada. One reason why the expenses of the penitentiary have appeared great has been owing to the fact that prices in Manitoba have been higher than they are in the eastern provinces, and in some cases higher than they are in British Columbia. In my county I have come in contact with some who have made charges against Mr. Bedson, who have told me that they believed things were rotten in the penitentiary. As far as I could, I endeavoured, as the member representing the district, to find out what basis these persons had for the charges they made, and they have utterly failed in every case to give any evidence for them. The only thing that could be pointed out was the amount of money paid for supplies. But with regard to Mr. Bedson playing a grab game or being guilty of personal misconduct, no one in that country believes it. Those who know Mr. Bedson best know him to have been incapable of anything of that kind, and I know that he retires from the service to-day a poorer man than any man in this House, and that is saying a great deal.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Whether Mr. Bedson is a wealthy man or a poor man I do not know; nor is it a matter of any consequence to this enquiry. It is no evidence of a man's honesty that he has become bankrupt. Whether Mr. Bedson is so or not I do not know; but I do know that the statements made to me were made by parties who said that corrupt offers had been made to them. One of those parties was Mr. McTavish, and the hon. gentleman knows him and what his standing was. Another is a member of this House at present and stands as well as any gentleman on that side, and another was a prominent member of the bar in the city of Winnipeg. Whether he is there yet or not I cannot say, but I believe he is. I have no doubt whatever of the accuracy of those statements, and the statements I make now I made twelve years ago to those who succeeded me in office; and I made them because I believed they were strictly true. The cost of the management of that institution from that day until Mr. Bedson's retirement has convinced me he was not an honest public officer.

Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg). As one of the members from Manitoba, I feel it my duty to say that I am certain no one coming from that province has any doubt about Mr. Bedson's honesty. I have been more than surprised to hear the remarks made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). I have no doubt the hon. gentleman believes them to be true, but I have very grave doubts as to their being founded on fact. I am very certain that if they were investigated, it would be found that although Mr. Bedson may have been extravagant in the management of the penitentiary, he has done nothing which reflects in anyway on his character as an honest man. I can easily understand the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) being astonished at the prices charged for some of the articles; but I believe that if the hon. gentleman had lived in Manitoba for some years, he would find the figures much more reasonable than he now considers them. Ever since I went to Manitoba, some nine years ago, I have known Mr. Bedson very intimately, and have always found him strictly honest and straightforward. I have never heard anyone who knew him speak of him as anything but a straightforward and honourable man; and I believe, if the hon. gentlemen who are attacking him to-day knew him better, they would admit that although he may have managed the penitentiary extravagantly—and I have not followed the figures closely enough to speak positively on that point—his integrity is undoubted.

Mr. WATSON. I am not at all surprised to hear the hon. gentleman eulogize Mr. Bedson, because Mr. Bedson is a good fellow who receives his friends well, but it has been a crying shame that the cost of the penitentiary is nearly double that of any other penitentiary in the Dominion. Last year it was pointed out that in the Manitoba penitentiary it cost almost as much to board the inmates as it would in a first-class hotel. Some articles of necessity cost but little more in Manitoba than in other portions of the Dominion, and others are cheaper. For instance: beef, potatoes and flour are articles which we export to the eastern provinces. While we have nothing to say against Mr. Bedson as being hail-fellow-well-met and a man who treats his friends well when he meets them, still he has been an extravagant officer. That was admitted by the Minister of Justice last year, who, I believe, instituted an investigation into the irregularities connected with the penitentiary; and if the result of that investigation were laid before the House, perhaps the hon. gentlemen who speak so well of Mr. Bedson would change their opinion as to his business management, and possibly as to his honesty.

Mr. MULOCK. I see an item for binding twine, showing a cost of 19 cents per pound. Is that a fair market price, and is there a contract for it?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We have no contract for binding twine, and the item is so small it is hardly worth while to call for tenders. I have no knowledge of the value of binding twine.

Mr. MULOCK. I assume the Government has paid the same price that an ordinary farmer would, and 19 cents per pound strikes me as rather high. I call the attention of the Minister of Finance to this in connection with a motion of mine which he has been inducing me to allow to stand over from time to time, and I trust, in view of the experience he learns from this document, he will see fit to make it unnecessary for me to press that motion, when he makes his Budget speech.

Mr. LANDERKIN. How much land is there in connection with the penitentiary?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Very little; there is really no farm there.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is there any stock kept there?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, some stock.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is the stock brought in by express? I see an item here showing two pigs cost $32, and the express $19.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is undoubtedly so stated in the report, but I am sure that is not expressage on the pigs.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. Minister said there was not much land under cultivation, but I see 313 lbs. of twine were required, or sufficient to bind 150 acres of crops.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That was used to bind the convicts.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. All the ordinary supplies are obtained by contract.

British Columbia Penitentiary. $45,982.72

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the meaning of the first note respecting the deputy warden's salary, that this is to be granted to him notwithstanding anything in the Act to the contrary?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The object is to put the deputy warden at his maximum, notwithstanding that he would not yet have arrived at it under the Penitentiary Act. I think that is the object, but, if not, it is to give him the $50 increase. He is an exceptionally good officer and an old officer trained in Kingston. He is chief keeper, deputy warden and farmer, and is altogether a superior man.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this simply giving him a statutory increase?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; I am inclined to think it is giving him more than that.

Mr. LANDERKIN. How may convicts are there in this penitentiary?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think about 60.

Mr. LANDERKIN. How many pounds of tobacco does each one get a year?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Not many.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Because I see here that 458 lbs. of tobacco are charged for at 45 cents a lb.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I see that the number of convicts in that penitentiary on the 30th June, 1890, was 76.

Mr. LANDERKIN. And they all smoke?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Possibly the Minister of Inland Revenue might explain how this is, because 458 lbs. of tobacco for 76 convicts is rather a handsome allowance.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no experience in regard to that, and I do not know that the Minister of Inland Revenue has any experience either.

Mr. McMULLEN. I also see that 30 lbs. of snuff are charged for in Kingston penitentiary.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Looking back, my hon. friend will see that others were more liberally dealt with, for in Manitoba they received 683 lbs. of tobacco at 65 cents a lb. It strikes me that they deal liberally with the convicts in the article of tobacco.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I find that in Manitoba 418 lbs were obtained and 265 lbs. used.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But 418 lbs. were purchased.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No doubt some is kept in stock.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does not the Minister think it is unnecessary to buy an amount of tobacco sufficient for two years?

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to ask something in regard to the furnishing of the British Columbia penitentiary. I find here tapestry carpet, 514 yards, $411.20; Brussels carpet, 290¾ yards at $1.05, $305.29; Brussels carpet, 229¼ yards at 90 cents, $206.33, or over 1,000 yards of carpets. Surely they did not carpet the whole place!

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. A house was provided for the warden last year for the first time. It was considered absolutely necessary to do that or to build a wing in addition to the present building, as we had no place for a hospital, and by providing a house for the warden we were able to give the deputy warden the warden's apartments, and to use the deputy warden's quarters for a hospital. In accordance with the practice we have supplied the regular furnishings, such as window blinds and carpets.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I should like to ask the Minister of Justice if he considers it proper to use tobacco in the penitentiaries?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, I do. A year or two ago I brought down a file of papers on that subject. Tobacco is given to sick men who are accustomed to the smoking habit, and it is also given as a slight reward to those who have been accustomed to use it, and have deserved the reward by extra labour, or by exposure, or by anything that requires recognition, and we have found it a very useful ration, and we have also found that the deprivation of it is a great hardship to those who have been accustomed to use it. It is not served out as a ration in the ordinary way, but is given for extra good conduct or hard work or exposure.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It seems to be a pretty regular ration, judging from the amount consumed.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In British Columbia the Indians are very often in hospital, and they are so accustomed to the use of tobacco that it has to be given to them regularly.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I should like to know if the Minister of Finance is of the same opinion as the Minister of Justice on this subject?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not considered it.

Committee rose, and it being Six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. McMULLEN. Before disposing of this item on the British Columbia penitentiary, which we reached before six o'clock, I want to draw again the Minister's attention to a point with regard to the new residence for the superintendent of the penitentiary of British Columbia. He said they had built a new house for him. Now, I have looked

into the matter, and if the Minister of Justice will carefully calculate the amount that is charged for carpeting, he will see that it must have been an enormously large house, if all this carpet was put in there, or else there must have been some carpeting used in the penitentiary in fitting up some of the rooms. It surely cannot all have been charged to the new residence, because there is carpet enough charged to cover 900 yards square. That will supply five houses 24 by 36, two stories high, with ten rooms each, and cover the stairs to boot. He will find that it will cover 30 rooms 15 by 18. Now, it surely cannot be possible that all that carpeting has gone into the new house. I simply wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Justice to it. I do not, for a moment, mean to insinuate that he is cognizant of any wrong being done, but I simply call this fact to his attention. It has cost altogether, for carpets alone for that new residence, if it all went in there, including cocoa-matting, $1,418.74, and it would cover the space I have mentioned. This appears to be an enormous amount to go into a residence of that kind. There are other little items to which I wish to draw attention. There is a coffee mill, $12; there are half a dozen coffee pots, costing $27; 12 razors, $1.50 each, $18; 18 rat and mouss traps, $12. There are many other items which I consider very exorbitant. Now, I think it is due to the Committee, when items of this kind come before us, to discuss them and criticize them. We have a duty to perform, and we desire to perform it. Our sole desire is to see that the country's interests and rights are protected. We have no desire to keep the Committee beyond the time that we can extract from the Government intelligent explanations of the items to which we call attention. This is the duty of every Opposition, and we do not propose to shrink from it, however small the item may appear to some hon. members. I say it is absurd to ask us to consent to the passage of this item of 1,100 yards of carpeting to put into the residence of the manager or superintendent of the British Columbia penitentiary. We have a right to some explanations. The Minister has said there was a new house built and carpeted. We admit that. It may have been necessary, although I challenge the propriety of giving these people such lordly mansions to live in, and I think that something less costly than Brussels carpet would do for them.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think, perhaps, the hon. member did not catch all that I said on that subject. I said that the warden's house had to be furnished with carpeting and window hangings, the deputy warden had been moved into the warden's apartments, and we furnished his house likewise to some extent. When I assumed charge of the department I found that not only the practice, but the regulations provided that we should furnish these houses. I thought that was unsatisfactory for several reasons that I need not enter upon now. But it was evidently necessary, when we provided a new house for the warden as for the deputy warden, that we should at least cover the floors and provide window hangings, or it was impossible for them to do it out of their salary. The house in British Columbia is not a lordly mansion; it is a good-sized house, but it is plainer and cheaper than the houses that have been given to the wardens anywhere else, unless, perhaps, at Dorchester, where the house is a very modest one. All I can say is that I agreed to furnish the carpeting and the window hangings for these two, and I was assured that the measurement that we provided for was the actual measurements for the two establishments, and I am assured that the sum to which the hon. gentleman refers in the Estimates as having been paid, is not enough to cover the actual cost of providing what I promised to provide, and in the Supplementary Estimates I have to ask for a further allowance for the same purpose. Of course I have no personal knowledge of the subject; all I can say is that I believe all these furnishings have gone into the new house and into the deputy warden's house, and that the quantities supplied there have not been enough to cover the floors.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). There are two or three items in the account upon which I would like some information. I notice that 211 tons of coal were purchased at $8.50 a ton. Now, I have understood that British Columbia was a coal-producing country, where coal could be obtained much cheaper than the price here mentioned. Doubtless the Minister can give me a satisfactory explanation. I find that British Columbia last year exported 499,000 tons, at an average price of $3.95 a ton, whereas the Government has paid $8.50 a ton to provide for the penitentiary, and I think this item requires some explanation. There is another item which the Minister may explain when he gets on his feet—that in regard to coal oil. There were only 20 gallons provided, but the expenditure was something extraordinary unless they sell coal oil there at a very much higher price than it brings here. We find that coal oil there cost 40 cents a gallon, whereas on importations from the United States by British Columbia only 28 cents a gallon were paid. Then again there is another item which appears to require some explanation. There are 14 hour's labour entered under the name of G. W. Cooley, for $7. Is he a professional man or an ordinary labourer, for he is paid at the rate of $5 a day? There is an item for Cumberland coal, which is charged at the rate of $30 per ton. There are 92 lbs. of rope, for which $27.32 were paid. Perhaps the Minister will explain these items.

Mr. PRIOR. In regard to the price of coal charged for British Columbia penitentiary, I may say that it is the usual retail price paid in Victoria, Vancouver and New Westminster, which retail price is $8 per ton as a rule. During the last 12 or 18 months we paid $10 for every ton we used. Although the mines are within 70 miles of each of these towns, there is to all intents and purposes a monopoly, only three companies getting out coal, the regular retail prices ranging from $8 to $10 per ton. The export price at the wharves for coal shipped to San Francisco and to South America is, I think, about $4.50 per ton; but there is no place we can get coal except from the Nanaimo mines, and every one has to pay the price I have named, not only householders, but manufacturers who have to use it for manufacturing purposes. In regard to the Cumberland coal for which $30 per ton is charged, that comes round the Horn from the east, and it is the usual price paid. I know the wholesale price is $25, the retail $30. In regard to rope, the usual price charged for small quantities by dealers, such small quantities as are mentioned, is from 16 to 20 cents per pound. No

doubt these will appear large prices to many hon. gentlemen, but every article sold on the Pacific coast is sold, as hon. members from British Columbia have frequently stated, at a price far in excess of that demanded east.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Both the coal and the coal oil are supplied by contract. We adopted the best means to obtain tenders for coal from all quarters, and even enlarged the usual number of advertisements in order to get the contract well advertized. I do not know exactly what claim Mr. Cooley has; but he is a mechanic, and was employed in connection with renovating a basement where the flooring had rotted away. He was the only mechanic employed, and convicts were under him.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The explanation of the hon. Minister in regard to the coal price is not satisfactory, because the Trade and Navigation Returns give the price as $3.95 per ton. It is most extraordinary that people of that province, which exported 4,495 tons to the United States last year, at an average price of $3.95 per ton, should be willing to pay $8, $8.50, and even $10 per ton. I cannot understand how coal is kept up to people of that province when it is sold at such a low rate to people of other countries. No doubt the British Columbians will see the necessity of free trade so far as that province is concerned.

Mr. PRIOR. If the hon. gentleman were living in British Columbia he would find a good many things he could not understand. Coal is sold in large quantities, such as by the ship load, at $3.95, $4, and $4.40 per ton; but as regards the price in Vancouver, Victoria, and New Westminster, I never knew it to be less that $7.50 during my residence there, covering a period of 18 years. This price is due simply to the fact that there is a monopoly. Only three companies sell it retail. It is shipped from the mines to coal dealers for retailing, and they keep up the price. If coal was brought from the east, it would cost more than we now pay, and the people of our province believe in patronizing home industries.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It may be as well to remind the House of a circumstance which may be fresh in the memory of a good many of the older members and to which this state of things bears close relation, namely, that the late Government, when in charge of public affairs, gave the most available and valuable coal territory in British Columbia to a certain corporation, on which occasion members of the Opposition told the Government they were trifling with the resources of the country and doing a very great injury to the future of British Columbia. No doubt the fact which we have now heard, that coal is exported at $4 per ton, for the use of American citizens, from British Columbia, but that the inhabitants of British Columbia have to pay from $8 to $10 per ton, forms a most striking commentary on the action against which we protested some years ago on the part of the Government, in depriving ourselves of the control of valuable coal areas and handing that control over to monopolists.

Mr. PRIOR. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) calls attention to the fact that great areas of coal measures at Vancouver were given away to a company, and therefore increased prices have to be paid by reason of the monopoly thus caused. Before the company obtained these lands, and especially before any portion of the Island railway was built, the people were perfectly willing to give away all the coal lands that were given away. Although different opinions may be entertained now, still at the time the lands were given away everyone was satisfied, and the majority of the people are satisfied now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That does not in the slightest degree alter the fact or undo the mischief that appears to have been done in regard to the future of our province on the Pacific coast. The whole future of manufactures in British Columbia will continue to be most seriously affected, if the state of things to which my hon. friend alludes continues, as apparently it is likely to continue: and it is a most ample justification of the protest which was made from this side of the House against that most improvident and foolish grant.

Mr. PRIOR. I draw attention to the fact that coal has been no dearer since the land has been given away than before. It has been the means, however, of raising hundreds of thousands of tons of coal and giving employment to thousands of men.

Mr. BOWELL. The mines from which Victoria is now supplied were owned by the Dunsmuir family long before the land was given to build the railway, and it is only now that the mines in the Comox district are being opened, and the products of those mines are being shipped to San Francisco and are being brought to these markets; so there is no telling what the effect of opening these mines may be on prices hitherto prevailing. The remarks of the hon. member for Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) have no force, nor are they at all pertinent, owing to the fact that the lands were owned by the Dunsmuir family before that railway was built and before the lands were given in aid of the construction of the road.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But my remarks have a great deal of pertinence from the fact that if the most available and valuable mines were placed in the hands of monopolists by the deliberate action of the late Government, the Government by that action deprived the people of British Columbia of the chance of getting cheaper coal. That is what they did.

Mr. PRIOR. The hon. gentleman does not see that the mines are in the hands of three companies and not one company, and if three companies can combine to keep up the price, fifty companies can do so. Every day in the United States, England, and even in Canada "corners" are arranged in grain, coal and almost everything.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman will find out that when these matters are placed in the hands of three companies it is three times as easy for the companies to arrange a "corner" as it is when they are in the hands of ten companies.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is earnestly to be hoped that the hon. member for British Columbia will support the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), in his Bill to prevent combines. Can the Minister of Justice give us any information as to the size of the residence for wardens?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I cannot give any idea as to what the size is. I will lay the plan on

the Table in a day or so. The deputy warden's quarters consist of half a dozen rooms.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Perhaps the Minister will give the information on concurrence, for the statements made by the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) disclose a startling condition of affairs, which should not exist.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The subject will come up under a different head, and I will then submit the information.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Government should adopt a system under which the buildings of these officials would be of certain specified dimensions. When you build a post office in a town you are guided by the importance of the place as to the size of the building, and I think that, in such cases as this also, the size of the building should be minutely described so as to leave no room for extravagance. If the amount stated here is correct, I think the Minister of Justice will find that there is a screw loose somewhere, and that they have intruded on his generosity to practice extravagance.

Mr. CORBOULD. In reference to the statements made with regard to the price of coal, I may say that my personal experience in New Westminster is that I have never paid less than $8 per ton exclusive of delivery, and I have paid as high as $10 a ton exclusive of delivery. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has stated that all coal lands in that region have been given away. I must differ from him there. There are plenty of coal lands found on the Island of Vancouver outside the railway belt, and so soon as the requirements warrant it these lands will be opened up and developed. I may also remind the hon. gentleman that on the mainland, and outside of that belt, we are paying $12 a ton for anthracite coal from Banff. If I am not mistaken I think that the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) was sent out there by the Mackenzie Government and made exactly the same offer as the present Government made with reference to the land in that railway belt.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Some years ago there was a vigourous protest in this House against the Government giving away the extensive coal fields they had in British Columbia. It is not to be wondered at that the settlement of British Columbia is very slow when, under the system of government we have, the great natural resources of the province are given away, and that the country has become so expensive for settlers that it is impossible for people to live there. If you do not provide that people can live cheaper, the immigration of settlers into that country will be very slow indeed. It is a singular thing that while coal can be exported from that country for less than $4 dollars per ton, the people living there have to pay from $8 to $10. The attention of the members from British Columbia having been called to this state of affairs, it should be their earnest endeavour to remove a system which is producing such prejudicial effects in British Columbia, and which is retarding the settlement of that province. It is well known, as mentioned by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), that a strong protest was made against the policy of the Government, in giving away these lands. It was foretold at that time that it would lead to a monopoly, and the statements now made by the hon. members from British Columbia show that a monopoly does exist in British Columbia, which is prejudicial to settlement and which interferes with the development of the province. We hope that the Government will now take some steps to prevent this monopoly, and to give the people who settle in that province an opportunity of living there cheaper than they do under the present system. I remember that the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Gordon), I think, struggled with all his might against this monopoly which the Government then gave, and he was supported by members on this side of the House. The people of British Columbia now see that if they are paying these high monopoly prices for the necessaries of life they have to blame the Government who gave these coal fields away to monopolists; and, I believe, Yankee monopolists at that.

Mr. ROSS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Landerkin), when he says that British Columbia is slow in growth, has made a statement not warranted by facts. I think I know a great deal more about British Columbia than the hon. gentleman does, and I can state that during the last ten years that province has grown remarkably, not only in population, but in the development of the various enterprises in that country. The census recently taken will prove that my statement in this respect is absolutely correct. The people of British Columbia have every reason to be proud of the manner in which their province has grown during the last ten years.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, allow me to call your attention to the fact that we are drifting from the item under consideration and undertaking a discussion over a very wide range as to the prosperity of British Columbia and the prices of articles there. Both sides of the House have now had their fling, and I would ask you to draw the attention of the Committee back to the item.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I must remind the Minister of Finance that it is pertinent to the question under discussion, which is the high price of coal, to point out that the Government have caused this high price by their former action. I am not going to prolong the discussion as the hon. gentleman has requested that we should not discuss it further, and very likely he has good reasons for that. A statement was made as to an offer said to be given by my hon. friend from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), which, to the best of my recollection, was wholly incorrect. I do not think he was ever authorized to make any offer respecting the coal lands of British Columbia. However, the hon. gentleman is here and he can speak for himself.

Mr. FOSTER. Order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. the Minister of Finance will recollect that this statement was made by one of his own supporters, and I have a right to require that it be proved or disproved.

Mr. EDGAR. With reference to the statement made by my hon. friend from Westminster (Mr. Corbould), as to my having been a party to offering these lands in British Columbia, I know that I offered the people of that province a great many things when I went over there, and I know that

most of them are very sorry that they did not accept the offer when they had the chance. I admit that I was responsible for recommending to the Government the construction of the Nanaimo Railway, but it never got so far as to consider the question of a land grant or a money grant. The railway itself was all that was proposed at these initial stages, and I had not the good luck to be in Parliament when the Nanaimo Railway Bill was introduced the first time, or when it was introduced and carried through the second time. So far as that goes, my hon. friend (Mr. Corbould), who was not in British Columbia at that time, cannot have read the ancient history of his province or he would never have made that mistake.

Mr. MULOCK. I wish to call attention to the high price of sugar, which, at page B—115 of the Auditor General's Report, is stated to be 8½ cents per pound. Now, we find that the present tariff enhances the price of sugar, not only to the Government who buy it for these institutions, but to the people generally, about 75 per cent. I should like to ask the Minister of Finance if we can hope for any relief in this direction. In the United States to-day sugar can be purchased for two or three cents a pound less than in Canada, and that is an uncalled-for condition of affairs. This operates against the interests of Canada, and I think the time has arrived when the Government should come to the relief of our people. If the necessaries of life are purchasable on the other side 30 or 40 per cent. cheaper than they are in Canada, that is an inducement to people to leave a dear country and go to the cheap one.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I think the hon. gentleman is not speaking to the question at all.

Mr. MULOCK. I accept your ruling, Mr. Chairman. I only ask the hon. Minister of Finance if he intends to devise a scheme for supplying these public establishments with sugar at a cheaper rate?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Everything appears to be very dear in British Columbia. I see that some newspapers have been subscribed for, one at $12 and another at $10 a year, while the *Empire*, the weekly edition, goes for $1 a year. While on my feet, I would like to ask if any portion of this 1,095 yards of carpeting was used for some of the wards of the penitentiary?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. None.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I also find a charge of $141.47 for 145½ yards of cocoa-matting. I cannot conceive how so much carpeting can be needed for a private house which is stated by the Minister to be not a very large one.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Carried.

Some hon. MEMBERS. The question was not answered.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I think the answer was given half-a-dozen times.

Mr. MULOCK. I would recommend you, Mr. Chairman, to be a little more gentle in guiding the course of the discussion. I think we want to facilitate the progress of these Estimates, but I doubt very much if that will be obtained if any member thinks, even unjustly, that he is prevented from obtaining information by arbitrary conduct on the part of the Chair. I am not suggesting that that is the case in this instance: but when an hon. member asks a question, an opportunity should be given for an answer before the Chairman decides whether the item is carried or not. I doubt very much whether it is the duty of the Chairman at all to suggest whether the discussion is ended or not.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I may take this opportunity of saying that I have noticed on many occasions that questions had been put by hon. members after the Minister in charge of the particular item under discussion has already answered the same question three or four times. Sometimes hon. members who are not in the House when a question is first put and answered, and afterwards come in, look over the Auditor General's Report, and ask the same question again. I am here to stay as long as the House sits, but I think it would be in the interest of all if hon. members would keep their seats so that each question could be put and answered once, instead of being repeated by different members one after another.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. As regards the action of the Chair, the Chairman had no alternative but to declare the item passed, if no one rises to speak. I did not dream of answering the hon. gentleman's question, because I had already answered it, and I supposed him to be not asking for information, but just restating his objection and indicating that he was not satisfied. The hon. gentleman must have heard me state that the whole of this carpet was bought for the two dwellings, and I promised at a future date to bring the plans of those dwellings down and lay them before the House.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The question asked by my hon. friend from East Huron was not regarding the carpet. He wanted to know why the Government were paying $40 or $12 a year for newspapers in British Columbia, and then he went on to give his opinion about the quantity of carpets.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He was answered at the time, by British Columbia members, that that was the usual price.

Mr. CORBOULD. That is the usual subscription price for daily newspapers in British Columbia. The *Colonist* and *Columbian* are each $10 a year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I sympathize with the hon. Minister of Justice, because I recollect when I sat on the opposite side of the House having, on a great many occasions, to answer the same question from the same gentleman eight or nine times over. I thought it very hard, and so I sympathize entirely with the remarks made by yourself, Sir, on this point. But I would just observe this: there is always a little murmur through the House, and it is not always easy by any means for hon. members a few seats back to hear what is said on the front benches. Of course we cannot expect the Ministers to speak at the full pitch of their voices in committee, but in justice to my hon. friends I think what is said is not always heard or is very imperfectly heard, and that is the reason questions are sometimes repeated two or three times.

Regina Gaol..... $13,520

Mr. McMULLEN. I think this requires explanation. I see the vote last year was only $900.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Last year when the estimate was taken, the gaol was not quite finished, and I only took a vote for the salaries of the permanent officers—the warden, and, I think, one guard; but the gaol is now completed and receiving prisoners, and this vote is not only for salaries, but is to include the maintenance of prisoners.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What was done with the prisoners before you had the gaol?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They were confined in the police barracks at various places, and the police authorities were paid by the Department of Justice out of the vote for Miscellaneous Justice.

Salaries and contingent expenses of the Senate..... $60,488

Mr. McMULLEN. I think it is time we should cut down a great many of the contingent expenses of both Houses. I find that in the Senate, last year, we paid for: 339 inkstands, $258; 416 knives, $373.80; 3,048 pencils, $323.84; 54,124 pens, $201.78; 228 pairs of scissors, $136.06; 144 scrap books, $93.20; 680 balls of twine, $84.26; 15,600 b.s. visiting cards, $30. What can eighty-six or ninety Senators want with 339 inkstands and the other articles? It is absurd to ask the committee to grant a sum of money to the Senate to repeat the extravagance which evidently exists in that body. I do not know whether those hon. gentlemen are under the control of this House or not. It appears we are asked to pass this item, and if so we have certainly the right to criticize the expenditure. I believe there are a great many very honourable, high-minded gentlemen in that chamber; men not at all responsible and not desirous to be responsible for the items here enumerated. I challenge anyone to go carefully over the different items and accounts and not find that these articles have been scattered right and left from that particular chamber. It is time some change should take place in the items connected with contingencies of the Senate. We really ought to ask those hon. gentlemen to meet with a committee of this House and let us investigate together this expenditure and see if we cannot ascertain where all this stuff goes to. I have only mentioned a few of the most extravagant items. As I have said, I do not believe many of these old gentlemen are aware of the facts. They quietly take their seats, and their knives, and their scissors; and knowing a great many of them as I do, I cannot believe they are winking at the extravagance that is going on in that chamber. We are entitled to some explanation from the Government.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are the champagne knives?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know.

Mr. MULOCK. There is something to be said in favour of the expenditure, because I wish to say a word on the other side, and give the Senators credit for an economy, though perhaps it may be an unwise one. I find that these seventy-eight gentlemen have only charged the country with three flesh brushes and one foot bath.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I notice each one of them has a thermometer.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. There is a charge here for sixty bottles of glue. Is that to fasten them to their seats?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). This involves a large amount of the tax-payers' money and I think it is the duty of some Ministers to give some explanation of this most extraordinary expenditure. If any Minister will take the trouble of going over the items in detail, he cannot help coming to the conclusion that there must be something radically wrong. Here are charges for cooking knives and saucepans. Why should the tax-payers be called on to pay for these? Here are other items for feather pillows and nail brushes and methylated spirits. I dare say there may be other spirits as well; surely we are entitled to some explanation of this extraordinary expenditure.

Mr. WELSH. It is easy to find fault, but the trouble is to find a remedy. Every session this question of extravagant expenditure at Rideau Hall and the Senate comes round, and the Government always acknowledge that the matter requires looking into. It is high time it should be looked into and some remedy devised; and as this is our first meeting, the Government should propose some plan for a reasonable supervision of the expenditure of both Houses. In other countries there is a committee of both Houses to settle what the expenditure shall be, and I think the Government pledged itself last session to see that some arrangement would be entered into with the different departments to supervise the expenditure of public money.

Mr. FOSTER. One of the hon. gentlemen who spoke thought that this was not a laughing matter, and rather chided us on this side for making light of it. I want to assure my hon. friend that the laughing commenced on that side, and we caught the contagion and laughed in unison. It is all very well to speak of the supervision of this expenditure, and it may be that some hon. gentlemen really think that the Government are responsible for it. We must take into account the fact that, both in the House of Commons and in the Senate, those expenditures are supervised and ordered by the Houses themselves. Hon. gentlemen have had a great deal to say about the Senate and their extravagance. I hope, when we come to the items of expenditure for the House of Commons, the hon. gentlemen will be just as free in criticism of themselves, because I think they are just as much open to criticism in regard to the contingencies of the House of Commons as the Senate are in regard to their contingencies. Now, as to the saucepans and matters of that kind, perhaps my hon. friend never strays far away from his own habitat, but if he should happen to wander into the Senate restaurant he would find that there is a place there in which he can be served with meals, and that requires cooking ranges, cooking materials and everything necessary for that purpose. My hon. friend must not run away with the idea that the Senators cabbage these saucepans, put them in their tail pockets and carry them home. These matters are arranged just the same as they are in the House of Commons. And so it is with regard to brushes, combs and so on. This does not only refer to what the Senators use, but there are rooms all around the corridors and offices, and these rooms are supplied with brushes, combs and everything necessary for cleanliness. These are not for the Senators to take away, but the amount is

simply for the contingencies for the Senate in its corporate capacity, and includes the rooms of all the Senate clerks and the Speaker's apartments. A proportion of that amount goes into the trunks which members of the House of Commons, as well as the members of the Senate are accustomed to get. I have never heard in this House any vigorous denunciation of that practice which has existed from old times, and I think it is not altogether disagreeable to hon. members to get their boxes of stationery. That is not done by the Government, at all events. It is done by a Printing Committee which is formed of members of both Houses, and I think it is a sub-committee of that Printing Committee that arranges for these boxes and for what is to go into them. A number of these fittings are quite familiar to members on both sides, as they come to them in the box they receive every year, and I have no doubt that they carefully treasure and sparingly use what they get. There is no doubt that more of these articles are got than are actually necessary. Hon. members who have been long in Parliament, know, however, how difficult it is to supervise expenditures of that kind. Two years ago a committee of members from both Houses was appointed, and they met day after day and hour after hour, and endeavoured to secure greater economy in this matter. I think not much eventuated from the meetings of that committee. At all events, a report was made to this House, but I do not think it was ever adopted. If that be so, it was the fault of this House itself. I think that report had good features, and would have been productive of economy, but it is not the fault of the Government that it was not adopted, but the fault of the House. Not being a member of the Senate, I am not acquainted with the inner workings of that House, but, I suppose, they are something like those of the House of Commons. However, if members of both Houses desire to be economical and to save a part of this expenditure, they can easily do it, and it would be, I think, a good thing to do, but the initiative rests with the House in each case.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. This expenditure as to trunks I do not think is attended to by the Printing Committee, but is left to the Senators themselves. It is notorious that their trunks are furnished with better stationery and better articles of every kind than those which are furnished to the members of the House of Commons, and I do not know why that should be so. I think there should be a change in the method of purchasing these articles. Some years ago I proposed that this whole system of supplying boxes of stationery should be done away with, but, so long as this provision is made, I think the Senate and the House of Commons should be on the same footing. I cannot see why the members of the Senate should have better articles than those which are furnished to the members of the House of Commons. For my part, I do not see why these articles should be furnished to either. I think it would be preferable that it should not be done, but, as long as this money is expended, there is no reason why the members of the Senate should be preferred above the members of the House of Commons, as they invariably have been since I have been a member of this House. I think it should be left either to the Printing Committee or to some other joint committee of both Houses to make a selection of those articles which are required, and that there should be no discrimination between the two Houses. I cannot see why the Senators deserve more consideration than members of the House of Commons in this regard, but they have always maintained their superiority and have always had something better than has been given to the members of the House of Commons. It was mentioned that, even in the matter of trunks, they have better trunks than are given to the members of this House.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope they are not larger.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. They are larger. If there is no way of controlling the exorbitant expenditure of the Senate, I think this House should have something to say about it. I see that the amount for these contingencies last year amounted to $60,247.96.

Mr. FOSTER. That takes in $32,933 for salaries, $1,059 for pages, $2,070 for messengers, and amounts for charwomen, postage, newspapers, $2,073 ; Debates, $9,000, unforeseen expenses, $2,000, and so on.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It is all in connection with the running of the Senate, and we ought to do something to equalize this matter. I think the Government should devise some means by which the expenditure in both Houses should be controlled either by the Government or by a special joint committee or by the Committee on Printing, so that the two Houses may be dealt with alike, and I ask the Finance Minister if some arrangement of this kind could not be made?

Mr. BERGIN. I think the hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. The Senate does not get better stationery than the Commons. The stationery for the Commons and everything that is furnished to the Commons in that small trunk, is furnished, as a rule, by the stationery department of the House of Commons under the direction, I may say, of the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Trow), the whip on the other side, and by myself as chairman of the committee; and we have endeavoured to provide just as good stationery for the House of Commons as for the Senate.

Mr. FOSTER. What committee do you mean?

Mr. BERGIN. The Joint Committee on Printing. We have given no advantage to the Senate over our own House. There has been the most perfect understanding between the hon. gentleman who acts as chairman for the Senate, when he happens to be chairman for the Senate alone, and the other members of the Printing Committee. If we have not as good stationery as the Senate, it is not because of any favouritism, but because the hon. member for Perth and myself have not had sufficient knowledge of what was necessary in ordering stationery for the House of Commons.

Mr. SPROULE. I must say that I partially agree with what the hon. gentleman opposite has said with regard to the difference in what was furnished to the Senate and what was furnished for the Commons, and I refer particularly to the trunks that have been given out this year. I do not think that the trunks that have been given to the members of the House of Commons reflect very great credit upon the parties who ordered them or the parties who made them. I think that anyone who understands the value would say that the trunks given out for the Senate are much more valuable than those for the Commons. Those given to the Commons are very inferior in many

respects. In my own trunk, when I lifted off the lid inside, I found it was only pasted on with mucilage, and the handles came right off. They were merely stuck on inside with mucilage, instead of being fastened on in a substantial way. There are no heads to the nails to protect the sides of the trunk, whereas the trunks given to the Senate have large brass-headed nails that protect the trunk to a large extent, and the trunk will wear very much longer. In looking through other parts of the trunk, I found it very much inferior to the Senate trunk, so I think there is a great difference in favour of the Senate. If they cost the same, there is something inexplicable that I cannot understand, because I think any one who has examined the two carefully will say that the Senate trunks are much more valuable. But I wish to speak more particularly with reference to the stationery provided in the trunks. It always seemed to me that it was useless. We have very nice letter pads that we get upstairs, and they are valuable for our purposes, but they are only supplied to us during the session. Why not have a supply of this in the trunks of stationery? We have note paper, but it is so small in size that it is practically useless, with small sized envelopes that we cannot use to advantage. If you would give us the kind of envelopes that would suit any ordinary size of note paper, they would be much more valuable. Now, I believe you might put in these trunks a much better class of stationery than we now receive, and give us letter pads so that we can use them, either ruled or unruled.

Mr. MULOCK. Did you say liver pads?

Mr. SPROULE. Liver pads might be needed on that side of the House, but we do not need them here. I say, put in letter pads the same as we can get upstairs, of the ordinary letter size, and put in a number of them, and not so many of the small pads. Then do away with package after package of small note paper, that is comparatively useless for any one who wants to do much writing.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Notwithstanding the statements made by the hon. gentleman opposite, I maintain that I am right with regard to the difference in the stationery. Ever since I have been a member of this House, the statement has been made that the Senate have the best stationery, and the Senate themselves claim that they have superior articles. I did not know until to-night how the selection was made. I have been a member of the Printing Committee for nine sessions, and during the whole of the time of my connection with the Printing Committee—and I have been at nearly every meeting—I never remember any sub-committee being appointed to select stationery. I doubt very much, if the minutes of the Printing Committee were examined for any one year during the last nine years, that a motion would be found appointing a sub-committee to select the stationery for the Commons and the Senate. It is possible there may be one, there may be an understanding that these gentlemen should do it, but there has been no regular appointment that I was aware of, and I do not think that there have been any meetings of that committee at which I was not present. However, I maintain that I am correct in saying that the Senate have had indulgence in this regard, whether by the committee or by the management of their own affairs, I do not know; but they claim it themselves, and no doubt it is a fact. Now, there is one item here which seems rather singular, as it can only be used during one year. During the last year in the Senate, which is composed of about 80 members, they had no less than 313 almanacs and 12 card calendars. Now, what do they do with 313 almanacs? They must have had them in every room. They must carry them around in their pockets, and have them pinned upon their backs, and use them in every sort of way. I think we ought to have some explanation of this item. If the member for Stormont (Mr. Bergin) is responsible for this stationery, I want him to tell me now why he authorized the purchase of 313 almanacs in one year for 80 members. They cannot keep them for another year's use, and if the member for Stormont is going to defend his position, I want him to answer that question.

Mr. BERGIN. I repeat that the articles of stationery have been selected ever since I have been a member of the Printing Committee, by the Chairman and by the member for Perth.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Who authorized that selection?

Mr. BERGIN. The Printing Committee authorized it. It was understood that the hon. member for Perth should act for the Opposition, and the Chairman of the Printing Committee for the Government, and we have always acted harmoniously together. I do not know that we went together during the last two or three years, because we thought that we had provided all that was right and all that was necessary. There are some hon. gentlemen who want nearly all their stationery in the form of letter pads, others want it in the shape of foolscap; others, who have ladies with them, want very small envelopes, which they think are more convenient for the dear creatures; but others, who are business men and write voluminous letters, want very large note, for they do not write *billets doux*. We know by experience that we cannot please every one. Officers of this House are furnished with almanacs.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. These 313 almanacs are for the Senate. What has the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Bergin) to do with the Senate?

Mr. BERGIN. We select the Commons' stationery, and I deny that it is inferior to that obtained by the Senate. I suggest that we place on the Table at our next Committee meeting a box of the Senate stationery, and I will show that our box is better and costs no more.

Mr. CHARLTON. We must have the test made.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Bergin) now takes a different position from that which he occupied at first. He then claimed that he selected the stationery for the Commons and the Senate.

Mr. BERGIN. No, no.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The hon. gentleman said the stationery was uniform because he selected it. He now says he does not select the stationery for the Senate. Who does select it? We should like to know.

Mr. BERGIN. We must enquire from the Senate.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It is evident that the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Bergin) does not know anything about the stationery business. He admits he does not know anything about the stationery supplied to the Senate; all he knows is in regard to the Commons' stationery, and, therefore, I do not consider he is an authority on the matter. I should like to ask the Government who selects the stationery for the Senate?

Mr. BERGIN. I told you that the Chairman of the Senate Committee, when not Chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, selected the stationery for the Senate as we did for this House.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Who joins him in the work? The Chairman of the Printing Committee has the assistance of the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow), and there is uniformity in their selection; but the chairman of the Senate Committee appears to act alone. If the Chairman of the Printing Committee of the Senate and the Chairman of the Commons Committee, with the assistance of the hon. member for South Perth, act together, I will be satisfied. The Government should make some other arrangement in regard to this stationery business. Although I have been a member of the Committee for nine years and have attended, I believe, every meeting, I have never heard a motion made to appoint anyone to select the stationery, either a member of the Senate or the Commons. There may have been an established practice before I became a member, but the practice has never been authorized by the Committee in an official way, to my knowledge. Will the Minister of Finance state if the Government will take any action on the matter?

Mr. FOSTER. This is a matter entirely in the hands of each House. I spoke merely from memory when I stated that the Printing Committee generally did this business. I remember once, when a member of that Committee, helping to select the stationery for the Commons. The members of the Commons on that Committee did not select the stationery for the Senate, and the Senate did not have anything to do with selecting the stationery for the Commons; but it was understood, whether by resolution of the Committee or not, that the heads of that Committee were to select the stationery. I quite agree that there should be no distinction between the class of stationery used by the two Houses. It should be equally good in each case, and one should not have any advantage over the other. I suggest to the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville), who is an influential member of the Committee, that when the Committee meets again, now that he knows the *modus operandi*, the matter should be discussed in order to ascertain whether the Senate and Commons cannot come to a satisfactory conclusion for a proper and uniform selection of the stationery for both Houses. The hon. member must not refer to the Senate too harshly. He spoke of 313 almanacs being required for 78 or 80 persons connected with the Senate, but he must remember that 215 persons connected with the Commons require 430 almanacs. So, both Houses are at fault if there is extravagance.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Do I understand that the Joint Printing Committee have full control of this matter? If not, it would be useless to attempt to arrive at an amicable arrangement, because the Senate members would act in their own way and the Commons in their way. Unless this House and the other House delegate the power to their representatives on the Committee, we might talk until doomsday and not arrive at a satisfactory conclusion. Do I understand that the Committee has absolute control over the matter?

Mr. FOSTER. I say that the Committee has done the work. This House finds the money, and if the House refuses to vote the money the stationery could not be bought. I made the suggestion as a feasible way of coming to an arrangement. If the hon. gentleman does not think it can be done, he may, perhaps, be able to devise some other means.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Has the Committee control of this matter?

Mr. FOSTER. The Committee having done the business for years is quite capable of making a recommendation to the House in regard to stationery.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is well understood that the power of each House is just the same as is the power of each House in the United Kingdom, and the House of Commons has no control whatever over appropriations made for the purposes of the other Chamber. Each House is in that respect complete master of its own business. It is true that if the Government pass a Bill to take this matter out of the hands of the two Houses and vest it elsewhere, a different system might be adopted; but there is nothing to prevent the House of Commons, if it chooses, obtaining the best quality of paper on the market, and there is nothing to prevent the Senate from adopting the same course. If this matter is to go to the committee the other House must consent. It cannot be done unless the other House chooses voluntarily to surrender part of the power it possesses. If the system is to be one of uniformity, legislation is required and a joint committee will not accomplish the purpose. It will require legislation, as we required legislation with respect to the Library in order to secure joint action there.

Mr. CHARLTON. There is a point in connection with the reading rooms of the two Houses that is worthy of consideration. The Senate and the House of Commons get along with the use of the same library, and I fail to understand why they cannot get along with the use of a common reading room. The Senate spent last year for newspaper subscriptions $2,073, while for the same purpose the Commons spent $1,967. It is absurd to maintain two separate reading rooms. The two Houses could get along very well with one, and the members of the Houses would become better acquainted with one another, and there would be no jostling or crowding caused by using a common room. By spending a thousand dollars or so less on one common reading room than the sum now spent on both, a reading room could be established which would be greatly superior to the two existing rooms. I am well aware that the Senate are very tenacious of their rights. The Committee which made various recommendations with a view to economizing the expenditure, and which might have been adopted with great advantage, found that feeling to prevail. The members who sat on that Committee could not have failed to have

noticed that the Senate were very tenacious of their rights, but it strikes me that if the matter were placed in a proper manner before them an arrangement could be come to whereby some thousands of dollars could be saved by having a general reading room.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see that the chief Opposition whip (Mr. Trow) has just come into the House. The hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) made some reference to the fact that he and the whip on this side of the House ordered these trunks for the Senate and the House of Commons, and I must say that it appears to be a general skirmish with regard to matters of incidental expenditure. I am not often able to agree with the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), but I am glad to be able to endorse what he has said about these trunks. They are no credit to the three gentlemen who had the ordering of them, as the trunks furnished to the House of Commons are very inferior articles, although I understand that the same price was paid for them as for the Senate trunks.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. McMULLEN. If that is not the case, then I would like to know how it comes that this inferior and trashy article is furnished to the members of the House of Commons, while members of the Senate get a superior and a more expensive trunk. I would like to know from the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) whether or not he has got the same trunk as the Senators. I have been credibly informed that he secured for himself a Senate trunk, and I do not know whether my friend the whip on this side of the House did the same. If the same price was paid for the trunks furnished to the Senate and to the House of Commons, the price paid for the House of Commons trunks was altogether too high, or the price paid for the Senate trunks was too low. I believe the Senate trunks were made in Ottawa and the House of Commons trunks in Montreal, and I would like to ask the hon. member for Cornwall if he has secured a Senate trunk?

Mr. BERGIN. I may inform the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that I did not state the member for Perth (Mr. Trow) had anything to do with purchasing the trunks. After prorogation, and when it was proposed to make a contract for trunks in obedience to the orders of the House, I wrote to the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Trow), and whether he was at home or not I do not know, but I did not receive an answer to my letter, and I did not see the hon. gentleman until we met again this session. I went to the different trunk makers in Montreal and the Chairman of the Senate Committee said he would do the same in Toronto. I found that I could buy no trunks for anything like the money it had been suggested in the House such articles should cost. I spoke to a friend of mine who is a commission merchant and a dealer in leather, and he said he would get samples of the trunks from different manufacturers and let us know when the samples would be brought together. I referred the matter to the Speaker and we saw the different samples of trunks at Montreal and selected the one which he thought was the better one. With all due deference to what has been said by the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen), in my opinion one of the trunks supplied to the House of Commons will outlast two or three of the trunks supplied to the Senate. They have not the appearance of the Senate trunks, I admit, but I think they are more solid and better constructed. They are made of solid leather on iron frames and I am informed they are equal to the sample. As far as the trunk which I have received is concerned, I may say that it is the same as that which other gentlemen have, and I have not a Senate trunk, nor would I exchange my trunk for the Senate trunk.

Mr. TROW. I will take some responsibility for these trunks, notwithstanding the statement of the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin). Some two years ago I urged upon the special committee of the Printing Committee to purchase trunks of the description we have received which would be of some service and of some value to us, instead of having our houses encumbered with shoddy trunks received every session which were totally useless, and the cost of five during the parliamentary term would cost nearly the price of the leather trunk. Now you have something that is useful for yourselves and families through time. I do not know what kind of trunk my inquisitive friend from Wellington received, but I fancy it was similar to the one I got. It was made in Montreal and cost $25, while the Senate trunks made in Ottawa cost $32. The latter trunks perhaps are somewhat better and a little more durable. Our trunks are in my opinion cheap, and good, and serviceable, and every member ought to be thankful that he has something to point to, to show that he has been a member of Parliament during his life.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It seems that, while the Minister of Finance is quite correct that the expenditure of money is under the supervision of the joint committee, yet, after all, the responsibility rests in the first place with the Government and in the next place with the House. If the members of the House are satisfied that things are wrong, it seems to me they ought to remedy them, and now is the time to do so, because it will not do to lay the blame on the committee or anyone else. We have the power in our own hands to stop this matter, and, if the Government think that there has been extravagance in this line, either in the Senate or in the House of Commons, they should not assume the responsibility of asking for so large a vote. I agree with the hon. Minister of Finance, in a large measure, that a comparison of the Commons with the Senate will not show that the Commons deserve a very great deal of credit for economy in this matter either. The question is, are we prepared now—and now is the time to do it—to control the committee by simply refusing to vote the money? If so, the Ministry ought to have the courage to reduce the item, and in doing so they ought to be supported by the House. But you cannot greatly blame the committee, when you vote this year as much for contingencies as was voted in previous years. You find the members of the House of Commons charged with 888 knives, nearly four for each member. If you place as much money at the disposal of the committee this year as they had last year, they will consider that they have authority to expend it. The control is really in the House, and now is the time to deal with the question by simply reducing this vote, or, if you like, by wiping out the whole amount for contingencies; or, if you still think you should in

the public interest have stationery, then vote the amount you think necessary.

Mr. BERGIN. There is no doubt a great deal of waste in stationery, and there can be no doubt that the House is charged with using a large number of different articles which are not used by the members of the House. Some hon. gentlemen forget that in addition to the members of the House, stationery is furnished to the *Hansard* reporters, to the press, to the clerks, and to all the officers of the House. Almost every clerk gets a knife. There can be no denying that there is a great deal of waste of stationery inside of the House, and that members are not as careful as they ought to be in the use of stationery. We endeavoured to introduce a check on this wasteful consumption of stationery three or fours years ago by asking Mr. Romaine to insist upon an order being sent by each member of the House for the stationery he requires, so that I think the amount of stationery used by each individual member is on record every day in the Stationery Department, and it can be seen at a glance who are the members so wasteful and extravagant. It is not only in paper, but in other articles of stationery that there is waste. You can understand that if a member goes to Mr. Romaine and tells him that he must have this or that, that one has carried off his knife or another his paper-cutter, Mr. Romaine cannot very well refuse him.

Mr. DENISON. I gather from the remarks of the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) that hon. members opposite each get two knives. I have only been able to get one. I think the paper they get is also very much better than what we get on this side.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I do not wish to belittle the efforts of the Printing Committee, but I think both Houses would be better served by having the selection of paper made by men who are thoroughly capable of making a proper selection.

Mr. BERGIN. Like the member for North Brant, I suppose.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. No. I am not like the hon. member for Stormont. I do not think all the common sense is contained in my own head ; I give others credit for having a little as well as myself, and I am going to suggest that the power to select this stationery be delegated to Mr. Romaine and the corresponding officer in the Senate. That would be the way to have a uniform selection made for both Houses, and they would probably be better served than they are at present. I do not think the Printing Committee have authority to delegate this power. I think the Government ought to take the matter up and instruct these two officers to make a uniform selection every year, so that there would be no disparity in the quality of the stationery supplied to the two Houses.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). It is not, I think, the quality of the article that we have reason to complain of. I think the stationery all round is perfectly good stationery for anybody, and if the Senators get a few articles of a little better quality than we do, I do not complain of that. I complain of the quantity, not of the quality. I see there were 888 knives bought for members of the House of Commons last year. I got only one knife ; who got six ? Where are the men who have appropriated these articles ? I suppose Mr. Romaine who distributes these articles makes an entry of the name of every man to whom he gives a knife. In more than one case, three extra knives have been given, but, of course, not to any members of this House. Let a member of the Government ask Mr. Romaine to send down a return of what has become of those knives and then we will know where the leak is. Why buy 888 knives for 215 members ? If a member loses his knife, let him buy another, and not ask the taxpayers to pay three or four times over in the same session for knives costing from $1.25 to $2. The difficulty is not so much in the quality as in the quantity, and the condition of things appears to be really worse here than in the Senate, with respect to knives at all events. I do not know how the scissors stand, but I know that in my trunk there is only one small pair. If there is a knife wanted for the reporters, buy that and no more ; and when a man loses a knife let him get another at his own expense.

Mr. FOSTER. The House will remember that two years ago we had a joint committee of both Houses which came to certain conclusions, that it was found impracticable, in some way or other, to carry out, and they made a report which was never adopted. The leader of the Senate has informed me that last year they appointed a sub-committee on contingencies, which went through the whole matter thoroughly and devised a means of cutting down this expenditure to the actual wants of the Senate, so that these extra knives, &c., will not hereafter be bought. They also sent us a report, which is on the Journals of the House of last year, so the leader of the Senate informs me. Now if the House of Commons will reform itself in the same way, we will get rid of these annual discussions and of a great deal of the blame which attaches to the Government throughout the country for these things which cannot be properly explained. I do not despair that before the session is over we shall be able to devise a means whereby this expenditure shall be cut down.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The best way would be to reduce the vote at once. So long as we leave it at the same amount, those who have the spending of it will purchase to the full amount at their disposal. If there is this economy to be effected in the Senate contingencies, they will not require so much money. The hon. Minister may say that they will not spend it ; but if they do not need the whole of it, we would be strengthening their hands if we did not vote the full amount. I do not hold the Government responsible for this thing, because it is in the hands of the House as well, and if we are honest we ought to be prepared to reduce the amount and thus accomplish the reform the Minister recommends.

Mr. FOSTER. No one can be prepared to say now, what, under the new regulations to be adopted, will be the exact sum required. We had better pass this item now, and if we can come to an arrangement before concurrence it will not be difficult when we find the basis on which we can proceed, to drop a certain amount before the item is concurred in.

Mr. TROW. I wish to say one word with reference to this streak of economy which has seized hon. members apropos of this small item of extras. We must take into consideration the fact

that it is not merely 215 members who receive these knives. The reporters all receive them—about fifty reporters; and there are other civil service men who receive knives. The *Hansard* staff and translators receive knives, the pages and the messengers of the House. Why, the very time occupied in this discussion is more costly to the country than all these extras hon. gentlemen have been speaking about. Very likely some of the hon. gentlemen whose ire is roused with reference to a few knives and reams of paper have been sinners themselves. I do not know any set of men in this country who could make a better selection of stationery than is contained in the stationery trunks. I am surprised that hon. gentlemen should be so ready to make complaints against the committee which has done its duty in every respect. I can say this conscientiously that I have received one knife each session and no more, and do not want any more. At the same time, I would not raise my voice over a few extra knives.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I wish to disabuse the mind of the hon. member for South Perth that I found fault with the selection of stationery. I have not done so, but what I contended for, and what every hon. gentleman in this House ought to contend for, is that there should be uniformity in the selection, and that the Senate should not receive better stationery than the House of Commons.

Mr. BAIN. Perhaps the most reasonable remedy for the complaint is that made by the hon. member for Huron. The leak is not so much in the selection, but in the fact that parties apply at the department when they have lost their knives, for others. They go to Mr. Romaine and insist on getting these extra things. If a man loses his knife he should buy another. For myself I may say—and I have had a good many years' experience in this House—I never on any occasion received more than one knife in any one session, which I got in my sessional trunk along with my stationery. I never asked Mr. Romaine for another knife. If I lost my knife, I thought I was to blame, but I think the leak occurs in a way for which we are ourselves responsible, and the sooner we realize that it is not creditable to the Commons the sooner we will have this leak stopped.

House of Commons—Salaries, per Clerk's estimates..... $73,350

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is an increase of $1,300 here.

Mr. SPEAKER. There are twenty-nine statutory increases of $50 each, making $1,450, and there is a reduction in the estimate for the assistant law clerk of $150. Mr. McCord, who was receiving $1,950, has been promoted to be the law clerk, and the estimates for the assistant is at the minimum of $1,800.

House of Commons—Contingencies.... $23,100

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice here an iten for a silk gown, $60, and also for 17½ yards of silk, $30.13. There is also an item for swords for Serjeant-at-Arms, $47.12, and many other items of expenditure that I think ought to be fairly explained. There is a payment to Mrs. F. Wilson of $1,500 for example. I would ask how many silk gowns are required?

Mr. OUIMET. I am informed that the silk gown was bought for the use of the Clerk of the House. It has been the custom for many, many years, long before I was here myself, to buy these gowns at the public expense, and I have seen no reason and no resolution from the House varying that practice. I suppose it was done in the same way as before.

Mr. McMULLEN. What about the 17½ yards of silk?

Mr. OUIMET. I know that some silk was bought for the ornament of the Speaker's chamber, and this may be the item, but I cannot say. I can state that no silk was bought for the private use of the Speaker or any of the employés of the House.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Speaker is allowed $300 for a private secretary during the time the House is in session. I understand that last year the Speaker used a clerk of the House as his secretary, and that the $300 allowed for that purpose was made payable to that clerk in his own office. I should like to know if that is correct?

Mr. OUIMET. That is not correct. The money was paid to the private secretary.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Has the Deputy Speaker a clerk?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. No.

Mr. MULOCK. Apparently there is no increase in this item, but I think there is an increase in fact. Last year the expenditure for contingencies of the House of Commons was $23,100, but it included $2,000, the salary of the Deputy Speaker, which appears this year under a separate item.

Mr. FOSTER. The Deputy Speaker's salary was a separate item last year.

Mr. MULOCK. I was quoting from the Auditor General's Report, but I see that I am in error. There is an item of $47.12 for swords for the Serjeant-at-Arms. Is this an annual expenditure?

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose the old swords have worn out. They have probably been used since Confederation.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see here items for cab-hire for the Speaker, $137, for his clerk $79, and for sundries $14.25, making about $230 last year. I think we should have some explanation in regard to those items.

Mr. SPEAKER. I suppose the $79 is not for the Speaker's clerk, but for the Clerk of the House, and my own experience is that the item of $137 for the Speaker is not very much.

Mr. MULOCK. This account should be better classified in the Auditor General's Report. It would be proper, under Commons' details, to have one account showing the expenses in connection with the Speaker's department and the Speaker's household, and so on, and a separate account in regard to the House of Commons itself. At present it is impossible to distinguish in regard to these items, whether they are for the House of Commons, or some officers of the House of Commons.

Mr. FOSTER. No doubt the Auditor General will read the suggestion; he is very apt to take suggestions.

Publishing Debates..... $40,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does that cover the expenditure? I doubt it very much. What was the sum last year?

Mr. FOSTER. $63,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman see any advantage in voting what we know will not be sufficient? I am afraid that $40,000 will not cover the expenditure, from my recollection of the experience of former years. I should be very glad if it would.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think there is anything gained in making an estimate smaller than it is known will be needed; but it is rather a difficult matter for a Finance Minister to make an estimate larger than the proper officer who sends in the amount thinks is necessary. I do not feel myself at liberty to make it greater.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where is the expenditure for the last year?

Mr. FOSTER. In B—164.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see the Debates last year cost $63,066.

Mr. FOSTER. It depends on the length of the session. It is impossible to estimate for it accurately.

Salaries and Contingencies—Serjeant-at-Arms' estimates.....$33,032.50

Mr. McMULLEN. On page 165—B, I see "Mrs. F. Wilson, two months, per Order in Council; $533.33; special vote, $1,000." What is that for?

Mr. SPEAKER. That was for the late law clerk, Mr. Wilson.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the salary of the law clerk?

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it is $3,200. It will be remembered that Mr. Wilson died rather suddenly, and there was an Order in Council to give his widow two months' salary.

Mr. McMULLEN. On page 165—B, I find an item for 20 yards of silk in one place, and 17½ yards in another place. What is that for?

Mr. SPEAKER. I imagine that is for furnishing the Speaker's rooms. These accounts, as the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) has stated, are all dispersed throughout the Auditor General's Report. They are arranged alphabetically instead of being arranged under the different services for which the amounts were paid.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have tried to keep some trace of the items connected with the Speaker's department in this chamber for the last seven or eight years. I notice that an enormous quantity of stuff goes in there. I do not know whether it is there now; but, I fancy, if the hon. Speaker now in possession found all the stuff there, he would not be able to get into the place at all. Year after year a large amount of stuff is bought and put in there, and when another Speaker comes in there appears to be room enough for any quantity of stuff more. I think there is room for saving a good deal of money in connection with that department, as well as in connection with the restaurant. I find a large amount of stuff is bought for the purpose of refurnishing the restaurant every year when Parliament assembles. I do think that all the expenditure connected with these two departments should be put under the strict supervision of some person who would be held responsible, and that when one man goes out the contents of the Speaker's department should be carefully listed and the list should be handed over to the new Speaker, and at the end of his term he should hand over to his successor everything that he receives, except those things that may be broken or destroyed. It appears to me there is an enormous quantity of stuff that is bought and charged to the Speaker's department and the restaurant downstairs, and I do not really know what becomes of it. If all that has been bought and paid for during these eight or nine years, were to be found either downstairs or upstairs, there would not be room for a rat to get through it. I would like to know what becomes of all this stuff that is bought and paid for every year. I was much pleased to hear the remarks that dropped from the Finance Minister. I think when the Senate go to work and cut down their expenditure after careful investigation, they set a wise example for us, and there is room to carefully criticize the expenditures in connection with the two departments I have mentioned. I have endeavoured to criticize these things from year to year, but it does not appear to do any good. We find afterwards the same quantity of stuff is bought, and the same expenditure is made. You would fancy, from the charges that appear in the Auditor General's Report, that at the end of every session the place is cleaned out and the stuff is carried off, and we have got to refit, refurnish, recarpet, and rearrange the whole place for the purpose of meeting the convenience of the Speaker who is going to occupy it. I think that there is something wrong, and some effort should be made to find out where the leak is.

Mr. SPEAKER. With regard to the restaurant, an inventory of the goods was made at the time the keeper took charge of it at the beginning of this Parliament, and an agreement was made with him that he would return these articles to the charge of the Serjeant-at-Arms at the end of the session, and would make good any deficiencies there might be. With regard to the Speaker's rooms, I suppose my hon. friend will hardly expect that no renewals would be needed. He, perhaps, has kept house himself, and he knows that articles wear out and have to be replaced, and he would hardly expect the Speaker, no matter who he might be, to exercise police supervision over the rooms during the recess between one session of Parliament and another. I take it that the servants are perfectly honest, and that nothing is taken away from the Speaker's chambers during the recess. But I think my hon. friend will understand that those goods, after they are used for a certain length of time, become worn out, and perhaps the Speaker's wives think they are rather unfashionable, and would like to change some articles. But I would say for my own part, that very few additions have been made to the furnishing of the rooms since I have had the honour of occupying the position of Speaker.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I will suggest the adoption of some plan similar to that adopted by the Public Accounts Committee in regard to Rideau Hall. When a Governor leaves, or at the end of every year, an inventory is taken of all the goods in the Hall; and, I think, a similar plan should be adopted with regard to the Speaker's apartments.

Salaries of Officers of the Library. ... $16,895

Mr. MULOCK. Will the Minister of Finance explain the increase?

Mr. FOSTER. There are the statutory increases, and, in addition, $200 to the salary of each of the librarians. It was thought that their present salaries were not sufficient, and an increase of $200 each is to place them at the same salaries as deputy heads.

Grant to Parliamentary Library..... $17,500

Mr. MULOCK. I notice $148 for newspaper subscriptions. If these subscriptions are to purchase papers for the accommodation of the staff of the library, they are unnecessary, because the reading room is quite accessible. An item of $288, travelling expenses of the librarians, needs explanation. I find that of the gross expenditure of $12,000 or $13,000, mainly for books, not more than $100 is expended in Toronto, a considerable sum being expended in Montreal and a large sum in Ottawa. I do not know whether special rates are obtained by dealing with particular firms. If not, the expenditure should not be made in this fashion.

Mr. FOSTER. The expenditures are made under the supervision of the Library Committee.

Mr. SCRIVER. As a member of the Library Committee I may say that these purchases are all made by the librarians. They are made subject to the supervision of the Library Committee, and the accounts are all accurately audited by a sub-committee of that committee during each session. The bulk of the purchases are made abroad, either in the United States, England, or foreign countries, but some are made in Ottawa. I do not know how it happens that the city in which my hon. friend for North York (Mr. Mulock) takes so much interest appears so infrequently. I suppose it is because, perhaps, they do not bind books as well, or publish as many books as many cities. At all events, the selection is made by the librarians themselves.

Mr. MULOCK. My hon. friend's explanation hardly covers the point. I do not suppose our book purchases are made direct from English or other publishers, but through Canadian dealers.

Mr. SCRIVER. The orders are sent direct to the publishers abroad by the librarians, but not always.

Mr. MULOCK. Do the librarians make the purchases themselves and afterwards account to the committee for the expenditure, or has the committee anything to say as to the channels through which the purchases shall be made? If not, I submit there should be a fair distribution of favours.

Mr. SCRIVER. The members of the committee are requested to make suggestions as to the character of the works to be purchased. I do not know that they are expected to make suggestions to the librarians as to the places where or the persons from whom the purchases are to be made.

Mr. MULOCK. Then I ask that the librarians be asked to furnish a statement as to the principle on which they purchase books, having reference to the sources through which they purchase them.

Mr. FOSTER. The report of the Library submitted to the House at the opening of the Session may contain the information. If not any other information necessary may be obtained through the Chairman of the Library Committee; who is Mr. Speaker.

Printing, printing paper and binding....$70,000

Mr. LANDERKIN. Much printing is done that is altogether unnecessary, and elaborate and expensive reports are scattered through the country and little use made of them. A considerable saving might be effected on this item without loss even to the country or to the individual.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It would be satisfactory, not only to members of this House but to the public, if some Government officer was instructed to prepare a comparative statement as to the cost of printing done at the Printing Bureau as compared with the cost of printing done under the old contract system. It would indicate to the country whether we had made an advance by establishing a Printing Bureau. In connection with this item, I desire to ask whether any further information can be given with respect to Barber & Co.'s suit against the Government for damages?

Mr. FOSTER. I have no further information to offer, and the Secretary of State is not in his seat. I am informed there has not been any decision in the case.

Revision of Electoral Lists under Franchise Act.....$ 150,000

Mr. LANDERKIN. Have instructions been given to the revising officers to go on with the revision of the lists, or do they go on without instructions? Because last year when they were going on with the revision they were told to stop.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There was some public intimation given that it was not the intention of the Government to introduce any Bill to suspend the operation of the Act and they are going on.

Mr. LANDERKIN. When you suspend, do you give them notice or do you let the Statute take its course?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Would the hon. gentleman say if this $150,000 is adequate to pay all expenses in connection with the preparation of the voters' lists?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am afraid not.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the total estimate?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. About $240,000.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I understand that the revising officers do not advertize when the preliminary revision is to take place. I believe this is one of the economies the Government has introduced into the system.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The revising officer prepares a list of additions and erasures, and he publishes this at a certain number of places and states that he will sit to hear objections, but he does not give notice when he begins his work.

Mr. DEVLIN. What is the consequence when the revising officer sends out notice that he will go and sit at a certain place and does not go and sit?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to know how this estimated amount is expended: how much does the Minister estimate as necessary to pay the salaries of the revising officers, whether it is proposed to pay clerks as well, and how much

will be required to pay the cost of printing the lists ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Speaking roughly, the amount required for the salaries and disbursements of the revising officers would be about $150,000. It is not intended to pay the clerks separately, but to follow the system which was adopted last year of paying the revising officer a sum sufficient for his services and his disbursements, and he provides his own clerks and his own bailiffs and pays them out of that sum.

Mr. FLINT. I would like to call the attention of the Government to a matter which was brought to my notice by a member of this House, namely, that at least in one electoral division of the Dominion one of the revising officers appointed by the Government is the law partner in business of one of the members in this House who is very likely to become a candidate in an election. I would like to ask the Government if any representations have been made to them in this matter, and if so what they propose to do in regard to it ? I need hardly say that it is considered very improper, and that it is looked upon as a violation of the spirit if not of the letter of the Franchise Act, that a person so near in relation to a member of this House, and to a probable candidate in a county in which the elections have always been very close, should occupy that important office. As this matter has been brought to my attention, and as it appears to be very pertinent to the subject under discussion, I would like to hear the views of the Ministry upon the matter.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The case the hon. gentleman refers to is not quite as he understands it to be ; however, I will not challenge the statement of fact which he has made. I may point out that the law makes no provision whatever for removing a revising officer, except the provision that he is to hold office in the same way as a judge does, and be removed by a vote of both Houses. We have, therefore, no power to remove a revising officer. There is no provision for his disqualification because of the fact that his law partner is elected to the House, but the subject is well worthy of consideration and will be considered.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). I believe I am the person to whom the hon. gentleman (Mr. Flint) refers, and I may say to him that he is quite astray altogether in his ideas on this point.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). I say that the revising officer is not my partner at all.

Mr. McMULLEN. Was he your partner ?

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). I am quite ready to give you a very full explanation.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Well, do so.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). He has never been my partner.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Then he does not refer to you.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). Yes, he does; and the reason I know it is that he has put a question on the order paper, and therefore I am quite satisfied the hon. gentleman refers to me. He never has been my partner. He was appointed revising officer before I had any idea whatever of running in an election. I may also say that the voters' list, as made in the County of Shelburne, gives

satisfaction to both sides of politics, and I venture to say that it would be impossible for the hon. gentleman to find anybody in the county who objects to the list as it now stands, or to the acts of the revising officer.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Last year a Minister of the Crown intimated that there would be a revision of the lists and I went to the trouble of getting blanks printed and having them sent out. It cost me a considerable amount of money, and after I had made that outlay, the revision did not go on. In the year 1888 a similar thing was done. If you are going to have a revision it should be stated publicly that you are going on with it, so as to save trouble and expense to the members. This Act has been suspended on several occasions, the first revision was in 1886, it was suspended in 1887, it was again suspended in 1888, it was revised in 1889 and was again suspended in 1890, and we want to know whether it is going to die or not this year. I want to have more than the words of the Secretary of State for this before I go to the expense, because we had his assurance that there would be a revision in 1890 and no revision took place. We would like to have the assurance of the leader of the Government now, as the Minister of Justice rather evades the issue.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am not evading the issue at all. I would advise the hon. gentleman to send out his blanks and I can comfort him with the assurance that they will not be wasted, as the same blanks will do. I am extremely sorry that we had not a revision, for I know the hon. gentleman likes it, but he will not be disappointed a second time.

Mr. BARRON. This item in itself may not be large but we all know that the cost of revising the lists is something enormous. A reduction might be made by reducing the number of revising officers. In Victoria you have two revising officers, one the county judge, and another a gentleman practicing law. The population of the County of Victoria is less than that of the County of Peterborough ; yet in the latter county there is only one revising officer, who is a County Court judge. If he can do all the business for a larger population, why would not one revising officer be sufficient for the County of Victoria ? This system of unnecessarily duplicating officers goes on all over the country. By doing the work with a fewer number of officers you could save a large amount of expenditure.

Mr. DEVLIN. I agree with what has been said to a certain extent, but I believe that in the Province of British Columbia there are six revising barristers, whereas in the County of Ottawa, which has a larger population than that province, we have but one. I can understand how it is that some portions of the county have not been visited by the revising barrister at all. When a revision of the list took place, there were three townships, Hartwell, Ripon and Suffolk, which received notices that they would be visited by the revising barrister ; but strange to say that gentleman did not see proper to go into those townships, with the result that although the provincial lists showed nearly 300 names in Suffolk, and over 300 in Hartwell, the Dominion list showed only 60 names in the one township and 62 in the other. So carefully was the list made, moreover, that even a public square was put on it, and that square voted, and I believe

voted against me. Therefore, if in the Province of British Columbia six revising barristers are necessary, it seems to me that in the County of Ottawa, which has 70,000 population, even a larger number are needed.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is the printing included in this vote?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Only in part.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is it the intention to do away with getting printing done by outside parties?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It will be all done away with outside except the printing of the supplemental lists in the first instance. That is to say, the list which the revising officer posts up indicating what names are to be added and what to be struck off will be printed in the locality, but the regular lists will be done here.

Mr. FRASER. Might I ask if the Government could not have uniform blanks furnished? At present different forms are used in different counties. Could not the Government prepare official blanks and sell them to both parties, instead of leaving the parties to prepare them themselves? That would give us uniformity.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not think that could be done under the law as it stands, but the question could be considered when the law comes to be amended, as to whether forms of application should not be embodied in the Act.

Mr. FRASER. It is hard to get amendments made here. I have no doubt that if the plans were prepared in the office of the hon. Minister of Justice, they would be accepted by all the officials.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think it would be an improvement if the revising barrister were paid in some other way than according to the number of names. Many names appear in duplicate, and sometimes I have seen the same name three times on the list, so that there is a direct inducement to the revising barristers to get as many names on the list as possible. Then they are also induced to keep on names which have been struck off. In the town of Chatham there were no less than 150 names struck off which we objected to, but strange to say when the list came to be finally revised these names appeared again. I do not know whose fault it was; but I think if the revising barrister were paid a definite sum for the work instead of by the number of names, we should have a purer and better list.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to direct the attention of the hon. Minister of Justice to the large size and inconvenient form of the present lists. Could he not direct the revising officers to prepare them in more compact and convenient form, which would be more easily handled and carried about?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think there is no doubt that a smaller sized list would be much more convenient, and I will ask the hon. Secretary of State who has charge of the subject, if the change can be made without adding largely to the expense. I fancy that some mechanical difficulty may be in the way, owing to the forms having been permanently made up.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Would the hon. Minister of Justice state what is the argument in favour of paying revising officers according to the number of names?

Sir. JOHN THOMPSON. I am sure that no case can have arisen of names having been left on the list by the revising officer in order that he might get a few cents for such extra names: but mistakes will necessarily sometimes occur. If any names were improperly left on the list after the final revision, it must have been through some oversight of the parties watching the revision. The object of establishing the mode of payment was to arrive at some system by which we could adjust the cost of revision to the labour in the revision. If you leave it at large, it will be impossible to get any standard by which the payment can be made. In rural constituencies the number of names is less, but the work is probably greater than in urban constituencies, as there is more travelling from home and greater inconvenience to the revising officer. We equalize the conditions to some extent by providing that there shall be a stated salary of $300 to each revising officer, no matter whether his constituency is rural or urban. Then up to a certain number of names we allow five cents a name, and above that number three cents. In that way we provide by a permanent vote of three hundred dollars a fair allowance to the revising officer in the rural districts where he has to travel more and has fewer names, and we provide compensation to the urban revising officer who has a larger number of names involving more clerical work. It is an attempt to get at equalization, and we have found it to work well in this sense, that there are very few complaints that the distribution of remuneration is not even. There are of course exceptional cases, enormous constituencies like the Counties of Ottawa, and Chicoutimi and Algoma, which always have to be treated exceptionally, but otherwise the present plan of payment has been found fairly to adjust the remuneration to the labour.

Mr. MULOCK. Did I understand the Minister to say this item would have to be increased by $90,000?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; about $240,000 altogether.

Mr. MULOCK. That would mean the vote is short by ninety thousand dollars of the amount necessary to pay the cost of revision. I am surprised and disappointed at that statement. Some time ago we were informed that the cost of revising the lists, on the only two occasions they have been revised, was $680,078; and on the 20th May last the Secretary of State said: "The old lists being in type will by so much reduce the cost of the next revision." Well, looking at the figures furnished by the Secretary of State on that occasion, it appears that the revision of the lists in 1889-90 cost $236,800, and I inferred from what he said that the revision for the current year would be much less. But now we are told it is much more; in fact it is nearly a quarter of a million dollars. In other words, for the sake of putting this Act into force, on the three separate occasions, the country has to pay $922,000. That is an unwarrantable waste of public money, for which there is not a shadow of excuse. The Act has been condemned by the Administration by their refusing year after year to enforce it. It is discredited by every person in the country. There is not one who has got to do with the enforcing of it, with the exception of those who receive their portion of the million dollars, who

does not condemn it. I have conversed with many members on both sides, and am perfectly in order when I say that I have not yet been able to find a member on the other side who approves of the Act.

Mr. DENISON. I approve of it.

Mr. MULOCK. I commend the hon. gentleman for his courage; but it does not follow that, because he approves of it, it is a good measure. One swallow will not make a summer. His opinion no more than mine will decide the question. I speak from observation and experience, and, whilst the hon. member for West Toronto approves of it, no one else on either side does so. If the new Government are prepared to strike out a new path and are not to be hampered by the policy of their predecessors, they could not inaugurate their Administration better than by reforming this obnoxious and cumbersome election law.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). As a young member, I take this opportunity of stating that I am of the same opinion as the hon. member for West Toronto. Having some experience in the matter. I must say that the Act is the best ever enforced in the District of Algoma, for this reason, that under the provincial Act a very large number of voters in that district are disfranchised. A very large number of young men engaged in fishing, mining and railroading, who have not the means to place themselves on the provincial lists, have a vote under the Dominion Franchise Act. For that reason I think the Act the best ever enforced in that end of the Dominion.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Explain how it is?

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). If you take the Act of the Ontario Legislature passed in 1888—I think it is on page 11 of the Statutes of that year—you will find that it stipulates that only householders and property owners in the unorganized districts of East and West Algoma, Hastings and Essex, and one other county, are allowed to vote. There are no lists provided. There is no machinery to provide lists in that unorganized portion of the Dominion I have the honour to represent. Thousands who are not householders or property owners have thus no means of getting on the provincial lists, and consequently have no votes in that district. If I am wrong, I am liable to be corrected.

Mr. BARRON. The hon. gentleman who has spoken knows very well that the Ontario lists are prepared, in the first place, by an assessor, and if there is an unorganized district, there is no assessor; and, as my hon. friend behind me says, every one votes. I want to point out to the Minister of Justice that he has not yet answered the point I made, whereby I think the extraordinary expense of the Act can be very materially reduced. Representations have been made to the hon. Minister on the advisability of reducing the number of revising officers. There is, for instance, the County of Peterborough, which has a larger population and area than Victoria, and yet has but one revising officer to two in Victoria. I do not mean to say an unkind word regarding the revising officer for North Victoria. On the contrary, I find him most accurate, and am perfectly satisfied with his fairness and justice. I delight in taking this opportunity to so speak of him, but it seems to me that, when we can have one revising officer in the County of Peterborough, surely one is sufficient in the County of Victoria, and I think representations have been made to the Minister of Justice to that effect. I see the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Stevenson) in his place, and no doubt he can tell us that the revising officer in his county had plenty of time to do his work and did it well. I, therefore, think that in the County of Victoria, with less area and less work to do, one revising officer would be sufficient and would have plenty of time, so that would be one way of reducing the expense of this unfortunate Act.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I agree with the hon. member that it is very desirable to decrease the expense by having not more than one revising officer in an electoral district, where that is possible, but that cannot be done in regard to the existing revising officers whose tenure of office is such that they cannot be removed. However, it will be remembered in future appointments.

Mr. McMULLEN. I should like to know if any instructions have been issued this season to revising officers in regard to the revision of the lists, and, if any instructions have been issued, what they are?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No instructions have been issued at all to them beyond the announcement that the revision would proceed according to law this year, and as to the scale of remuneration which would be adopted.

Mr. WATSON. In the election of 1882, when a portion of the western territory was added to Manitoba, every resident householder had a vote, as I understand he has now in the district of Algoma, in the Province of Ontario. Consequently, the franchise is more liberal for the Local House of Ontario than it is for the Dominion, where a man has to have a house and has to be registered.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). The state of affairs in Algoma is entirely different from the way which it was represented by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson). The Ontario Act provides that householders and property owners only shall vote in the unorganized district. The Dominion Act provides that everyone 21 years of age and a British subject, and not otherwise disqualified, is entitled to a vote.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). Well, provided he complies with the conditions of the Act. It is not necessary for him to be a householder or a property holder, but if he has $300 a year he can vote. We have a very large element there composed of railroad men, lumbering men, fishermen and miners. They generally board. The Act contemplates that every man shall have a vote. It is practically manhood franchise. The Ontario Act is manhood franchise in a measure, but in these unorganized districts it is not, because they are neither property holders nor householders.

Mr. DEVLIN. The hon. member is perfectly right, but I think what is complained of is that, in this unorganized district, there are a great many of these railroad navvies and men engaged in the mines who have votes in other counties, men who go into these lumbering districts for the winter and possibly into the mines in the summer. They work in Algoma and have a vote there, and they have votes elsewhere at the same time.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It is worthy of putting on record that, of all the members who sit on the other side of the House, only two have had the courage of their convictions, and have risen to declare that they think the Franchise Act is a good one. Evidently there are two men there at all events who believe in that Act.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would make another appeal to the Minister of Justice. This season has been very unfavourable. I am told the prospects are that we are not likely to have a third of a crop. If ever there was a time to reduce expenditures which are unnecessary and uncalled for, that time is now, and this quarter of a million might be saved to the people by repealing this Act and might be expended in furnishing the people with seed grain, which it may be necessary to do if the weather remains as dry as it has been. I, therefore, appeal to the Government to lop off this quarter of a million in the interests of the country, though not perhaps in the interest of the Tory party, and expend it, if they are bound to expend it, in some work which will be useful to the people.

Patent Record.....$15.000

Mr. FOSTER. That may be made $12,000.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That might be dropped altogether this year in view of the hard times.

Mr. FOSTER. It is out of that that a large revenue comes to the country.

Committee rose and reported the resolutions.

ADJOURNMENT—THE BUDGET.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to know from the Minister of Finance if he proposes to make his Budget statement on Friday?

Mr. FOSTER. I am diffident about making another announcement. I have made so many that I am afraid the House will consider I am fickle in this matter. I think, unless extraordinary events occur, the Budget will be delivered on Tuesday next.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think it is important that the Budget should be brought down immediately. It should have been brought down long ago. The Minister must know that the sugar trade of the country, which is an immense trade, is, I may say, almost paralysed. It is in such a state that extra provision had to be made for handling it meanwhile, and the large season of consumption is upon us. It is expected, whether rightly or wrongly, that the Government may deal with it in some way. It seems to me that the public interest demands, if any tariff changes are made, that they should be announced at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Finance does know all that the hon. gentleman has stated. It is not his fault that the Budget was not delivered a fortnight ago, but events over which we had no control kept it back. It may be possible to deliver it on Friday, and if so, I shall certainly do so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is well, for many reasons, that the date should be definitely fixed. If the hon. gentleman says Friday, all right.

Mr. FOSTER. I will be able to say to-morrow.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 17th June, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT.—CONTRACTS.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that, in obedience to the Order of the House of yesterday, Mr. Michael Connolly had delivered to the Clerk of the House the books of accounts, &c., required for examination by the Committee on Privileges and Elections, in connection with the enquiry relative to the Quebec Harbour Works, &c.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 104.) to amend the Bills of Exchange Act, 1890 (from the Senate).—Sir John Thompson.

DECK AND LOAD LINES.

Mr. TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 106) to provide for the marking of deck and load lines. He said: It will be recollected that last year the owners of ships built chiefly in the Maritime Provinces, were exceedingly alarmed to find that it was proposed by the Parliament of Great Britain to adopt extraordinarily severe regulations in reference to the loading of ships. By the provisions of the Imperial Bill then under consideration, all colonial ships, as well as ships built at home, were compelled to conform to these rules, regarding the extent to which they could be loaded and the amount of free-board to be given any vessel loading and clearing outwards at a British port. The history of that sort of legislation began in 1876, when the Imperial Parliament adopted what was known as a load line or a maximum mark under which a ship could be loaded on departing from a port in the United Kingdom. The fixing of the load line was left, however, entirely to the owner, a penalty being imposed only when no load line whatever was fixed; and the criticism on that measure was that the load line could practically be put upon the mast, and therefore the Bill fell entirely short of its object. Very exhaustive enquiries were promoted after 1876 by Parliamentary Committees, and elaborate calculations gone into in order to settle, mathematically as well as nautically, the exact measurement which should be adopted and the exact capacity of each ship for carrying certain cargoes, and after these elaborate enquiries had been made, chiefly with reference to iron and steel vessels, built as vessels in England and Scotland are, the Bill to which I have just referred was brought forward in the British Parliament. But instead of being confined to the vessels which had been chiefly considered with reference to the framing of rules for the free-board, it embraced the wooden ships of this country, although apparently the rules and calculations had very little reference,

if any, to the requirements and capacity of our wooden ships. Those interested in the wooden ships of this country became exceedingly alarmed at the contemplated legislation, more particularly as the surveyors contemplated by the Imperial Bill, under the Board of Trade, upon whom devolved the duty of fixing that load line, were Lloyds' surveyors; and as the vessels of this country were chiefly classed Bureau Veritas, it was also feared great injustice would be done by these surveyors in dealing with ships classed entirely under different forms and rules from those of Lloyds. The Canadian Government, acting at the desire of the ship-owners of this country, immediately proceeded to represent to the Imperial Government the grave injustice and the great injury which would be done to the Canadian wooden ships, and the Bill in England was, after consideration, considerably amended, and passed with the following section added, to meet, if possible, the objections raised by the ship-owners of this country :—

"An Act to amend the Merchant Shipping Acts relating to load lines, Chap. 9, 53 Vic., Imperial Act, Sec. 3, provides: Where the legislature of any British possession, by any enactment provides for the fixing, marking and certifying of load lines on ships registered in that possession, and it appears to Her Majesty the Queen that the provisions of that enactment are based on the same principles as the provisions of this Act, and are equally effective for ascertaining and determining the maximum load lines to which such ships can be safely loaded in salt water and for giving notice of the load line to persons interested, it shall be lawful for Her Majesty, by Order in Council, to declare that any load line fixed and marked and any certificate given in pursuance of that enactment shall, with respect to ships so registered, have the same effect as if it had been fixed, marked or given in pursuance of this Act."

In consequence of that clause, this Bill has become necessary. I may say that in the petitions, large numbers of which have come to this House, with many signatures from those owning ships in the Maritime Provinces, the difficulties are pointed out that are to be encountered in the English Bill, notwithstanding that in another clause of it, which I did not read, the surveyors charged with the ascertaining where this load line is to be marked may be either Lloyds or Bureau Veritas; and the petitioners have pointed out that the rules upon which these surveyors are bound to act, under the Imperial Act, are inapplicable to the style of ships built in this country, no reference having been made, —the subject, perhaps, not having been understood in England—regarding the breadth of beam and the extraordinary buoyancy of the wooden ships of this country, and they point out that if it is impossible to get rid of the restrictions under the Imperial Act, if the load line is to be marked, it be marked by surveyors both here and in the United Kingdom appointed by the Dominion Government, who have special knowledge of wooden ships and their great carrying capacity. The proposition on the part of the ship-owners of this country seems to me not at all unreasonable, nor do they appear to be actuated by any selfish interest or desire to escape the imposition of necessary restrictions; and in support of this, I would refer to the very elaborate report I have included in the last annual report of the Department of Marine, of the Marine Conference held in Washington in 1889, where all the shipping countries in the world were represented, and where the very able English representatives endeavoured most earnestly to obtain the passage of a resolution in favour of a universal load line mark. After careful investigation and able presentation of the British case, the report of that conference was to the effect that it was impossible to lay down a general rule, or adopt a broad rule for the shipping of the various countries in the world. I would like to read to the House one extract in connection with this, as it supports, to my mind, the position taken by the shipping interests in Canada in favour of the load line being controlled by the authorities in the country to which the ships directly belong. The members of the conference, referring to the English rules, say :

"The above mentioned rules have proved to be a good standard upon which to determine the proper loading of British vessels, which are classed in Lloyds' register, or for other vessels, the particulars of whose strength and fitness to carry any particular cargo can easily be ascertained by the surveyors of the Board of Trade. As regards foreign ships, however, which are loading in the United Kingdom, and which are either not classed in Lloyds' register or the particulars of which cannot be ascertained without a minute examination, the difficulty is, that the law which intends to guard against dangers arising from overloading cannot be enforced without serious disadvantages to the owners of ships and cargoes consequent upon the difficulty of ascertaining whether the ships are fit to carry the cargo in question."

And they concluded that this very important subject of underloading or overloading ships should be left to the Governments concerned, and while they made many recommendations in regard to shipping, which they thought of universal application, and in the interest of the world's shipping generally, they took special pains to point out that, in a delicate matter such as this, it was impossible to make any hard and fast general rule which would apply to the different ships of different countries, since they are all built on different models and for different purposes. In the Bill which I ask leave to introduce, I have endeavoured to meet as far as possible the principle which is at stake, that is, to fix the maximum load line, but in fixing that line, I have endeavoured to secure the interests of our own shipping, and to prevent their being handicapped in a competition for the world's carrying trade, or for the trade which they now get in English ports. In the Imperial Act of 1890, the owner has no voice, whereas he has all the voice in the Bill of 1876, as to the fixing of the load line. I propose that, as we have no mathematical rule in this country, and no machinery to fix this even if we had the rule, so as to make it applicable to our shipping, we shall include the owner in the settling of the load line and associate with him a surveyor from the British Lloyds' Register, or from the French Bureau Veritas, or any authorized surveyor appointed; and, if they do not agree as to where the line shall be fixed, then the department shall take the responsibility, as it does in other matters which are represented in England by the Board of Trade. There are many other provisions suggested in regard to the safety of ships, and all the owners are agreed upon that point. The safety of their ships is important to them. Many safeguards have been thrown around them, and the only danger is that we might go too far and injure them. I know that the provisions of the Bill will be carefully scrutinized by the representatives of the shipping interests in this House, but, the House being aware that we are without any scientific calculations which have been applied in the rules adopted by the Board of Trade, I propose that, on the second reading of

this Bill, it shall be referred to a select committee, composed chiefly of the representatives in this House of the shipping interests which are concerned, and, with the aid of that committee, I hope we will be able to meet the difficulty which now presents itself. It must be remembered that, on or after the 1st October, the rules of the British Board of Trade will apply, and without complying with those rules no vessel will be allowed to enter or clear from any British port. Those rules of the English Board of Trade are very stringent, and, to comply with them, the vessel must go into dock and suffer great detention and consequently great embarrassment.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CATTLE TRADE.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Marine to the fact that, in regard to the Bill respecting the Shipping of Live Stock which he proposes to allow to stand, the persons engaged in the cattle trade are very anxious to see some legislation passed. I have a telegram on the subject which I will send to him.

Mr. TUPPER. I intended to introduce this Bill to-day, but I find that there is a necessity to pass a resolution first, as it has to do with trade and commerce. I am obliged to the hon. gentleman for promising to send me the telegram. I am also in receipt of a telegram stating that certain vessels have left our ports in such a condition in regard to the accommodation for cattle that should not have existed. But the Minister of Agriculture has, it seems to me, power to deal with the chief question at point—that is, the space allowed for the animals—under the Order in Council which is passed under the Act relating to Contagious Diseases of Animals, and I think the objection will be satisfactorily met, notwithstanding that this Bill is not now introduced.

Mr. FEATHERSTON. I have to-day received a message from Montreal from some shippers there, who say there is an order sent there by which a space of only 2 ft. 6 in. is allowed on deck, and the shippers say their cattle are too large at this season of the year, especially distillery cattle, which have to go on deck, and are not able to go into any space less than 2 ft. 8 in.

Mr. TUPPER. I think that information is incorrect. The Minister of Agriculture told me instructions had been sent to insist upon 2 ft. 8 in. space on deck and below deck. That is the space which has been adopted by the American Board of Trade.

Mr. FEATHERSTON. This is the telegram :

"Dr. McEachran says: Has orders fixing space for cattle at 2 ft. 8 in. on main deck, and 2 ft. 6 in. on upper decks. This compromise not satisfactory. Impress on Minister the fact that all the exporters in Canada have signed requisition to have space on all decks fixed at 2 ft. 8 in. They own the cattle and should know what is necessary. It is their property that is being injured. Salesmen on other side report cattle arriving in bruised condition owing to overcrowding, and boats have sailed within past few days which no Montreal insurance inspector would pass, one losing eighteen head before reaching Quebec."

Which shows that they were right in their judgment.

Mr. SPROULE. I have also received a telegram——

Mr. SPEAKER. I must call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that there is nothing before the House at present. All these messages may be sent to the Minister or spoken of when the Bill is introduced, but the Bill has not been introduced.

Mr. LAURIER. This is a very important matter, and at present we do not know exactly where we stand, whether the space is 2 ft. 6 in. or 2 ft. 8 in. I think that hon. gentlemen should have an opportunity of bringing this important question before the House.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not know whether it would be appropriate to mention this matter here now, but, seeing that the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Featherston) did so, I thought it would be proper for me to read the telegram I received from Mr. Dunn, who went to Montreal with about 2,000 head of cattle to ship. I telegraphed him yesterday, after seeing the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Marine, who stated that they had telegraphed to the inspector there to see that the space allowed was 2 ft. 8 in. for each head of cattle. This is the reply I received from Mr. Dunn :

"Government inspector here says he has orders fixing space for cattle at 2 ft. 8 in. on main deck only, and 2 ft. 6 in. on upper deck. This compromise not satisfactory. Please impress upon Minister the fact that all the exporters in Canada have signed requisition to have space on all decks fixed at two feet eight inches. They own the cattle and should know what is necessary. It is their property that is being injured. Salesmen in England report cattle arriving in bruised condition, owing to the overcrowding, and boats have sailed within the past few days which no Montreal insurance inspector would pass, one steamer losing eighteen head before reaching Quebec."

Mr. TUPPER. I thought the House understood, if the hon. member did not, that this is immediately under the charge of the Minister of Agriculture in consequence of the provisions of the Act to which I referred, and I understood him distinctly to say that they had conversation with reference to the matter on several occasions, and that instructions had gone to insist upon a space of 2 ft. 8 in., whether above or below, and whether on the upper deck or not ; and I was surprised to hear some hon. gentlemen make a statement as to the instructions that were actually sent. I shall see the Minister and have the matter cleared up at once.

Mr. DENISON. Do I understand the Minister of Marine to say that those instructions were telegraphed yesterday or to-day ?

Mr. TUPPER. I understood that those instructions went yesterday. With reference to that I may be mistaken. I know the Minister told me, when I spoke to him about the matter to-day, that 2 ft. 8 in. was the space.

Mr. DENISON. I have a telegram also, and they say they can take only 2 ft. 6 in. on the upper deck, and that the inspector was acting on these instructions.

Mr. TUPPER. There has apparently been some confusion.

Mr. DENISON. If the Minister will say that he had been instructed to make it the same on the upper deck as on the lower, that would probably cover the whole thing.

Mr. TUPPER. I understand the Minister has already said that. I shall see him with reference to the instructions.

THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. BOWELL moved for leave to introduce a Bill No. (105) respecting the Intercolonial Railway. He said: The Government railways on the mainland now comprise the Intercolonial Railway, the Eastern Extension, the Cape Breton and the Windsor Branch Railways. A separate set of books for capital account on each of these railways has been kept in the past up to this year, which entails a considerable amount of extra work and expense. The object of the Bill is to make the three railways last named a part of the Intercolonial Railway, by which means the branches, ferries and all connected with the mainland will simply be designated the Intercolonial Railway, which will do away with the necessity for keeping a number of books, and the employment of a number of clerks for that purpose.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. LAURIER. Before you proceed with the next order, I would call the attention of the leader of the House to the fact that in the statement which he gave to the House yesterday with regard to the formation of a new Cabinet, he made no statement whatever as to what would be the policy of the new Administration. I shall expect that to-morrow, or on any other day which would be convenient for him, he will give information to the House in that respect.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will probably be able to make some statement to-morrow, but I do not promise the hon. gentleman.

THE BUDGET SPEECH.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is a convenient time to enquire of the hon. Minister of Finance when he intends to deliver the Budget speech, whether on Friday or on Tuesday next?

Mr. FOSTER. As a sop to my hon. friend, I will present him with the ten days' statement down to the 10th June, and say that the Budget speech will be delivered on Tuesday next.

SEALING IN BEHRING SEA.

Mr. GORDON asked, Whether this Government had been advised by the Imperial Government that it is the intention of Her Majesty to issue, immediately after the passage of the Behring Sea Bill, now before the Imperial Parliament, an Order in Council as provided for in said Bill, prohibiting persons belonging to British ships from killing, taking, hunting, or attempting to kill, take or hunt, any seal in Behring Sea during the remainder of the present sealing season? If so, has Her Majesty been advised by this Government, that up to the 24th of May last, no less than forty-nine British or Canadian registered vessels, with a tonnage of 3,042 tons valued at $458,000, have been fitted out, and have cleared from Canadian ports for the purpose of sealing in Behring Sea during the present sealing season? If this Government have not so advised Her Majesty, will they do so at once by cable? so that no misapprehension may exist in the mind of Her Majesty as to the magnitude of the interests involved, and of the compensation that should be provided for to indemnify the vessel owners and crews for the losses they will necessarily sustain, if driven out of Behring's Sea before the end of the season.

Mr. TUPPER. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I may say that while this Government has not been advised by the Imperial Government that it is the intention of Her Majesty to issue, immediately after the passage of the Behring Sea Bill now before the Imperial Parliament, an Order in Council as provided for in said Bill, prohibiting ships and those interested in taking seals, a convention has been entered into between the United States and the Government of Great Britain, which contemplates the passage of an order of that character, under the provisions of that Bill which has now become law. I may say that Her Majesty was advised by this Government of the great magnitude of the interests involved in Canada, so that no misapprehension exists as to that point, and as to the compensation that should be provided to indemnify the vessel owners and crews for the losses they would have necessarily to sustain.

QUARANTINE REGULATIONS.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron) asked, Has the attention of the Government been drawn to the following order issued by the United States Department of Agriculture, dated 19th May, 1891, quarantining for fifteen days lambs and swine imported from Canada:—

"Whereas, under the Act of Congress approved August 30, 1890, it has been provided by the Department of Agriculture, in order to protect the sheep and swine of the United States from contagious diseases now existing in foreign countries, that all sheep and swine imported from Great Britain and the Continent of Europe must be held in quarantine for a period of not less than fifteen days; and,

"Whereas the Dominion of Canada makes no requirement of quarantine for sheep and swine imported into that country from Great Britain and the Continent of Europe: and,

"Whereas to permit importations of these animals from Canada into the United States without quarantine would be dangerous to the stock interests of the United States, owing to the failure on the part of the Canadian authorities to enforce this measure of protection, and would enable importers to evade the quarantine of the United States ports: therefore, it is

"Ordered, That all sheep or swine to be imported from Canada into the United States are hereby made subject to the regulations of the Department of Agriculture of date October 13, 1890, and the exception contained in the third and sixth regulations of said date, as applicable to Canadian sheep and swine, is hereby rescinded, and all animals named in said regulations, except cattle imported from Canada, are subject to the same conditions and requirements as if they were imported into the United States from Great Britain or the Continent of Europe.

(Sd.) "J. M. RUSK,
"*Secretary.*"

If so, has the Government taken any steps with the view of having the order withdrawn, and what are they? If no action has yet been taken by the Government, does it intend at the earliest possible moment to take action to have, if possible, the quarantine removed? If so, will the Government remove the cause assigned by the United States Department for the issue of the said order, namely, the absence of quarantine by the Government of Canada against the importation of sheep and swine from Great Britain, by establishing a quarantine

against such importations? If not, what line of action does it propose to adopt?

Mr. HAGGART. The attention of the Government having been drawn to the United States order relating to the quarantining of sheep and swine referred to, an Order in Council was passed on 6th instant amending the Canadian regulations, so as to place a quarantine of fifteen days on each sheep and swine entering Canada at the seaports of Canada (which is a similar quarantine arrangement to that which the United States itself possesses), instead of a simple inspection. This order has been published in the *Canada Gazette*, and officially communicated to the United States Government.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS.

Mr. AMYOT asked, Whether the Government has any intention of moving the adoption, during the present session, of a measure prohibiting the sale by wholesale of intoxicating liquors, within the compass of any municipality in which the municipal authorities have passed a regulation to the same effect?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In the opinion of the Government, this is a matter which should not be pressed on the municipal authorities.

Mr. AMYOT. That is not the question.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman will see that it is, for the hon. gentleman enquires whether the Government will pass a law contingent on the acts of the municipal authorities.

INDIAN AGENT AT SUTTON WEST.

Mr. MULOCK asked, Out of what moneys did they pay the sum of $181.65, being expenses incurred by the Government in connection with an investigation held into the conduct of the Indian Agent at Sutton West in 1885?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The sum of $141.65 was paid out of contingencies, and $40 out of the Indian land management fund, making a total of $181.65.

VOLUNTEERS OF 1837-38.

Mr. ALLISON asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to make a grant of land to each of the survivors of the volunteers who assisted in suppressing the rebellion in Canada in 1837-38?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is not the intention of the Government to make a grant of land to each of the survivors of the volunteers who assisted in suppressing the rebellion in Canada in 1837-38, as we have always considered, and this House has always considered, this is a matter affecting the old Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada previous to Confederation.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, When was the Electoral Franchise Act passed? How many times has it been amended since? How many times have the lists been revised? How many times suspended? Have the revisions and suspensions occurred alternately? Were revisions promised which did not take place? If so, why? Will the lists be revised this year? What has been the cost of each revision? What the total cost? Was anything paid for the lists in seasons when suspended? If so, how much?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Electoral Franchise Act was passed in 1885. It has been amended three times. The lists have been revised three times. The operation of the Act has been twice suspended. The revisions and suspensions have not occurred alternately. Revisions were not promised that did not take place. The lists will in all probability be revised this year. The cost of each revision has been already stated fully to Parliament. A small sum was paid, the amount of which I am not in a position to state this afternoon, for lists during one year when the revision was suspended, this amount being necessary for preliminary expenses which had been incurred before the introduction of the Bill to suspend the operation of the Act

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. gentleman has not given the amount paid when the revisions were suspended.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I said I was not able to state this afternoon the amount so paid; but I will give it subsequently.

BREAKWATER AT CENTREVILLE, N.S.

Mr. BOWERS asked, Has the Government received any report from their engineer as to the amount required to repair the breakwater at Centreville, Digby County, N.S.? If so, is it their intention to allow the breakwater to remain as it is, risking the total destruction of the same by the next winter's gale? Or will there be placed in the Supplementary Estimates an appropriation sufficient to save it from destruction?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I sent to my department for information in this matter, and received the following answer: No report has been received as to the amount required to repair the breakwater at Centreville, nor has any information been received by the department relating to the state of that work.

POST OFFICE BOX AT KINGSTON.

Mr. AMYOT asked, Who was, on or about the 28th May, 1889, the lessee of box No. 524, in the post office at Kingston, Ont.; and what was the name of the person who appeared on the books of the post office as having paid the annual rental of that box?

Mr. HAGGART. The department has no knowledge as to who was the lessee of that box at Kingston post office.

WALKERTON POST OFFICE.

Mr. TRUAX asked, Has the contract for fitting up the interior of the Walkerton post office been awarded? If not, will it be let by public tender, and when? Will notice be given in the local papers as to the time for receiving tenders?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. A contract has not been given. It is usual to give such work to the party who has the contract for the erection of the building, when his work is satisfactory, and the work is given at architect's estimates. Of course,

the notices referred to will not appear in the local papers.

DRILL SHED AT TORONTO.

Mr. COCKBURN asked, 1. Have any contracts been awarded in connection with the erection of the drill shed in the city of Toronto? If so, for what parts of the work and who are the contractors? 2. If any contracts have been awarded, when is the work to proceed? 3. Have tenders been asked for the other parts of the work yet? If not, when will the Government advertize for tenders?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. To the first portion of the question, the answer is, yes. To the second portion, the answer is, that a contract has been let for the excavations to Davis & Son. To the third portion of the question, the answer is, that the work will be proceeded with on 1st August. To the last question the answer is: Tenders have not been asked for the other parts of the work yet, but they will be called for within the next eight or ten days.

NEWSPAPER ADVERTISING.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL asked, In what newspapers is the table showing the hours of the arrival and departure of the mails for the Ottawa post office published? What amount is paid to each of the said newspapers yearly for publishing the said table? Is the table inserted in any French newspaper? If not, why not; and if so published, what is the name of the newspaper and the yearly sum paid for the service?

Mr. HAGGART. The time table showing the hours of arrival and departure of the mails for the Ottawa post office is published in the following newspapers:—*Citizen*, $100 per annum; *Journal*, $100 per annum; *United Canada*, $50 per annum. The time table was also published in *Le Canada* until the 30th April, 1891, at $50 per annum.

WELLAND CANAL—SURPLUS WATER.

Mr. GIBSON moved for:

Copies of all petitions, letters and communications from the city of St. Catharines, and other municipalities on the Welland Canal, or from any persons or corporations, for the privilege of using surplus water from said canal for manufacturing or other purposes; and of the reports of Engineers of Canals thereon, and the replies of the Government to all such applications.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in moving for this return I desire to say a few words regarding the vast quantity of waste water that is continually passing through the waste weirs of the new Welland Canal, that might with profit to the country be used for manufacturing purposes. In fact, sufficient water could easily be spared to run several factories according to their requirements at each one of the twenty-four regulating basins, without, in my opinion, affecting the efficiency of the canal. If encouragement were given by the Government for the free use of water for a few years, or at a nominal rental, until industries were securely established, there is every reason to believe that the Welland Canal would be the means of making that section of the province a veritable hive of industry. Within a very few miles of the Welland Canal, on the American side of the Niagara River, an aqueduct or tunnel is in course of construction for manufacturing purposes, which, I understand, will cost about $3,000,000. Now, Sir, we have a much better supply of water running to waste, and connections with the regulating basins of the new Welland Canal could be made by the Government, and the cost would be gladly paid for by parties requiring the use of water. I understand that investigations have already been made by the engineers of the department, as to the practicability of supplying water to mills and manufactories along the canal without affecting navigation, and I think it is time that the matter should be brought to a practical issue and the public fully informed thereon. It may be said that several sites on the old canal are at present unoccupied, but it must be borne in mind that the large vessels now passing up and down on the lakes cannot pass through the old canal, so that for all practical purposes the old canal is simply fit for a mill-race. I was pleased to hear the late right hon. Minister of Railways and Canals state that my hon. friend from Welland (Mr. German) was mistaken as to the reasons for the water being let off the new canal. But I am afraid, Sir, that the right hon. the late First Minister was not furnished with the exact reasons, or, I am sure, he would never have given his consent to expose the embankments of the canal and basins, and the lock and weir masonry, to the winter frost, even to secure a political victory. A public work that cost the country millions of dollars, a work of so much value and importance, should not have been exposed just because an election was taking place. This work stands to-day a credit to the memory of the late Mr. Page and his able assistants, Messrs. Monro and Thompson; a work which Mr. Page often said to me would be his monument after he had passed away. I am sure, Sir, that if Mr. Page were then living he would not have given his consent to run the water off the canal during the winter months. It never was done before, and even on the old canal the work of repairs is not commenced until spring, immediately before the opening of navigation, for the reasons I have just given. If this care is exercised upon the old canal, how much greater care should be taken with the works of the new one. There was no excuse for letting the water off, as far as repairs were required; because four years ago during the work of the enlargement every part of the canal was thoroughly overhauled and renewed, and so perfect were the specifications and schedules covering the works made by the late Mr. Page, that the Government did not require to arbitrate on a single case from sections A to J. Being one of the contractors I know whereof I speak, and I have to add that it was the talk of the Counties of Lincoln and Welland, that letting off the water was a wilful waste of public money. The only repairs that was really done when the water was let off was to fix up the banks damaged by their exposure to the frosts of winter during the time the water was let out of the canal, and the only qualification required to secure work was a promise to vote for the Government candidate.

Motion agreed to.

MINING MACHINERY—FREE ENTRY INTO BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. MARA moved for:

Copies of all correspondence between the Minister of Customs and the Collector of Customs at Kootenay Lake, and between the Minister of Customs and any other person, relating to the admission of mining machinery into the Kootenay Lake district free of duty. Also copies of the instructions of the Minister of Customs to the Collector of Customs at Kootenay River, referring to the free admission of mining machinery.

He said: My object in asking for this correspondence is to ascertain where the difficulty lies in respect to the admission of mining machinery into the Kootenay Lake district free of duty. At the close of last session, before leaving here, I received assurances from the hon. Minister of Customs that every facility would be given to the mine owners on Kootenay Lake to bring in mining machinery free of duty, and that the most liberal construction would be placed on the law. I am informed that instead of that being done, so many obstacles have been placed in the way of the mine owners that they have ceased to take advantage of the liberal Act passed last session. I am also informed that in one case, six months after the machinery was entered, and after it had changed hands, the collector of Customs, in the most arbitrary manner, wrote to the mine owners stating that unless the duty was paid immediately the machinery would be seized; and to prevent the machinery being seized and the mine being closed down, the duties were paid under protest. There is an impression in the Kootenay Lake district that the department is responsible for these obstacles being placed in the way of the free importation of mining machinery. The correspondence I ask for will, no doubt, show where the difficulty lies.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no objection to bringing down all the correspondence that has taken place between the department and those who are interested in the introduction of mining machinery into Canada, either in the Kootenay district or in any other portion of the Dominion; nor is there any objection to bringing down the instructions. On the contrary, I shall be very much pleased to do so, when not only the House but the country generally will know what has been done by the department in this respect. I think it will be found that the difficulties and delays which have arisen in the passage of what is termed mining machinery are due to the difficulty of establishing whether such machinery is manufactured in Canada or not. With the view of preventing similar difficulties in future, I had an Order in Council passed requiring importers to make an affidavit that the machinery imported is for the purposes of mining, and that it is not made in Canada; and upon an affidavit of that kind being produced, no delay that I am aware of has taken place in the admission of the machinery into the country. On the contrary, the machinery has been admitted, the duty has been exacted, and afterwards when the necessary affidavit has been made a refund of the duty has been made; and if there are any such cases in the Kootenay district, it will be the duty of the Government to see that the amount is returned to the parties making the importation. The intention, not only of the Government, but of the House, in making that change in the tariff was to encourage, as far as practicable, mining operations in this country, while at the same time guarding against the introduction of such machinery interfering with Canadian enterprise.

Motion agreed to.

NEW CARLISLE WHARF.

Mr. FAUVEL moved for:

Return of all payments and cost of construction of the New Carlisle wharf, including amount paid to the Crown Lands Department and owners of timber limits in the County of Bonaventure, for timber used on the said works.

He said: The wharf referred to in this motion has been in course of construction for the last ten years, and I must say it has been most miserably built. In the County of Bonaventure we have three public wharves on which during the last two years the Government have exacted wharfage dues, whereas I find, on asking my friends in the House, that there are several counties in the province where the Government do not exact similar wharfage dues. I would like to know from the hon. Minister of Public Works what is the reason he subjects the County of Bonaventure to these tolls?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not know the correctness of the statement for which I suppose the hon. gentleman has authority, but if there are some wharves on which wharfage dues are not charged, I have no doubt that upon my colleague's attention being called to the matter, he will see that in future we shall have the advantage of similar tolls being collected there.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) I must protest against the Government's policy of charging wharfage on farmers' goods deposited on the St. Lawrence River wharves. The Government, while boasting the prosperity they claim to have created in the country, is acting in this in antagonism with commerce and free navigation, in the course of which it puts obstacles by means of such dues. The Government levies taxes right and left by means of which it exercises political persecution. It is not those who support it or who are in favour of its policy, it is not the blind partisans of the Administration who suffer from them, but its political opponents. The farmers' goods are allowed to be put on board the boats, and then advantage is taken of that for batches of actions to be taken against our friends. It is not public revenue that is cared for—this barely brings a few paltry dollars: but the object is to encourage a few lawyers who advocate its policy, as well as to persecute the friends of the Opposition. I say that this conduct of the Government is not worthy of the reputation they pretend to have in this country; and if the Government build wharves here and there with the object of using them as means of persecution and as fetters for trade, it certainly does not deserve the support of the population. For my part, I denounce it. I say that when these wharves were built it was understood that the farmers would have the free use of them; and now the practice of charging them three or four cents per head of cattle or box of goods, is not calculated to encourage agriculture, and is contrary to the principles of the protective policy of the Government.

Mr. TUPPER. I believe, although I did not gather it from the notice of this motion, that I have some connection with the subject to which

the hon. gentleman has alluded. While my department does not construct these wharves or look after their repair, it devolves on my department to do that horrible work which the hon. gentleman has been so vehemently denouncing—to collect the tolls from the vessels using those wharves. I have not heard before in Parliament any denunciation of the policy of the Government in collecting a small toll in order to pay some man to look after each wharf, and this toll, I may say, is fixed in the same manner for all the different wharves, under regulation by Order in Council. There is not a very handsome revenue from those wharves, as will be seen by the annual return published in the Marine Report. In most cases, the wharfinger is allowed twenty-five per cent. of the toll, so as to enable us to secure the services of some man to look after the wharf. The neglect to which the hon. gentleman has alluded in connection with the imposition of these tolls, is due chiefly to the fact that, in the Province of Quebec, I have found it exceedingly difficult, owing to various causes, to get men to undertake the work of wharfinger for the very small remuneration allowed them, there being no remuneration at all when there are no receipts.

Mr. LISTER. There are no wharves of that kind in the country.

Mr. TUPPER. There are some, and a case was brought up the other day from Prince Edward Island, in which it was stated ships used the wharves and paid no fees; but, so far as the department is concerned, I can assure the House that no attempt, direct or indirect, is made to favour any person or class of persons who use these wharves, the one great difficulty being to get people to act as wharfingers for the small pittance they receive in most cases. In many places, of course, the wharves are a great necessity, and the people along the coast have been most anxious to have them; and in some places the Federal Government took charge of the wharves built by the old provinces; but after the wharves are built, the demand naturally arises that they should be maintained free of charge to shipping. That demand, however, has never been seriously advocated. In some cases it would work great injustice to the owners of private wharves, and the system now administered is one that has prevailed from the beginning.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I also must protest against the action of the Government in the matter of wharf dues. There are two wharves in my county. Until after the election not much was said about the levying of dues. The wharfingers had been chosen among the Conservative chiefs, and in election time they made it understood to their friends, on the hustings or otherwise, that no tolls would be collected on the wharves. But as soon as the elections were over, the first thing done was to appoint a lawyer for the collection of the dues and the prosecution of the people who had used the wharves, especially the Liberals. The hon. Minister of Marine says that no protests have been made before the House about the collection of these dues. It is quite possible; but it is perfectly certain that the system was denounced to the department. Two years ago, and last year again, I myself wrote several letters on the matter, and I caused to be sent by the municipal councils of the parishes of Berthier and Crane Island, petitions praying for the removal of these wharfages. In the parish of Berthier, what do we find to have been done? A wharf was built, and the municipality was caused to build a road of at least ten arpents to reach this wharf, with the promise that nothing should be paid for the use of the wharf. The municipality had to spend considerable sums of money to build this road, and then the Conservative chief who was appointed wharfinger, takes the people by the throat and makes them pay three or four cents to put an animal, a tub of butter or a bag of grain on the wharf. This should not be, all the less, since the Minister of Marine gives no good reason for the continuance of such a system. He says the receipts are so small that he can find no one to keep the wharf for its tolls. Well, if the revenue is so petty, the system should certainly be discontinued: these dues should not be kept as an arm over the heads of the farmers, and the arm then handed for political purposes to the Conservative chiefs in the parishes where such wharves are in existence, who will say to the farmers: "If you vote for the Government, I, the wharfinger, will make efforts to save you from that tax." There are no reasons for the maintenance of that tax, which is rather an encumbrance than an advantage—for when people reach the wharf they have enough to do to see to their horses and their cattle without having to seek the wharfinger to pay him two cents, ten cents or a shilling, for the privilege of putting their goods on the wharf. Therefore there is no reason for the continuance of these wharfage dues and the Government ought to abolish them. As to the parish of Berthier, I specially protest against the existing state of things: for, when the Government built the wharf, it obtained from the municipality that a road should be built to reach it, by promising the people of the parish that they would never have to pay a cent for the use of the wharf. But now that the people have built this road at a great expense, and that they have put it in a fine condition for the benefit of the wharf, they are made to pay the wharfage. Under such circumstances, I believe that the Government should change its policy, and abolish this system of taxes altogether.

Mr. PERRY. The other day I asked the Minister of Marine if the wharfinger at Tignish had made a return. The hon. gentleman said no, but that he would write for it, and I am not aware that it has come yet. What is the reason? I suppose it is that if the wharfinger were to send a correct return, the name of every unfortunate Grit who has had to use that wharf would be down as having paid his fees, while not a single Tory would find a place in it. Is it honest that such a state of things should be allowed to exist? I know that the Liberals have been made to pay their taxes for the use of that wharf, and that the Tories have gone scot free. Is that the policy of the department? Does the hon. gentleman intend to allow this year to pass, as he has allowed last year, without having any return from that harbour master? I think it is high time that gentleman should be dismissed; for if he intends following up the course he has hitherto pursued much longer, there will be a small rebellion down there. The breakwater there is more for the benefit and advantage of the fishermen of New Brunswick, who

are well represented here—well, I do not know that they are much represented here this session. I went there one day last winter during a storm, and saw the harbour filled up so that you could not pass your hand between the crafts. There were ninety-five boats there, and ten outside, and twenty-five had to go to Alberton, and our boats were inside and could not get out, and so they lost their morning's fishing. Is there any use in having a harbour master there when such a thing as that takes place? I wrote to the member representing the constituency of Gloucester—I think his name is Burns—asking him to use his influence with the Government to get them to do something, either to dredge the harbour or do something so as to allow the smaller boats to get out in the morning. He promised me that he would do everything in his power, and said he was all-powerful with the Government. I have not seen him this session, and I am afraid to approach the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It would be no use anyway.

Mr. PERRY. Yes, it would be no use; he is so cross; but I hope, if I get this report, I will be able to show this House how the people of Tignish are affected in regard to politics. I know all these vessels, and who owns them, and the side of politics they belong to, and I think I will be able to convince the Minister of Marine that his friends are made political gods of, and that the Liberals there are sacrificed in order to gratify the spite which the Tories have against Liberals. It is not just. When a poor man sends his sheep, cows or produce across the line in order to purchase in return flour or lumber, he is heavily taxed, and what he brings back is heavily taxed. I would not wonder so much if all were treated alike, but a poor man cannot get a blanket from across the line without having to pay a heavy tax upon it. This is the way in which we are treated in Tignish, but the Minister of Marine will sit there quietly and will not try to show that he has swollen the treasury of the Dominion of Canada by this means, because he will give us no information whatever. We have no information except what the Minister is inclined to give us. Is this the kind of Government we have? I am not prepared to submit to this much longer, nor are my people inclined to submit to it. I should not wonder one day or another, on a dry day, to see them give him a little wetting to cool him off. I hope the Minister will at once see that this return is laid before the House, that there will be no more humbugging about it. That report ought to have been here in the month of January or February, but it is not here yet. At all events I have not seen it. There was also a return which I moved for more than a month ago in reference to the *Stanley*, and that is not here yet. How can members discharge their duties properly when they are kept in the dark, when Ministers of the Crown will not give information they are legally bound to give? I say that we, representing the Opposition, have a duty to perform, and we are willing to perform it, but the fact is that the Government are afraid of the Opposition. I hope the Minister will at once cause this report to be laid before the House.

Mr. LISTER. I understand the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to make a statement that the compensation paid to those who are in charge of docks and wharves is 25 per cent. of the annual receipts.

Mr. TUPPER. As a general rule.

Mr. LISTER. Then there are exceptions?

Mr. TUPPER. Where the receipts are so small that it would not induce anyone to act, the amount is sometimes 50 per cent.

Mr. LISTER. Since I have been a member of this House, I have heard complaints constantly, session after session, from the Maritime Provinces as to their treatment in regard to public works constructed by the Government and in the hands of the Government. It seems that on the inland lakes of this country they have adopted the same principle, that is, of constructing works at certain ports on the upper lakes according to circumstances of a political character. The statement made by the Minister of Marine justifies to the fullest extent the charges which have been made against the Government from time to time, that these public works have been constructed in order to influence the electors. We know that the policy of the Government in the past, in order to secure support from different parts of the country, has been to erect custom houses and post offices where they were not required and where the revenue did not entitle those places to have them, while in other places that kind of work has been neglected, if not refused, simply because those constituencies have not returned members to support the Government. The Minister of Public Works knows that that is the case. So far as docks are concerned on the Sault Ste. Marie river and on Lake Superior, the Government have erected docks particularly at Sault Ste. Marie. There was a gentleman who ran in support of the Government, and the Government purchased his dock at an enormous cost, erected another dock in its place at a cost of from $5,000 to $10,000 and placed that gentleman in charge of the dock, as I am told by residents of that place, at a fixed salary. Not only that, but they appointed that gentleman's brother as Custom-house officer at that place, and the result is that anyone who desires to land goods at Sault Ste. Marie must go to the public dock. There are other docks there built by private enterprise, but they are of no value to the owners because, in consequence of the policy of the Government, it is an inconvenience for any shipping to go there. The consequence is that what was, in effect, public property is to-day, for all practical purposes, the property of this individual, although it has been built by the Government, with the money of the people of this country. At St. Joseph Island the same state of affairs exists. There the Government, whose object and motive are perfectly manifest, built a very expensive dock, which should have been built by private enterprise. To-day the gentleman who is the practical owner of that dock, collects the fees and attends to it, and I am told he is paid a salary; in other words, the Government has, with the money of the people of this country, built what he was not enterprising enough, apparently, to build for himself, they constructed a dock with a very large sum of money; and to-day this individual owns what the country has paid for. I point out these things because there has been, and there is, a strong feeling in certain sections of the country that private enterprise should not be anni-

hilated and destroyed by the Government stepping in and doing what private enterprise ought to do, doing what, in effect, there is no necessity for, inasmuch as other wharves exist in several places that offer all needed facilities, and their value is reduced very much, if not entirely destroyed, by the action of the Government. Sir, these things should not be encouraged. People should not resort to the Government for aid in every enterprise which private individuals should undertake. Private enterprise must, to a certain extent, meet these cases, and the effect of the Government policy is prejudicial and injurious to a large section of the country. So far as I can see there can be no possible justification or excuse for the Government except the desire to expend public money in order to influence the electorate of a certain section.

Mr. BOWELL. I have no information upon any of the points to which the hon. gentleman has alluded. I desire to say, however, that he has been misinformed with reference to the necessity of vessels, or any persons, being compelled to go to the public dock when they bring goods into the country. There are at present three or four officers appointed for the express purpose of attending the different docks, receiving entries and examining dutiable goods when they are brought in from the United States. If the hon. gentleman's information, with reference to other matters, be no more correct than that which refers to the Customs, he has been sadly misled as to the facts in connection with the construction of these docks, as well as to facts in connection with their management. As I have already stated, I do not desire to refer to the other points alluded to by the hon. gentleman, because I have no official or personal knowledge of them; but I desire to assure him that he is in error, he has been misinformed, with reference to the management of the Customs Department at Sault Ste. Marie.

Mr. LISTER. I am making no charge against the Customs Department, but I only ask, why, if there are other docks at Sault Ste. Marie, should there be a Government dock there at all? The public have opportunities of landing their goods already, and why, in the name of common sense, should the Government go to work and build a Government dock at all? This dock was owned by the gentleman I speak of. He was the owner of it before the Government took it over, and they went to work and built a new wharf.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Customs does not answer one part of my hon. friend's statement. I understood the member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) to say that the Custom-house officer at Sault Ste. Marie is a brother of the present owner or lessee of the dock, or is a partner of the lessee or owner of the dock. Is that the case?

Mr. BOWELL. I did not hear the hon. gentleman say that. In the first place, the hon. member for Lambton asked no question whatever. I merely got up to make an explanation, so far as his reference to the Customs Department was concerned. He did say, however, that the Collector of Customs was a brother of the owner of the dock.

Mr. MULOCK. A partner.

Mr. BOWELL. No, I did not understand the hon. gentleman to say that. I did not understand him to say that he was the partner of the owner of the dock.

Mr. LISTER. What I did say was that the *de facto* owner of the dock is the brother of the Custom-house officer.

Mr. BOWELL. Can you give me the name of the owner of the dock?

Mr. MULOCK. Mr. Plummer.

Mr. BOWELL. A Mr. Plummer—I do not know his Christian name—is the Collector of Customs at Sault Ste. Marie.

Mr. LISTER. Mr. Plummer is the owner of this dock.

Mr. MULOCK. I have some information on the subject which I will bring up at a later period; and when I do bring it up, in order that the Minister may be able to deal with it, I will tell him now that the papers which I have here show, if I have caught the point correctly, that the two gentlemen, the Messrs. Plummer, are in partnership in Sault Ste. Marie.

Mr. BOWELL. In mercantile business?

Mr. MULOCK. I do not know; at all events, they are in business that involves the importation of articles at that point. I am informed by these documents that one of these gentlemen is the Custom-house officer, and the other imports through this Government dock. It is further suggested that the one who imports receives favours through the Custom-house officer, and it is further stated in these papers that underneath the dock which the Government has placed in the custody of the Custom-house officer, the one who imports has facilities for bringing in small crews who are able to proceed under the shelter of this dock, and when they are under the dock they are practically beyond the reach of the Custom-house officers.

Mr. BOWELL. I will only say to the hon. gentleman that if the statements which he has made are true, the collector will be subject to dismissal. In the first place, his alleged conduct is directly opposed to the provisions of the Audit Act, which prevents a man receiving a certain salary, from entering into any other business. In all cases where an officer receives a salary beyond a certain amount, he is strictly precluded by law from being connected with, or interested in, importations. I may add, for the information of the House, that Mr. Plummer, brother of the collector is a merchant of long standing at the Sault. I have no knowledge, nor has the department, that his brother is a partner with him, or has any connection whatever with the business. I can only repeat that if the allegations made by the hon. gentleman are substantiated, the collector will be subject to dismissal.

Mr. MULOCK. I am not making the allegations on my own authority.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I wish to take this opportunity of calling the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the pier at Wood Islands, which is an important public work in Prince Edward Island. I had the honour, I think last year and the year before, of calling his attention to the condition of that work. I pointed out to him that for the last ten or twelve years the Government had been making the repairs by day work, spending

only one or two thousand dollars upon it. I pointed out to him the fact, which I know from personal observation last year, that the Wood Islands breakwater at that time was in a very dilapidated condition, although the Government were charging wharfage for everything landed at that wharf. As a matter of fact a horse and cart could not be taken within half a mile of that part of the breakwater where vessels land their goods. When any article was landed from a schooner it had to be carried on the backs of men over the breakwater till it reached the upper portion, where it was placed in a cart. This was most cruel and intolerable. I was promised by the department that steps would be taken to place this most important work in an efficient condition. I am glad to know that an engineer of the department proceeded there last year, Mr. Brown, I think was his name, and he no doubt made a report to the department as to the condition of the breakwater. The hon. Minister will no doubt find, although I have not seen a report or Mr. Brown since, that the condition of affairs was very much as I stated it from my place last year. I cannot allow the session to pass without bringing the condition of this breakwater in a very formal way before the attention of the House, unless some assurance is given, as I hope it will be, that the Government intend to place that wharf or breakwater in efficient repair. The people in the immediate vicinity of that work have to endure more than any people I know of in the Island as regards shipping. They have no harbour and no breakwater within miles of them, except this one, and it has been allowed to gradually get out of repair until to-day it is hardly any use whatever. I hope, therefore, the suggestion which I and my colleague made last year in regard to the repairing of this breakwater, backed up, as no doubt it is by the report of the engineer sent by the department, will have the effect of inducing the Minister of Public Works, not to expend a thousand dollars on repairs to be done by day work, because the money might as well be thrown into the sea, but to expend such sum as the engineer reports to be necessary to place it in a fairly efficient condition. If the Minister will do that, he will confer a great boon on the people in that vicinity, and do a simple act of justice to a long-suffering people.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I remember the hon. gentleman made a remark to that effect last year, and he is perfectly right in stating that an officer of my department, I think Mr. Brown, was sent to report on the matter. As I was unable during three or four months to attend to my official work, being very unwell, I cannot say what the report was. I cannot say whether the work has not been repaired to a certain extent; but I know that after the remarks last year by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) and the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Welsh), I gave orders that such small repairs should be done as, I understand, the Local Government would have done, tenders being called and the contract being given to the lowest bidder. I think that was done last season. At all events, those were my instructions. I shall take a special note of it.

Mr. WELSH. Hope deferred maketh the heart sick. For four years I have brought up this question every session. Hon. members may talk about the Minister's promise; he has given me his promise verbally and in writing, and he has broken his word; and if there ever was a dead-meat business brought before this House it is this, and it is the most false act ever perpetrated against Prince Edward Island.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. WELSH. I will rise and say what I think. If I were to express my feelings in regard to the way the Minister has treated the Island in the matter of this breakwater, my remarks would not be very complimentary to him or to the Government.

Mr. BOWERS. While the subject of breakwaters is before the House, I desire to call attention to several breakwaters in Digby County, N.S., which are suffering for lack of repairs. At Centreville there is a wharf which cost several thousand dollars. A sum of $500 or $600 is required to place it in repair. If this is not expended, $5,000 or $6,000 will be required at some future time to place a new wharf there. At Comeauville, in Digby, there is a wharf which requires an expenditure of $1,000 or $1,500 to place it in a proper condition of repair. At Salmon River the inhabitants have asked several years for an addition to their breakwater, and which has been promised them several times. For lack of the necessary accommodation trade suffers, as the vessels cannot load their cargoes for the American or other markets. I also call his attention to the condition of the wharf at Meteghan, for which $3,000 will be required to place it in repair. This is a very important work. A large sum of money has been expended in erecting a breakwater outside the wharf, but certain portions of the wharf inside of the breakwater have become out of repair. The inhabitants do not object to pay wharfage, provided the Government place the wharves in such a state of repair that they can be used. I hope that as the Government's attention has now been called to those works they will do something towards the wharves in Digby County, which county has a seaboard of 125 miles and requires a large number of these public works.

Motion agreed to.

NORTH SHORE RAILWAY.

Mr. LANGELIER moved for:

Copies of all Orders in Council, correspondence, papers, reports and documents in relation to the returning of the debentures of the North Shore Railway Company.

He said: During the session of 1885, it will be remembered, a discussion took place regarding the Short Line Railway. It will be in the recollection of hon. members that two principal lines were proposed for a short line railway from Montreal to the sea. One was through the city of Quebec, involving the construction of a bridge over the St. Lawrence River. The other, and it was the one adopted by the Government for reasons which are very well known, was through Sherbrooke. When the question was under discussion, the Minister of Public Works, speaking for the Government, pretended that he deeply regretted that the Government could not adopt the route by the city of Quebec, but he said they had adopted the shortest route, and that was through Sherbrooke. It appears now that the shortest line was not through Sherbrooke, and, in fact, that the line through Sherbrooke was

neither the shortest nor the best. It was the worst and not the shortest. But we will pass that by. On that occasion there was a very strong feeling expressed in favour of the route by way of the city of Quebec by members from that part of the country supporting the Government. Two members especially were very active in their opposition to the line through Sherbrooke and in support of the line through Quebec: they were the then hon. member for Montmagny and the then hon. member for Dorchester. In order to give them some consolation the Government stated that they had taken steps to secure to the city of Quebec the eastern terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and, in order to effect that purpose, the Government proposed to the House a grant of $1,500,000. I must say at once that $1,000,000 of that amount was only a revote, it having been voted at a previous session. The Minister of Public Works, explaining the policy of the Government, stated the manner in which the money was to be used. He said that it was proposed with that money to secure the control of the North Shore Railway, that is to say the portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway between St. Martin's Junction and Quebec, which was then the property of the Grand Trunk. Everyone knows the history of the construction of that line, and it is not a history very much to the credit of the then Government of Quebec. Before the construction of that line, we had only the Grand Trunk Railway between Quebec and Montreal, and it was stated over and over again, when the North Shore Railway was about to be built, and as a reason for the construction of that line, that it would be a Government railway, that it would be a competitor to the Grand Trunk Railway and consequently advantageous to the city of Quebec. However, the line was scarcely finished when in 1882, under the Administration of the present Secretary of State at Quebec, a law was passed confirming a sale made by the Government of the Province of Quebec to a company authorized by the same statute, which was called the North Shore Railway Company. By the Act creating the company in question, it was authorized to issue second mortgages on the railway, because the first mortgage was in order to secure the purchase money which was to remain due to the Government of the Province of Quebec. I repeat again, that the Minister of Public Works on that occasion, in 1885, solemnly promised that the $1,500,000, which he was then proposing the House should vote, was to secure the eastern terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway at the city of Quebec. I forgot to mention that this line which had been publicly proclaimed as a competing line to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, was afterwards sold to the Grand Trunk Railway Company by the North Shore Railway Company. That very same company which had obtained control of the railway a few months afterwards, sold it to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and Quebec was in a worse position than ever it had been before so far as communication with Montreal was concerned. Such was the state of facts when the Act of 1885 was passed. The Minister of Public Works explained to the House then, that with the $1,500,000 which he asked Parliament to vote, the Government would try to secure control of the North Shore Railway from the Grand Trunk Railway, which then owned and ran the North Shore Railway, and he added that if the Government could not secure control of the North Shore Railway they would use the $1,500,000 to subsidize another line which would be built between Quebec and Montreal. That would, of course, compel the Grand Trunk Railway to sell the railway in favour of the Government; and after the session of Parliament the Government succeeded in getting control of the North Shore Railway. They paid $500,000 to the Grand Trunk Railway Company; $250,000 to recoup the Grand Trunk Railway of what it had paid to the North Shore Railway Company, or rather, I should say, to Senator Senecal, because he was nearly the whole company himself, and $250,000, the profit of the Grand Trunk Railway, on the transaction which they had made with the North Shore Railway Company. I am giving these sums in round numbers. There then remained a sum of $1,000,000 of the money voted in 1885, and what did the Government do with this money? It had never been contemplated by this House that the money voted would be used to pay Senator Senecal's debts to the Bank of Montreal or to any other bank or individual, but the Government found that Mr. Senecal's company had issued debentures for a certain amount and nearly $1,100,000 had been pledged as collateral to the Bank of Montreal for a loan to Mr. Senecal. The Government acquitted the debt of Mr. Senecal to the Bank of Montreal, and with this money which was to be used in the interest of the city of Quebec, they bought these debentures in order to release the debt of Mr. Senecal to the Bank of Montreal. The result of this is, that up to the present moment the Government are holding these debentures, for which, I think, they paid $970,000, so that there remains nothing of the $1,000,000 which was to be used for the city of Quebec and to secure for that city the eastern terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway. What has been the consequence of all this? Every one can see that it would be in the interest of the city of Quebec that the traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway line should be developed, but by the arrangement which was entered into between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, coupled with the fact I have just mentioned in reference to that debenture indebtedness of nearly $1,000,000, the city of Quebec is suffering. It is now in the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company not to develop the traffic on that portion of their line, but rather to prevent its development, and why: for this reason, that under the arrangement entered into the Canadian Pacific Railway Company must take from the gross receipts of the railway, first, whatever is necessary to pay the running expenses of the line; then, whatever sum is necessary to pay the interest that is due to the Government of the Province of Quebec on the balance of the purchase money, which, I think, is some $3,500,000; and if any surplus remains it must be used to pay 5 per cent. interest to the Government on these debentures which they got by releasing Mr. Senecal's indebtedness to the Bank of Montreal. The result is that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company see very well that if they develop the traffic on the North Shore line it will not be to their advantage at all, for it would be simply to enhance the price of these debentures. Of course the Canadian

Pacific Railway must be anxious to get hold of the debentures in question to discharge the mortgage which they bear on the railway, and they see very well that if they give themselves any trouble to develop the traffic and increase the receipts of the railway between Quebec and Montreal, they would be enhancing the debentures which they want to get hold of. The result has been practically ruinous to Quebec, for instead of having that great railway company working to develop the trade and commerce of the localities with which it is connected, it is doing its best not to extend the traffic between Quebec and Montreal. Another very serious consequence is, that under that arrangement the Government seem to be so very anxious to secure the 5 per cent. interest on their debentures, that they do not want the Canadian Pacific Railway to be at liberty to spend too much money for the maintenance of the road, and the company is not even allowed to build a new bridge or to purchase new rolling stock. At one time we were threatened with a complete stoppage of traffic on the North Shore road, because the bridge engineer of the Canadian Pacific Railway reported to that company, as was stated to this House last session, that two bridges were dangerous and that the Pont Rouge bridge, 24 miles from Quebec, was so dangerous that the engineer suggested to the Canadian Pacific Railway to completely stop the running of trains on that line. Eventually the company obtained permission from the Government to rebuild that bridge at an expense of some $17,000. I have learned from some of the highest officers of the Canadian Pacific Railway that they have had the greatest difficulty in getting the repayment of that money out of the $1,000,000 which remains, and which should have been used for that purpose. Another bridge which became dangerous was the Portneuf bridge, and although there were two years of negotiations on the subject the Government failed to repair it. These facts, with many others, will give an idea of the way in which the city of Quebec has been treated. I need not tell the House that the release of the $1,000,000 of debentures has been a burning question with the citizens of Quebec. They are a dead load, not only on the Canadian Pacific Railway, but on the trade and commerce of the city; and the city council, the board of trade, and almost all the important commercial men of the city have been urging the Government during the last three or four years to release them. Promises were made to every delegation that came to Ottawa on the subject, but nothing was done. The elections of this year came on. It had been stated that if the Canadian Pacific Railway Company could obtain the release of that indebtedness they were prepared to use the money in improving the road, building elevators on the Louise embankment, repairing the bridges and increasing and improving the rolling stock of the railway; and I am told on good authority that such is the present intention of the company if this indebtedness is released. They do not want to keep the money for themselves, but will use it in improving the road. I need not say that in the last election this was a very prominent question before the electors of Quebec, and especially before the electors of Quebec Centre. A meeting took place for he purpose of selecting a candidate to oppose me. That meeting was attended by no less personages than the hon. Minister of Public Works and the hon. Minister of Militia. At that meeting a very respectable gentleman, a vice-president of the Board of Trade, Mr. Chateauvert, was selected as the candidate, and I will take the trouble to read to the House the speech he made on that occasion in the presence of those two hon. Ministers. I translate the report:

"I can say without boasting that I have succeeded with Col. Forsyth"——

A great friend of the hon. Minister of Militia——

——"to induce the Government to release the $1,000,000 of debentures on condition that the Canadian Pacific Railway do the improvements necessary on the Louise embankment by building elevators and executing other works which shall help to make of Quebec a centre of distribution like Montreal and Toronto, and one of the finest harbours in the world."

There can be no mistake as to the correctness of the report of that speech, because Mr. Chateauvert himself took the trouble to distribute it among the electors of Quebec Centre along with a circular which he did me the honour to send me, and in which he says:

"You will see by the enclosed report of a speech which I delivered on Saturday night what my views are, and for what purpose I solicit the suffrages of my fellow-citizens."

That was not enough. Mr. Chateauvert was so sure of the promises he had obtained from the hon. Minister of Public Works and the hon. Minister of Militia that he went further and published in *Le Courrier du Canada*, the special organ of the hon. Minister of Public Works, his promissory note, as it was called by the paper, and he was so sure that these promises would carry the division that he called himself already the member. Here is the promissory note:

"QUEBEC, 21st February, 1891.

"As member for Quebec Centre and in return for the confidence of my electors, I promise to give them the settlement of the $1,000,000 of debentures of the Canadian Pacific Railway and assistance for the bridge."

This promissory note, so called, was published in every issue of that paper for a considerable time during the election contest, at the top of its editorial page, with the following commentary added:——

"Here is a promissory note signed by a business man in full knowledge. It has not been signed in blank; the date, the consideration, the amount, everything is mentioned therein."

That is perfectly true. Well, Mr. Chateauvert is a very respectable gentleman, who, I believe, would not tell a lie even privately, and still less publicly, in a statement of that kind; and when I saw it I could not have any doubt, nor could the citizens of Quebec, that he had received from the hon. Minister of Public Works and the hon. Minister of Militia the promise which he stated he had obtained from them. In connection with the same matter, the city of Quebec had the honour, among other cities during the elections, of a visit from the High Commissioner, and of course, he made a speech, in which he, of course, made promises. I do not think he could make a speech in election times without making promises of money. I take the report of his speech in the *Morning Chronicle*. I am sure the hon. Minister of Public Works will not dispute the fidelity of that paper to the Government and to himself personally. The meeting took place in a hall in the centre division called Tara Hall. Here is what the paper says:

"Sir Charles then addressed the audience for about two hours, speaking most eloquently and being loudly applauded. Sir Charles stated that, not being a member of the Government, he had telegraphed Sir John to-day—(meaning Sir John A. Macdonald)—what he could say on the question of the Quebec bridge and the North Shore railway bonds. The answer received had been as follows, and he published that answer before the meeting :—

"'KINGSTON, 26th February, 1891.

"'Parliament will be asked to transfer bonds to Canadian Pacific Railway, on conditions imposed by the city of Quebec.

(Signed) "'JOHN A. MACDONALD.'

"(Loud applause.)"

Of course the applause must have been very loud, but it would not have been so loud if the same audience had read the answer given by the Minister of Public Works some time ago to a question which was put for me by my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island. Here is the question :

"1. Whether it is within the knowledge of the Government, that, at a meeting held in Tara Hall, at Quebec, on the 26th of February last, Sir Charles Tupper, the High Commissioner for Canada to London, declared, that having telegraphed to the Right Honourable Sir John A. Macdonald, First Minister of Canada, in order to know from him what he ought to say on the question of a bridge at Quebec, and on that of the North Shore Railway debentures, he had received the following telegram :—

"'KINGSTON, 26th February, 1891.

"'Parliament will be asked to transfer bonds to Canadian Pacific Railway, on conditions proposed by the city of Quebec.

(Signed) "'JOHN A. MACDONALD.'"

"2. Whether the said telegram was sent by the Right Honourable Sir John A. Macdonald, to the said Sir Charles Tupper? 3. What are the conditions imposed by the city of Quebec, referred to in the said telegram? 4. Whether the Government intends to keep the promise thus made in its name by Sir Charles Tupper? 5. When does the Government intend to introduce the measure promised by the said telegram? 6. Whether the Government is aware, that, at the said meeting, Sir Charles Tupper declared that the citizens of Quebec might regard the building of the said bridge as an accomplished fact? 7. Whether the Government authorized the said Sir Charles Tupper to give the said promise? 8. Whether the Government intends to carry out this promise? 9. When does it propose to introduce a measure to give it effect?"

I will now read the answer given by the hon. the Minister of Public Works. I am quite sure there would have been very little applause if such an answer had been given in Quebec. The hon. Minister said :

"The telegram mentioned in this question is not complete : it is only a portion of the telegram, and that is the only answer I can give to that part of the question. There will be a measure brought down during the present session in reference to the bonds of the North Shore Railway."

It is not said in what respect the telegram was incomplete. If it was garbled, it was not garbled by myself, for I took it as it was published in the *Morning Chronicle*, nor was it garbled by that newspaper which took it from Sir Charles Tupper himself. Therefore, if there was any garbling of the telegram, it was done by Sir Charles Tupper. I would like to know what does the rest of the telegram contain? I think the hon. the Minister of Public Works should have stated whether the portion of the telegram which was not read contained a promise of help for the bridge, for that was the respect in which the telegram was deficient. The Tories of Quebec were very exultant the next morning. Every one of them said : "Now we have the bridge; we heard Tupper yesterday, and we will have the million dollars of debentures released, and we will have the bridge. He said so, and of course he always tells the truth. He never made a vain promise." So they all thought they would get the bridge. I read the telegram again and again, and could not find in it any promise about the bridge. Most probably that is the portion of the telegram which has been left out, and I expected the Minister of Public Works would have read that portion, which must have contained the offer of assistance for the bridge. What we want to know is the exact truth with reference to the question concerning the million dollars debentures of the North Shore Railway. Every one must see that the answer of the hon. Minister is most incomplete. There may have been some excuse for the incompleteness of the answer when he gave it, for then nobody was in charge of the Railway Department, but now we have reorganized the Government, and there must be somebody in charge of that department and in a position to give us the information we want. The House will see this is a subject involving a million dollars, and it is entitled to correct and complete information. I put another question on the same occasion. I asked :

"Whether the Government are aware that during the period of the last election Victor Chateauvert, Esq., ministerial candidate in Quebec Centre, published in *Le Courrier du Canada* the following notice :—

"'QUEBEC, 21st February, 1891.

"'As member for Quebec Centre, in return for the confidence of my electors, I promise to give them a settlement of the Pacific million, and help for the bridge.' And that in a speech made by the said Victor Chateauvert, Esq., about the same date, to the electors of Quebec Centre, he made the following statement :—

"'I can say, without boasting, that I have succeeded, with Colonel Forsyth, in inducing the Government to give up the million dollars of debentures (the million dollars of debentures which the Government retains on the Canadian Pacific Railway, between Quebec and Montreal) on condition that the Canadian Pacific Company shall make the necessary improvements on the Louise Embankment, construct elevators, and carry out the other works which will serve to make Quebec a distributing centre like Montreal and Toronto, and one of the finest ports in the world.

"'After having secured from the Ottawa Government, through the influence of our Ministers, Sir Hector and Sir Adolphe, the return of the million of debentures, and a promise of aid for the bridge between Quebec and Lévis, I should consider myself a bad citizen if I did not consent to come forward under circumstances so favourable for the city.'

"2. Whether it is true, as so stated by Mr. Chateauvert, that he had secured from the Government the remission of the said million of debentures and a promise of aid for the said bridge? 3. What is the nature of the aid so promised? 4. When do the Government intend to introduce measures to carry out the remission of the said million of debentures, and to assist in the construction of the said bridge?"

Here is the answer which the hon. the Minister of Public Works gave to my question :

"The Government are not aware that the article in question was published in that paper, but they do know that Mr. Chateauvert exerted himself very much about this remission of the million dollars, and also about the bridge in question. The Government will introduce a measure about the million dollars debentures. The remainder of the question I cannot answer now."

Certainly the Minister of Public Works should have been in a position to say whether or not Mr. Chateauvert told the truth when he publicly stated, in a speech to the electors of Quebec, that he had obtained from the Minister of Public Works and also from the Minister of Militia a promise for the release of the North Shore Railway debentures. Either Mr. Chateauvert was publicly telling a lie to all the citizens of Quebec and should be branded for having told a lie, or it was true that the Minister of Militia and the Minister of Public Works had promised the release of that million of

debentures. We want to know whether Mr. Chateauvert, whom we have always known to be a Tory, but whom we have also known to be a good and respectable citizen of Quebec, is to be branded publicly as a liar or whether the Ministers referred to made the promise, and, if so, whether they are prepared to redeem it. Let them say whether they are or not; let them say whether the promise was made or not, and, if it was not made, we shall know how to deal with Mr. Chateauvert in Quebec. We do not want to be fooled any more. We want to know whether the citizens of Quebec have been shamefully deceived by Mr. Chateauvert or whether Mr. Chateauvert has been shamefully deceived by the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Militia.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would say a few words in answer to some of the observations which the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Langelier) has made, because some of the matters he has touched upon happened to come under my notice in a departmental way. I presume that the speech he has made this afternoon is not intended to elicit the policy of the Government upon this question of the million dollars of bonds, because the hon. gentleman and the House have been promised at an early part of the session that a measure on this subject will be brought down during the session, and it will be more convenient for him, as well as for us, to discuss that question when the papers and the correspondence and the documents are accessible to members on both sides of the House. The hon. gentleman is quite misinformed, or else he has unintentionally misstated the question as to the betterments required from time to time to be made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The hon. gentleman stated, for instance, that we did not wish betterments to take place in connection with the North Shore Railway. He also stated that a great deal of difficulty occurred in the negotiations between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Government in relation to repairs which were actually necessary for the safety of the travelling public, and he intimated that, at one time, there was a serious danger of the road being closed because there were bridges which were not safe for the travelling public. I beg to say that there is not the slightest foundation for the supposition that we did not wish betterments to take place on the road, or that there was ever any delay on the part of the Government of Canada in regard to the necessary repairs taking place on the bridges on that road. The single question that arose in regard to betterments was as to whether we were bound by the terms of our contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to allow them to increase the capital expenditure on that road at our expense. They were entitled by the terms of the contract with us, according to our interpretation of it, to make renewals from time to time, but if they were to substitute, for instance, steel bridges for wooden bridges, we had no objection to their doing so and they did not require our consent, but they did require our consent to charging against the capital sum the additional cost of steel as compared with wood. In that respect we felt we would not be warranted, without coming to Parliament in regard to the matter, in assenting. We felt that our position under that contract and under that lien might be changed, but in regard to necessary repairs or betterments, the Canadian Pacific Railway were always free to make any betterments, to substitute steel for wood wherever they pleased, to make repairs where they were necessary, or to substitute wood for wood. In these matters they were at perfect liberty, because they would involve no extra capital charge whatever. As to the question which was put to us across the House the other day by the hon. gentleman, and in regard to which he has made some complaint in reference to the answer he received, I think the answer was pretty full, considering that there was a definite promise that a measure would be brought down in regard to the million dollars of railway bonds. The hon. gentleman finds fault with us, and indicates that we could not have paid very close attention to the progress of the election contest in Quebec or we would have discovered that the Quebec *Chronicle* did contain the article which he has read from *Hansard*. I might with equal justice say that the hon. gentleman did not pay much attention to his own election contest or he would not have had to come to the House of Commons to ask if that article had appeared in a paper published in his own constituency. The Government had no official knowledge of the publication. He had the same knowledge as the Government had on that subject, and his question was not a fair one. As to whether Mr. Chateauvert has deceived the electors of Quebec or Ministers of the Crown have deceived him, the hon. member will find, when the measure comes to be laid on the Table of the House, a full answer to that question, and he will find that, in any indication that Mr. Chateauvert has given of any pledge on the part of the Government of Canada, there will be no difficulty in carrying that pledge into effect. The measure will be brought down in the course of a few days, and the hon. gentleman will be able to see from its details whether it corresponds with the promise Mr. Chateauvert gave to his constituents or not. What may have transpired between the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Millitia and Mr. Chateauvert I do not know, but the Government of Canada will keep faith and will ask the House to ratify whatever promise was made by the Government of Canada, upon which no doubt the statement of Mr. Chateauvert was based. I will not go further, because I presume the hon. gentleman desires to have the returns and it is close to six o'clock.

Mr. LAURIER. It is, perhaps, to be regretted that, in the discussion of a matter of this moment, the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Militia are not present to defend their own course, and to explain the promise which they gave.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They will be here when the matter is before the House.

Mr. LAURIER. But they are not here now.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Six o'clock.

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

After Recess.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 87) to revive and amend the charter of the Quebec Bridge Company.—(Mr. Desjardins, L'Islet.)

Bill (No. 91) to amend the Act to enable the City of Winnipeg to utilize the Assiniboine River Water Power.—(Mr. Macdonald, Winnipeg.)

Bill (No. 92) to incorporate the Anglo-Canadian Electric Storage and Supply Company.—(Mr. Mackintosh.)

Bill (No. 102) respecting the Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Company (Limited).—(Mr. Sutherland.)

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT.—CONTRACTS—MEETINGS OF COMMITTEE.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Before the next Order is called, I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that the Committee on Privileges and Elections, which was supposed to have been called, beyond all manner of doubt, for to-morrow, has not been called, and that rumours have been circulated to the effect that that Committee is not to be called to-morrow, but is to be called on Friday instead. I cannot but think that this is to be regretted for many considerations. We cannot ignore the fact that one of the leading members of this House is on trial before that Committee, and the dignity of the House demands that under circumstances of that kind, at least reasonable speed should be adopted by the Committee in its proceedings. Now, we know very well that for the convenience of members of that Committee, or a portion of that Committee, the Committee does not meet upon Saturday and it does not meet upon Monday; but it was clearly understood, and the understanding was expressed when the Committee had met once or twice, that we should meet *de die in diem*. It was afterwards suggested that, as many members would be away in Montreal and Toronto on Saturdays and Mondays, that understanding should not be carried out to the extent of meeting upon those two days, and while I myself yielded, and yielded very reluctantly to that conclusion, I think the understanding of the Committee was that on those two days we should not be called together, but outside of those two days it was clearly understood by all members of the Committee that the Committee should meet on every other day and proceed diligently with the important charge which this House entrusted to them. Sir, we have a large number of witnesses in attendance by virtue of the subpœnas we have served upon them in the Committee. The expense, no doubt, is comparatively trifling, hardly to be spoken of at all, but when one considers the magnitude, the gravity of the charges, and the position of the hon. gentleman against whom those charges are made, the serious character of these charges, and the inevitable conclusion that if they are proved they will result in the most serious consequences, one stands aghast in surprise at the fact that this Committee is not called to meet from day to day, but that its meetings are, it seems to me, to be postponed so far as it is possible to postpone them. I cannot, for one, assent or consent to this delay. I protest in the strongest language against this procedure. I think if the Government are responsible, they are to be blamed; I think if the Chairman of the Committee is responsible, he owes an explanation now to this House and to the Committee. I think the agreement which was come to has been broken. I think the hon. gentleman himself who stands charged before that Committee owes it to his own dignity to insist that that Committee should meet at once and determine whether he is guilty or not. If he is innocent, why, Sir, it is the interest of the whole country, it is in the interest of this House, it is in the interest of its representatives, I won't say anything of his own interest—that his innocence should be proclaimed, and if evidence is given to justify any other conclusion, it is in the interest of the whole country that we should have that evidence given before us, and that this matter should be brought to a close. Sir, I cannot but think that, looking at the matter from a general standpoint, and looking at it from an outside standpoint, the Parliament of Canada does not occupy a dignified position. Its leader stands to-day impeached before one of its principal Committees, and that Committee ought to put all other considerations to one side, and proceed at once to determine the innocence or guilt of the hon. gentleman charged before it, instead of allowing his reputation to lie under a cloud. I will say no more upon that point, but I do say that the Committee has a right to insist that the understanding which was come to shall be carried out, and this House has a right to insist and to know why it is that that Committee does not proceed with the investigation of these serious charges.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman, in framing his protest, has used language which was utterly undeserved and inappropriate to the occasion. The hon. gentleman said that it was the fault of the Government, and he intimated——

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). I did not.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman said so in exact words.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). I did not. I said if it were the fault of the Government, they should be held responsible, and if it were the fault of the Chairman of the Committee, I should expect him to rise in his place and explain his conduct to the House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman said that it was the fault of the Government.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no. Order.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It will be entirely in vain for hon. gentlemen to say "No," and "Order." I am perfectly in order. I say that the hon. gentleman did impute fault to the Government in the matter——

Mr. LAURIER. I rise to order. My hon. friend beside me has stated distinctly that he made no such imputation. He said: "If it is the fault of the Government," and in face of such an explanation the hon. gentleman is entirely out of order in persisting to attribute to my hon. friend words which he declares he did not utter.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman—

Mr. LAURIER. I ask your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have a right to speak to the question of order; I am going to speak to the question of order. I was interrupted by the hon. member, and I am speaking now to the question of order, and the hon. gentleman would not have pretended I was out of order if he had allowed me to finish my sentence. My statement was this, and I am speaking now to the point of order, and the hon. gentleman will see I am entirely in order: The hon. member from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), who spoke, imputed

blame to the Government in this matter, and as the hon. gentleman has stated he did not do so, I am bound to assume he did not intend to do so, although at the same time the hon. gentleman's words certainly bore that construction. I wish to say a few words with respect to the proceedings of the Committee. I desire to say, first, that it is very much to be regretted, indeed, that a matter of this kind should assume a party aspect. We have conducted the proceedings of the Committee so far almost without any difference of opinion. We have all realized, I think, on both sides of the House that the investigation was a most disagreeable and painful one, and we must all have regretted that charges like these had to be investigated. We all, however, realized that these charges having been made, the investigation had to be proceeded with by regular methods, no matter where they led us. The Committee arrived at a determination, subject, of course, to be changed as circumstances made absolutely necessary to sit *de die in diem*. The hon. gentleman, I again admit, I may not have properly heard him, said, or I understood him to say, that everything had been done to put off the investigation. We have sat *de die in diem*, except when it was the unanimous wish of the Committee that we should adjourn over a day. I am quite willing that the Committee should sit on Monday. I explained to the Committee at the last meeting that we could not sit on Saturdays, because it is absolutely necessary for the business of the House that the members of the Government should be in Council all day, and inasmuch as the charges are so important and involve one of our colleagues, it is very unsatisfactory to be absent when witnesses are giving their testimony, and trust to reading the evidence afterwards. Subject to that reservation, I am quite willing that the Committee should sit on Monday and *de die in diem*, without any exception, except when the business of this House makes it imperatively necessary that the sitting of the Committee should be suspended. This is what occurred: We continued to sit *de die in diem* except when the Committee unanimously agreed that it was inadvisable to meet, as they did on one day, when we gave way to the Committee on Railways and Telegraph Lines. On the last day the House sat before the adjournment, in consequence of the death of the late Premier, I attended at the Committee room at half-past ten o'clock. The Committee were to have met that day. I found, not at all to my surprise, there was no quorum present, and one could hardly have been expected, because everyone understood that the House would adjourn, and in the minds of members there was no disposition to go on with ordinary business. That, therefore, made an adjournment *sine die*. If there had been a quorum there might have been a different result. I do not think there were half a dozen members present. I know that when I arrived, not more than five minutes after the hour, there was no member present, and I was told by the clerk that two or three members had been present but they realized there was no possibility of a meeting being held. The Committee thus stood adjourned *sine die*. We could not meet yesterday or to-day because the Committee of Railways and Telegraph Lines required to meet, and that Committee has forty Bills before it. The business of the House in that regard was standing still, and we gave up the room to that Committee. To-morrow it will be absolutely impossible to meet in consequence of other engagements that have been made, or to get a quorum even if the Committee did meet. Friday is the only day we can give. I am very sorry. I would be quite willing to give next Saturday, if I supposed a sufficient number of members would remain in town to constitute a quorum. We are not only willing, but as anxious as any members of the Committee can be, that this Committee shall go forward next week and sit *de die in diem*, without interruption, except such as is inevitable on account of the business of the House. I say to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies), as I understand him to say the Government is to blame, that we have no wish except to get at the end of this investigation. It is no more agreeable to us than to him, and nothing will stand in the way of speeding it to a conclusion except the transaction of the business necessary in connection with this House. Considering we are meeting after that last adjournment under very peculiar circumstances, considering that the Cabinet had to be reorganized, and that this had to be done in the middle of the session, with very important questions of policy to be considered, it is not unreasonable that we should ask the House for one day to deliberate before important questions touching the Budget and other matters which are now on the Order paper should come up for determination. That is the necessity which makes us ask that to-morrow should not be given to the business of the Committee. I must say as regards my colleague against whom these charges are brought, that he has not only never expressed an opinion, but has never been consulted as to the propriety of the Committee adjourning on any occasion. It is only on account of what we consider imperative necessity that we ask to have the Committee not to meet to-morrow. I have already explained why no meeting was held yesterday, and why to-day had to be given up; but it was not in accordance with our wish that there should be a suspension of one day.

Mr. TARTE. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the very long delay that is taking place in the production of papers that I feel necessary for my enquiry. I made the statement on which this investigation proceeded on May 11th. On May 15th the first meeting of the Committee took place. An order was then given for the production of all papers connected with the charges. Since that time they have been delayed from day to day. Of course I do not want to assume anything I am not in a position to prove, but there is one thing perfectly sure, and it is this: I have found in private letters that fell into my hands, traces of official letters and other papers that were not produced before the Committee. Some of these were only produced after we put in the hands of one of the officers called before the Committee a book containing evidence that such a paper existed and had not been produced. I might say more than that. There are to-day letters and telegrams, which were exchanged between Mr. Trutch and Mr. Perley, under the control of the Minister of Public Works, and which have not been produced before the Committee, and I state here that those letters are an essential part of the evidence that I desire to present to the Committee. As I said, I do not want to make any imputations. When I made the very

grave charges that I thought it was my duty to make, I fully realized all the difficulties I would have to meet: but when objection was taken in this House in regard to the Minister of Public Works keeping control of the papers, I did not take part in sustaining it. I hope that the Minister of Public Works, who is the official leader of my race in this Parliament, will not place me under the painful obligation of believing that those who at the time made that objection were right. I hope that they were wrong, but, Sir, I hope at the same time that he will realize that it is his immediate duty to order that all the papers should be brought down, and brought down without any more delay. Look at what we have witnessed, Mr. Speaker. We have seen people who have for the last eight years controlled, as a matter of fact, a great many things in a great public department, hiding their books from day to day.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Will the hon. gentleman not confine himself to the mere statement which he wishes to make on the Orders of the Day being called? He is now entering upon matters which give rise to a debate.

Mr. EDGAR. In order that this matter may not be slurred over, I move the adjournment of the House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is no occasion to slur it over at all. I simply reminded the hon. gentleman of the Rule of the House, which I thought perhaps he had not in mind. There is no objection to his making a full statement of what he desires, and it will be answered.

Mr. TARTE. What I say, Sir, is that we have before this Parliament in the official report of the Committee, the clear evidence, I might say more than that, the clear admission that the books were not forthcoming and that the book-keeper was dismissed.

Mr. SPEAKER. Let me draw the attention of the hon. member to the fact that he is now speaking as to the delay in producing papers by the Department of Public Works. What connection has that with the holding back of the books or with Connolly's clerk, I do not see.

Mr. TARTE. If you allow me, I believe that I can show you that I am perfectly in order, and, more than that, that there is a perfect relation between that delay and the other delays that we have suffered before the Committee. It should not be forgotten, I think, that the persons named in the charge I have brought are Larkin, Connolly & Co., and also, unfortunately, the Minister of Public Works. My charge is, that improper dealings have taken place between the parties named. I yet hope that the hon. Minister will prove that my charges are false: but still the charges are there, and they are now being investigated. Well, Sir, I was saying that we could not obtain until to-day important correspondence, letters and telegrams that are under the control of the hon. Minister. I state this from my seat in the House, and I will prove it in due time. At the same time we see that the other parties accused of having corruptly dominated the department have themselves hidden their books and sent away their man who was in a position to explain the entries in these books. This cannot be denied, because one of them has clearly admitted that he has dismissed the bookkeeper. I made these charges with a certain hope that they were going to be investigated in an honourable manner. I have expected justice, and I still expect justice, from this Parliament. Well, Sir, if we cannot get these papers, if we are delayed from day to day, I will certainly not be able to make all my evidence, although persons who may have been parties to destroying papers may be deceived in the long run. But still let us take the facts as they are before us. As a matter of fact we have been delayed, but I fully admit that the Government, I believe, is not responsible for that delay. I am quite prepared to say that I have received justice from the hon. Minister of Justice, who has directed all our proceedings in the Committee, but one thing that all the members of the House will be obliged to admit also is, that we have not acted with the energy that was to have been expected from us. We have been delayed from day to day: papers we have had a right to have are not produced yet, and I again call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact that he has got under his control in his department a great many letters extending between the years 1885, 1886 and 1887 that he had an order to bring before us, and that have not been brought down yet. I do not wish to say any more now, but, Sir, I believe that the House will agree with me that, in the interest of all parties, we should not prorogue until this enquiry is over. I believe that I may appeal to both sides of the House. If I have been deceived in the accusations I have brought I am quite prepared to bear the full responsibility and penalty of it, but, Sir, if my accusations are true, as I have every reason to believe they are, then the guilty parties ought to be punished.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I will not follow the hon. gentleman in his argument nor in his speech, because I believe the House does not expect that from me. The only thing I can say to the House is this: That every paper, every letter, every document, every plan and every thing that is in my department connected with this case, I have given orders from the beginning that they should all be produced before the Committee. I repeat again, that if the hon. gentleman will lay before the Committee when it meets to-morrow or the next day, a list of what he wants and which he does not find in the numerous papers and documents that have been laid before the Committee already, if any of those documents are to be found in my department every one of them will be brought down as soon as possible. I know perfectly well that my position as a member of Parliament and a Minister of the Crown is this: That as the head of that department, and the House having ordered through its Committee that all these documents and papers should be produced, they must be produced, and an order has been given to the deputy head of the department to do so. He has full liberty to do so, his duty is to do so, his orders are to do so, and I have no doubt that if any document is missing it is because he did not find it. If the hon. gentleman will give a list of one, or two, or three, or twenty documents which he wants, Mr. Gobeil, the Deputy Minister of my department, is bound to find them if they are in the department.

Mr. GIROUARD. With regard to these missing papers, I may be allowed to make one or two remarks. First, the papers coming from the De-

partment of Public Works are contained in several large boxes. Evidently this investigation requires the production of a large number of papers, and it would not be surprising if some of them, on the first inspection, should be found to be missing. The hon. gentleman mentioned the other day, at the sitting of the Committee, that he had found out that some papers were missing. Surely there could not have been any intention of deceiving the hon. gentleman, or preventing his going on with his investigation. He found complete lists of those papers published in the blue-books.

Mr. TARTE. It was a very small blue-book.

Mr. GIROUARD. If those papers were mentioned in the blue-books, there could not have been any intention of hiding them.

Mr. TARTE. They were not produced.

Mr. GIROUARD. But there could not have been any intention of deceiving him or the public. I wish to make another statement as to the papers which were not found in the two boxes, but which were mentioned in the blue-books. They were produced on the very day that it was noticed they were missing, and I notified the hon. gentleman that he could have access to them. With regard to the correspondence of Mr. Trutch, I was informed yesterday that the hon. gentleman had made a demand on the clerk of the Committee for those papers. I looked at the order of the Committee, and I found that he was entitled to have them produced; I therefore, immediately, gave instructions to the clerk to demand the production of the papers from the Public Works Department. I do not know yet what answer he has received from the department. I am sure the hon. gentleman has no reason to complain of delay. He has received from the Committee and the Government all the assistance he could get.

Mr. IVES. I wish to say, on behalf of the private members of the House, that we do not complain that the Committee on Privileges and Elections should sit every day; but we have been in session now nearly two months, and we have had only two meetings of the Railway Committee, and none of the Committee on Banking and Commerce, or the Committee on Private Bills. The whole time has been monopolized by this investigation. Now, it seems to me that arrangements should be made by the Government for this Committee to sit simultaneously with the sittings of the other Committees, and for its vacating the Railway Committee room. We had a short meeting of the Railway Committee this morning with over forty orders on the paper. Among them was one Bill the promoters of which asked that we should not only pass it, but that we should reduce from two months to two weeks the notice required to be given to the Governor General in Council for the sanction of a lease, the reason given being that the whole season would be lost for the work of construction if the time were not reduced. I have no doubt that other very large interests are being injured and imperilled in consequence of the monopoly of our time by this Committee, to the exclusion of all the ordinary legitimate business of the country. Now, while we sympathize with the Government in their anxiety not to delay this investigation, I think it is not too much to ask them, because they have the control of the matter, to make provision that the ordinary business of the country may go on in the meantime. Of course, we do not expect to satisfy certain gentlemen who seem bound to find fault anyway—to find fault with the non-production of papers which were only asked for yesterday, and all that sort of thing; but we do think that the Government—and I am speaking not only for my own friends, but for hon. members on the other side who have Bills before the different committees—should make arrangements so that the other committees may meet simultaneously, and that they should not ask us to wait till the end of the Session for private Bill legislation which is urgently needed.

Mr. LAURIER. I am sure it is not the intention of any hon. member to cast suspicion or blame upon anyone in connection with this matter. For my own part, I will gladly add my testimony to that of the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Tarte), that the hon. Minister of Justice is entitled to credit for the manner in which he has discharged his duty to the House in this investigation. At the same time, the anxiety of the hon. member for Montmorency is natural, because he has assumed a task which is painful to him, and the consequences of which may be very serious to him if he does not establish the charges which he has made; and it seems to me that a remark made by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) fully justifies the complaint of my hon. friend. My hon. friend has complained that certain papers which were ordered to be produced by the Department of Public Works were not produced.

Mr. TARTE. A month ago.

Mr. LAURIER. Ordered to be produced a month ago. The hon. Minister of Public Works says that he gave orders for the production of those papers. I unhesitatingly accept his statement; but it appears from what the hon. member for Jacques Cartier has said that up to yesterday certain papers which were ordered a month ago—that is, the correspondence of Mr. Trutch, the inspector of public works in British Columbia—were not yet produced. Therefore, while I will not say that there was a failure of duty anywhere, for one reason or another the papers were not produced, and the remark of my hon. friend that the Order of the House has not been complied with is fully borne out. It is easy to understand that some warmth of blood may be exhibited; but when we come to sift the matter, let us admit that no one has intended to do wrong, though there has been a hitch somewhere, and it is quite natural that the matter should be brought to the notice of the House.

Mr. GIROUARD. The Order of the House was for papers, correspondence, and so forth, without specifying any particular papers. As the papers produced filled two trunks, it was quite possible that some of the desired documents might be missing; but the moment any paper was specified, an immediate order was given for its production.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think this matter is irregularly before the House, not only because we are having a debate on the Orders of the Day being called, but also in this sense—and it may not be amiss that I should make the suggestion now for future guidance—that we are really prosecuting the business of the Committee in the

House. It was an order of the Committee that was given for the papers some weeks ago; that order covered not particular papers or letters, but all papers, contracts, specifications, plans, accounts, vouchers, and so forth, relating to four large transactions, and extending over a period of twenty years. From my experience of the departments, I venture to say that if any order were given for documents extending over that period of time, there would be no surprise if when we came to examine them we found that a further search would have to be made and further papers obtained. But I submit to the hon. member for Montmorency that if he again finds that to be the case, as is not at all unlikely in view of the circumstances, it would be more convenient for all purposes to bring up matters of that kind in the Committee. Then if it is found that the order of the Committee has not been obeyed, the officers will be called up and put on their guard to be more vigilant; and instead of anyone in the House being subject to suspicion, we shall have the officers before us under oath to say why the papers were not produced and produced before. If such a course is followed, I think feelings of impatience and irritation will be less likely to be excited.

Mr. TARTE. I did more than that. I went myself to Mr. Gobeil four or five days ago. I indicated to him the papers that are missing, and these papers are not yet brought down.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the suggestion of the hon. Minister of Justice is a very proper one. It is only the importance of this question that, to my mind, justified its being brought up here to-night at all. These papers were ordered by the Committee, and the proper place to deal with their non-production is in the Committee and not in the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not going to enter into a discussion as to these papers at all, but I would like to say to the Minister of Justice and the Government generally, that I think there is a good deal in the suggestion made by the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives) thus far. I think the importance of this enquiry demands that precedence be given at any cost, even to the delay of ordinary business, to the investigation before the Committee of Privileges and Elections; but, after all, that Committee only comprises forty-two members, and there is no reason why the various committees of this House should not sit in other rooms during a reasonable number of days. If questions arise which absolutely require the presence of Ministers who have to be present at this investigation, these questions might be held over, but I think it is desirable the other committees should sit as well as the Committee on Privileges and Elections. If there is any difficulty with regard to obtaining a sufficiently large room, it might possibly be necessary to poach on the room immediately adjoining this, which is now handed over to gentlemen of the Conservative party; but I think the other committees, and certainly the Public Accounts Committee, should sit even while this investigation is going on, but, of course, in other rooms.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the other committees will have to be called.

LANGEVIN BLOCK—PAPERS.

Mr. MULOCK. Before proceeding to the Orders of the Day, I wish to bring to the attention of the Government the non-production of certain papers ordered some time ago. I refer to the papers connected with what is known as the Langevin Block. The hon. Minister of Public Works has several times promised to have the Order complied with.

Mr. SPEAKER. Were these ordered by the House or the Committee?

Mr. MULOCK. There is an Order both of the House and of the Public Accounts Committee; but, even if the order were only made by the Public Accounts Committee, you will see there must be some way of getting the order of the Committee complied with. We have not had a meeting of that Committee for a month, and, if we cannot ask for the papers until it meets, we may not be able to ask for them at all. I was notified by the clerk yesterday afternoon that these papers had been produced, and this morning I attended before the clerk to examine them. I can only say that there has been, in my judgment, a great deal more attention paid to the non-production than the production of the papers. The most studious efforts have been apparently made to prevent their production. As far as I went, I made a note of a few of the papers that I could see have not been produced and are pertinent to the enquiry, but I am perfectly satisfied that there has not been a proper compliance with the Order of the House or of the Committee.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The deputy of my department has told me that he had sent to the Committee on Public Accounts all the papers that were in the department and were asked for by the Committee. In so far as this House is concerned the hon. gentleman asked for a number of documents and information, which the House granted. I said to the hon. gentleman, and I repeat it now, that it is impossible for my department to comply with the Order of the House so long as the Committee on Public Accounts has the original documents from which we could give the information asked for: and I said to the deputy of my department that whilst he was sending these documents to the Public Accounts Committee he should tell the clerk of the Committee that so soon as the Committee would send back the documents, we would prepare a statement for the House; but we have no double sets of original documents, and therefore cannot comply with the Order of the House until the Public Accounts Committee has returned the originals.

Mr. MULOCK. The documents, the non-production of which I complain of, are not with the clerk of the Public Accounts Committee, but have been withheld from him.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is no intention on the part of my department or my deputy, who is an honest, straightforward man, to keep away from the Committee or members of the Committee any paper or document that is to be found in my department. If the hon. gentleman will send a list of what he says is missing, and if these papers are to be found in the department they will be sent here. It must have been because the documents could not be found that they have not been sent, but if they are in the department they will be laid on the Table. We have no reason to fear the investigation of the hon. gentleman or the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. LISTER. I understood the Minister of Justice to say that all the documents are not produced to the clerk of the Committee because the officers in his department are engaged in copying them.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

Mr. LISTER. There can then be no possible reason for not producing the original documents before the Committee.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. All the original documents which are not in a book used every day by the department have been sent. Documents, such as letters, which are in books that are used every day, must be copied, because we cannot stop all the work of the department by sending away the books; but all the original documents which are not in books are sent.

Mr. BARRON. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works if he will comply with the promise made last session by the late Premier in regard to the production and laying on the Table of the evidence taken by the Trent Valley Canal Commissioners in regard to the completion of that route. That subject is very important to a great many people in Ontario, who are very anxious to know something about it. Of course, we have the report of the Trent Valley Canal Commissioners, but we require to have the evidence on which that report is based in order to discuss it intelligently.

Mr. BOWELL. Might I ask the hon. gentleman if those papers were moved for in the House, either last session or this session?

Mr. BARRON. I am glad the hon. gentleman has referred to that question. They were not moved for because the late Premier promised that, if they were not too voluminous, they would be printed during the recess and given to each member of the House, but that, in any event, I or anybody could see them on applying at the office where they are kept. He intimated, at all events, that members could get possession of them as soon as possible, and, inasmuch as the promise was of a nature which did not require anyone to move for the papers, I mentioned it at the beginning of this session, and there was an intimation that they would be given to the House.

Mr. BOWELL. I will make enquiry in the department as to the character of the evidence. There is no possible reason for withholding it, and I will see that such evidence as it is possible to lay upon the Table shall be brought down as early as possible.

Mr. LANDERKIN. When are we to have a meeting of the Public Accounts Committee?

Mr. FOSTER. I understand a meeting has been called for Friday morning.

PROHIBITION OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

On the Order being read for the proposed motion of Mr. Jamieson:

That, in the opinion of this House, the time has arrived when it is expedient to prohibit the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes.

The motion of Mr. Mackintosh in amendment thereto and the motion of Mr. Taylor in amendment to the amendment.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have to renew the request which I made when this subject was called on the Order Paper the week before last and for the same reason. The motion will, of course, be reached this night week, and, unless something unexpected occurs in the meantime, we shall not ask for any further postponement.

Order postponed.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville) moved second reading of Bill (No. 5) to amend the Dominion Elections Act. He said: The object of this Bill, as I partly explained on its introduction, is to change the Dominion election law in two respects: first, as regards the form of oath; and, secondly, to remove some confusion which exists in consequence of the provisions of the Act as it now exists. The first part of the Bill seeks to prevent British subjects who have become American citizens from voting in this country. The second part seeks to amend the law in such a way as to make the instructions contained in the Act itself correspond with the 46th section of the Dominion Elections Act. It is within the recollection of almost every member of this House that, after the recent elections, recounts were had, and difficulties arose over the taking of the ballots in certain constituencies. The result, I submit, was owing to no fault on the part of the deputy returning officers themselves, but might very naturally be attributed to the peculiar or confused reading of the instructions contained in the Act. There is no necessity for enlarging any further upon the Bill, but I will read one of the clauses of form "M" which it is proposed to change, and I think hon. members on both sides will see the necessity for a change:

"The voter will then fold the ballot so as to show a portion of the back only, with the number and initials of the deputy returning officer."

From that wording, I submit that any person, even though he had a legal education, might consider that not only the initials but the number of the deputy returning officer should be placed on the back, and, when you consider the very small number of persons who are allowed to each polling sub-division, and the consequent necessity for a large number of deputy returning officers, farmers' sons, clerks and others, who are not versed in law, it will be felt that every line or clause in the Act which tends to confusion should be made as clear as possible, because, when a mistake is made, the quick tendency is on the part of those against whom the mistake may be made to say that it is done from some improper motive. We know that, when we are in the heat of a conflict and even when the smoke of the battle has not quite cleared away, none of us are too careful to avoid imputing motives, and in that way many are brought under the ban of suspicion. I think both sides of the House will assist me in putting this Bill through so that we may make the Act as clear as possible.

Mr. EDGAR. The hon. gentleman who moves this Bill seems to have in his mind the idea that he is going to make a tremendous reform in the law by preventing British subjects who have been naturalized in the United States from voting here as British subjects. I apprehend that is the main scope of his Bill. I am very much mistaken in my reading of the law if that is at all necessary. I think the hon. gentleman must know that a British subject who goes to the United States and becomes

naturalized there has no right to vote in Canada to-day. He is no longer a British subject when he becomes naturalized in a foreign country, and under the Franchise Act he cannot vote, he cannot be placed on the list, and he cannot take the oath as it stands to-day, because he cannot truthfully swear that he is a British subject either by birth or by naturalization. Perhaps he was a British subject once by birth, but he cannot swear that he is to-day. That there may be no doubt whatever on this subject, I will refer the House to the Naturalization Act in the Revised Statutes on the subject of "Repatriation," and there it is laid down that

"Any British subject who has voluntarily become naturalized in a foreign state shall, from and after the time of his so having become naturalized in such foreign state, be deemed within Canada to have ceased to be a British subject, and shall be regarded as an alien."

Now, a man who has ceased to be a British subject has no right, in the first place, to be placed upon the voters' list under the Act, because only British subjects can be placed there, and he cannot take the oath truthfully, because he has to swear that he is a British subject by birth or by naturalization. Therefore, the introduction of this additional clause proposed by the hon. gentleman, "and am not a subject of any foreign country," while, perhaps, it will not do any particular harm, does not work any reform in the law as it stood. It does not do any good. I will not refer to any former debate, but I think I have a distinct recollection, indeed I know, that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) was on one occasion very loud in his expression of opinion that the only thing necessary to make the law perfect and to stop non-residents voting, was a Bill such as the hon. member proposes now. I think I heard the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) say the same thing, and I think the Minister of Justice even did not, on that occasion, point out to the hon. member who is moving this Bill to-day, that a British subject who became a naturalized citizen in the United States, was no longer a British subject and could not vote. The hon. gentleman thinks that it does no harm to make this change. If he puts it on that ground, and will admit that it is not necessary, then, I think, there may be something in his Bill; but he cannot surely pretend that he is going to effect a great reformation in the election law.

Mr. LISTER. I think the Bill which my hon. friend has introduced to the House is one that should receive the approbation of this House. If it has the effect of making clear what before was somewhat confused, it will be advantageous. Any person who has any experience at all in election matters knows perfectly well that so far as marking the ballots is concerned, many deputy returning officers throughout the country not only initial the ballots, but they also number them, which is against the law. The provisions of this Act make it perfectly clear that the numbering of the ballots should not take place, and that only the initials of the deputy returning officer are allowed upon the ballot which is handed to the voter. Then again, as respects the affidavit, or oath, which the voter has to take on presenting himself to vote, I think the amendment of my hon. friend is one which should receive favourable consideration. As I stated a moment ago, it makes clear what was before confused. We all know that many men present themselves to vote who have become citizens of the United States, and they satisfy their conscience by swearing that they are British subjects by birth. There is an idea prevalent throughout this country that once a British subject, always a British subject, that nothing he can do divests himself of that natural allegiance that he owes to his country by birth. I think it is safe to say that during the last election hundreds and hundreds of people who have taken the oath of allegiance to a foreign state, and have, under the law as it is, no right to vote, satisfied their conscience by declaring that they were British subjects by birth. This section makes it clear that if they have become subjects of a foreign state they lose their right of franchise under the law of this country. For these reasons this Act shall receive my support, and I think it ought to receive the support of hon. gentlemen who want to make the law perfectly clear. It may be, as my hon. friend at my right says, that under the law as it is, they have no right to vote, and their names ought to be struck off the first list. But who looks after the first list? When you come to make out your list then you find out whether a man has really a right to vote or not on the ground of being an alien. That is the time you object to him, and although men have over and over again been challenged, they have taken this oath, believing they were entitled to vote, and they did vote. This law makes it clear, and I think it should receive our support.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I desired to make remarks very much in the line of those which the hon. gentleman has just made. I do not think any one overlooks the fact that a British subject who renounces his allegiance to Great Britain and becomes a subject of a foreign country, is no longer a British subject. But that is not the point. The point is that our statutes at present do not, at any rate with clearness, proscribe such person from voting or from being on the election list. For my part I have no doubt whatever, except such doubt as arises from the opinions expressed by lawyers just now—I have never had any doubt that such persons have an absolute legal right to vote, because the only thing we ask is the oath which requires them to say they are British subjects by birth or by naturalization. Undoubtedly, although a man may have renounced his allegiance to Great Britain and be no longer a British subject, he is a British subject by birth, and if the intention of Parliament was, as it probably was, to prevent such persons from voting as being no longer British subjects, the least that we can do is to make the law plain. I think the current opinion is that such persons have a legal right to vote. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) says hundreds of persons voted in the last election who had renounced their allegiance to Great Britain and had become subjects of a foreign country; they took the oath and satisfied their consciences in the belief they had a right to do so. I may indicate to the House that if it should be the pleasure of the House that the Bill should be read a second time now, I will move that it be referred to a sub-committee. There are other Bills on the Order paper touching the same subject, some provisions of which it may be wise to adopt, and it would be convenient for the Committee to weld these together, so that we may have one Bill on the one subject.

Mr. BURDETT. While approving most of the letter and spirit of the Bill, I would suggest that we go a little further and that the ballot should not only be initialled by the deputy returning officer, but that it should be initialled also by authorized agents of the opposing candidates. Deputy returning officers are not always emblems of purity. A deputy returning officer, if he is so inclined, may issue a few ballots before the polling occurs with his initials upon them, and they can be circulated outside the booth, and a man may get his five dollar bill and the ballot already marked, provided he goes in and brings out one with the initials upon it not marked. That may occur, and if the initials of the deputy returning officer and the agents of the opposing candidates are allowed to be put upon the ballot as well, nothing of this kind can occur. Speaking on another point of the Franchise Act, I think that men who have gone to the States with the intention of residing there, ought not to be allowed to come back here and vote and thus affect the conduct of affairs in a country that they have left practically forever. Respecting the matter of postage, it is one of great importance to those who object to votes on the list. Now, these lists have to be registered and sent out at a cost of eight cents, and I think it ought to be made as cheap as possible to those gentlemen who revise the list, because under the present Act enough trouble and difficulty occur to both political parties.

Mr. BARRON. I, too, would like to see the Bill become law, including the suggestion made by my hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Burdett), because it has come under my own notice that electors go to the polls and take the oath that they are British subjects by birth, relying upon the fact that, though they had removed to the States, they were born British subjects. But my main object in addressing the House now is to draw the attention of the Minister of Justice and also the hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill to the fact that this Bill should not become law at all events this year, because it specifies what is a qualification for an elector. It may be that the revising officer in accepting declarations, knowing what is the qualification of an elector by this Bill, might require the clause setting forth that I am a British subject by birth and not the subject of any foreign country, to be incorporated in the declaration. We know that the revising officers, by statute, began their work on 1st June last, and if this Bill became law, without a clause being provided that it shall not be retroactive, those officers might hold that declarations received before this Bill became law would be bad, inasmuch as they would not contain the whole of this paragraph, "I am a British subject by birth and not the subject of any foreign country." I, therefore, suggest to the Minister of Justice and the promoter of this Bill that there should be a clause making it not applicable to the present revision, or, at all events, not to become law until after this year.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). It is only the form of the oath that the Bill seeks to amend. A person coming from the United States to Ontario could take the present oath because he could swear, and with something of a clear conscience, that he was a British subject by birth, notwithstanding that at the same time he was a citizen of the United States. The objection taken does not hold, because in the declaration required by the revising officer the party who seeks to have his name placed on the preliminary list only swears that he is a British subject.

Mr. BURDETT. The revising officer can accept the declaration whether this clause is in it or not.

Mr. MASSON. Surely the question as to what the revising officer may do cannot interfere with the passage of this Bill. It will be his duty to act in accordance with the Franchise Act and this Act, and I understand that the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood), also proposes to amend the Franchise Act bearing on the same subject. I am glad to see that made clear which was obscure. I would suggest that a further step be taken, and it should be declared that the person making the declaration is not only not the subject of a foreign country, but has not filed any declaration of intention to become the subject or citizen of a foreign state. In many of the Western States persons resident a few months are allowed certain privileges as citizens, provided they file a declaration with the county clerk of their intention to become citizens of the United States. I think such a clause should be embodied in the Bill as drawn, because, to use the sentiment expressed by Mr. Blaine, that Canadians should be taught that they cannot be Americans and Canadians at the same time. Canadians must be taught that they cannot be American citizens and at the same time come here and assist in controlling the legislation of this country.

Mr. FRASER. That argument does not apply to this case. The fact of a man declaring his intention to do a thing is not the performance of it. If so, every man who declared his intention to steal would be entered as having stolen. I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the Bill should cover cases where the parties had simply declared their intention to ultimately become American citizens.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Some of the States permit a man who declares his intention, and makes a formal declaration to that effect, of becoming an American citizen, to enjoy all the rights of American citizenship although he may not have been a resident long enough to have become a citizen.

Mr. FRASER. He has only certain rights concerning municipal matters, and he is not a full citizen. He is not a full citizen unless he has taken out his naturalization papers, as in this country. There is no necessity of placing such a clause in this Bill.

Mr. MASSON. In the Western States men, on filing such declarations, secure many of the rights of citizenship. If these people choose to go to a foreign country and make a declaration of their intention to become citizens, it is only right that we should provide that they should have nothing to do with the Government of this country.

Mr. CHARLTON. The object of making this declaration is to enable persons to hold real estate. In many States aliens are not allowed to hold property, but in no State, I believe, does the filing of such declaration entitle such a person to the right of citizenship and suffrage. The person has simply the right to acquire property; but he is not a

citizen, he has simply made a declaration of his intention to become a citizen, and is looking forward to the enjoyment of the rights connected therewith. I do not think that a person going from Canada to the United States, making possibly a declaration of his intention to become an American citizen in order to hold real estate, but not consummating his papers by becoming a citizen, perhaps returning to Canada and never becoming an American citizen, should be prevented from subsequently voting here. We will go far enough in declaring that an individual shall lose his right to vote after he has become an American citizen.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Does the promoter of the Bill intend to bar out any persons who have acquired property in the United States? Some young men may go to that country, may possibly file declarations to become American citizens in order to acquire property, and may subsequently return to Canada. Will this Bill permit such young men to vote or not? This question should be carefully considered, and it should be stated as to whether this Bill will place such men under the ban, and if so, for how many years after the return. There are members in this House who have acquired property in the United States, and I wish to know if this Bill is intended to strike a blow at them. It would be well that the promoter of the Bill should take the House into his confidence and let it be known whether it is intended to meet such cases.

Mr. McMULLEN. I concur in the view expressed by the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson). There are no less than fifteen states in which a man may vote for President if he has declared his intention of becoming a citizen of the United States. I can give the names of the states, if my statement is challenged.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved:

That Bill No. 5 be referred to a special committee consisting of Messrs. Wood (Brockville), Cameron (Huron), Amyot, Barron, Sir Adolphe Caron, Sir John Thompson, Langelier, Desjardins (L'Islet), Montague, Skinner and McKeen.

Motion agreed to.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

Mr. CHARLTON moved second reading of Bill (No. 31) to amend the Electoral Franchise Act. He said: The Bill I shall call the attention of the House to is one which I trust will commend itself to the Minister of Justice and to the Cabinet. I have introduced this Bill without any desire to make political capital or to make a point against the Government, but simply with a desire to correct an abuse which has existed and which is liable to occur again. The Bill is a brief one and I shall preface my remarks by reading its provision:

"Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:—

"1. Section thirty-nine of '*The Electoral Franchise Act*,' chapter five of the Revised Statutes, is hereby repealed and the following substituted therefor:—

"'39. If, from any cause, the list of voters for any polling district is not revised and certified at the time when it should, under this Act, be sent to the returning officer at any election, then the last list of voters, revised and certified for such polling district, shall be sent to the returning officer and used at such election: but if such last list is not as recent as the last list of voters prepared under the laws of the province in which such polling district is situate, then such last provincial list shall be sent to the returning officer and used at such election.'"

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have had two revisions of the Dominion list under the Franchise Act since 1885. These revisions are expensive and vexatious. They are vexatious to the members, vexatious to the provinces and to the Dominion at large, and I have no doubt that many members of this House would be pleased if the revision of the lists for the present year is postponed. We had the last general election held upon an old list, and I presume that there was scarcely a young man in the Dominion of Canada under twenty-three years of age who was entitled to a vote. The result was that many thousands of young men who ought to have voted and who were entitled to a vote, were not able to do so in consequence of the delay in the revision of the voters' lists, as the list was practically two years old at the time the election was held. The elections were held upon a list which disfranchised all the young men, which left on the voters' lists thousands of men who were dead and who were in many cases personated; a list which included thousands of men who had removed from the country, because the older the voters' list is the larger the number of people on it who do not live in the country. The consequence of this was that at the last election we had not a fair expression of public opinion. It was estimated that there were fifty thousand young men debarred from voting who had a right to vote, thirty or forty thousand dead men on the list, many of whom were voted for by personators, and tens of thousands of voters who were out of the country, and there was a disposition in some quarters to use improper means to bring these men back. The result of this condition of things was most unfavourable to political morals, and the consequence of it was to secure a verdict which in many cases was not one that would not have been given if the lists contained the names of those actually entitled to vote.

This Bill does not propose that the provincial list shall be substituted for the Dominion lists except in cases such as occurred last election, where the Dominion list was an old one and where manifestly it was unjust to have used this list. This Bill proposes that in such cases, where the provincial list is a more recent one, and if for any cause a revision has not been made under the Dominion Franchise Act, and the Dominion list does not properly represent the electorate of the country, then in such cases the provincial list if more recent, will be substituted for the Dominion list. I think this proposition is a very fair one and if the Government orders a revision of the Dominion lists every year, its provisions are of course inoperative, but if for any reasons, one, or two, or three years should elapse without a revision and there should be a bye-election in the meantime, this election would be held on the provincial list. If, as was the case last year, there should be a general election precipitated on the country and there was an old Dominion list, under the operation of which no one under twenty-three years of age could vote, then it would be in the interest of the country generally to adopt a voters' list which would allow these young men to vote and which had all the names of those entitled to vote upon it, and the names of dead men and absentees excluded. Looking at the matter entirely free from political bias I think that it would be in the interest of the country generally

to adopt the provision of this Bill. I move the second reading of this Bill, hoping that my motion will be carried and that the Minister of Justice will consent that the Bill be referred to a special committee to see if there is anything in its provisions which would be advantageous or useful to the country.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am very sorry that I cannot acquiesce in the opinion so politely expressed by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) when he invited me to concur with him in making this Bill law. I think its adoption would introduce very serious confusion into the franchise law of this country and I am inclined to believe from the observations which the hon. gentleman himself made at the close of his remarks that he has hardly himself realized the confusion that would result. If the qualifications of voters for local elections and for Dominion elections were the same, and it were a mere question of the remoteness of the revision it would be a matter of no concern which list was taken and it would be most desirable to have the most recent one, but we cannot forget that the franchises are materially different in some of the provinces ; indeed in some of them widely different.

Mr. CHARLTON. They are different under the Dominion list also.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Now, it is absolutely necessary that we should have certainty, whatever inconvenience or delays there may be, as to what the franchise is, and as to the persons who should exercise that franchise. But under this Bill, in certain circumstances one set of persons might be qualified to vote for a member of Parliament, and a few days later an entirely different set, and only that set, would have the right to vote. I suppose the case which the hon. gentleman probably had in his mind, and in which the inconvenience would be somewhat less, is the case of a suspension of the Franchise Act for a year. I infer that from the hon. gentleman's closing remark that the operation of a Bill like this would have the effect of compelling the Government to prompt revisions—I suppose he meant regular revisions without suspensions. If that is his object, the Bill would come up more appropriately as a clause in a Bill providing for the suspension of the Franchise Act, because I need not inform him that without a special Act the revision must go on. But what I wish particularly to call the attention of the hon. gentleman and the House to is the unforeseen inconvenience—for I think the hon. gentleman has hardly foreseen it—which would result, even with prompt and regular revisions of the lists, from the passage of this Bill. Let the present law be carried out regularly and fairly, and the lists completed by the 1st of November every year, as I suppose they could be. In all conscience those lists ought to be good for twelve months. But a vacancy occurs in the following June, before the time for revising the lists again comes around. In the month of May, the local revision has taken place ; so that in the month of June, were the hon. gentleman's Bill in force, we should find that all the electors who were qualified in November would be disqualified in June, and the lists made in the month of May would come into force instead. Not only would that inconvenience be open to occur in any province in which there would be a different date for revision from the date for the revision of the Dominion lists, but in point of fact there would be different dates in the different provinces, because I venture to say that the revision is completed at a different date in every province in Canada. So that, if we adopt this amendment we shall never know, when a bye-election is likely to occur in a province, under what list or what electoral qualification the election is to be carried on. I think the hon. gentleman will see that it would lead to an enormous amount of uncertainty, an uncertainty multiplied by the number of provinces in Canada ; and I therefore feel compelled, notwithstanding the hon. gentleman's courtesy in recommending this Bill to my consideration, which I duly appreciate and very often comply with, to move that it be not now read the second time, but that it be read the second time this day three months.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) With most of the observations made by the hon. Minister of Justice, I must say I concur. I think my hon. friend, whose motives I have no doubt were the best, had not fully considered the difficulties and inconveniences that would arise necessarily from the passage of his Bill. It is absolutely essential, in matters of this kind, that there should be certainty—that the candidate on the one hand and the electorate on the other should know on what lists the election would be conducted ; but the Bill of my hon. friend, so far from introducing certainty, would introduce an amount of uncertainty which would be very trying. As between the Dominion franchise and the provincial franchises I have never scrupled to declare my preference for the provincial, but this is not the question now before us. The fact that the provincial lists are not coterminous with the Dominion electoral districts would involve a difficulty which could not be overcome. I hope my hon. friend will not press the Bill to a division, as I certainly cannot concur in it, and would be obliged to vote against it.

Mr. WALLACE. Another difficulty would arise in this way : The provincial lists are prepared by the various municipalities. In case there are no appeals to the county judge, the lists are certified by him at least as early as October in each year, while if there are any appeals, the hearing of them is fixed for some time ahead, and the lists are not completed until a later period, perhaps not till January. The result might be that in the same district you would have to use the Dominion list in one municipality and the provincial list in another. For this reason I think the Bill should not become law.

Mr. SPROULE. I think all amendments should be designed to make the law as simple as possible ; but if this Bill were carried, it would only cause the worst kind of confusion. Suppose a voter came up to a polling booth, and you wanted to swear him, which oath would you put, the Dominion or the provincial? Then, the Dominion law provides that one man may vote in different ridings, while the provincial law provides for one man one vote. In other respects the rules of voting in the two cases are different. So that the only result of passing this Bill would be to introduce confusion, and perhaps a violation of the law, though unintentionally, by returning officers and voters.

Mr. CHARLTON. If the hon. Minister of Justice is not willing to accept the Bill or to submit it to a committee to see whether it can be made acceptable, I submit to his decision and will withdraw it. I must say, however, in justice to myself, that the reasons urged against the Bill, many of them, I am not able to see the weight of. In every state in the American Union the revision of the lists takes place immediately before the elections, and it is held wrong to hold an election on a list even three months old. I think it is not an objection to this Bill to say that a revision of the Dominion lists might take place on the first of January, and then an election be held six months later on provincial lists revised a couple of months later than the first of January, but on the contrary that is a recommendation. It is an advantage to have an election on lists revised one month previously rather than on those revised seven months previously. I do not see any advantage in the Dominion franchise, with regard to equalization over the provincial lists. There is as much inequality under the Dominion Franchise as in the franchises of the various provinces. Under the Dominion Act, there is universal suffrage in some provinces and not in others, and there are different property qualifications in different provinces, so that no claim of uniformity can be made with regard to the Dominion lists in preference to the provincial lists. I believe the most recent lists should be used, as it is not in the public interest to use a list seven months old in preference to one revised but a month previous to the election. Although the object of the Bill is to provide for cases where a greater disparity exists than that, I do not believe the objection made can lie against the measure. Of course, I hold that the provincial franchises are, on all occasions, preferable to the Dominion franchises. I hold that we should go back to the provincial lists and that any step in that direction is in the right direction; but of course I bow to the decision of the Minister of Justice, and will give him not only three months but twelve months to consider it.

Amendment (three months' hoist) agreed to.

PREVENTION OF FRAUDS.

Mr. BURDETT moved second reading of Bill (No. 42) to prevent fraud in the sale of certain articles. He said: I cannot speak for the eastern or western provinces, but I know, as a matter of fact, that very extensive frauds have been committed on the farming community in the central part of Ontario by men who have sold hulless oats and other seed grain to farmers, obtaining from them promissory notes, the sellers giving the farmers bonds to purchase in the fall the produce of the seed grain so sold. For example, they will get a farmer to buy ten bushels of hulless oats at ten dollars per bushel, taking his note for a hundred dollars. They will then give him a bond to take back twenty bushels of the proceeds of those oats in the fall at ten dollars a bushel and to sell the balance of the crop produced from that ten bushels at $7.50 per bushel, the farmer allowing 25 per cent. commission. When the fall comes round, these parties will redeem their bond by selling the crop to the neighbouring farmers on similar terms, being thus enabled to hand over to the first farmer sufficient notes or money to cover their indebtedness. Thus, they can go on perpetrating the fraud, and in the county from which I come it has been carried on for three years. Last year public attention was drawn to it by newspapers in the city of Belleville, and the schemers had to leave the country. Still, frauds to a very great extent were committed there. I think I am within the bounds when I say that in the neighbourhood of one hundred thousand dollars has been taken out of the community in this way. That scheme has been practised of late in other parts of Ontario. This same class of men will go to a farmer and dispose of an article, say a piano, and get the farmer to sign a document by which he agrees to assist in selling four on condition that he will then become the owner of the one in the house. Another agent will soon come along and the farmer will find that he has signed an absolute order for the piano at a price of, say, $480, for which the agent will insist on his giving a promissory note, and all he will have in return is a basswood box filled with penny whistles. I propose to meet that class of frauds, first, by preventing any person from taking notes or other securities for the sale of cereals or other grain, or musical instruments, or farm implements, where the sale is of a fictitious character, or at double the market value of the article sold. I propose also to reach the case of persons who give bonds to become agents for selling this class of property. I propose to make guilty of misdemeanour all those who, knowing the character of those notes, receive or dispose of any notes or securities they may get in that way, or that they may get by reason of their becoming agents to sell for the farmers. This Bill reaches the case completely and in saying that I speak with knowledge of the law of which it is a transcript. This is virtually taken from the statutes of Ohio, where similar frauds were committed for a number of years, and where it was found effectual in putting down that class of fraud. It is true our court of appeal has held that the persons to the original transaction, those who had knowledge of the character of the notes and the transaction, could not recover from each other, but that if the notes had fallen into the hands of an innocent purchaser, they would have to be met at maturity. I may also state that I understand from the legal gentleman who argued the case in the Court of Appeal in Ontario, that it was suggested by the court it was time a law of this nature was passed. I know of the case of a man who is to-day in prison for having carried out one of those piano transactions, but under another section of the criminal law, he having been indicted for fraud. I trust the Minister of Justice will permit this Bill to become law. It can do no injustice to honest dealers, as it only treats of cases where property is sold at a fictitious price or at a price double its value. I trust, therefore, there will be no serious opposition to this Bill. It is in the right direction, and I believe its passage will deter men from going into similar transactions and being robbed. It may be said that anyone who enters into such a transaction and makes a note of this kind is served right if he gets beaten. That is true to a certain extent, but a man's folly often reaches further than himself. His wife and family who have done more than he has to make the farm valuable may suffer, and thus innocent people may be wronged.

I hope this Bill will meet with the approval of the House as it has met with the approval of the Legislatures in many of the States and as I believe it has the approval of the people generally.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Is this the Bill which was introduced last year?

Mr. BURDETT. Yes.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I forget what the fate of it was last year.

Mr. BURDETT. You intended to bring in some amendments to the criminal law. I was unfortunately ill at the end of the session and was unable to be here, and the Minister of Justice did not deal with this measure. I think it was to have been incorporated in the criminal law amendment, if the Minister of Justice approved of it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I remember now that I was introducing a Bill amending the criminal law, and intended to refer that Bill and this one to a committee, but the hon. gentleman was unfortunately not able to be here. I think the Bill is a good one. The only objection is the preference it proposes to give. We are endeavouring to pass a criminal law amendment Bill which will probably be dealt with by the House, but, if the hon. gentleman thinks this measure is urgently required, I will not persist in objecting to its passage.

Mr. BURDETT. I know that there is a person now charged with attempting to commit some of the frauds at which this Bill is aimed. They are attempting to reach him through another clause of the criminal law. I would suggest that the hon. gentleman should allow the Bill to pass, and, when he does codify the criminal law, he should incorporate this provision, or something like it, in his measure. I know this is of paramount importance to the people of the County of Hastings and the adjoining County of Prince Edward, and I think the Minister of Customs will agree with me in that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is this a copy of the law in force in the United States?

Mr. BURDETT. Yes; of the law in the State of Ohio.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I am glad to hear that the Minister of Justice approves of the principle of this Bill, and I hope he will allow it to become law this session. I understand that he does not intend to proceed this session with the Bill for the codification of the criminal law, and I, therefore, hope he will allow this Bill to pass. I know that the frauds which have been spoken of by my hon. friend prevail to a considerable extent in the west. The only objection I have to the Bill is that it does not cover a great many other cases, but it does cover a very extensive class of frauds; and if the Minister of Justice is in favour of the principle, I hope he will allow it to pass the second reading, refer it to a special committee if necessary, and by the strong arm of the law stamp out a class of frauds which is very prevalent.

Mr. BERGIN. I think this is a very valuable Bill, and will be productive of much good, but I agree with the last speaker that it should take a wider range and include other articles which are being sold in a most fraudulent way by which people are being robbed every day. I hope the Minister of Justice will allow this to go through this session.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that there might be some conflict of jurisdiction between this measure and the provincial laws in reference to contracts, but, if it were possible to frame a Bill which would not interfere with the provincial legislation, I think it would be very important that this Bill or some other provision of the kind should become law at an early date. It is patent to every member, especially from the rural districts of Ontario, that a certain class of individuals are going around every year victimizing the farmers and taking their hard earnings and giving little or nothing in return. If a law of this kind were put in force, I believe the passage of it would have a good effect. These people are careful not to go into towns and villages but to keep to the rural districts where they are not likely to be detected by those who understand the law better. I think there were thousands of dollars taken out of East Grey a few years ago for seed grain. One year it is seed grain, another year it is implements, and so on, but the fraud is carried on almost incessantly and the farmers are being victimized by unprincipled men. I think, if it were possible, this Bill should go further, and that manufacturers who sell agricultural implements should be prevented from taking a lien of such a character that prevents the farmer from disposing of any portion of his stock until that lien is disposed of. If the farmer sells a horse, if he has bought a mower or binder or reaper, the manufacturer has a lien, with such provisions that the note becomes due at once, though it may not be properly due for a year, and the purchaser of the horse may be sued at any time and the note collected from him. While it may be true that many manufacturers will not take advantage of this provision, I think it should not be left in their power to do so, and the notes which are given out at present by manufacturers to their agents for signature by the farmers are a disgrace to any civilized country. There is no reason why the manufacturer should have a lien on all the property of a farmer, when perhaps the value of his purchase may be only $14. I think the law should prevent the manufacturer from having the power to do that. I would not abrogate the section itself, but I would prevent manufacturers from taking a lien upon a man's property that would prevent him selling that property to advantage when necessary.

Mr. McMULLEN I desire to say a word upon this subject. Hon. gentlemen will remember that during the last Parliament one of the members from Hamilton (Mr. Brown) asked for a committee to enquire into frauds practised upon farmers. I happened to be a member of that committee, and the member for Brockville (Mr. Wood), whom I do not see now in his place, was also a member of that committee. We took up something like six weeks in the investigation, and although we were aware in our individual experience of the frauds committed in the several sections of the Dominion from which we came, we were surprised to find how general they were in all sections of the country, and I am quite certain that the interest taken by Mr. Brown at that time in finding out the existence of those frauds led to the introduction of this Bill. I think it is fully time that we should have such a measure. I quite agree with the remarks dropped by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). There are enormous frauds practised in

the way in which notes are now taken by implement agents, the notes reciting that if the party parts with any portion of his property the note shall mature at once. I have known cases in which these have been used, and parties have almost ruined some men by suing on the notes, although they were not due for two or three years. I do not know whether we can reach anything of that kind in this House. I think there is an Act of the Ontario Legislature which would reach these parties, although I am not sure. However, I am quite in accord with the spirit of the Bill introduced by the hon. member, and I am exceedingly pleased to learn that the Minister of Justice is disposed to recognize its importance, and to give it his serious consideration, with the view of having it become law at the earliest possible date.

Mr. McMILLAN. The hon. gentleman has not alluded to another class of frauds that have been largely practised in the West—that is, the lightning rod frauds. A case came under my observation where a lightning rod agent came into a settlement and went to a farmer, and asked the privilege of putting lightning rods on his buildings without costing him anything, as the agent only wished to put up the rods for an advertisement. The farmer was simple and uneducated, and the agent got him to sign what he supposed was a paper allowing him to put a lightning rod on his barn without being guilty of trespass. But after the man had left the farmer's suspicions were aroused, and it turned out that he had signed an order for a lot of lightning rods, and given his note for them, and it almost ruined the man when he had to pay the note. I think this Bill is necessary in the interest of the agricultural community, and I hope the Minister of Justice will not throw any impediment in the way of its becoming law. It may be impossible to include in this Bill all classes of frauds practised upon farmers; but if a Bill was once passed and it was found to be ineffective, it could be amended so as to cover other classes of frauds.

Mr. CORBY. I agree with the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Burdett) that it is very important that this Bill should pass this session. The County of Hastings has been overrun for years with hay-fork agents, hulless oats agents, and seed-wheat men, and I hope the Government will take up this Bill and pass it this session.

Mr. BARRON. The House will probably remember that in the first and second session of the last Parliament this matter was brought up by way of resolution, and a committee was appointed, who went on and took evidence throughout the first session, and also, I think, during the next session. That evidence was printed in book form and distributed, and was very useful indeed. I think there was a consensus of opinion in that committee that it would be very difficult indeed to legislate so as to meet the variety of cases which came before the committee. There is no doubt whatever that a large portion of the community, throughout Ontario especially, are demanding legislation of the kind proposed by the hon. member for Hastings. It seems to me, however, that the criminal law, such as we have to-day, will reach nearly every case that has occurred.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. McMULLEN.

Mr. BARRON. Well, some hon. gentlemen say "no," but I think that if they will put the criminal law in force they will find that it will reach the majority of cases, at all events. That has been my experience, because I have had something to do in prosecuting men who have carried on these vicious practices. There is, however, this much to be gained by this legislation, that it aims at these practices which have been carried on, and it may frighten people who have been in the habit of carrying them on and prevent them from doing so in the future. However, if it is possible I hope that some such legislation as is proposed may be brought about, and perhaps my suggestion that the work of the committee during the first and second session of the last Parliament might be utilized will be adopted by the Minister of Justice. He might examine that evidence and take in the variety of cases that came before the committee, with a view of framing legislation that would cover them all.

Mr. MASSON. I quite agree with the principle of this Bill, and think it is very necessary that these frauds should be met in detail by special legislation. Many years ago we had a very extensive clause put in our Criminal Act, known as the omnibus clause, which was supposed to embrace all these kinds of frauds. The gentleman who has just spoken says that in many cases these frauds can be reached by that law, but my experience, not in prosecuting, but in defending, is that it is very hard to secure a conviction. In fact, grand juries throw out the bill. When the Crown closes the case judges dismiss the accused: when petit juries consider them they find them not guilty. These fraudulently-disposed persons display great ingenuity, and with a full knowledge of the statute as it stands to-day, they try in some way to evade the strict language of the statute. Even when this Act provides a penalty for selling these articles at a fictitious price or at a double price, they will evade it in some way by selling a little less than double price, and in that way, being at the same time assisted by grand juries and by petit juries, they will succeed in evading the penalties which they should incur. I am in favour of the principle of the Bill, and I think many of the points that have been spoken of should be embraced in it—not that I believe the placing of such an Act on the Statute-books would frighten or alarm those fraudulent persons and prevent them attempting to carry out their nefarious practices, but it would enable us, when they do so, to secure convictions.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the state of our society is that indicated, I fear very much that the passage of this Bill will not give any relief. If grand juries fail to find bills against such parties, if petit juries refuse to find them guilty, and that under the direct cognizance and with the consent of the judge, no Act that can be passed will relieve the evil. I am quite sure nearly every hon. gentleman is in favour of the object of the present Bill. Personally, I agree with the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Barron) in the opinion, and I think it is one worthy of consideration, that the law as it stands enables you to reach any person who commits a fraud such as is contemplated by this Bill. The difficulty I have always found is, that the person committing the fraud leaves the country, and the note or other security signed by the farmer is left in the

hands of an innocent endorsee. The bill is sued on, and recovery cannot be prevented. There is no measure to punish a man who holds innocently a bill. If this proposed measure were adopted the obstacles and difficulties would be increased, because if grand and petit juries are disposed not to find these persons guilty—and I cannot see why their sympathies should be with the criminal or offender—you are, by defining the offence, as this Bill does, rendering the difficulties of conviction double what they are at present. I find some of the clauses very difficult to understand. For instance, a man must sell an instrument, and he must sell it at a "fictitious price." What is a "fictitious price?" How are you going to define it? The law does not define it. The hon. gentleman must not imagine I am raising captious objections. I am only looking at the Bill as a lawyer. I personally would like to assist in the passage of any Bill which would punish people engaged in these frauds, but I have been long enough in Parliament to know that hasty legislation does not always attain the desirable end which many hon. gentlemen have in view, and it is very desirable that this Bill should be very closely scrutinized and its language to a certain extent simplified.

Mr. COCHRANE. I desire to offer a remark from the farmer's standpoint. These frauds are being perpetrated throughout the country, and I am sorry to come to the conclusion that all the legal ability in this House appears unable to frame a statute that will cover these cases. It is strange that with all the legal ability here, and the knowledge that these frauds are being constantly perpetrated, this House is not able to cope with the evil. If lawyers cannot cope with it, let a committee of farmers be appointed and they will try to do so. We had the fact brought prominently before the House and country by a committee appointed to consider this question, and of which I happened to be a member, that these frauds were perpetrated to an alarming extent in the western part of Ontario, and my constituents suffered very largely from these frauds. Some people say that farmers are fools. They are not fools, but they allow these rascals to impose on their honesty. It is because the farmers are honest, and not fools, and because they expect that other people are as honest as themselves, that they permit these frauds to be perpetrated on them, and then find they are mistaken. I hope the House will try to frame a Bill to cover the case. It goes without saying that at present these rascals cannot be reached, but I trust the law will be so amended that they will be dealt with by its stern hand.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman has too little faith, both in the power of lawyers to frame a suitable Bill, and, more than all, in the common law of the country, which is more to be relied on than is the ingenuity of any draughtsman. I agree with a great deal that has been said by hon. members. Any man who commits the offences enumerated is guilty of a felony or a misdemeanour, and can be indicted and punished; nevertheless, I do not oppose the passage of the Bill on that ground. I am convinced that sometimes offences of a peculiar nature crop up all over the country, and people do not realize that the law is strong enough to punish the offenders. It is supposed that some of these offences are not punishable by law, and sometimes advantage is gained by declaring what the law is. I hope the Bill will be read a second time, and to-morrow we can go into committee on it, after giving attention to the points mentioned by hon. gentlemen to-night.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 18th June, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

DOMINION LANDS ACT.

Mr. DAVIN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 108) to amend the Dominion Lands Act. He said: The object of this Bill is to enable coulées, where water can be stored, to be guarded from contamination. The first clause provides that wherever, under this Act, lands entered either for homestead or pre-emption are sold or otherwise disposed of, and there is water on a coulée or ravine in said lands, or which may be utilized for the purpose of forming a reservoir for storing water, such entry or disposal may be made subject to the condition that no building shall be erected within a specified distance from the border of such coulée or ravine, the object being to provide water for the cattle and to keep it from being contaminated by outhouses or other buildings. The other clause provides for the repeal of section 43 of the Dominion Lands Act, and proposes to substitute one in its place, the only difference between the clause to be substituted by this Bill, and the clause in the Act of 1887, being that instead of 1887, 1889 is inserted. Should this clause be adopted, you will hear no more of second homesteads in this House. The next clause provides that where land has been homesteaded and five years have elapsed without the homesteader taking out his patent, his interest may be sold by the municipality, or the school board, for the taxes levied by the municipality or school section in which they are situated. At present, by not taking out a patent in time, the homesteader escapes the school tax, and, if in a municipality, the municipal tax, whereas those who have been energetic and have taken out patents have to bear the whole burden. There is a difficulty about this, but I fain would hope, if the Government approve of the clause, they will be able to overcome it. The difficulty is that we are trying to collect taxes in regard to land, the patent of which has not passed to the homesteader. The Government is still seized of the land, but these people if they have, say, forty or fifty acres and a house worth $500 or $600 on the one hundred and sixty acres, have clearly an interest there; and if we could so manage that the municipality or school board should be able to tax the interest, then the chances are that, instead of the homesteader holding back to avoid taxation he would, at the end of three years, take out his patent, or, at all events, as soon as he had fulfilled the conditions.

The next clause provides that from and after the 1st January, 1895, no patents shall be issued to the homesteader except on the condition that should the land be suffered to remain two consecutive years without cultivation of at least fifteen acres, the homestead shall revert to the Government, and any homestead sold by the homesteader, or by anyone who has purchased from him, shall be sold subject to the same condition. There, again, I apprehend that in this House and out of it there may be some adverse criticism, but the object is one which has been pressed upon my attention by the farmers in the North-West, and it would effectually prevent homesteads being dealt with as a speculation. We have a large number of what are called buckboard farmers, men who fulfil the letter of the law without carrying out its spirit; and the moment they get their patent they allow weeds to grow on the fifteen acres they have cleared, and the shack they have built goes to ruin and decay. I know that I am, in some of these clauses, out of order; but I hope the Government will take them, and indeed the whole Bill, in hand. This would effectually prevent any person buying a homestead from a homesteader without intending to cultivate it.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not know whether the attention of the Minister of Justice has been called to the provisions of this Bill, but I question whether it is in order.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I understand that part of it is in order and part is not.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 107) to incorporate the Burrard Inlet and Westminster Railway Company.—(Mr. Corbould.)

Bill (No. 109) to regulate private detective, financial and commercial agencies and corporations.—(Mr. Sproule.)

MARITIME PROVINCES—GEOLOGICAL MAPS.

Mr. FRASER asked, When do the Government intend to publish accurate geological maps of the Counties of Guysborough, Antigonish, Pictou, Colchester and Halifax? When published, what will be the size of each?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It would be impossible to state precisely the time when the geological maps referred to can be published. The survey in Nova Scotia is progressing satisfactorily in view of the small strength of the staff available for the work. When the surveys are completed they have to be plotted, reduced and drawn for the engraver, and are, when engraved, published in sheets of uniform size (12 by 18 inches) covering 3,456 square miles. The first sheet (Cape Canso) is already engraved, and will be published during the year.

EAST RIVER—DEEPENING.

Mr. FRASER asked, What amount do the Government propose expending this year in deepening the East River, Pictou, between New Glasgow and Pictou?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The distance from the harbour to the town of New Glasgow is six miles. To open a channel 120 feet wide over this distance, to a depth of 16 feet below low water, will cost $208,923; for a depth of 18 feet, $299,000; and for a depth of 21 feet, $466,125. Therefore the Government do not intend expending money this year for this purpose.

NEW HARBOUR, &c., BREAKWATERS.

Mr. FRASER asked, Do the Government propose building breakwaters at New Harbour and Port Hillford, Guysborough County, this year?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In 1874 an examination was made at New Harbour, Guysborough County, relative to the construction of a breakwater, the cost being placed at $53,500. No action was taken. During 1884 the department was asked to ascertain if a small and comparatively inexpensive work could be built at New Harbour, for the benefit of the fishermen. The report furnished states that owing to its extremely exposed position and the want of any natural protection, it would not be possible to provide a comparatively inexpensive shelter for fishing boats or craft of any kind, and a breakwater near the head of the cove would have to be of considerable length, and to be constructed in a strong and massive manner to withstand the heavy seas and undertow from the Atlantic. Nothing is known in the department of any place in Guysborough County under the name of Port Hillford. The Government do not intend going on with the works this year.

RED RIVER SURVEYS.

Mr. ROSS (Lisgar) asked, Are the surveys on the Red River yet completed and reported upon? If so, what is the estimated cost of the necessary improvements on the said river for the purpose of navigation?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The surveys have been completed and reported on. The estimated cost of the works proposed is $922,000.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH WASHINGTON.

On the Orders of the Day being called,

Mr. LAURIER. May I ask the Minister of Justice if he can give us a definite answer in reference to when the correspondence with Washington will be brought down?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think that all the remaining papers which will be available this session will be laid on the Table on Monday.

ACCOMMODATION OF OFFICIAL REPORTERS.

Mr. BARRON. I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to a matter to which I drew his attention last session. If he could find it convenient to visit the room which is occupied by the *Hansard* reporters, he will find eighteen gentlemen working in a room 18 ft. by 25 ft. It is almost impossible for them to do their work or even to live in such quarters with comfort. The Minister promised last year to give this matter his attention, but nothing has been done in regard to it. I understand that, prior to the last Parliament, the *Hansard* reporters had a room above that in which they now are, but that the predecessor of

the present Speaker took that room from them, and they had to put up with their present accommodation. I am informed that you, Mr. Speaker, do not find it necessary to use that room, but I understand that it has been occupied as a private room by some members of this House on the back benches, and, I think, in view of the limited accommodation we have, before those members are considered the *Hansard* reporters ought to be considered, because we know what their work is and how difficult it is for them to perform it in a room such as they now have. I hope the Minister of Public Works will promise that he will at once see that these gentlemen have better accommodation provided, for it is impossible for them to do their work with any view to comfort or even to health in the room they now have.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I remember that the hon. gentleman called my attention to this matter last year, and I enquired about it; but the hon. gentleman knows how difficult it is, when rooms are occupied, to evict the tenants, and therefore, I have not found it possible to accede to his recommendation of last year. However, now that my attention has been called to this matter again, I think I will be able to give some more accommodation, or certainly will try to do so, to these reporters, who certainly deserve more room than they now have.

POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I wish now to answer the question which was put by the leader of the Opposition yesterday, who wanted to know whether I was ready, either to-day or on any other day, to make a statement as to the policy of the Government. I have this to communicate to the House: The Government proposes to carry out the policy which has hitherto guided the Liberal-Conservative party, the outlines of which, in respect to the measures of this session, are indicated in the Speech from the Throne. The trade and financial policy will be declared in the Budget speech.

Mr. LAURIER. I cannot say that the declaration just made by the leader of the House takes me in any way by surprise.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must say to my hon. friend that this practice of raising discussion on ministerial statements has, I think, reached a point that requires my intervention by calling for the Orders of the Day. It will be remembered that yesterday the discussion went on at considerable length, and I think it is about time that the practice should be put a stop to. I would ask the House to sustain me in endeavouring to put down that practice which, I think, if it continues to grow as it has done this session, will become a very inconvenient one for Parliament.

Mr. LAURIER. I bow to your ruling, and will give my humble assistance in carrying out your very safe policy. I did not rise for the purpose of criticizing the statement of the hon. Minister, but simply to point out to him that the promise of the Government somewhat reminds me of a certain place which is said to be paved with good intentions. I have no doubt at all that they want to follow the policy of the late Sir John Macdonald, but, in my estimation, they have already departed from it very widely, as I will, to-morrow, endeavour to convince the Government and the House.

PREVENTION OF FRAUDS.

The Order being read for House in Committee on Bill (No. 42) to prevent fraud in the sale of certain articles (Mr. Burdett),

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I would respectfully suggest to the Minister of Justice that if he is in favour of this Bill, as he appears to be, the object of the Bill can be better obtained, in my judgment, by referring it to a select committee. It is an important Bill, and it cannot be as thoroughly considered in Committee of the Whole as it can be by half a dozen members sitting and quietly deliberating upon it. It may become necessary to enlarge the scope of the Bill to some extent, and it may become necessary to consider carefully the phraseology of the Bill, and I submit that that can be better done by a select committee than by the Committee of the Whole.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no objection at all to that course, if it commends itself to the hon. gentleman who has the Bill in charge, although it seems to me that the Bill is very carefully drawn.

Mr. BURDETT. I agree to the proposition.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I suggest that perhaps it might be well for the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Burdett) to take a little time to select those members to whom he would like to refer the Bill.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Does the Minister consent that the reference of the Bill to a select committee should be made later on in the day?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

NORTH SHORE RAILWAY.

House resumed consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Langelier for:

Copies of all Orders in Council, correspondence, papers, reports and documents in relation to the returning of the debentures of the North Shore Railway Company.

Mr. LAURIER. The answer given by the Minister of Justice to my hon. friend from Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) requires, perhaps, a word in reply on my part, though a single word only. The answer given by the hon. Minister of Justice was, in the first place, that the Government of Canada had not at all interfered with the Canadian Pacific Railway to prevent them from improving the line of railway formerly known as the North Shore Railway. This was not at all the gist of the charge made by my hon. friend. He did not at all complain of the interference by the Government with the conduct of the North Shore Railway by the Canadian Pacific Railway, but he stated that by the action of the Government the Canadian Pacific Railway were placed in such a position that they had no object in improving the line, but, on the contrary, if they did improve it, they made their position towards the Government worse than it was before, and that until that position had been rectified the company allowed the road to deteriorate and would not at all attempt to make it better than it was. That is the gist of the charge

made by my hon. friend from Quebec Centre. As to the rest of the charge brought by my hon. friend, the Minister simply stated that it was the intention of the Government during the present session to introduce a Bill with regard to this question, and he asked us to wait until then. He did not indicate what would be the character of the Bill. But the Bill can have but one object, and it is an object against which I must protest—the object of the Bill can only be to free that section of the Canadian Pacific Railway, formerly known as the North Shore Railway, from the encumbrance that now rests upon it in the shape of debentures. But why is this legislation necessary in the year 1891? Why should there be the necessity for such a measure as is contemplated? It is in the memory of every member who was in the House in 1884-85, that the policy then indicated by the Government was to extend the Canadian Pacific Railway to the city of Quebec, and to make the harbour of Quebec the summer terminus of that railway. Nothing can be more certain than what I have stated. It was declared by the then Minister of Railways, Sir Charles Tupper, and embodied in resolutions. Here is the language used by Sir Charles Tupper when this policy was first propounded in 1884:

"Thus the policy of Parliament and this Government has been that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company shall be extended on the north shore of the St. Lawrence down to the seaports of the Maritime Provinces, and on the north shore of the St. Lawrence, by the North Shore Railway, to Quebec, and thence by the Intercolonial Railway."

Such was at that time the declared policy of the Government—to extend the Canadian Pacific Railway along the south shore towards a maritime harbour, and on the north shore towards the city of Quebec, to make the harbour of Quebec the summer terminus, and to connect the North Shore Railway with the Intercolonial Railway. For this purpose a sum of money was appropriated, and it is to be found in the statute of 1885:

"For the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway from its terminus from St. Martin Junction, near Montreal, or some other point on the Canadian Pacific Railway, to the harbour of Quebec, in such manner as may be approved by the Governor in Council, a subsidy not exceeding $6,000 per mile, and not exceeding in the whole $960,000."

At the same time Parliament appropriated this amount, $250,000 a year for twenty years for the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway to a port of the Maritime Provinces, by the south shore. This latter part of the agreement has been carried out. The subsidies have been paid towards the completion of the railway from Montreal by the south shore to a port in the Maritime Provinces, but nothing of the kind has been done towards the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Montreal to the city of Quebec. Certain transactions have taken place by the Government. The road has passed from the North Shore Company into the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, but neither the letter of the statute nor the intention of the statute has been carried out. This subsidy of $6,000 per mile, amounting to $960,000, has never been paid by the Government. The Government have distributed money; $960,000 have been taken out of the treasury, not towards carrying out the object contemplated, that is to say, the application of this subsidy for the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway to Quebec, but the Government have made an investment of that amount, and this sum is to be found entered in the Public Accounts. On page 12 of the Public Accounts we find, under the title of investments, North Shore Railway bonds amounting to $960,000. What my hon. friend from Quebec (Mr. Langelier) complains is, that the intention of Parliament in this matter has not been carried out, that neither the intention of Parliament nor the letter of the statute has been carried out, under which that sum of $960,000 should have been paid as a subsidy to the road and have discharged the liabilities and debts that were accruing. Instead of so acting, what has the Government done? It has simply purchased bonds, which are to-day assets of the Government of Canada. This was certainly not the intention of Parliament. When Parliament voted this money, it had no intention of voting it to be invested in this manner, but simply to have it applied in like manner to that adopted on the south shore of the St. Lawrence, and to have the railway carried as far as Quebec. But, instead of doing so, the Government have simply taken the bonds of the North Shore Road, and now hold them against the Canadian Pacific Railway, who are the owners of the road; and, under such circumstances, the policy of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is simply to let the road go to decay and not improve it, because if they improve it they give value to those bonds and make it worse for the company to redeem them. That is what my hon. friend pointed out. The policy of the Government is such that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has no object in improving the character of the road. On the contrary, the company are serving their best interests in allowing the road to fall into decay, because then, forsooth, the Government bonds will be valueless, and the company will get rid of them. What we have asked, and what has been asked by the people of Quebec generally, is, simply, that the letter of the law should be carried out, and that the money voted in 1885 for this object should not be kept in the treasury in one form or another, because it is still in the treasury in the form of bonds, but should be applied to improving the character of the road. That is a just policy. This question was again and again brought before Parliament by the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier), and no dissent was ever expressed by the Government. During the last election there was a new departure. When a candidate was selected to contest Quebec Centre on behalf of the Conservative party against the present member, the Conservative candidate, Mr. Châteauvert, appeared flanked on one side by the Minister of Public Works and on the other side by the Minister of Militia and Defence, and he stated that he had the promise of the Government that justice would be done and the question connected with the $1,000,000 of North Shore Railway bonds would be settled. That is what we object to. The people of Quebec desire no favour, they simply ask for justice. What was the measure of justice demanded? It was simply one that could have been given long before. A measure, that should have gone into effect some years ago, was then held out as a bribe to the electors in order to corrupt them from their conscientious and correct view of public affairs generally. I say, again, that the people of Quebec desire no favour in this matter but simply

ask for justice, and not only for justice but for the carrying out of the letter of the law; and if it had been carried out, we would not be now in our present position. I maintain the position taken by my hon. friend (Mr. Langelier) yesterday, that it was a bribe offered, and that of the worst kind, because the people of Quebec were told that if they would elect a member to support the Government, then indeed they would have extended to them that measure of justice for which they were contending. The measure of the Government should come not as a favour but as a right, and as one carrying out the orders of Parliament.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think that yesterday, when I was out of the House for a few moments, the Minister of Justice answered the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Langelier), and told him, among other things, that the Government intended, as we have stated before, to bring in a measure to settle this question. The hon. leader of the Opposition does not say that it is a bad thing.

Mr. LAURIER. No.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. But the hon. gentleman is not pleased that this measure is to be brought in by us, not at his instance, but because we think it is for the public interest, for the interest of the north shore of the St. Lawrence, and also for the city of Quebec. Whether the good is done in that way by the present Government, or at the suggestion of my hon. friend opposite, surely he should not find fault with us when we are doing a good deed, for the hon. gentleman says it should be done, and that it should have been done some years ago. Suppose it should have been done as he suggests, now at all events he should not find fault with us because we are now adopting the course which he thinks should have been followed four or five years ago. The hon. gentleman calls this a new departure, on account of the election in Quebec Centre, and he represents the Conservative candidate (Mr. Châteauvert) as flanked on one side by the Minister of Militia, and on the other side by myself. I did not flank that gentleman very long, because I was only half an hour at one of the meetings, I being there as a citizen and an elector of the division. Unfortunately, I was not in the city to give my vote at that election, so the present member obtained an additional vote. I was present at the meeting, as I had a right to be, and as an elector. On being requested to address the electors, I did so in a very short speech, but I went there certainly for the purpose of showing that we were taking an interest in that election, in the same way as the member for Quebec Centre did not fail to have his friends to attend his meeting, and his wisdom in that regard was shown by the fact that he is here now. The hon. leader of the Opposition spoke of the sum of $960,000, the appropriation which was used for the purchase of bonds. Well, these bonds were a mortgage on the property itself, and whether we purchased the bonds or whether we gave the money to the company, it was certainly the same thing. The bonds were always there, and the money would have been in the hands of the company purely and simply to meet the bonds. In this case we purchased these bonds—I do not remember at the moment what was the amount we paid for them, but, if I am not mistaken, we purchased the bonds at a large discount, and, therefore, it was to the profit of the Government representing the country that these bonds were purchased in that way. To-day the question is not to go and squander these bonds, but the object is, as the Bill will show, to benefit the North Shore Railway and the city of Quebec. This money was given for that purpose and it is intended to be applied to that purpose. The hon. gentleman says that the interest of the company was not to improve the line, but rather to allow the line to run down, because, he says, if they improved the line then it would give value to these bonds and the company might have to pay interest on the bonds. I do not think there was much danger of that. I think the improvement of the line might not have given all the advantage that the hon. gentleman believes it would have given; but, on the other hand, the hon. gentleman must see that the traffic on that road must have increased, and is increasing very much just now. It will increase much more when the money which has been used for these bonds may be used in some other way. It is just the time to use this money now; the traffic is coming to this railway line, and if this very rapid line of steamers coming to the St Lawrence comes very soon——

Mr. LAURIER. Yes; they are coming very soon.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, no doubt; I hope they will, and when they do, the hon. gentleman will see at once that the improvements intended will be of great benefit, not only to the city of Quebec and to the north shore of the St. Lawrence, but to the country at large; and, therefore, this money which the hon. gentleman calls an investment has been properly invested, and now the use of that investment will be a very great advantage to the country. The hon. gentleman said—and I have no doubt that when he says it he believes it—that the appropriation made by Parliament of $1,000,000 or more was for the purpose of extending the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the city of Quebec. Well, that has been done; the road has been extended to that city, and now there is only a very little gap which may be necessary to fill up to join it with the Intercolonial Railway, and I suppose time will settle that question as it has settled many other difficult questions. At all events, let us take things quietly, one by one, and I have no doubt that in that way we will succeed tolerably well. In this case the Government has promised and intend to bring down a measure to settle this question. That Bill will be forthcoming, but the hon. gentleman will be kind enough to give us a little time to bring it down, because we have had very little time lately to consider these matters. However, as soon as we possibly can the Bill will be brought down, and then the hon. gentleman, as well as all the other members in the House, will be in a position to see how the matter will be settled in so far as the Government is concerned. The House can obtain this information from the papers asked for by the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier), and from the provisions of the Bill itself which the Government will submit to Parliament.

Mr. FRÉMONT. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, the question brought up by the motion of the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier), is of

such an importance, not only for the residents of the city of Quebec, but also for those of the district of Quebec and those of the whole Province of Quebec, that I cannot let the matter pass without saying a few words. Some years ago, when the question of the short line of the Pacific was debated in this House, the electors of the Province of Quebec were allowed to believe, nay, Mr. Speaker, were given promises, that the summer terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway would be the harbour of Quebec. However, Mr. Speaker, owing to the position into which the Pacific Railway was placed, the company found that they had no interest in favouring trade and promoting business on their line between Montreal and Quebec. Such is the reason why the former North Shore Railway, that is to say, the portion between Montreal and Quebec, is not run any more as a main part of the line, but rather as a branch connecting Quebec with the great Pacific road. In that respect the whole electoral body of our district was greatly deceived, and for many years the electors of the district of Quebec and those who reside along the line of the former North Shore Railway, have been clamouring for justice. Until to-day, this justice was denied them. It is only during last elections, in the midst of the election broil, that at last silence was broken, and that the promises which were mentioned by the hon. member for Quebec Centre, and the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) were made. I must say in addition that not only were these promises made in the city of Quebec, but that they were repeated in several other constituencies. A question of justice pure and simple was used as a powerful election lever. Thus, Mr. Speaker, in the county which I have the honour to represent here, the County of Quebec, one of the great arguments used by my opponent was that he had had long interviews with the hon. Minister of Public Works and the hon. Minister of Militia, and that he had obtained the formal promise of a favourable settlement of the question now before the House, as well as the promise of help in the matter of the building of a bridge between the two shores of the St. Lawrence in front of the city of Quebec, or quite near. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that this question came before the House. I intend to discuss it more at length when the measure promised by the Government is presented. I hope that, at least, justice is to be rendered to this portion of the province, which is so vitally interested in the question before the House.

Mr. DELISE. (Translation.) I cannot let this question pass, in which the district of Quebec and particularly the county I represent are so much interested, without taking the floor to show that the Government, by the conduct they seem to have adopted during the last elections, is far from having deserved the congratulations and the sympathies of the district of Quebec. The question now before the House and which we have to consider, is not a new one. Since the building of the North Shore Railway, since the engagements taken by the city of Quebec, the Government has tried to induce the electors of the Province of Quebec, and especially of the district of Quebec, to support it, by ever fallacious promises that the city of Quebec would get what she was entitled to. When the time came for the decision as to where the terminus of the Pacific was to be, certain friends of the Government, making then a great show of devotion to the public good and of their personal disinterestedness, made loud but little to be feared threats to their party, trying to obtain from the Government a satisfactory arrangement for the city of Quebec. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, other interests carried the day. If we consider the contempt with which the Government seems to have treated the district of Quebec for the last ten years, it must be admitted that the Government has done very little for the interests of the district and Province of Quebec, notwithstanding its election promises. Mr. Speaker, during last elections the Government wanted to make a masterly stroke in trying to deceive the electors and promising to settle this important question. One of the most important men of the Conservative party was sent to Quebec, a man, who, for long years, was identified with all the important political questions which interested the Dominion, and particularly the Maritime Provinces and the Province of Quebec. This man, Mr. Speaker, was called from England; he was dragged away from his duties, and caused to come here in the midst of the election turmoil, in order to deceive the electors in giving fresh life to the promises which had so often been made and never fulfilled—I mean the Hon. Sir Charles Tupper, who in the midst of an election, with the object of deceiving the electors of the city, of the district and of the Province of Quebec, came and held a public meeting in which he undertook to procure the settlement of important questions of interest for the district and particularly the city of Quebec. He told us in his speech there that the question of the debentures of the Pacific, which concerned the city of Quebec, would be settled. Then, Mr. Speaker, he induced the Conservative candidate, Mr. Châteauvert, to make the same promises. Mr. Châteauvert, pushing zeal very far, went the length of publishing over his own signature, in the newspapers, promissory notes, in which he stated that if he was elected the questions which were interesting the district and city of Quebec would be settled. Mr. Speaker, the members of the district of Quebec now wish to know if the Government made such promises to Mr. Châteauvert. We wish to know if Sir Charles Tupper was authorized to come and make these declarations to the public of Quebec. We desire to know whether the people of Quebec can depend upon the pledges of Mr. Châteauvert, and whether Mr. Châteauvert could depend on the pledges given to him by the Government. The whole question is there. Although this is the first time I occupy a seat in this House, I know that this is not the first time the members for the district of Quebec complain of their representatives in the Government. Now that the question is brought before the House, and in view of the dangers which threaten the Government, we hope that the representatives of the district of Quebec in the Government, will do justice to the city of Quebec, to the electors that they so often deceived, and thereby to the whole Province.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I would not feel called upon to address you on this question, which has already been very well presented, if it was not for one point which I wish to elucidate. In referring to chap. 8 of 47 Victoria, it will be seen that, in 1884, the Dominion Govern-

ment granted the Government of the Province of Quebec a sum of $6,000 per mile for the railway between Montreal and Quebec, on the north shore, and a sum of $12,000 per mile for the same railway between Montreal and Ottawa. Further on will be found another sum of $6,000 per mile given for the extension of the Pacific Railway from St. Martin's Junction to Quebec, that is to say, $960,000. Mr. Speaker, what I have to state I state here, while those who have known the facts are still in existence. I intend to reveal no secrets, to make known nothing of what took place in caucus; and I will only relate facts which became public at the time. I wish to record them here, in order that when we shall have a Government with the courage and ability to keep a pledge we may hope that the honest and true agreement then arrived at will be fulfilled. When it was requested from the Dominion of Canada, from the members convened in Parliament, to grant the Pacific Railway an additional help, amounting to about $30,000,000, we, the then ministerial members of the Province of Quebec, had a meeting, and said that we believed that the policy of building and supporting the Canadian Pacific was a good policy, provided it did not have the effect of exhausting the old provinces. We were ready to vote additional grants. I hear caterwaulings. If the night is not long enough for those cats, their propensities must be strong indeed to so bring them out in plain daylight. If the Government means to have ill-bred individuals as supporters, or if it wishes to pass for having such, it may let them behave in this way. If it is thought that we will be intimidated by such treatment it is a great mistake. We are good-natured enough not to use often our right to speak French in this House; but if an attempt should be made to curtail our rights and liberties in this respect it is the reverse that will be gained. Instead of spending here a session of two or three months listening to bad English spoken in this House, these people will be forced to stay one or two months longer hearing good French. Mr. Speaker, we, of the Province of Quebec, said that we were ready, provided we had a share of advantages equivalent to the sacrifice we were making. We did not prevent the other provinces doing the same. We did not prevent Ontario, New Brunswick nor Nova Scotia demanding what they wanted; but we, representing the Province of Quebec, made plain our demand. It may be said this is sectional. Well, when it comes a question of choosing Ministers, is not the choice a sectional one? When public moneys are to be apportioned, the total is always proportionately allotted to the provinces. So, we, of the Province of Quebec—and I say it openly, so that it may be well understood—we told the Government: We are ready to support the Canadian Pacific provided the Province of Quebec may have a *quid pro quo*. And then, in room No. 8, that room which remained famous, the Ministers came before all the ministerial representatives of the Province of Quebec, and they solemnly promised that the Government of that province would receive, as compensation, not $6,000 per mile, but $12,000 per mile, computed on the length of the railway from Ottawa to Quebec. And as early as 1884 this promise was broken, and $6,000 per mile only was granted for the road from Montreal to Quebec. So, this vote had been extorted from us under false pretences. Such was the commencement of the policy which was, later on, to bring disaster on the city and district of Quebec; for since these $960,000 were taken from the Province of Quebec to be given to the Canadian Pacific, what has been done? This sum was used to destroy the commerce of Quebec, because, owing to a contract imposed upon the Canadian Pacific Railway, it had become the interest of the Canadian Pacific to kill this commerce, in fettering traffic between Quebec and Montreal, in preventing the travelling public from using this road, and the merchants from sending their goods that way. From the date of this contract, the Canadian Pacific has been interested in having this road fail to pay, and it bends its efforts towards preventing it from becoming a paying road. Such being its interest, I do not blame the company; but I blame the Government for having broken the solemn pledge which they gave us then; and I blame them for having, ever since 1884, used this promised money, which belongs to the Province of Quebec, prejudicially to the interests of a great district, and contrary to the interests of the country, since its general commerce is thereby made to suffer. On the other hand, is the Government now ready to proclaim before the country that they can, on the eve of an election, in the full turmoil of a campaign, and in the name of the Government majority, say to the electors: Here are so many millions for the purchase of your votes? They have the courage of not admitting that they were wrong. They have the courage of not regretting having come to the electors and of having said: Here are millions; vote for us, in spite of our bad general policy, in spite of our having no trade with the United States——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh!

Mr. AMYOT. Mr. Speaker, if those cats do not go back into the bag, let them remember that we have a voice that cannot be squealed down, and we will use it. It is really to be deplored, Mr. Speaker, that here we cannot be presumed to address an assembly composed entirely of gentlemen.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I regret that the Government should not somewhat deplore the grave offence they committed during the election excitement. Happily the city and district of Quebec are enlightened enough not to allow themselves to be bought, to be bluffed, to be deceived by false promises. For a long while the Government has been at fault in this matter. They now promise to do better. Very well: let them do this; it will be in order afterwards to settle the accounts between them and the country. These are, Mr. Speaker, the observations I had in mind to make when I took the floor.

Mr. LANGELIER. The hon. Minister of Justice, in replying to me yesterday, misstated what I said. I never pretended that the Canadian Pacific Railway had been or were being prevented from improving the road. What I stated, and what I repeat to-day, is that under the arrangement entered into with the Government the company are not at liberty to make any improvements on the road out of the money voted for that purpose in 1885, without the consent of the Government. Of course, if they choose to make those improvements at their own expense, the Government would not interfere; they would be only too glad to see them made. But how can it be expected that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will improve

the road at their own expense? It is not denied that the company have experienced the greatest difficulty in getting the consent of the Government, not only to important, but to most necessary improvements on the road itself, not to speak of the rolling stock. The hon. Minister of Public Works stated a few moments ago, that we should be satisfied with the statement he has made. We are satisfied, but he should not expect us to be very grateful to the Government. We do not owe anything to them, under the circumstances. In 1885 they got some of their supporters from the district of Quebec, to vote for the policy they were then proposing to the House, by promising to use $1,500,000 to make Quebec the terminus of the railway. Instead of doing so, they used nearly $1,000,000 of that money for another purpose altogether, for purchasing bonds. The members from the district of Quebec supporting the Government would never have voted for the policy of the Government on that occasion if the Minister of Public Works, who spoke for the Government, had stated to them: Gentlemen, we are asking you to vote $1,500,000, of which $1,000,000 is to be used, not to give you the eastern terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway in summer, but to buy $1,100,000 of bonds which Mr. Senecal has pledged. I am bound to say that the Government on that occasion obtained the votes of those gentlemen on false pretences: and as they did not intend to use the money for the purpose stated, they obtained the money from Parliament under false pretences also. But there is something worse. As has been stated by the hon. leader of the Opposition and by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), that money, which belonged to us and was voted for us, and should have been used for the benefit of the city and district of Quebec, has been used as a bribe. They attempted to bribe the people of Quebec with their own money, and therefore it was worse than an ordinary bribe. Fortunately, the city and district from which I come is not one of those portions of the Dominion which can be bribed by railway subsidies. We have been asking the Government for improvements year after year; and when a local or bye-election has taken place, the attempt has been made to get the support of the electors by more or less definite promises of those improvements: but the electors of Quebec have always taken this position, which I hope they will always take: If those improvements are in the public interest, let them be made, no matter what our vote may be, and if not, we do not want to obtain an expenditure of money which is not in the public interest. But we need not be surprised that the Government have attempted to bribe our city and district with money belonging to them, because that is only carrying out the policy announced by the late leader of the Government. At a banquet given to that eminent statesman at Quebec three years ago, the question of that $1,000,000 of debentures, and of a subsidy to the bridge, was brought up; and what did he say in regard to it in the speech he delivered on that occasion? That it was the practice of his Government to bribe the people of the country with their own money; and he added, what is perfectly true, I think, that when he would leave the Government there would be very little money left in the public treasury for the Liberals if they came into power. I am sure that the promise to release that $1,000,000 was only intended as a bribe. What did the Government say, only two or three weeks before the beginning of this session? The board of trade of Quebec held a meeting at which they instructed their secretary to write to the Government, asking them when and in what manner the promise made by Sir Charles Tupper at the public meeting in Quebec would be redeemed. The reply of the First Minister was that the question was under the consideration of the Government. It was quite evident that when the bribe was held out by Sir Charles Tupper, there was not the slightest intention on the part of the Government to carry out the policy adopted by this Parliament in 1885, because, two months afterwards, the Prime Minister in this way intimated that the Government were then for the first time taking the question into consideration. This was not because the question had not been brought under their notice. Last year I brought it to the attention of the House, and the First Minister then said that that was the first time he had heard of it. Although he had two colleagues from Quebec, they had not said one word to him about it. I am glad that we have compelled the Government to-day to state at last that they will redeem the promise made in 1885 in this Parliament.

Mr. MULOCK. There is one feature of this question which, I think, requires a little attention. We all sympathize with our friends from Quebec in their desire to improve their means of communication with the rest of the Dominion and the outside world: but some of the points referred to by the hon. member for Quebec Centre are likely, I think, to have more far-reaching effects than the betterment of the North Shore Railway. It appears that the promises out of which this discussion has arisen were made in the city of Quebec on the 26th of February, 1891, by Sir Charles Tupper, the duly accredited agent of the Dominion Government; and in the *Morning Chronicle* of the 27th of February you will find those promises set forth, I presume, accurately. Now, I presume that the Government propose not to repudiate the promises made by Sir Charles Tupper, but to make them good, and if so it is time that the House and the country should understand how far ante-election promises are intended to be binding upon the people and the people's representatives. It appears that Sir Charles Tupper—shall I say, in the public interest, or for the sake of carrying a few constituencies—made certain promises; and I would ask the Government and the House if they have the slightest idea of the extent to which the carrying out of those promises will mortgage the resources of this country? I find there were three distinct things promised by the High Commissioner on this occasion. First of all, he promised to hand over $1,000,000 of the assets of the Dominion to the Canadian Pacific Railway; then he promised to deal with the bridge; and for fear that I might overstate his words, I will read them as they appeared in the press:

"On the question of the bridge in which all are equally interested, why he——"

That is, Sir Charles Tupper.—

—"would say that from the time he took the matter up, as Minister of Railways, he had concluded the bridge was necessary as connection between the Intercolonial Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway; and his old colleagues in the Government knew how strongly he held to that view. Yesterday——"

What a singular circumstance—on the 25th of February—eight days before the general election—

—"he had met Mr. Schreiber, the Government Engineer of Railways, who had told him there was no great difficulty in constructing this work, which was destined to make a great railway centre of Quebec and a great Atlantic port. In fact, he said, you may, one and all, regard the work as an accomplished fact. (Tremendous applause)."

The High Commissioner there declared publicly, in the presence of the present leader of this House, and of another member of the Government, that so convinced were he and his colleagues of the necessity of this work, that now, those who were listening to him might consider it as an accomplished fact. When did the Government decide in favour of that important work? I well remember, only four or five years previously, when that work was the subject of an animated discussion in this House. I remember when, on one occasion, a number of hon. gentlemen refused their support to the Administration on a very important issue, but gave it afterwards, and it was admitted in the lobbies and outside that something in the nature of the Quebec bridge was to be the outcome. But as soon as the votes of those hon. gentlemen had been secured, from that time until the 25th of February last, we heard no authoritative utterance on the part of the Government with regard to this work. But suddenly on the 26th February, within eight days of the election we find the pledge given on behalf of the Government, which makes this country responsible—for how much? Has there been any estimate? I ask the Minister of Public Works, who was listening to this speech, whether any estimate of the cost of this public work has ever been made as to how far the public treasury would be taxed to carry out this pledge? Surely the High Commissioner did not speak without the authority of the Minister of Public Works. No doubt the High Commissioner must have consulted him, for the hon. Minister was at his elbow, and, I presume, incited him to make the speech. I would like to know where are the papers to show the cost of this work, for surely an Administration such as we have would not pledge the country to an uncertainty, even to accomplish so necessary a work. Where are the surveys, and plans, and estimates? Or, was the statement made by the High Commissioner in the name of the Government absolutely made to deceive, as has been represented? Or was it a statement intended to be carried out? If made to be carried out, surely it was not made hastily, just after a conversation with Mr. Schreiber, but must have been made, in a business way, after more mature consideration. But that was not the only pledge. I am told that this bridge will cost at least $5,000,000, if it can be built for that. Add that to the $1,000,000 bonds, and you have $6,000,000 promised by the High Commissioner. No wonder his promises were popular in that district. Again, he made another promise, which involves a little bagatelle of expenditure of a few more millions. It appears some time previously this House had passed an Act in favour of improving our Atlantic service; but this Government or its predecessors, great in promise, dealing continually in futures, put this statute on the Statute-books, and it has never materialized since. What have become of those Atlantic steamship promises made in 1889? Parliament, in 1889, voted a subsidy of $500,000 a year for ten years for the construction of this Atlantic service, but the Government did nothing. They went to sleep upon it, or mismanaged it, or whatever may have been the result, we have had nothing practical done from that day to this, and they never could be induced from that day until the 26th of February last to give their serious attention to the question. But suddenly there was an awakening. Again the Atlantic steamship service was to be utilized, and Sir Charles Tupper, speaking to the electors in the presence of the Minister of Public Works, told them that Sir John Macdonald was so deeply concerned in the development of the Province of Quebec and of the city of Quebec that he had agreed to that $500,000 subsidy which Parliament voted some years before, and an increase of about $250,000 a year, or an actual amount of £49,200 sterling, in round numbers $250,000 a year. I presume for the whole time the original subsidy was granted, or ten years, or in all Sir John Macdonald gave his word the Government would grant $2,500,000 extra money, without ever having taken the House into his confidence or having had any consultation with the people's representatives in Parliament, or concerning which, in so far as I know, there had never been any action taken by the Administration in Council or otherwise. Nevertheless, eight days before the general elections, Sir Charles Tupper promised the people of Quebec that there would be an extra grant of $2,500,000 given by the Government. In all, our High Commissioner promised, in that two hour speech, three things: to hand over $1,000,000 of bonds to the Canadian Pacific Railway: to build a bridge costing $5,000,000; to increase the subsidy to the Atlantic service, which would help the city of Quebec, by $2,500,000. He pledged the resources of this country to the extent of $8,500,000. And for what purpose? Was it for the purposes of the election? Or was it a mere coincidence that an election was about shortly to be held? I do not wonder that the Minister of Justice should shrink from discussing this part of the question. I do not wonder that the other members of the Government shrink from reviewing these wild promises. But the people of Quebec apparently believed in them, because it is said, in the editorial column of the newspaper from which I have quoted, that never before was such applause dealt out to any public speaker: that the people fairly stood on their heads, so great was their excitement. They rose as one man, they surrounded him, and with torches accompanied him to the railway station, and sent him on his way, bringing other gifts to the Maritime Provinces, and illuminated his whole trip down the St. Lawrence with fireworks, until at last he had ceased to be visible. Our High Commissioner, continuing his journey, repeated himself five days later in the Maritime Provinces. On the 5th of March, addressing an audience at Amherst, he said: Now is your opportunity, now is the time when the Maritime Provinces hold the balance of power, to demand what he called justice. It would be interesting to work out what I might call a mathematical problem. If the result of his addressing one meeting in the city of Quebec, is a series of promises to spend $8,500,000, how many more millions must he have promised to spend during the remainder of his campaign in the Maritime Provinces?

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I think it is proper to explain the circumstances

which have given rise to the question now before the House. During the session of 1885, the Government submitted to the House certain resolutions which served as a basis for a law by which it was declared that in order to help the Pacific Railway Company to extend its road as far as the harbour of Quebec, the Government was authorized to spend a sum of $1,500,000, either for the purchase of the North Shore Railway, which was then owned by the Grand Trunk, or for the building of another line between Quebec and Montreal. The resolution stated that if the Canadian Pacific Railway wanted to buy the North Shore Railway, the Government undertook to acquire the latter from the Grand Trunk Company in order to re sell it to the Pacific, and to spend for this purpose the sum of $1,500,000. Here are, in fact, the words of the statute 48-49 Victoria, chap. 68 :

"Sec. 2. Whereas it is essential, in the interest of Canada generally as well as of the Province of Quebec, that free access to the port of Quebec be obtained by the Canadian Pacific Railway, as contemplated by the said last mentioned Act, and such access has not been obtained, and it is necessary to make further provision for the purpose of procuring such access: therefore the Governor in Council may grant a further subsidy as an aid towards procuring free access as hereinafter described for the trains and traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company from St. Martin's Junction, near Montreal, a sum not exceeding in the whole the sum of $1,500,000, payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada."

Section 3 provided that if the Pacific Company failed within two months to obtain a free access to the Harbour of Quebec, then

"The Governor in Council may acquire the North Shore Railway, and may apply the said sum of $1,500,000, or any part thereof, in aid of such acquisition, and upon such acquisition may transfer and convey or lease the said railway to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, subject to such obligations as the Government shall have assumed in acquiring it."

This was therefore, in the intention of Parliament, an aid given the Pacific Company for the purpose of allowing it to reach the harbour of Quebec, and to give a first class railway service to that part of the country which extends from Montreal to Quebec. In this choice of either building a new road between Montreal and Quebec or purchasing the North Shore Railway, the Government, and the Company of the Pacific chose the latter. Of the million and a-half voted by Parliament, it was agreed that the Grand Trunk would receive $525,000, that $5,000 would be used to cover certain costs, and that the available balance of $970,000 would go towards the improvement of the road. Instead of giving the road the benefit of that sum, and of obliging the Pacific Railway Company to spend it in improvements which were daily becoming more urgent, the Government bought and paid for an amount of North Shore Railway bonds, and forced the company to accept the following agreement, to wit: That if the net receipts of the North Shore were not sufficient to meet the interest on the North Shore Railway bonds which the Government of Quebec had on hand, the Government undertook to pay the deficiency out of the $970,000; but the day the net receipts would be sufficient to pay such interest, then the Pacific would lose all right to this sum, and would even have to pay the interest on the bonds redeemed and held by the Dominion Government. This stipulation is contained in the following terms in the contract passed in September, 1885, between the Government and the Pacific Company, which is to be found in the Sessional Papers of 1886, No. 35*d* :

"In consideration of the premises the Government agree to apply and use part of the said sum of $1,500,000, to wit, the sum of $970,000 in aid of the said company in the acquisition of the said railway in the following manner, that is to say: in the event of the net receipts of the operation of the said railway, after paying the operating expenses thereof, proving insufficient to meet the interest on the first mortgage bonds of the said North Shore Railway Company, including those held by the Government of Quebec as collateral security for the balance of the price of the said railway, the Government will apply the interest on the said sum of $970,000, at the rate of 4 per cent. per annum, in whole or in part, as may be required towards the payment of the deficiency. But if or when after payment of all such deficiencies, the net receipts of the said railway as aforesaid shall be sufficient to pay the interest on the said bonds, the said company shall cease to have any further claim or demand upon the Government in respect of the said sum of money."

And in order to prevent the company from being in a position to spend in works of renewal any portion of this sum, and with the view to secure its being employed only in the payment of the deficiency on interest, the Government have stipulated that no renewal could be made with materials more costly than those originally used and charged to operating expenses, without the consent of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and this had been done in the following terms :—

"Provided that as regards operating expenses the cost of no new works or renewals of a more expensive character than existing works were when new, shall be accounted as forming part of such operating expenses, unless the previous consent of the Minister of Railways and Canals has been obtained to their construction."

Mr. Speaker, what was the result of this proviso? For months, and I could say for years, the Pacific Company applied to the Government for the permission of replacing by iron bridges the wooden constructions which were falling into ruins; and and it has taken months and years of negotiations to obtain this permission. It is only last year for the most part, and the year previous for the rest, that this permission was granted, thus allowing the road to be put in a proper condition of safety. For there existed then, between Montreal and Quebec, dangerous bridges over which none could pass without fear, and which had been recognized as dangerous by the engineers of the company. Another result was that the company knowing that the Act of 1885 entitled it to $970,000, while the contract of September, 1885, forced it to pay interest on that sum, was unwilling to make the necessary improvements to give that part of the country means of communication proportionate to its importance. The reason given by the managers of the Pacific was that they did not intend to work their line in the interest of the Government, and that they would not do anything until the question of the million was settled. It had been agreed between prominent citizens of Quebec and the Pacific Company that the latter would contribute to the construction of a large hotel in Quebec. The Pacific Company had even bought the necessary ground for the purpose; but owing to the temporizing of the Government the hotel was not built, and the ground was re-sold. The Pacific had also promised elevators and other improvements, but in consequence of the Government failing to put into execution the law of 1885 according to its spirit and its letter, Quebec did not get these improvements nor these elevators. I believe that it is more than time that the Government should fulfil the obligation contracted in 1885.

ELECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) moved second reading of Bill (No. 9) to amend the Acts respecting the election of members of the House of Commons. He said: I was not in the House last evening, when the Bill of the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) was moved. I understand, however, that upon the hon. member's moving the second reading, the Minister of Justice indicated his intention of referring all Bills amending the Electoral law to a select committee. If that is so, I shall not trouble the House with any explanation other than I gave on the first reading of the Bill.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I stated that there were some Bills on the paper relating to the Election Act and the Franchise Act which it would be better to refer to a committee, and I had in view this Bill as well as some others. This Bill contains some features which I object to, and some features which I think are embodied in the present law, but it also contains some provisions which I think are worthy of the consideration of a committee. If the hon. gentleman thinks fit to press it to a second reading and refer it to the same committee, I shall acquiesce.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time and referred to the Committee on Bill No. 5.

MEMBERS' MILEAGE.

Mr. McMULLEN moved second reading of Bill (No. 43) further to amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons. He said: In rising to move the second reading of this Bill, it is necessary, perhaps, for me to offer some explanations why I considered it necessary to introduce this measure. It will be within the recollection of hon. members who were members of the last Parliament, that an hon. gentleman, who represented the County of Shelburne, N.S., had, after his election, removed to the city of London, in England. On receiving notice that Parliament was about to assemble, he left London and came to Ottawa to discharge his duties for the County of Shelburne. On applying to the pay clerk for his mileage and answering the question as to where his mileage was to count from, a reference was made either to the Department of Justice or to some Minister, and the clerk was advised that, if the member for Shelburne was so disposed, he was entitled to mileage from London to Ottawa, and that mileage was paid to him. At the time, I objected to the law as it then stood, and I drew the attention of the Government to the matter and asked whether they intended to introduce legislation to prevent a repetition of incidents of that kind. No definite promise was made that they would introduce such legislation. I consider that when a man is elected as a representative of a constituency in this Dominion, he should at least be a resident of the Dominion, and that some provision should be made that, when a man becomes the representative of a county, he should not be permitted to remove to a foreign country or to any part of the world outside of this Dominion, and be allowed to draw mileage from that point to the city of Ottawa when he comes here to discharge his duty. My object is to provide that any senator or member of the House of Commons shall be entitled to mileage from his residence, which shall be in Canada, on coming to Ottawa to discharge his duties. That, of course, requires that he must be a resident of this Dominion. I believe that, in the interests of the whole Dominion, the sooner we get down to the principle which is virtually carried out in the United States, that a man has to be a resident of the state and of the constituency he claims to represent, the better for all parties. I think that a man coming to this House should at least be a resident of the province in which he has his constituency. However, I do not wish to go so far at present, but we should ask at all events that the representatives of the people in this House or the senators in the other Chamber should be residents of this Dominion, and for this reason I have introduced the Bill now before the House.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 45) to amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act.—(Mr. Amyot.)

COMPULSORY VOTING.

Mr. AMYOT moved the second reading of Bill (No. 53) to make voting compulsory.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Will the hon. member explain?

Mr. AMYOT. The object of this Bill is to enforce upon every elector the obligation of performing the material act of voting, at least to act as if he were voting, that is, he must go to the poll and receive a ballot paper, then go into the polling booth and hand his paper over to the deputy returning officer. When he is in the room assigned for the purpose of depositing his ballot, he may vote as he likes, for whom he pleases, he may spoil his ballot paper, or do what he pleases with it, he may write down his name upon it, or may make as many crosses upon it as he likes. The Bill compels him to go there on his own responsibility, and relieves the candidates or the friends of the candidates, from paying any vehicle to transport him to the poll, or from paying for his day or half day that he may be off work to go to the poll. I know that in addressing this honourable House, composed of members who have gone through elections, I shall be easily understood. One of the great causes of electoral corruption is found in the fact that, in spite of the law against it, we have to pay for transporting the electors to the poll. I have seen it stated in the press that this Bill would be an infringement upon the liberty of the subject. This objection, at first sight, appears to be very serious, and in my view, any unnecessary restraint upon the liberty of the subject is blameable. But a moment's reflection will convince us that nearly all our laws are infringements upon the liberty of the subject. If we consider our municipal laws relating to road inspectors, the valuators or the assessors of property, and all the municipal officers whom the Legislature forces to act, we will see that the liberty of the subject in infringed upon. If we consider the restrictions on trade and commerce in the manufacture of liquors, in the selling of tobacco, in the imposition upon commerce of taxes in the shape of Customs laws, in fact on nearly every page of our statutes, we will see that for the general welfare private parties are asked to give up a portion of

their individual liberties so that the good of the nation may be enhanced. This is the object of the Bill: to put a stop to the intense corruption to which the candidates are almost forced to resort, by the necessity in which they stand to-day of paying for the transport of electors to the poll. I have not heard any plausible objections yet made to the Bill. I think it will tend towards securing purity in elections, although I do not pretend that it will have the effect of putting a stop to all corruption. Doubtless some other way will be discovered of purchasing electors, of bribing their consciences, but the passage of this Bill will do something towards taking away from the enemy that source of corruption. At the present time a great many men enjoying the right to vote are out of the country, and if we force them to be present a great amount of money will be saved to the candidates, a great source of corruption avoided, and a great improvement will be made on the present system. I have also been told that an elector might not like to go to the poll and vote, but the Bill provides that in such a case an elector would have to write to the revising barrister—and an interval of 30 days has been suggested, although we might make it longer—asking the revising barrister to erase his name. His name will then be erased, and he will no longer be an elector, and the candidates will not be at the trouble of looking him up and sending for him. This would greatly simplify the law as compared with the present system, and greatly lessen the work of the candidates and the anxiety of all interested parties, and would tend, as I said before, towards the purity of elections, which is my only motive in introducing this Bill. I hope the measure will not be looked upon as a party measure in any sense, either in fact or in intention, and I hope that if the Government see no harm in it, they will take charge of it so as to secure its passage during the present session.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Bill which the hon. member has just moved is altogether too important to be treated like the measures which were referred to a select committee for consideration, because it involves an entirely new principle. The other Bills applied to details of the Franchise Act, the Controverted Elections Act, and the Elections Act, but this Bill makes a fundamental change in our system of voting, and I feel bound to call the attention of the House to it, because the principle is one that certainly should not be adopted in silence. My own impression is that the Bill is a very severe restriction, not only on liberty, as the hon. gentleman has said, but on the right of choice of the electors. The condition of things occurring in an election contest in any electoral district when all the candidates are distasteful to an elector, is one that very often occurs. This Bill, under such circumstances, compels him to vote for a candidate who he thinks ought not to be a representative.

Mr. AMYOT. He may spoil his ballot.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The principle of this Bill is that a person shall be subject to a penalty because he does not vote for a candidate who he thinks ought not to be elected, or else he must perpetrate a fraud and deceive the returning officer by pretending to vote when he does not vote. At the election it is intended to supply ballots, not for the purpose of electors spoiling them, but for the purpose of enabling them to vote. This Bill will compel a man either to spoil a ballot or violate his conscience by voting for a man who he does not think qualified to represent his constituency. To spoil the ballot would be merely to evade this Act. Every line of the Bill is open to objections of the same kind. For instance, he must have "a valid and sufficient excuse," and the burden of proof as to the validity and sufficiency of the excuse is upon him, and it is a matter of pleading. But the authority before whom the penalty is collected is to be the judge of the "valid and sufficient excuse." One cannot tell, and no guide is furnished by the Bill, as to how the judge or magistrate is to decide whether the excuse is valid or not, whether it is from personal inability, as on account of illness, distance of the poll, or disinclination to make a choice between the candidates. Then he is to "appear at the polling station of his electoral division where he is entitled to vote, in order to apply for and receive a ballot paper and exercise his franchise according to law." The Bill falls short of the hon. gentleman's intentions, because it requires him to be there for that purpose, but it does not require him to carry that purpose into effect. Then mark the severity of the penalty. It may reach $50 with costs, or, in default of payment, a term of imprisonment not exceeding thirty days, and also to be disqualified from voting at any election during the next five years. So an elector has to violate his conscience by voting for some person who he does not believe should represent the county, or pretend to vote when he does not vote, or be disqualified for five years, although in the meantime a suitable candidate may come forward. The second section enables any person of full age to exact this penalty and put it in his pocket. There are very few cases in which people should be subjected to a procedure of that kind. In nearly all of those cases where the informer is rewarded out of the fine, the proceeding is subject to the supervision of some public officer; but in this case every person of full age may sue for the penalty.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is the law now.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is the law in some cases, and in every case it is a bad law, and of late years has never been adopted by Parliament, that I can remember. There are several bad laws on this subject, and the action of Parliament has been growing stricter on that point of late years. The Bill further provides that "upon receipt of a duly certified copy of the final judgment, the revising officer shall strike off the list of electors the name of the elector (who is disqualified for five years) and in default of doing so he shall be held guilty of a misdemeanour." Section five is the only one in which an attempt is made to preserve freedom of choice, and that enables the elector to go to the revising officer and have his name struck off the list in force, providing he does so 30 days before the election. But that is at a time when candidates have not been nominated according to law, and it is impossible for him to tell who may come forward; and by fixing so remote a time, 30 days before the election, perhaps before any general election is announced, or any writ issued for a bye-election, it is impossible for an elector to tell whether he will desire to vote or not. The Bill, of course, involves a principle of very great importance, besides being objectionable as regards these details; and in order

that it may be fully considered by the House, after its attention has been thus called to it, I suggest that the debate be adjourned. I must say I do not see my way clear to accept the Bill, but I do not desire the House to pronounce on it now, because hon. members may desire to have a debate on the proposed measure at a future day.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the hon. Minister is not quite fair to the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), in declaring this Bill invited any man to commit a fraud. That is a harsh construction to place on the provision which enables a man who does not like either candidate, to spoil a ballot, and I hardly think it was warranted either by the terms of the Bill or the speech of my hon. friend. Nevertheless, there can be no doubt that the Minister of Justice is perfectly right in saying that a departure of this importance ought to be very carefully considered by the House. I am bound to say, however, that my experience, extending over a very considerable number of years, leads me to believe that there are no sources of corruption in elections at present greater than those which are inflicted upon candidates by the temptation to bring persons from a distance to vote in any constituency. I know at the present moment enormous frauds and enormous corruption exists, and has existed for a number of years past in connection with the bringing of electors from distances, and more particularly in bringing them from the adjacent States, were, unfortunately, a very large number of persons qualified to vote at our elections are to be found. Then there is another evil that has been growing and increasing all the time, that is, the evil of personation, of bringing persons forward to represent men who have been for a considerable time absent from the particular constituency. Both these evils will be very largely removed by the adoption of the principles of one man one vote, and that party resident in the constituency in which he gives his vote. However, with respect to the question of compulsory voting, I think there is a great deal to be said for the principle, although I am at one with the Minister of Justice in the opinion that the penalties proposed in this Bill are decidedly too severe. I do not think it is an offence, if we create it an offence, which should be subject to imprisonment or fine, because an elector does not choose to exercise his privilege of franchise. But I do think this: If a man does not choose to exercise his franchise without having good and valid reasons for neglecting that duty, for it is a duty and not a mere right, I think it would be a good thing if some penalty were inflicted on him, and if a man without sufficient valid cause or excuse neglected to exercise his franchise, it would be a very fair thing indeed to disqualify him for a term of years, five years or even more, from exercising the franchise, and that the returning officer, on proof being given that, without just cause, an elector had neglected to exercise his franchise, might very fairly strike his name off the list of voters. I therefore think that the principle of the hon. gentleman's Bill is one that well deserves consideration, although I cannot say that I myself, any more than the Minister of Justice, can see my way to agree with its details. However, I am glad that the Minister of Justice has proposed an adjournment of the debate, and I hope various members of the House will express their opinions on this subject. I believe if steps were taken to make voting compulsory in some degree, they would tend very largely to reduce the expenses of elections all over this country, and that is very desirable indeed, and they would tend largely to put down corruption, which, as our election courts show, has existed to a very considerable extent in the conduct of our elections.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) has rendered an important service in bringing this question before the House for consideration. It has for some time been a subject of discussion in the country, and it is just as well that it should be carefully considered in Parliament. Of course, the Minister of Justice is quite correct in saying that this measure is far more radical in character than the others we have been considering this afternoon. It will necessitate a very material change in Parliament, and in the existing law, in order to give effect to this measure. The rule referred to by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), of one man one vote, and the exclusion of non-residents in a constituency from voting within that constituency, would be a necessary part of a measure of this kind; because you can scarcely enforce a law of this kind against non-resident voters, and especially where these non-resident voters are no longer dwelling within the limits of the Dominion. I must say that, so far as my own individual opinions are concerned, it always seemed to me that although a measure of this sort would remedy many existing evils, yet there were many serious objections to it; objections which, in my judgment, counterbalanced any advantages which would be derived from it. I do not go into a discussion of the objections to the details of the Bill referred to by the Minister of Justice, but I thought some of these objections were scarcely fair and did not properly apply to this measure any more than to the existing law. Certainly, if the elector comes to the poll the object of this measure is entirely met; it is not necessary that he should even vote. At the present time the elector comes to the polls, tenders his vote, and if some scrutineer present asks that he should be sworn, and he refuses to take the oath he cannot vote. Surely the Minister of Justice would not press his criticism so far as to say that the person who comes to the poll should be compelled to take the oath in order that his vote might be recorded, whether he was willing to take it or not. That is not the intention of the Bill; the intention is that the voter shall come to the poll without being induced to come by any improper or corrupt consideration, and if the law requires him to be present at the polling division in which it is necessary that his vote should be recorded, if recorded at all, the object of the Bill is in that respect entirely accomplished, whether he spoils his ballot or refuses to take the oath, or records his vote for one or the other candidate. But, Sir, under our system of parliamentary government one of the things that happens at an election is, that sometimes there is a very great deal of indifference exhibited by the electors owing to the fact that no important issue interesting to the public at large has been presented in the elections. Sometimes that indifference is confined to a particular party, because the members of that party are not altogether satisfied with the policy

that has been marked out by its leaders, or with the views that have been put forward in Parliament. Now, under our parliamentary system, although we have often changes of administration, we have not very often, or to any very great extent, a change in the political opinions of the electors. There are more frequently change in the results of the elections, arising from a large number of the electors refusing to record their votes, than from their having gone from one political party to the other, and it does seem to me that a measure of this sort tends to interfere with that free play and free working of our parliamentary system which is necessary to make it really a representative system of government As an instance, let me refer to what happened in England in 1885 and in 1886. We know that the Government of Mr. Gladstone introduced into Parliament after the elections of 1885, a measure of Home Rule for Ireland, and that measure was defeated by a small majority in the House of Commons. When an appeal was had to the country the Government of Mr. Gladstone was defeated and the Conservative party, led by Lord Salisbury, obtained a decided majority in Parliament. Now, if anyone looks at the vote in these two elections, he will see that it was not due to the fact that a very large number of those who had hitherto supported Mr. Gladstone and his party had changed their votes in the elections which took place in the various constituencies in the United Kingdom, but that a large number of those who had, in the previous election, supported him had abstained from voting altogether. We may have this condition of things in this country: you may have a large number of electors of one or the other political party not disposed to change sides but disposed to withhold their votes for the time being, and the fact that they have withheld their votes brings about a change in the constitution of the Parliament as complete, and makes the Parliament as completely a representative body as if these voters had gone to the polls. In some instances, by introducing the principle contained in this Bill, you would alter the result, and alter it not in accordance with the interests of the country. Let me suppose that a large number of persons who support one or the other political party in this country were, at an election, compelled to attend the polls. Whether these parties would spoil their ballots or whether they would mark them for one of the candidates, would depend very largely upon how far their dissatisfaction extended. In nine cases out of ten, I will venture to say that if a person is compelled to go to the polls, and actually did go there, he would not spoil his ballot, but he would give his vote for the candidate from whom he was disposed to withhold that vote, and thus, by compelling him to go to the polls you might in the end produce a different political complexion in Parliament, and you might give to a party a political ascendancy in Parliament that, if the electors were left free to do just precisely as they desired, would have been different from what it is under a measure of this sort. I do not see myself, nor have I ever seen, how you are to reconcile compulsory attendance at the polls with the free working of our representative system. I am of opinion that if you adopt the rule of excluding non-resident voters from the electoral lists, and if you adopt the principle of one man one vote, then you will have done all that can well be done with a view of preventing that system of corruption and that large expenditure at elections which my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) proposes to remedy by this measure. It is a fact that under the present system non-residents do remain upon the electoral lists, and this in a large degree has led to the discussion of this subject and induced a very great number of the intelligent and thoughtful electors of this country to subscribe to the views embodied in the Bill which the hon. member now presents to the House. The subject is, however, an important one, there is much to be said on both sides of it, and it ought to be very fully considered.

Mr. STAIRS. The hon. gentleman who has introduced the Bill, refers to the large expenditure at elections, and it would seem that he expects to secure the decrease of this expenditure, as well as to prevent corruption at elections, by compelling voters to attend at the polls. Now, it seems to me that this Bill, if passed, will not have the effect of lessening corruption. It does not follow, if you make it compulsory for voters to go to the polls, that in every case they will not be taken, or if they do go, that they will vote. My experience is that the parties are most anxious to bring voters to the polls, and generally succeed in inducing them to go; and, I understand, that it is not proposed to make it a corrupt act to bring voters to the polls. There is nothing in the Bill that I can see, that is going to prevent corruption that the present law fails to provide against. I put forward these views very briefly as a layman, and, I think, before such a radical change is made in the election law, it should receive very careful consideration.

Mr. COCKBURN. As a layman, may I add something to what has already been said? It seems to me that the provisions of this Bill will be of peculiar benefit to the rich man, because if he wishes to abstain from voting, he can afford to pay the fine of $50, while a poor man, if unable or unwilling to go to the poll, and if he cannot afford to pay the fine, is practically disfranchised for five years or is sent to gaol as a criminal. Then, I cannot help thinking, from the little experience I have had in these matters, that provision number 2 would tend to bring into existence a class of persons who would be a curse to the country, namely, persons who, by threatening those who had failed to vote, with the penalty of $50, would try to compound with them for a sum of money, varying from the full sum of $50 down to whatever they could extort. It appears to me that this provision would tend to create the worst class of informers, such as those who flourished in the days of Charles II, and tend to produce more corruption than exists under the present Act. Then, the question arises, what is a valid and sufficient excuse? Now, while we are all willing to do everything that lies in our power to secure purity of elections, I think it would be very difficult for any of us to decide what is a valid and sufficient reason. What in one case would be a valid and sufficient reason might not be so in another case. Therefore I cannot but think that the provision in section 2, which, instead of tending to diminish the bitterness of party, which is already great enough in this country, would encourage men to attack a man of means and worry him into paying $50, is a provi-

sion that would defeat itself, and that is unworthy of the further consideration of this House.

Mr. McMILLAN. I believe that this Bill instead of favouring the rich man, would, if passed, be very much to the advantage of the poor man, for this simple reason, that many wealthy men who are the employers of labour, while not daring to compel their men to vote in a particular way, are at present able to influence their votes by compelling them to remain away from the polls if they are likely to cast their votes in opposition to their employers' wishes. Under a system of compulsory voting the poor man would be able to go to the poll, and if he could not conscientiously cast his ballot, he could spoil it. I think such a measure would do away with a great deal of the corruption which exists at the present time, because it would enable a workingman to cast his vote independently, instead of being compelled to remain at home or lose his place if his sympathies were not with those of his employer. I would not be in favour of a fine of $50, but I would require the deputy returning officer to keep a list of those who did not cast their votes, and send that list to the revising barrister before he finally revised the voters' list; and I would disqualify those persons from voting for a number of years. I think this is a greater measure in the interest of the purity of elections and in the interest of the workingman, than almost any other that could be introduced on this subject.

Mr. SPROULE. I, for one, cannot assent to the principle of this Bill for the following reasons: I believe it is against a man's liberty. It is out of harmony with the freedom of our humanity as exercised in the British dominions. In no line of life, so far as I am aware, whether for candidates or for by-laws, or for anything that may be submitted to the public, is it compulsory on men to vote; and if it has not been found necessary in other cases, why should we think it necessary for the election of members of Parliament? It might be that both candidates would be objectionable to many voters, so that they would prefer remaining at home. But it is contended that if this Bill were made law it would do away with a great deal of corruption. I am informed that in some States where compulsory voting is now in existence, it is not successful in this respect.

Mr. AMYOT. Which State?

Mr. SPROULE. I am not able to give the hon. gentleman the name of the State,——

Mr. AMYOT. I am not aware that it exists anywhere yet.

Mr. SPROULE,—but I will, perhaps, be able to do so at a later stage of this Bill. I speak with some knowledge of the subject, because I was a resident of the States for some time, and I believe that although a measure of this kind was enacted for the purpose of accomplishing what it is supposed this Bill would accomplish, it did not accomplish that purpose; but corruption is just as rife, and election expenses there are greater than in Canada.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not think such a measure is in existence in any State. It has been suggested, but not tried.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman may be giving only his opinion, and I will endeavour to satisfy him whether I am correct or not. If I am incorrectly informed, I will be pleased to set myself right, but that is the information I have. I think this is too radical a change for this House to assent to. I think it would introduce a new system of corruption which we have not had to contend with hitherto. It would make compulsory what is now a duty, and I do not think we should impose that obligation upon free electors of this country, who at present are free, not only to vote or not for members of this House, but in every other line of life in which they require to record their votes—in municipal elections, elections of school trustees and others. I say the principle of this Bill is out of harmony with the freedom of that system which is now enjoyed.

Mr. HAZEN. I would like to call the attention of the hon. gentleman to another difficulty which exists in some parts of the Dominion, owing to some people being opposed to voting from religious convictions. I understand that is the case with the Mennonites who have settled in the North-West and Manitoba; but the representatives from that section can speak with more authority on that point. I know, however, that, during the course of the canvass in my constituency, I met a number of people who told me they belonged to a denomination of Christians against whose principles it was to vote at all. That being the case, it is clearly useless to force these people to come to the polls, when they have not the slightest intention of voting on reaching there. Should the principle of this Bill be admitted, certainly exemptions should be provided in the case of the people to whom I have referred. The Bill which the hon. gentleman has introduced involves a principle of great importance and worthy of the highest consideration; and the hon. gentleman who introduced it is evidently seized of the old idea that while one man is able to bring a horse to water, ten men cannot force him to drink, for the hon. gentleman is clearly of opinion that though we may by law compel a man to come to the polling booth, yet it would not be right to compel him to vote. The main thing, however, he seems to think, is to get him there, and then let him destroy the ballot paper if he likes. The point made by the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) was very well taken indeed, namely, that very little can be accomplished in the line contemplated by the mover of this Bill, that is, putting down corruption. As the hon. member for Halifax has pointed out, the law to-day declares that, if a candidate conveys voters to a poll he is liable to disqualification, or if his agents convey them, he is liable to be unseated. Yet I venture to say, that there is not a constituency in the Dominion—certainly not a rural constituency—in which, at the recent elections, voters were not conveyed to the polls in defiance of the law. Now, if the law at present is unavailing to prevent electors being carried to the polls, I would ask the hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill, how it would be possible to successfully carry into effect the principle of his measure, which is to prevent candidates and their friends from conveying electors to the polls? If they break the law which exists to-day, we may be pretty certain that they will violate the one proposed by the hon. gentleman also. I must confess, if the only object of his Bill is to

compel people to come to the polls, whether they vote or not, no good, from the standpoint of purity, will be accomplished by it. It seems to me, if anything is to be accomplished, the principle of compulsion should be carried further, and the voters not only be compelled to go to the polls, but also to cast their ballots. I cannot see—leaving out of the question the propriety of adopting the principle of compulsory voting at all—what object there can be in forcing people to come to the polls and then saying it makes very little difference whether they cast their ballots or not; and certainly I do not see what there is to be gained, from the standpoint of purity of elections.

Mr. AMYOT. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat says that the religious scruples of some electors prevent them from voting. In that case all they would have to do is to avail themselves of the clause of the Bill, which allows them to have their names erased from the voters' list. They could thus either adopt this means and avoid going to the poll at all, or save equally their fifty dollars cash and secure their eternal salvation by going to the poll and then abstaining from voting. The hon. gentleman says if the present law is ineffective, how can we expect the proposed law to be effective? The answer to that objection is that the sanction of the proposed law is very severe. If a man who makes default of going to the poll to vote is to be deprived of his right to vote during five years, or be condemned to pay a fine, he will no doubt not fail to do his duty as a citizen. This is, however, a matter of detail. The question involved at the present stage is the principle of the Bill. Is it right or wrong to compel the attendance of an elector at the poll? Some hon. gentlemen contend that to do so would be to interfere with his liberty. But we force a man to attend court as a witness or as a juryman and keep him in court away from his business, for fifteen or twenty days or even a month if necessary, or even a year, and this is, no doubt, an infringement on the liberty of the subject. But each individual is bound to make personal sacrifices for the general good of society. The question for us to consider is, can we do away with the corruption that now exists by making the attendance at the polls compulsory? I am very grateful to the Minister of Justice for having given his attention to the matter, and I accept his suggestion. I hope every member of this House and every citizen in the country will look into the question involved, and see whether, if it does seem to curtail the liberty of the subject, the sacrifice is not one which every one should be prepared to make in order to obtain purity in elections. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) sees nothing at all in the Bill, and prefers going on with the present system. He could not have heard the hon. member for Halifax tell him that in the last election there was not one rural division in which teams were not hired to carry the electors to the polls. Does he owe his election to bribery and corruption?

Mr. SPROULE. No; I deny that.

Mr. AMYOT. I have too much respect for the hon. gentleman to believe that he has calumniated himself, or he does not wish, like us, to be returned by electors who have voted from patriotic motives and have not been bribed or corrupted. I am sure, if the hon. gentleman will look over the Bill, he will find that the only objection to it will be that it comes from this side of the House. I accept the suggestion of the hon. Minister of Justice. If we agree upon the principle that we should make attendance at the polls compulsory, I will be satisfied, as I do not pretend to have a perfect Bill. I do not pretend that this Bill is perfect, and I will be most happy to receive any suggestion or to hand over the Bill entirely to any hon. gentleman who may be more competent to deal with the details than I am. I only desire to give the House an occasion to express its opinion upon the principle of the Bill, and if the principle be found good, I hope we will unite our efforts to make it the law of the country as soon as possible. No doubt it is a radical change, but, when the evil is radical as it is now, it requires a radical cure.

Amendment (Sir John Thompson) agreed to, and debate adjourned.

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

After Recess.

ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. BARRON moved second reading of Bill (No. 54) further to amend the Dominion Elections Act. He said: The first section of this Bill proposes to define beyond any possible doubt the nature of the money which is to be paid into the office of the clerk of the county court whenever a candidate requires to have a recount. The Bill has been suggested to me by reason of recent occurrences in the south riding of the County of Victoria. A recount was demanded there, and the $100 required to be deposited by the 64th section of the Act I propose to amend was paid in to the clerk, not in money, but by a cheque. The gentleman who paid the money thought he was sufficiently protected by getting the receipt of the clerk in the language of the statute. However, his Honour the judge of the county court thought differently, and it was considered by many that the ends of justice were defeated by a recount not being had. The county court judge gave a long judgment on the subject, and I think the concensus of opinion was with him. He held that the deposit of the gentleman who applied for a recount was not a deposit according to the language of the statute. The statute says: "One hundred dollars." The learned judge held that that should be in legal tender. I ask the House to say in this Bill, in order to prevent any question, that it shall be either in legal tender or in bills of any chartered bank doing business in Canada. The second clause is intended to afford means to compel a county court judge, at the instance of a dissatisfied party, to hold a recount. At present, if a judge of a county court declines to go on with a recount, a mandamus will not lie from a superior court to compel him to go on, and thus again the ends of justice may be defeated. I would refer the House, and the Minister of Justice especially, to the Centre Wellington case, reported in 44 U.C.Q.B. Reports. This is a portion of the decision given by Chief Justice Hagarty on that subject:

"I am satisfied that there is no jurisdiction in this court to interfere in the manner proposed."

The manner proposed was to issue a mandamus to compel the junior judge of the County of

Wellington to hold a recount, after he had declined to do so. The learned judge goes on to say that :

"The right to deal with all such matters belongs to the House of Commons, except so far only as the Legislature has expressly devolved on the courts certain express duties and powers respecting elections, and this proposed interposition by mandamus is not one of those so devolved."

So that, inasmuch as there are, or might be, cases where injustice might be done by a county court judge in his refusing, no doubt rightly, in his opinion, to have a recount, I propose that mandamus will lie compelling him to have a recount. I understand from the hon. member from Queen's, N.B (Mr. King), that the same difficulty has arisen in his province, but there they do not seem to have held in the same way as the judges of the Court of Queen's Bench in Ontario. In New Brunswick they think that a mandamus does lie, but it is not so in the Province of Ontario, and, if there is a difference of opinion in the several Provinces of the Dominion, I think all doubt should be set at rest by the Act which I ask the House to pass to its second reading. It will be observed that I have not provided for a prohibition as well as a mandamus. It might be well, perhaps, if the Minister of Justice thinks the Bill should pass, to amend that clause by providing for a prohibition, because, if a writ of mandamus should lie, a writ of prohibition should also lie. I do not think it is necessary to give any more explanation, but I hope the House will pass the measure.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and referred to the Committee on Bill No. 5.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville) moved second reading of Bill (No. 59) further to amend the Electoral Franchise Act. He said : I think it is the intention of the Minister of Justice to refer that Bill to the special committee appointed to consider Bill No. 5, and I think perhaps that would be the best course to pursue.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and referred to Committee on Bill No. 5.

PREVENTION OF FRAUDS.

Mr. BURDETT moved that the Order for the House to go into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 42) to prevent fraud in the sale of certain articles, be discharged, and the said Bill be referred to a special committee composed of Sir John Thompson, Messrs. Wood (Brockville), Barron, Skinner, Desjardins (L'Islet), Corby, Lister, Cochrane, and the mover.

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In order to facilitate the business of that Committee, I move that it be an instruction to the committee to which Bills numbered 5, 9, 43, 45, 54, and 59 have been referred, to consolidate such Bills or unite any provisions of one Bill with the provisions of another.

Motion agreed to.

RAILWAY BRIDGE AT QUEBEC.

Mr. LANGELIER moved for :

Copies of all Orders in Council, instructions to engineers, correspondence, papers, reports and documents respecting the building of a bridge at Quebec.

He said : I wish to say a few words on the subject with which this motion deals. For the last forty years the question of a bridge over the River St. Lawrence at the city of Quebec, has been more or less prominently before the public, and it has especially acquired great importance within the last five years. A company was incorporated some years ago to construct such a bridge, and the Government have been very frequently approached by delegations from Quebec asking for assistance for the construction of a bridge. It cannot be said that it is an extraordinary proposal to ask for assistance for such an undertaking, because we have seen other undertakings of the same kind assisted by public money. It is very well known that the Victoria Bridge at Montreal was constructed with money advanced by the old Province of Canada. The bridge constructed at Lachine by the Canadian Pacific Railway has not, perhaps, been built directly with money advanced by the Government, but indirectly it has been built with such money. It is very well known that the country has advanced immense sums of money to that great corporation, the Canadian Pacific Railway, and it was with money advanced by this company that another bridge has been built near Montreal. As I have said, the question of the construction of a bridge near the city of Quebec has acquired a great deal of importance within the last few years. Within the last ten years a bridge at that point has become a matter of life or death for the trade of the city of Quebec. As I stated on one occasion when I headed a deputation from Quebec to interview the Government, matters have come to such a point that without a bridge Quebec now stands commercially in a worse position than it was before it became connected by rail with other points of this country. Before there was any railway Quebec, commercially, stood in the same position as Montreal and other cities, but since railway communication between the two cities has become so easy, the absence of a bridge has been the cause of a large portion of the trade and commerce of Quebec being transferred to Montreal. Every one at all acquainted with the position of Quebec knows that in the winter time, especially, when the crossing of the river is almost impossible at that point, country merchants coming from localities below Quebec and who used to make their purchases at Quebec, now go directly to Montreal. It takes them no longer to reach Montreal than to reach Quebec. Take, for instance, merchants coming from Rivière du Loup, or Rimouski, or any other place below Quebec, and who used to come to Quebec to do their business ; if they arrive in the evening after the ferry has ceased to run, they have to remain till next morning at seven o'clock, which is the earliest hour at which they can cross the river. But if they continued on directly towards Montreal, they could reach that city at half-past six the next morning ; therefore, it is an advantage to them to go to Montreal. There is also another great practical difficulty which I may mention, and that is the cost of transport by the ferry. For the transportation of goods between Quebec and Rimouski, especially for those merchants of Quebec who deal in bulky or very heavy goods, it is more expensive for them to take their goods across the River St. Lawrence than it would be to carry them all the way from Quebec to Rimouski. Another difficulty is that at present we have no direct communication with the United States by rail, nor can we have ex-

cept by some such arrangement as was proposed a long time ago—that of a railway ferry. It is in the recollection of members of this House who were here in 1884, that it was proposed by the Government to establish a railway ferry for crossing passengers and freight cars. The execution of that enterprise has been postponed from year to year, and now we hear no more of it. I think such a ferry would be a waste of money. I do not think it would pay the Government to establish such a ferry, because it would be a very imperfect solution of the question which interests the citizens of Quebec, and it would cost a sum of money almost as great as the interest and sinking fund on the money which it would be necessary to advance for the construction of a bridge. Therefore the citizens of Quebec have not paid much attention to that scheme. Without such a ferry it becomes almost impossible to send goods, not only from Quebec, but from all the country north, which is now served by the Lake St. John Railway, to the United States, or to the southern portion of the Province of Quebec. I may give an instance of some of these difficulties. There is at St. Raymond, a place 36 miles north of Quebec on the Lake St. John Railway, the largest manufactory of pulp in the whole Dominion. It is controlled practically by the Canada Paper Company of Montreal. The pulp has to be carried from St. Raymond by the Lake St. John Railway to Quebec and up to Montreal, a distance of 172 miles, and then back all the way by the Grand Trunk from Montreal to Windsor Mills, a distance of over 100 miles; whereas, if there was a bridge at Quebec the distance would not exceed 100 miles. The absence of a bridge at Quebec renders it impossible for the Lake St. John Railway, which is an enterprise of great importance to the Dominion, and which has accordingly been very largely subsidized, to accept freight that is offered it every day. I happen to be a director of the company, and I know that on several occasions proposals have come from firms to carry lumber of one kind and another from the Lake St. John region to the United States. On one occasion the company refused more than 1,000 carloads of lumber, which is supplied very largely from the country north of Quebec. We could not accept the offer, because it would have cost just as much for the crossing of the river at Quebec as to send the cars all the way to Montreal, and from Montreal by the Grand Trunk or Canadian Pacific Railway to the United States. These are the principal reasons why the citizens of Quebec consider it a question of life or death to them to obtain the construction of a bridge at that city. The cost of the bridge has been estimated at between $3,000,000 and $4,000,000. As to the traffic, estimates have been prepared by no less an authority than Mr. Walter Shanly. Taking only the present traffic between the south and north shores of the St. Lawrence, and supposing it would not increase, he has calculated that it would be sufficient to pay interest on the cost of the bridge. Then it was said, why should not the bridge be constructed by private enterprise, without any help from the Government? The answer is easily given. It is very well known that in enterprises of that kind much higher interest is demanded for money borrowed on the money market when the enterprise does not receive any public assistance. The assistance that is asked at this moment is not a bonus of $3,000,000 or $4,000,000, but only a guarantee of interest on certain bonds of the company necessary for the construction of the bridge. To the several demands made, not only by that company, but by influential delegations of citizens, delegations from the city council of Quebec, delegations from the board of trade, the Government have always promised more or less aid, or if the Government have not promised it directly, it has allowed the deputations to believe that some assistance would be given. The objection made at one time was that no complete plans had been prepared for the bridge and no estimate made. That objection does not exist longer. At this present moment there is a Bill before the House to continue the company's charter for a certain number of years. That company obtained assistance from the Local Government at Quebec, and plans and surveys very complete in their character, were prepared two years ago. The company is now in a position to say to this Government the kind of a bridge that is to be built, and the amount it will cost to build it. There is another point to which I desire to refer. The Local Government has found it to the advantage of the general interests of the province that such a bridge should be built, and during the last session but one of the Legislature of the Local Parliament subsidized the bridge to the extent of $1,000,000, that subsidy being made conditional upon this Parliament, which is more interested in the scheme than the Local Parliament, doing its share, that is to say, assisting in proportion to its means and its interest in this public undertaking. I need not say that the question of the bridge has come up at every election during the last ten years, especially during the last two general elections. It is a question brought forward before the electors, not only of the city, but of the whole district of Quebec. It interests not only the three divisions of Quebec, one of which I have the honour to represent, but also all the counties south and north of Quebec which do business in that city, all the way from Rimouski to Quebec on the south and Montmorency to Three Rivers on the north shore. The people of these counties have signed a petition, which has been presented to this Government, asking aid for the construction of a bridge at Quebec. Such was the condition of affairs when the last elections came on. In a previous debate, to which I need not refer, I spoke of what took place with respect to the other question brought prominently before the people of Quebec during the same visit made by Sir Charles Tupper to that city, and to which I alluded the other day. Sir Charles Tupper spoke of the scheme for the construction of the bridge. Here is what he is reported to have said on the subject:

"From the time he took the matter up as Minister of Railways, he had concluded that the bridge was necessary as a connection between the Intercolonial Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway. His old colleagues in the Government knew how strongly he held to that view. Yesterday he had met Mr. Schreiber, the Government Engineer of Railways, who had told him that there was no great difficulty in constructing the work, which was destined to make a great railroad centre of Quebec, and a great Atlantic summer port. In fact, he said, you may one and all regard that work as an accomplished fact."

He also said:

"He was certain that the traffic of the Quebec bridge would repay all that would be expended upon it, whether the different railways interested voted subsidies towards its construction or paid tolls for using it."

Those were the statements made by Sir Charles

Tupper, after having by telegram consulted Sir John Macdonald. As if that were not sufficient, the ministerial candidate for that division, Mr. Châteauvert, having on his right hand the Minister of Public Works, and on his left hand the Minister of Militia, both of whom were present, according to the paper, at a meeting where he was chosen as a candidate, spoke on the question of the bridge. I wish to call the attention of the House and of those two Ministers to this statement, and I want to know from them whether the statement is true or not. Mr. Châteauvert said:

"After having obtained from the Ottawa Government, through the influence of our Ministers, Sir H. Langevin and Sir A. Caron, the release of the million dollar debentures and a promise of assistance for the bridge between Quebec and Lévis, I should consider myself a bad citizen if I did not consent to come forward under circumstances so advantageous to the city."

There is the statement that, through the influence of the Ministers in question, Mr. Châteauvert had obtained a promise of assistance for the construction of that bridge, and, as I have already said, there can be no dispute of the correctness of the report of that speech, because it has been sent to all the electors of the division by Mr. Châteauvert himself. I have here a circular addressed to myself enclosing that speech, and in which Mr. Châteauvert states that this is a correct report of the remarks he made at this meeting which was attended by the two hon. Ministers I have referred to. Some time ago I put a question to the Government with respect to this speech. I asked the Government as to their intentions with regard to the bridge, and I asked the Ministers whether it was true that Mr. Châteauvert had made the speech and had obtained the promise. Here is the question I put:

"Whether it is true, as stated by Mr. Châteauvert, that he had secured from the Government the remission of the said million dollar debentures and a promise of aid for the said bridge? What is the nature of the aid so promised? When do the Government intend to introduce measures to carry out the remission of the said million dollar debentures and to assist in the construction of said bridge."

Here is the answer that was given to these questions by the Minister of Public Works:

"The Government are not aware that the article in question was published in that paper (*Courrier du Canada*) but they do know that Mr. Châteauvert exerted himself very much about the remission of the million dollars and about the bridge in question. The Government will introduce a measure about the million dollar debentures, but the remainder of the question I cannot answer now."

The article referred to, was the article containing that promissory note of Mr. Châteauvert promising to his constituents the remission of the $1,000,000 debentures and the assistance of the Government for the construction of the bridge. This is a very unsatisfactory answer; as a matter of fact, it is no answer at all to the principal portion of my question, and I am very much surprised that such an answer should be given by a Minister of the Crown. The principal part of my question was: whether it was true or not, as stated by Mr. Châteauvert in that speech, which was distributed broadcast all over the city of Quebec and especially in my division, that this promise was made to Mr. Châteauvert. That gentleman states, that through the influence of the two Ministers now sitting in their seats he obtained such a promise, and yet, one of the Ministers alluded to by Mr. Châteauvert was the very one who, I suppose, is charged by the Government to give that answer to my question. The hon. Minister did not say anything on that subject in his reply, he did not say whether it was true or not that such a promise had been made, and I ask him again now, is it true or is it untrue? If it is untrue that the promise has been made to Mr. Châteauvert, then Mr. Châteauvert would be branded in Quebec as a liar, and I would regret it very much, because he is a respectable citizen. There is no two ways about it; if the Ministers now state that they made no such promise, then Mr. Châteauvert told a lie to the citizens of Quebec, and he tried to get the votes of the electors under false pretences through that lie. On the other hand, if it is true that such a promise was made by the Ministers to Mr. Châteauvert, we want to know it, and we want to know also whether they intend to redeem that promise made to him, and in what manner they do intend to redeem it. That is the object of the motion I now make. There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that this speech of Sir Charles Tupper in Quebec, and that this promise which was spread broadcast through the city of Quebec as having been made by the Government, were all intended to bribe the city. Mr. Châteauvert said he was not boasting when he said that he had obtained this promise from the Government, and I think that I may state without boasting that very few other constituencies could have resisted such bribes as these which were used in the city of Quebec. It is well known that only one division was carried by the Conservatives in Quebec. I want to know if the people of Quebec are going to get assistance for this bridge; we do not want to get it as a bribe, we want to get it as a matter of justice to our city, which has been so neglected by this Government, and if it is not just we do not ask for it. The people of Quebec want a grant in favour of the construction of the bridge to be given as a matter of justice and as nothing else. I will await the reply of the hon. Minister whose name was mentioned as having given that promise on the part of the Government, and I want to know in that reply whether such a promise was made.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the full extent of the remarks which the hon. gentleman has just made in reference to two very important questions affecting Quebec. I thought possibly, from the remarks which I heard, that the answer to the question might be found in the information which the hon. gentleman has given to the House to-night. He said that, in so far as the bridge was concerned, that it was indicated that the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Intercolonial Railway would find it to their interest to build that bridge, and I, for one, am prepared to agree with my hon. friend in this and to think that for once he has been practical and has viewed the question from the standpoint of commercial interests. I am well known in Quebec to have been an advocate of the building of that bridge from the time the subject was first brought before the public; and I believe it can only be built when the different railway interests so combine as to make it a commercial necessity. Now, the hon. gentleman has referred to another question which is quite different from that of the bridge—the question of the $1,000,000 of bonds which are still in the hands of the Government, and which different in-

terests ask us to remit in exchange for the great commercial advantages which we could obtain for the city of Quebec; and my hon. friend and colleague, the Minister of Public Works, has announced to-day that a measure settling that question will be brought down. Until that measure comes down, the hon. gentleman is not in a position to discuss the policy of the Government; and when it does come down I am prepared, as a representative of the district of Quebec, to stand up and discuss that question with him. But, Sir, though I am an advocate of the building of that bridge, I never considered that the Government of this country should assume the responsibility of building it alone.

Mr. LANGELIER. Hear, hear.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. "Hear, hear," says the hon. gentleman, though I am only repeating what the hon. gentleman himself said. He says that when the combination of these various interests, the Intercolonial, the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway, make the building of that bridge a necessity, it will then be time for the Government of Canada——

Mr. LANGELIER. I said nothing of the kind. The hon. gentleman did not hear me. That was what I quoted from the remarks of Sir Charles Tupper.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That is exactly the position which the hon. gentleman has taken, because he says that all he knows about this bridge is what Sir Charles Tupper has promised, and the promise of Sir Charles Tupper is the promise of a man who knows the interests of Canada: and I am quite prepared to say that when that bridge becomes a commercial necessity from the development of the great railway interests at that point, then will be the time for the Government of Canada to discuss what proportion of help we can give towards the building of that bridge. Now, I know very well that the hon. gentleman feels very bitter against his late opponent in Quebec Centre because he was very nearly defeated by that gentleman.

Mr. LANGELIER. Not so nearly as the gentleman who was defeated in the County of Quebec.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I know that the hon. gentleman feels very sore, because he met there a foe who very nearly defeated him, and nearly prevented him from sitting in the seat he now occupies. I can say more than that. I can say that Mr. Châteauvert, in all his pledges to the electors, displayed that judgment which might be expected in a man occupying the prominent position which he does in commercial circles in Quebec, and never made any promises as a candidate on behalf of the Government which he should not have made. Now, Sir, when the papers are brought down and the Bill with regard to the $1,000,000 of bonds is introduced, if that Bill is not acceptable to the House, it will be time for the hon. gentleman to complain that the Government have not looked after the interests of the city of Quebec.

Mr. LANGELIER. The hon. gentleman does not seem to understand the remarks of Sir Charles Tupper any better than mine. He attributed to me some words which I quoted from the speech delivered by Sir Charles Tupper when he came to Quebec, but I said nothing of that kind myself. I did not say that we would have to wait until the Intercolonial, the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railways would build a bridge. If they would build a bridge, it would be unnecessary for us to come to Parliament to ask for assistance for it. I never talked such nonsense, nor did Sir Charles Tupper either. But here is what Sir Charles Tupper said on that occasion—I repeat it because the hon. Minister does not seem to have understood his remarks:

"You may, one and all, regard that work as a completed fact."

That is the statement of the paper.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That is exactly what I said.

Mr. LANGELIER. If it is an accomplished fact, according to the speech made by the hon. Minister, I must say that the bridge is much easier to build than we ever thought it would be. I wanted to know, when Mr. Chateauvert stated, not only in his spoken speech, in which allowance might be made for a slip of the tongue, but in the speech which he took the trouble to get printed and distributed, in the shape of a circular, broadcast through the city of Quebec, that:

"After having obtained from the Ottawa Government, through the influence of our Ministers, Sir Hector and Sir Adolphe, the remission of the $1,000,000 debentures and a promise of assistance for the bridge from Quebec to Lévis"——

He was only coming forward after having obtained that promise; he stated the truth. Did he ever obtain that promise? The hon. Minister did not say one word to show that he had made any such promise, or that any such promise had been given by the Government; but he said, when all those great commercial corporations, the Intercolonial, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway, agree, the Government will agree that they should let them build the bridge. That is the substance of what he said here. Is that what he said to Mr. Châteauvert? If it is, it is not what Mr. Châteauvert said to the citizens of Quebec. If we are to take as the truth what the hon. Minister said a few minutes ago, and we are bound to believe him, he made no such promise, and Mr. Châteauvert shamefully deceived the citizens of Quebec. The hon. Minister said that Mr. Châteauvert talked a good deal of common sense when speaking of that bridge. There is no question about Mr. Châteauvert's common sense, but what about his veracity? Did he tell the truth when he said to the citizens of Quebec that he had such an important promise, and was attempting to be elected on the faith of such promise. We have not been able to obtain from the Minister an answer, yes or no. I believe the Government never gave such a promise, or, if they did, they do not want to keep their word.

Motion agreed to.

THE CASE OF WILLIAM LAIDLOW.

Mr. McMULLEN moved for:

Return of all letters, correspondence and papers relating to the cause of the resignation and removal of William Laidlow, of Arthur, from the North-West Mounted Police, and all papers and correspondence relating to his application for compensation for the loss of his thumb while in the service; also, the award of compensation paid him, if any.

He said: In 1874, Mr. William Laidlow engaged in the first corps of the Mounted Police that went

up to the North-West. He went from Port Arthur to the Rocky Mountains and back, and was some fourteen months in the service. Unfortunately, while in the service he lost the thumb of his right hand. He had been a widower before he left, and had lost all his property, leaving some four children in the care of his father-in-law, his intention being, if possible, to serve out his period of service in the police and then take up land in the North-West and establish himself and his family there. Unfortunately, however, he suffered the accident to which I have referred, and was compelled to obtain his release. That was in the year 1876. He made at the same time an application to be compensated for the loss he had sustained, and his petition came before the Secretary of State, who was the Minister then in charge of the Mounted Police. The Secretary of State, after considering the matter, wrote to the then member for the county I have the honour to represent, Mr. Drew, now Judge Drew, and to which county this man Laidlow belongs, to say that all the Government could allow him was his expenses home and one month's pay. Mr. Drew had pressed very strongly upon the Secretary of State that something should be done for this man, and this was the reply given. The poor man had to accept this, and returned home, and from that day to this he has not been able to get a single cent in addition. I think it is a very great hardship that the law should be in such a state that a man who engaged in the Mounted Police Force at its inception, and underwent all the hardships and privations to which those who first composed the force were subjected, should not receive some remuneration for the loss occasioned by his labours in that force. The loss of his thumb was due to the fact that after the doctor performed the operations in the first place, owing to the exposure which this man had to suffer without shelter from the inclemency of the weather, he had to undergo a second operation, and, finally, a third, and in that way he almost entirely lost the use of his right hand. The commanding officer under whom he served reports that he was a most efficient and attentive servant, discharging his duties faithfully and well, and that by the accident he met he was rendered unfit for work. Now, I hold that it is a cruel thing that this man who has suffered so serious a loss—a loss which has compelled him to be a burden on his friends ever since, his father-in-law having virtually to keep both him and his family—should be sent adrift with only one month's pay, and have had to struggle along some sixteen or seventeen years in that condition without getting a single farthing. Those who went to the North-West during the rebellion were dealt with very generously, and justly so, by this House and the country, and I think that somewhat similar treatment should be meted out to those who were the pioneers of the Mounted Police Force, and who suffered the privations the men had to undergo at the outset. It is nothing short of an outrage to force that man, who has to work out the balance of his life with only one hand, and that the left, to be a burden on his friends, through an accident suffered by him in his country's service. My principal object, in moving for these papers, is to give the hon. Minister an opportunity to reconsider the whole question from the beginning. If the hon. gentleman will refer to the officers under whom Mr. Laidlow served, he will find that Mr. Laidlow was an efficient and faithful man, and it is with the hope that the Minister will be able to see his way to giving the man some remuneration, I make this motion. I believe an alteration has been made in the statute, and that those who now suffer loss in the service by accident are allowed a certain pension. I think it is right they should be, and I hope that, if the law stands in the way of this man receiving some consideration for the privation to which he has been subjected, even if the action of this House is necessary to reach an unfortunate case of this kind, the Minister of the Interior will ask for such legislation as will enable him to deal with the case, which bears on its face evidence of gross injustice and evidence that this man, who has submitted to this condition of things for seventeen years, should have some consideration. I have no personal interest in this matter except sympathy for the man and for his children. I know the circumstances of himself, his family and his friends, and I know the struggling efforts of himself and his relations to get along and support these children. I hope some step will be taken, and that the Minister of the Interior will ask power to enable him to reach this case in some way. I am sorry that, when this case came before Mr. Mackenzie's Government in 1876 or 1877, no settlement was made and nothing was done. I do not desire to reflect upon any person, but I very seriously regret that the law was in such a shape that nothing was done. Something should have been done, and, if the law establishing the Force barred the way, the Government should have got such legislation as would enable them to reach a case of this kind.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not think anyone can object to the hon. gentleman bringing this matter before the House at this time, although the accident he refers to occurred to this policeman some sixteen or seventeen years ago, nor do I think it is too late to do justice to the man if at that time an injustice was done to him. The accident which is referred to by the hon. member (Mr. McMullen) was, I believe, the loss of his thumb in connection with the coupling of a waggon or something of that kind; at least so it was reported. The matter was reported to the department here shortly after it occurred, and an investigation was ordered. As I understand, the doctor's report was that the injury to the thumb did not originate from the accident with the waggon, but from an old whitlow from which the man had been suffering for some time. However, an enquiry was made, and I think it went further than the Secretary of State. I think the Minister of Justice, the Hon. Mr. Blake, reported against any material amount being given to this man, and probably that resulted in his receiving his month's pay and his passage back to his home. At any rate, an investigation was held, and I think the matter was carefully considered by the gentleman who then had charge of the Mounted Police Force. I understand that the officer who was in charge of his company will be in Ottawa to-morrow or on Monday, and the sergeant-major, who is now an inspector in the Force, is available. From both of these officers we can get further information in regard to the case. If we find that the enquiry made before obtained incorrect information, if the commanding officer is aware of the facts of the case, and the sergeant-major, who was with him when the accident oc-

curred, can give information on the subject, I shall take pleasure in asking my colleagues to allow me to put a sum in the Estimates in order to recompense that man. I will see that this is not the last of it, and I will bring the papers down at once and make the further enquiry I have mentioned.

Motion agreed to.

SETTLERS ON VANCOUVER ISLAND RAILWAY RESERVE.

Mr. LAURIER moved for:

Copies of all reports by any officer of the Department of the Interior, on the complaints of settlers in the Districts of Cranberry, Cedar, Wellington, Nanoose and Nanaimo, British Columbia, in reference to their claims on lands comprised in the Island Railway Reserve.

He said: The Minister of the Interior will probably remember that last year I brought to the notice of the House the complaints of certain settlers in the section of country referred to in this motion, who complained of a very serious grievance. That grievance was that they had settled in good faith upon lands which afterwards were reserved for the railway from Esquimalt to Nanaimo, and that, therefore, they were entitled to all the benefits accruing to settlers, and that their patents should convey to them, not only the surface, but the minerals as well—perhaps not the precious metals, which are ordinarily reserved to the Crown, but the ordinary minerals. But the patents conveyed to them only the surface. When I brought the matter to the attention of the Minister of the Interior last year, he promised that at an early day in the recess he would cause an officer of his department to go to the island and investigate the claims of the settlers. This is what he said:

"An officer of the department will be sent at an early day to investigate the alleged grievances, with the view of ascertaining the rights of the squatters under the said Act, and the patent of the company."

My present object is to ascertain, first, whether the promise then made by the Minister of the Interior has been redeemed, whether an officer has been sent over there, and, if so, to have a copy of his report laid on the Table of the House.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I recollect very well the hon. the leader of the Opposition bringing this matter to the notice of the House last session, and also the promise which I made that some means would be taken during recess to enquire into the grievances complained of. The hon. member states that the settlers on what was known as the Railway Belt on the Nanaimo and Esquimalt Railway, or a number of them, appeared to have had grievances, and there are two or three classes of those grievances depending upon the different times when they settled within that reservation. Immediately after the close of the session I brought the matter before my colleagues, and it was proposed to send out Mr. Burgess, who is acquainted with all the circumstances of the case, and to join with him Mr. Aikman, who, up to a late period, had been one of our Dominion Land Commissioners, but who had left and was then practising as a barrister with his partner in the city of Victoria. Mr. Burgess left on that mission, but before he reached Winnipeg we received information that Mr. Aikman was not available for the purpose. I was then about leaving myself on an official visit to British Columbia, and I determined, when there, to make enquiries into the circumstances myself, so far as I was able. On my arrival in Victoria, I found that one of these cases which were mentioned by the hon. gentleman, was before the court in Victoria, and I thought it unadvisable at that time either to make an investigation myself or to have one made through another party.

Mr. LAURIER. Is that the case of Heoggan?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes. It was subsequently, I think, taken to the Court of Appeal, and the judgment, whatever it was, of the first court was sustained, and, I think, to-day it has been argued before the Supreme Court here. Those are the circumstances with regard to the investigation which I have mentioned, and the case remains practically as it was before the hon. member moved in the House last year in reference to it. The case, I think, involves questions of an intricate character, and, when we get a decision from the Supreme Court, we shall be far better able to come to a decision as to what action we shall take in the matter.

Mr. LAURIER. It seems to me that the answers given by the Minister of the Interior are not at all satisfactory. A solemn promise had been made to the House that these cases would be investigated. They were not investigated, and what is the reason? The reason given is that litigation is going on between two parties. I know something of the case to which the hon. gentleman refers, though I do not pretend to be quite familiar with it. If my information is correct, and I believe it to be correct, this case of Heoggan does not turn at all upon the grievances of the settlers. It is a case between settler and settler, not a case arising out of complaints made by other settlers: that is to say, it is not an endeavour to obtain from the Crown the minerals to which they believe they are entitled by their patents, but it is a case between one settler and another settler as to the ownership of a piece of land which is in dispute between the two. So that, if my information is correct, the hon. gentleman is altogether misinformed as to the nature of the case, and his information would certainly lead to what will be a denial of justice to these men. It matters little, however, whether the case of Heoggan turned upon the question at issue now or not. A promise has been made to the settlers who have been, as I am told, year after year seeking to obtain from the Government a decision as to what their rights were under their patents. Certainly, whatever their position may be, the answer we have from the Government is simply that they do not know whether, in the opinion of the Department of Justice, these men are entitled to the minerals or not. This question should have been investigated. Now, what is the consequence of delay? Another year must elapse before these men will know where they stand. I am not conversant myself with the matter, but, judging from the answer of the Minister, it seems to me, under the circumstances, that it will amount to an absolute denial of justice on the part of the Government.

Mr. DEWDNEY. All that I can say is that I acted in accordance with my own judgment at that time, and I thought I was acting in the interest of the settlers when I refused to make an investigation which might prejudice their case before the courts.

Motion agreed to.

RAILWAY BRIDGE AT QUEBEC.

Mr. LAURIER moved for:

Copy of the report of Collingwood Schreiber, Esq., upon survey made by him, of the River St. Lawrence immediately opposite and in the vicinity of the city of Quebec, for the purpose of ascertaining whether it was possible to build a railway bridge there.

He said: I desire to ask the Minister of Public Works if the report of Mr. Schreiber will be brought down on the motion of the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier)? If so, my motion will be without any object.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Let the hon. gentleman make his motion, and let the two go together.

Mr. LANGELIER. May I press on the Minister of Public Works the importance of bringing down the report as early as possible At the next meeting of the Railway Committee the Bill to continue the charter of the company, which was formed some years ago for the construction of the bridge, is to come up, and it is of the highest importance for the consideration of the Bill that Mr. Schreiber's report should be before the Committee. Sir Charles Tupper stated in his speech delivered at Quebec that Mr. Schreiber had made a favourable report on the bridge, and it will, no doubt, have considerable influence on the Committee, in considering the Bill for the continuance of the charter, and also, I hope, with the Government when they are called on to give a subsidy to that company.

Motion agreed to.

SHOALS AT ST. JEAN DESCHAILLONS.

Mr. RINFRET (translation) moved for:

Copies of all correspondence, letters, reports and paper writings of every description, respecting the dredging of the River St. Lawrence, and the lifting and removal of the boulders from the shoals of St. Jean Deschaillons.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) I wish to ask the hon. member if he really desires to obtain all the information mentioned in his motion. The motion has the following: "All correspondence, letters, reports and paper writings of every description respecting the dredging of the River St. Lawrence." I believe the hon. member could restrict his request to the latter part of his motion, for the information wanted in the other part covers the whole of the River St. Lawrence, and it would be a work of several months to prepare such.

Mr. RINFRET. (Translation.) I believe there is an error in the translation of my motion. What I mean to ask for is the papers relating to the dredging of the river and removal of boulders on the shoal only.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) I would suggest to the hon. member to strike off from his motion the words "the dredging of the River St. Lawrence" after the word "respecting."

Mr. RINFRET. (Translation.) I have no objection to the striking off of those words.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

DOMINION AID TO RAILWAYS.

Mr. McMULLEN moved for:

Return showing: 1. The names of the several railways in the Dominion to which Dominion aid has been granted, except the Canadian Pacific main line and Soo Branch; 2. The province within which the said railway, in whole or in part, is located, and if located in two or more provinces, the number of miles in each; 3. The county or counties through which the said lines run in each province: 4. The amount of money paid to each up to the 1st January, 1891: 5. The railways built in the Dominion by the Dominion since Confederation, excepting the main line of the Intercolonial and main line of the Canadian Pacific: 6. The province within which built: 7. The entire cost of each line built in each province, including equipment: 8. The entire sum spent up to 1st January last, on the construction of Dominion roads in each province, excepting the Intercolonial main line and Canadian Pacific main line.

He said: There has been considerable agitation, more particularly in the Province of Ontario, with regard to a refund being made to sections of the province which have built railways at the entire cost of the people of those sections and of the Ontario Government. A very large deputation came here during the session and waited on the late First Minister and the Minister of Finance for the purpose of presenting their claims for a refund of a portion of the money so expended. The railway statistics issued each year do not contain the information I desire to obtain by this motion, hence the necessity of asking for the return. The deputation that waited on the Ministers was a very large and influential one. But there were a great many places represented that should not have been represented, such, for instance, as towns along the line of the Grand Trunk, which never contributed a dollar towards the building of that road, because no municipal bonuses were granted, and the towns sold out their stock at par value. Other places were represented that had already, under the present policy of the Dominion Government, received aid for competing lines, such as Kingston, Guelph and many other towns. I consider these places do not stand in the same relation to this important question as other sections that have never received a dollar from the Dominion treasury towards the construction of their roads. It is an important question, and the people of the section from which I come, and also the people in the Counties of Bruce and Huron, and a portion of the County of Grey, will not rest satisfied with anything short of receiving some sort of return for the enormous sums spent on railways, while railways have been built in other portions of the Dominion, in some cases entirely at the cost of the Dominion and in others largely subsidized from the Dominion treasury. It is quite clear to anyone who will investigate the claim presented, that it is a just and equitable one. The First Minister very generously and kindly promised to give the subject his serious and careful consideration. Unfortunately he is not here to do that now. Last year, when I brought the question before the House he stated that, if a case was presented to the Government during this session, they would take it up and consider it. A deputation came here for that purpose. The First Minister's reply was in the direction of giving some encouragement at least, although no immediate relief, but he promised the Government would give the question careful consideration, and if some scheme was devised whereby those sections that had been called on to provide for themselves the necessary accommodation and to contribute such large sums of money could be recouped in some way, the Government would consider it. The object of this resolution is to enable those sections, and all other sections, to ascertain the extent to which the people have contri-

buted towards the construction of railways and the extent to which other sections have been benefited by the expenditure for the construction of Dominion lines, or by sums of money granted to bonus competing lines, or lines entering into new territory. I have no desire to detain the House with further remarks at this stage, but I intend before the close of the session to bring the whole question before the House by resolution.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman will find most of the information asked for in this motion in the railway statistics and in the report of the Minister of that department, but I have no doubt that he desires to have a compilation of the whole as a matter of easy reference. I think a moment's reflection will show the hon. gentleman that it will take some time before it can be prepared in the complete state in which he requires it. Take, for instance, the seventh paragraph of the motion in which he asks "for the entire cost of each line built in each province including the equipment." It would be somewhat difficult, I think, to give the information required by that paragraph, because, if I understand it aright, it applies to all the railways which have been built in each province in the Dominion since Confederation, whether by private parties, or by the Dominion, or the Provincial Governments. The hon. gentleman shakes his head as if I do not read it aright. If I am in error as to his meaning I think it would be well that the paragraph should be more explicit in order that the Railway Department, when they set their clerks at work to prepare the return, should know precisely what the hon. gentleman wants. The paragraph does not say, you will observe, that it refers to roads built by the Dominion or by provincial or other aid, but it makes a bald request for the entire cost of each line built in each province, including the equipment. I will also call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the first paragraph of the motion in which he makes an exception to the Canadian Pacific Railway main line and the "Soo" Branch. I do not know why the hon. gentleman has added the "Soo" Branch, because it implies that Government aid of some kind has been given to that road. I believe the House is aware that the Dominion Government has never extended any aid to the "Soo" Branch which was built entirely out of the resources of the Canadian Pacific Railway. If I might be permitted I would suggest the propriety of striking out the words "the Soo Branch" in that paragraph, for I do not suppose the hon. gentleman wishes to have the motion pass in such a manner as would imply that aid has been given to a road which has received no aid. As far as the information can be obtained by the department it will be prepared and brought down as early as possible.

Mr. McMULLEN. My reason for leaving out the main lines of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Intercolonial Railway was this: The Dominion was supposed to be committed to the construction of those lines. The Intercolonial Railway is looked upon as a necessity and so is the Canadian Pacific Railway. It was undoubtedly understood at Confederation that the Intercolonial Railway should be built, and it is understood also that the Dominion should construct the Canadian Pacific Railway. Consequently I consider that the money spent on these lines was spent in accordance with the understanding that the Government had to carry out.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman will understand that I only made objection to the "Soo" line being included.

Mr. McMULLEN. I was not aware that no aid was given to the "Soo" line, and I am quite willing that that should be dropped out of the paragraph. As regards the seventh paragraph, I will consent that it should read "the entire cost of each line built or assisted in each province by the Dominion." That was my object in asking for the return, and I am quite willing that it should be confined to those lines assisted by the Dominion.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think it is very desirable that we should get the information as fully as possible, which is asked for by the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). I was one of those who attended the deputation which waited on the First Minister some time ago in reference to the refund of these bonuses. The difficulty complained of by the First Minister at that time was just the difficulty which is sought to be removed by the return asked for in this resolution, for none of those gentlemen who spoke on that occasion were able to lay clearly before the First Minister the various places in which Dominion aid had been granted. This return now asked for, if made out fully and thoroughly, will enable the Government to see whether all these people who ask for a refund have a clear and a distinct right to receive it. It will at once settle that question and remove that objection. Certainly it did appear to me, as it appeared to the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), that there were gentlemen attending that deputation who could scarcely expect any refund for their localities as they had already had public money expended in them and it would be impossible for them to get a refund. In fact it did appear to me that the deputation was so unwieldly, embracing so many and widely different interests, and involving such a large outlay of public money, that the Government could not entertain their proposals. Instead of there being a sincere desire to secure to these localities that had a right to the refund, that had reasonable grounds to expect the refund, and from the assurance given by the First Minister last session that their claims would be considered, the unwieldly character of the deputation would have a tendency to prevent these localities which had a right to expect it, getting justice. On that ground I regretted the composition of the deputation, because I know, and I think the members of the Government know, that there are some counties which have never received any public money, and which have been paying all along to enterprises which have been assisted by the Government in other localities. It is on behalf of these counties that we want to get the clearest and most distinct information that it is possible for the Government to give, so that there will be no invidious distinction made, and so that there will be no counties or localities coming to the Government asking for aid unless they are entitled to it. It is only through the fullest and most ample knowledge which we can obtain from the Government that we will be able, and that the Government itself will be able to arrive at a decision as to the justice of the claims put forward. The county from which I come has a perfect right to a refund of some portion of the railway bonuses

which it has granted. The people of that county have not only very largely built railways for themselves, but they have contributed by taxation to the building of railways all through the Dominion, without having had any public money for railways expended there. I remember that the late First Minister stated to the gentlemen who waited upon him: "Are you prepared to show the Government the position you occupy in reference to these claims?" They were unable to lay all the necessary information before him, and for that reason he could hold out very little hope of any refund being made to them. Now, this matter has been before this House on several occasions. I had the honour of bringing it before the House the first time several years ago, when the Dominion had entered upon the policy of taking over local roads and making them roads of Dominion concern. The claims of these localities have since that time become so strong that justice demands that they should be satisfied in the near future. For instance, in the County of Grey there has never been a single public building erected, or a single dollar expended by the Government on railways. I believe it is the same with the County of Bruce as to railways, and I know that very little, if any, public money has been expended in North Wellington. But these sections have contributed largely to building local roads elsewhere, and I think the time has come when their claims should be considered. I am glad the hon. member has brought this question up again. When it was brought up last year the late First Minister told the hon. member for North Wellington that if the claims of those localities which appeared so strong were brought before the Government they would be considered this session. It is no answer to those claims to say that to satisfy them will involve a very large sum of money, and I do not think that objection will prevent the Government or the House from doing justice to those localities which are entitled to it. I am very glad to find that the question is still engaging the attention of Parliament, and I believe that the claims of localities such as that from which I come are so strong that the Government will be obliged at no distant day to look into them and settle them.

Mr. WATSON. While this question is before the House, I deem it my duty to call its attention to the claims of the county which I represent. That county has aided largely in the construction of a railway for opening up and developing a large section of the country, and I think that it has a strong claim for compensation for the money which it has expended. In 1873 and up to 1880 the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, as surveyed, was intended to run through the county I represent, along the route now taken by the Manitoba and North-Western Railway. In 1881 the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway was deflected south; consequently the people who went into that country from 1873 to 1881 were deprived of the advantage of having the road run through the district, according to promise. A local charter was obtained by the North-Western people for the construction of a road to accommodate the settlers, which had to be bonused by the various municipalities of the district with cash bonuses to the following amounts: Portage la Prairie, $50,000; Westbourne, $75,000; Shoal Lake, $20,000; Birtle, $40,000; Neepawa, $17,000; Minnedosa, $25,000; Rapid City, $10,000; and Birtle Town, $12,000; amounting in all to $249,000. Now, the expenditure of these moneys has benefited the Government to a great extent, because it had the effect of opening up a tract of country and securing the construction of a road which has increased the value of lands belonging to the Dominion. Therefore, I think the Government should, in all fairness, reimburse those municipalities in the amounts which they have expended in this way. No cash subsidy has been given to any railway in Manitoba, except to the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is true, some roads have received land grants: but large sums of money have been paid to assist local competing roads in the eastern provinces. About $34,000,000 has been voted since 1882, of which I believe $24,000,000 has been paid, while not one dollar in cash has been granted to any road in Manitoba. I think the municipalities I represent have a strong claim on the Government to be reimbursed for the expenditure they have made in building a road which was promised to be built for them previous to the settlement of the country.

Motion agreed to.

CLAIM OF DR. WALKER.

Mr. BAIN moved for:

Copies of Order in Council, correspondence, reports, statement of claims, receipts or accounts with or made by Dr. Walker, or on his behalf, or with or by any other person, respecting the Dundas and Waterloo Macadamized Road, since the close of the session of 1889.

He said: This is a matter that I have at intervals brought before the House during a long series of years. It was one of the questions between the Minister of Public Works and myself. The purchaser, after he realized that he could not acquire a title to the property, like any other man having an eye to his own interests, was not particularly anxious to expend any very large sum of money in keeping this road in repair; and at intervals I used to draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to this question. But I am bound to say that the masterly inactivity he displayed was always too much for me; and if the Minister of Justice had not finally come to the rescue and declared that the work belonged to the Province of Ontario and not to the Dominion, I suppose we should have continued indefinitely to go over the whole difficulty. However, about the close of last year it was decreed, on investigation of the original papers, that the Dominion were not the proper owners of this property, and to-night I am only asking for the completion of the papers in connection with that road, from the time I brought it last before the House in 1889. I may say this, however, that the condition of the road was such that as soon as the winter frost broke up this season, the bottom, in two or three places, disappeared altogether, and the authorities were obliged to make temporary repairs to enable people to pass at all. Under these circumstances, I felt it was a matter of great interest to us to know as far as possible what amount of money the occupant acquired out of the road and what amount he claims he has expended on it. It is simply for this purpose I make the motion to-night, and will then say good-bye to my hon. friend the Minister on this question.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am sorry the hon. gentleman parts from me in this way, as we have been

good friends for several years in this matter. Although he applies the term "masterly inactivity" to me, nevertheless he may be sure that if I could have obtained a decision before it would have been given: but there were great difficulties in ascertaining, first, whether this was a military road, and then whether it belonged to the Province of Ontario or to the Dominion. Finally, after having obtained what information we could on the subject, the whole matter was referred to the Department of Justice, which, after careful investigation, decided that it belonged to the Province of Ontario. The hon. gentleman says that the bottom has disappeared in some places. Well, we cannot help that, but at all events what remains has been declared to belong to the Province of Ontario. An Order in Council was passed to that effect and sent to the Government of Ontario. Dr. Walker has made a claim, but I must be excused if I do not discuss that claim here, because it must be considered elsewhere, and if Dr. Walker has a good claim, of course it will have to be decided in his favour. It would not be convenient, however, to discuss a question of that kind here. The proper place is in the department, and most likely the final decision will be given by the Department of Justice. The papers will be brought down.

Motion agreed to.

H. M. S. *LILY*—RESCUE OF CREW.

Mr. EDGAR moved for:

Copies of all papers and correspondence in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, relating to the saving of the lives of part of the crew of H.M.S. *Lily*, wrecked on the coast of Labrador, in September, 1889.

He said: It is not often that a member of this House has so agreeable a duty to perform as I have on this occasion. I have been asked to bring before the House an instance of remarkable bravery and heroism displayed by the family of a Canadian lighthouse-keeper, the story of which should be known from one end of Canada to the other. I am not personally familar with the facts, but they have been vouched for, and I have been requested to bring them forward by a gentleman whose name is a household word in Canada for everything that is kindly and chivalrous and true. It is only necessary for me to mention the name of the Hon. J. G. Joly, of Quebec, as the gentleman who asked me to bring this matter forward, to satisfy the House in advance as to the merits of the case. It appears that H.M.S. *Lily* was wrecked in the Straits of Belle Isle in September, 1889, and the following are the circumstances of the case as given by Mr. T. Wyatt:—

"The wreck of H. M. S. *Lily* took place on the 16th September, 1889, between four and five in the afternoon, at Forteau Light Station (marked on the maps as Pointe Amour, Straits of Belle Isle, Labrador coast) during a terrible gale from the south-west, and one of the thickest fogs ever seen there—what we call a black fog. Our fog-alarm had been sounding regularly for the last eighteen hours. Between 4 and 5 p. m. my son, Thomas Wyatt, who was in charge of the fog-alarm, and has since succeeded me in the charge of lighthouse-keeper at Forteau, heard the sound of a steamer's whistle, out at sea, followed immediately by two short blasts. He ran down to the water's edge, and heard a steam vessel, which he could not see, owing to the fog, blowing off steam, and soon after heard loud screams and saw a number of men struggling towards shore, in a terrible surf.

"My son ran up at once for ropes, which he brought down, accompanied by two men, Jack Davis and William Cannon, and by my wife, my daughter, eleven years old, and our maid servant, who helped the men to carry the ropes. My son, with a rope around his waist, the end of which was held ashore by the two men above mentioned to prevent the under-tow from dragging him out to sea, rushed into the surf.

"He had a heaving line in his hand, which he flung to one man and brought him safe ashore; then he saved two more in the same way. He then attempted to save a fourth, who was so helpless that the sea was rolling him over, but ultimately he managed to tangle his heaving line around him and brought him near enough to take him up in his arms and carried him ashore, senseless.

"He went in again and managed to throw his line to an officer, whom he brought ashore safely. In attempting to save a sixth man, a coloured sailor, he was drawn out by the under-tow and drew after him the two men who were holding with the rope, and nearly perished.

"Twenty-one men managed to reach the shore, that evening, in a state of exhaustion, some with no clothes on, having stripped to save themselves; seven perished in the attempt. Knowing how little chance those who had remained on the wreck had of reaching shore by swimming in such a surf, Thos. Wyatt attempted to make them remain on board, he ventured out in the surf as far as possible, and shouted with a speaking trumpet, but they could not understand him. One of the officers saved, then asked him if he could telegraph by the sound of the fog-horn. Owing to the construction of the new fog-horn actually in use, he could not do so with it, but he ran to the old steam whistle, not in use, a quarter of a mile away, got up steam, and with some knowledge he had of telegraphing and the help of one of those who had been saved from the *Lily*, a signal man, who was so weak that he had to be supported while he pressed my son's arm, heavily for a long sign, lightly for a short one, so as to indicate the different letters, he succeeded in sending the following message to the *Lily*:—'Stay on board if possible. Don't attempt to come ashore; life-line fouled on rocks in bottom, midway.'

"This was the means of saving valuable lives among the seventy or eighty men still on board. They waited until the next morning, when the sea went down considerably, and they were then able with a small boat, the only one left to the *Lily* (as all her other boats had been smashed in launching, except one that only landed next day) to bring a life-line ashore from the wreck; a hawser was stretched and a boatswain's chair rigged, by means of which all those remaining on board were saved, the captain being the last to leave the ship.

"When all the survivors were crowded in the lighthouse the order was given 'hats off,' and the chaplain of the *Lily* returned thanks to God and all joined heartily in the Lord's prayer.

"The lighthouse-keeper's wife and children did all they could to comfort the poor sailors (my wife even clothing some with her own clothes). They gave them all they had, provisions, blankets, everything, and spared themselves in no way in nursing those that were saved through the surf and were almost gone when they reached land. The names of the officers of the *Lily* that I can remember are:—Commander, Gerald W. Russell; First Lieutenant, John G. Hewitt, and Henry W. Sharpe.

"The old lighthouse-keeper, in giving this account, says he does so, not for the sake of reward, but that our country may know that the Canadian lighthouse-keepers can do their duty, and that their wives and children will stand by them, with open hearts and open doors, to relieve those in distress.

"It appears that these services have been promptly acknowledged by the Lords of the Admiralty. Sir Baldwin Baker, Baronet, Captain of H.M.S. *Emerald*, on arriving in Forteau Bay in the spring of 1890, sent for young Wyatt, and on the deck of his ship, in the presence of officers and crew, presented him with a beautiful clock, on which was engraved the following inscription:—

"'Presented to Mrs. Wyatt, Mr. Thomas Wyatt and the members of their family, by the Lords and Commissioners of the Admiralty, in recognition of their valuable assistance and kindness and hospitality on the occasion of the wreck of H.M.S. *Lily*, September, 1889.'"

Now, when the ponderous machinery of the Imperial Government was set in motion and the services of these people were recognized publicly so long ago as the spring of 1890, I would be sorry to hear that the Canadian Government had not done its duty in that way. I am informed that this young man Wyatt has already succeeded his father in the position of lighthouse-keeper, and that, I have no doubt, is some practical acknowledgment of his

services, but I think we would all be glad to know that, if the Government had not already done so, they will soon do what is right and proper to acknowledge the services of these people; and, at any rate, I am sure every member in this House will agree with me that Canada should be proud indeed that she has such faithful servants along her stormy coasts, who are willing to risk their lives in the attempt to rescue vessels and human beings in distress.

Mr. TUPPER. I suppose it would be only proper that I should say a word upon this subject. From enquiries that I have recently made, it appears that the heroic action of this light-keeper—which I say with great pride is not an uncommon thing to hear of the light-keepers on our coasts, for, whenever there is distress or has been distress in the vicinity of the different light stations I have yet to learn of an instance where a light-keeper has played any other part than that of a true man—in this particular case the facts have not been presented to me or have not come to my knowledge in the succinct manner of the statement made by the hon. gentleman who has made this motion. I have learned, however, that when my deputy was in Halifax, N.S., shortly after the occurrence of this disaster, the Admiral on the station, Admiral Watson, consulted with him in regard to the matter, and the papers and the account of the transaction were forwarded at once and promptly to the Admiralty, and not to me. Certainly they were not brought to my personal notice, and it was only after seeing this notice in the paper that I became aware that the usual course in these matters had not been followed, and it has not yet been followed, as I understand. Certainly, this is a case which deserves the best consideration that can be given to it, and the best recognition that can be given at the hands of our department. I understood that the Admiralty had sent the reward and presented it in the most solemn and impressive manner to the light-keeper, but the incident to which reference has been made at such length only came to my personal knowledge a short time ago. It speaks a good deal for the modesty as well as the bravery of the men in question, that they have not been active in pressing upon the department the incidents connected with this transaction. It will give me the greatest possible pleasure, if it be not too late, to show that the Canadian Government is glad to appreciate, and reward, and encourage any such conduct as that which has been described to-night.

Motion agreed to.

PUBLIC WORKS EXPENDITURES.

Mr. LANDERKIN moved for:

Return showing the amount of money expended and the date of expenditure in each electoral district since Confederation, under the following heads:—(1.) Public Buildings; (2.) Harbours and Rivers; (3.) Roads and Bridges; (4.) Telegraph Lines.

He said: I have thought that the information I have asked for in this return would be very valuable to members of the House during the session, and it can be compiled very easily and speedily. Perhaps it would be well to substitute the year for the date.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I would suggest, first, that instead of saying the date of the expense, we should say the year.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I suggested that.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN Then, as to the fourth item, concerning telegraph lines, the hon. gentleman must see the difficulty there would be in giving him that information because the question covers each electoral district, whereas a telegraph line usually runs through several districts. However, we will do the best we can.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Perhaps we might as well drop the telegraph lines.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of the pay-roll of the last military camp at Sorel and St. John's, P. Q.—(Mr. Lépine.)

Statement showing: (*a*) The number of suits which have been instituted by the Government against persons accused or suspected of smuggling within the Province of Quebec, and of having introduced therein intoxicating liquors without paying the duties imposed thereon by law, from 1887 up to the month of March, 1891; (*b*) The names of the persons against whom suits have been brought in the premises; (*c*) The respective places of residence of these persons; (*d*) The names of such of these persons as have been condemned; and the sums to the payment of which they have been condemned, respectively; (*e*) The dates upon which they have thus been condemned; (*f*) The nature of the judgment rendered against each of them, and the amount thereof; (*g*) Whether the persons thus condemned have paid to the Government the amount of the judgment rendered against them, and whether further proceedings have been instituted against those who have not paid this amount; (*h*) The sums the Government has in this way received, since the said first above-mentioned date, from the persons thus condemned to pay the penalties, under the judgments; (*i*) The names of the advocates who were employed by the Government to conduct the said suits and proceedings; (*j*) The amounts which the Government paid to each of the said advocates in connection with the said suits; (*k*) The suits of a similar nature, now pending in the courts; (*l*) The amount of the account filed by each of the said advocates for his services in connection with such suits and proceedings.—(Mr. Delisle.)

ADJOURNMENT.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 19th June, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. DAVIN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 110) to amend the Railway Act. He said: This is a very important measure. It contains a clause that was in the Railway Amending Act of last session dealing with prairie fires. This clause is one which the people of the North-West Territories take a great interest in, and, after the late Sir John Macdonald had agreed with me to insert this clause in the Government Bill, great discontent was felt when it was found that the Senate excised the clause. What happened is this: When the Bill, having been printed with the clause embodying the provisions of a resolution I had on the paper was sent up to the Senate, it was referred to the

Railway Committee. A large number of railway men being in that committee room, great interest was manifested in the clause by them, and the clause was struck out in the committee. When the Bill came down, I went up at once and spoke to a leading member of the Senate, and said: "How is this? The Government accepted my clause; it goes up to the Senate, and it comes back with that clause excised." I was then told that our own North-West senators had done this; and I went and saw my friend Mr. Perley, who, I understood, had moved in the committee that the clause should be dropped, and he told me that he had done so, and explained to me a much better scheme that he had for protection against prairie fires. That scheme I have not seen take shape anywhere, but when I went to Mr. Lougheed I found that he, instead of being opposed to the clause, was in favour of it, and he said that he had seen more interest taken in it by certain members of the Senate on that committee than he had ever noticed before. Now, Sir, I move this clause. It runs somewhat like this:

"Every railway in the North-West Territories shall have the right to enter upon uncultivated land within 200 feet on each side of the track for the purpose of ploughing a fire guard, and shall burn off the grass between the fire guard and the track. Every railway in the North-West Territories shall, not later than the 30th June in each year, through the uncultivated lands where the Railway Committee of the Privy Council may order or direct from time to time, plough a fire guard six feet wide on each side of the track parallel thereto, and not less than 200 feet distant therefrom, and, as far as practicable, burn off the prairie grass between such fire guard and the track: and every railway failing to comply with the order or direction of the Privy Council in this behalf shall be liable to a penalty of dollars, which shall be enforced before any judges of the Supreme Court in the Territories sitting without a jury."

Now, Sir, I want to urge on the Government's attention the importance of dealing with this question of prairie fires. I have no doubt whatever that objections will be made to this clause on behalf of the railways, and I grant that a railway—for instance, the Canadian Pacific Railway—may very properly say: "This is not in our bond. We have a contract with you, we have fulfilled our contract, but where will you point out to us in our bond any obligation to make these fire guards which you require us to do now?" If the Government should come to the conclusion that this contention on the part of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and other railways, is a just contention, then the Government should communicate with the Canadian Pacific Railway. Let the Railway Committee of the Privy Council come to an arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and other railways, as to what shall be their mutual obligations, and arrange some plan by which the dreadful scourge of prairie fires can be averted. The other clause is to the effect that:

"Every railway in the Dominion of Canada shall, on and after the 1st January, A.D. 1893, equip its freight cars with automatic brakes, and both freight and passenger cars with automatic couplers."

Now, Mr. Speaker, every member of this House will occasionally find a newspaper on his breakfast table announcing the death of a brakesman, and upon enquiry we will find that, in nine cases out of ten, it arises from the dangers attached to running freight cars with the present inefficient equipment. I may say that in some States of the Union laws have been passed compelling all railways running in those States to have, as a protection, automatic brakes and automatic couplers. The next clause is an amendment of clause 194 of the Railway Act. The only change really made in clause 194 of the Railway Act is this: that whereas that clause provides that railways shall build fences where the line runs through municipalities, the clause as I amend it will provide that it shall not only be bound to build fences on each side of the line where a railway runs through municipalities, but where it runs through any settled district. I do not apprehend, I may say, any objection to this clause from the railway interest, although they may possibly wish that we should define more clearly what a settled district may be. But after that has been defined it will be for the judge to say what a settled district is. Now, this clause does not merely relate to the value of cattle killed; it does not aim merely at estimating the damage done to some poor man in the North-West, whose cattle have strayed on to the line and have been destroyed by an engine or train coming along. I am not thinking merely of the damage done to these men, and when they come into court the counsel for the railway gets up and pleads that these cattle were trespassers. When I had time to practice law in the North-West one of the first cases I had was a brief from the Canadian Pacific Railway in a case of this kind, and I had the man non-suited at once. It was my duty to have him non-suited, hard as it was on him. But, Mr. Speaker, what I am thinking of is the danger to life. Every day we read in the papers of a train coming along where three or four cattle is on the track. The engine strikes against the cattle and is thrown off the track, and then what happens? Fifty or sixty persons are killed, and more are wounded. A case like this occurred only the other day; such cases occur constantly; and I am perfectly certain that railway magnates who show themselves, as we are glad to recognize and admire, so philanthropic, after they have piled up vast wealth, and so generous to every charity, will agree that more protection must be afforded. I have not the least doubt whatever that the dangers that arise from exposing valuable lives through cattle trespassing, as it is called, on the railway, will persuade them to take the same view of this question as I do. I may say that I have spoken to a prominent railway man—I have not his permission to give his name—in regard to that clause, and I do not anticipate any opposition on the part of the railways. I move for leave to introduce this Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved:

That Government Orders have precedence on Thursdays for the remainder of the session.

Motion agreed to.

INLAND REVENUE ACT.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, on Tuesday next, to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to amend The Inland Revenue Act, and to provide that the person in whose name a license is granted to act as a compounder shall, upon receiving such license, pay to the Collector of Inland Revenue the sum of one hundred and fifty dollars.

Motion agreed to.

SETTLEMENT OF ACCOUNTS BETWEEN CANADA, ONTARIO AND QUEBEC.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 99) respecting the settlement of accounts between the Dominion of Canada and the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, and between the said provinces. He said: The accounts referred to in the title of the Bill have been in course of adjustment since the union of the provinces, and the difficulties which have arisen from time to time in the progress of that adjustment are pretty familiar to the House. It is very desirable, in the interest of Canada, as well as in the interest of the individual provinces concerned, perhaps more in the interest of Canada than in that of the provinces, that this subject should be brought to a conclusion. The Government of Canada are trustees of funds bearing a considerable, even a high rate of interest, and it is very desirable we should pay; but we are unable to pay until the accounts between the provinces in respect of these funds are adjusted. There is no established method by which these accounts are to be settled. Last autumn I had an opportunity to confer with a representative of the Province of Ontario and a representative of the Province of Quebec, and the conclusion arrived at was the scheme embodied in the present Bill. The scheme is simply this: These unsettled accounts shall be submitted to arbitration. The arbitrators shall be of judicial rank, and shall be agreed upon before being appointed by all of the parties; they shall be three in number, one being appointed by the Province of Quebec, one by the Province of Ontario, and one by the Dominion. They shall have the fullest power of arbitrators, in order that the settlement shall be complete, and shall leave nothing undetermined as regards these accounts. Inasmuch as we desire the settlement to be a complete and final one, we have clothed them with larger powers than judges possess in ordinary cases, and we make their decision final unless they shall decide on questions of law, and then they shall state the question of law and the decision shall be subject to review.

Mr. LAURIER. The object of the Bill is certainly a most desirable one. I suppose it has been brought forward after previous conference with the Governments of Ontario and Quebec. I suppose there is correspondence on the subject.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is no correspondence on the subject, but I had personal communication, as I explained a few moments ago. We had a meeting at which both Ontario and Quebec were represented, and, in pursuance of the understanding arrived at there, those provinces have passed a similar Bill, and it only requires our assent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We shall all be very glad to see the matter settled; but I venture to hope that the arbitration may not take quite as long a time as other arbitrations we wot of—such, for example, as the arbitration between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. We cannot, however, make any absolute provision for closing the arbitration at a certain date.

Mr. LANGELIER. A Bill was passed by the Legislature of Quebec at its last session, containing about the same provisions as are to be found in the Bill now before the House, and this Bill carries out the arrangement entered into between the Governments of Ontario and Quebec and the Dominion Government.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Will this include the settlement of the Indian claims under the Robinson Treaty, with respect to lands on the north shore of Lake Huron?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes; it will.

Mr. EDGAR. I observe that by this Bill only Canada is bound. I suppose the two provinces bound themselves by their own legislation?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to make an enquiry of the Minister of Justice. I see these gentlemen must all be judges. I suppose, however, it is not intended that they shall merely take up this arbitration during such intervals as their duties permit. If that is the case, it may go to a great length. It seems to me these gentlemen will have to give their time pretty much *de die in diem* until they get through, or some arrangement must be made to this effect.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I should like to enquire of the Minister of Justice whether the claims of the Mississaugas as to accrued interest will be included in the reference?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes; they will be.

Motion agreed to; Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. With regard to the question asked by the member for South Oxford, (Sir Richard Cartwright), there will be little difficulty in the arbitration being disposed of within a short time, quite within the period of an ordinary piece of litigation. A great deal of the account-taking has been done, and the duties which will devolve on the arbitrators will be mainly the deciding of legal questions. I do not think any long examination into details will be necessary.

Mr. EDGAR. I should like the Minister of Justice to explain what is meant by the term "judges." There is no definition of the word, and no statement as to what kind of judges is mentioned, and whether retired judges are included.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It was considered desirable not to define the rank the judges shall be of, and therefore, if they come in any sense within the term "judges" the choice is free. I do not think retired judges would be considered judges, however. The hon. gentleman will see that it is provided that there shall be unanimous consent, although the selection in the first place is made by the Provincial Governments and by the Dominion Government respectively.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

CERTIFICATES TO MASTERS AND MATES.

Mr. TUPPER moved second reading of Bill (No. 12) to further amend the Act respecting certificates to masters and mates of ships. He said: As I have already explained, this Bill is for the purpose of making regular the practice that has obtained since we have had a law concerning the granting of certificates to masters and mates, to

have a distinction made by the department between the minor waters and the other waters of Canada. That practice seems not to be in strict accordance with the original statute, and this Bill will make its provisions more clear.

Mr. BURDETT. I desire to call the attention of the Minister to the necessity of having it distinctly enacted that certificates may be granted to masters to run vessels on these minor waters upon passing a very slight examination, as very slight, if any, knowledge of navigation is required in many cases. For instance, in the Bay of Quinté there are a number of small ferries which require very little knowledge of navigation on the part of the masters of these boats, and to subject the owners of these ferries to the necessity of having certified masters as well as engineers, renders it impossible to run such boats with any profit whatever. In fact, a case has occurred in which, in a suit at the instance of the Crown, judgment was given against two owners of such boats for a penalty of $500, because the boats were run without a certified master. The fact is, the owners cannot afford to pay for certified masters and engineers, and these small boats can be very well run without such certified officers. I understand that in the case I have referred to the judge, in giving judgment, recommended the remission of the penalty by the Minister on such terms as may be deemed just. There certainly should be a clause in this Bill to permit a certificate to be granted to masters of these minor ferry boats which ply on the inland waters, without their having to pass anything like a difficult examination.

Mr. TUPPER. That is the object of the provisions of the present Bill, and it was supposed to be the law until a recent date. However, it will be remedied by this measure.

Mr. BURDETT. I would suggest that the Minister should take power in this Bill to remit any penalties already incurred by reason of the violation of the law, if the violation has not been very serious.

Mr. LISTER. Is it the practice or the law at present, that a person obtaining a certificate must be a British subject?

Mr. TUPPER. That is the law at present.

Mr. EDGAR. Is it intended by this Bill that all steamers on the minor waters carrying loads of over ten tons shall require to be sailed by certified masters?

Mr. TUPPER. What kind of steamers?

Mr. EDGAR. Any steamship, not a pleasure yacht of over ten tons register.

Mr. TUPPER. The law will be the same with regard to that as hitherto. This Bill simply provides that the masters of small steamers, on the minor waters, shall have a less severe examination to pass. It makes a distinction between the certificates of masters of the larger steamers, on the greater inland waters, and the masters of small steamers on the minor waters.

Motion agreed to; Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. BURDETT. I would call the attention of the Minister to a case of hardship which occurred on the Bay of Quinté, where the owner of a barge carrying a little over sixty tons was compelled to have two certified engineers. The barge was simply used for carrying stones from one point of the bay to the other; it was only used in the day time; there was no necessity for two engineers, and it cost the owner a great deal of money to have two certified engineers on the same barge at the same time. I think the Minister should have a clause inserted in this Bill which would make its provisions more elastic, so as to meet a case of this kind, and which would permit a steamboat to have only one engineer where a sufficient case is shown to this effect.

Mr. EDGAR. What is the interpretation of the Minister of the expression "inland and minor" waters. Take, for instance, the Gulf of Georgia or James' Bay. The inland waters as defined at present mean the St. Lawrence to a line drawn across at Father Point.

Mr. TUPPER. The division made in the section is that which has always obtained, and I felt it right to stick closely to it, because there has been no representation in favour of any other division.

Mr. CHARLTON. Would the Hudson Bay be a minor water?

Mr. TUPPER. No; it is part of the ocean.

Mr. EDGAR. The Gulf of Georgia and James Bay are inland waters, but I do not know where they are defined as such—certainly not in the original Act, and they are not so defined in this Bill.

Mr. TUPPER. This Bill relates only to special certificates for navigating inland waters and minor waters. Then there are certificates for sea-going ships not confined to any particular waters, which would embrace all waters, whether inside of Canada or not.

Mr. EDGAR. Under this Bill the Gulf of Georgia and the James' Bay would be minor waters, because they are inland waters.

Mr. TUPPER. Navigation in the Gulf of Georgia would require a sea-going certificate.

Mr. EDGAR. The Gulf of Georgia is in Canada, between the Island of Vancouver and the mainland. Then, what about the navigation of the Fraser River up to Yale?

Mr. TUPPER. That would be included in the minor waters of Canada.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). As I understand the Minister, he confines the words "inland waters" and "minor waters" to fresh waters, and embraces no part of the sea.

Mr. TUPPER. No part of the sea.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is not stated in the Bill. By clause (*h*) he gives a definition of inland waters, which he makes to embrace the River St. Lawrence, and in clause (*i*) he says that the expression "minor waters of Canada" means all inland waters other than those stated. He uses the expression "inland waters" in two different senses in these two clauses.

Mr. TUPPER. One is the statutory definition, and in the other case the term is used in a general sense.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is not made clear in the Bill. If the hon. gentleman means to con-

fine inland waters to fresh waters the Bill should say so. I do not think that this measure ought to extend to such waters as the Gulf of Georgia, the Hudson Bay or James' Bay at all.

Mr. TUPPER. Perhaps I am wrong in saying that the expression "inland waters" refers only to fresh waters, because, of course, there is salt water at Father Point; but the line must be drawn somewhere, and I draw it there. I would not like to make a change in that respect, because there are sea-going certificates covering outside waters which are recognized by the Imperial Board of Trade. These rules have worked satisfactorily so far, and while not saying anything about salt or fresh water, I think we have drawn a line; and so far as that excludes other waters, then the sea-going certificates come in. If a master wants to go beyond the limits he can get the larger certificate. This is made simply in the interests of navigators and ship-owners, where the limited certificate means limited examination and limited knowledge.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Take clause (*i*): the expression "minor waters" means all inland fresh waters of Canada other than Lake Ontario, and so on, leaving untouched the mouth of the St. Lawrence.

Mr. TUPPER. That is so, and you must draw the line. It is drawn at Father Point, and I will not disturb it unless some substantial reason is given for extending it. For years the line has been at Father Point, and the master who wishes to navigate a vessel outside of that will not get the benefit of these provisions unless he passes a severer examination.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The suggestion I make does not at all interfere with extending the expression "minor" as far as the navigation of the St. Lawrence to Father Point; but I call attention to this, that there are waters elsewhere—for instance, the Gulf of Georgia. The hon. gentleman does not say whether that is included or excluded.

Mr. TUPPER. That would depend whether it it was an inland water. Under our Bill it certainly is not.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is the point. If you use the term "fresh water" in clause (*i*), you make it perfectly clear that you do exclude it.

Mr. TUPPER. That would confuse us at Father Point, which is salt water.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is provided for in clause (*h*).

Mr. TUPPER. "All other inland waters."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That would be other than those already provided for.

Mr. EDGAR. The difficulty is that this Bill, or the old Act, defines what is meant by inland waters. Clause (*h*) says that inland waters include the River St. Lawrence, but does not say what else. It would be better to have a complete definition than a partial one.

Mr. TUPPER. As the clause has been administered since 1869, the waters on the coast—for instance, the Gulf of Georgia—have been included in the sea-going certificate, and the only exceptions made to the general rules and regulations were for these limited waters; and it does appear to me, on reading the clause, after the observations made, it is clear what the Act means, because we have said we have drawn a line from Father Point, and then we have said inside of that are inland waters, and a minor water certificate can be given for all other inland waters other than Lakes Ontario, Erie, Huron (including Georgian Bay) Superior and Winnipeg.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Evidently the Bill has been prepared to suit the Act of the old Parliament, where the inland waters are much more limited.

Mr. TUPPER. 1883 is the date of the Act we are now amending. The original Act may have been so.

Mr. EDGAR. Under which definition does the Fraser River, from the mouth up to Yale, which is navigable, come?

Mr. TUPPER. That certainly is inland water as a matter of fact, being within the boundaries of our own territory.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It would certainly be advantageous if clauses (*h*) and (*i*) were reconsidered, because there are certainly parts of the law very much older than the Dominion, and altogether unsuited to the present day.

Mr. TUPPER. I do not think there is any practical difficulty. None has arisen so far. The clause will read as follows: "The expression minor waters of Canada means all other inland waters of Canada except Lakes Ontario, Erie and Huron, including Georgian Bay, Lakes Superior and Winnipeg."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the hon. gentleman will see that it is very confusing. The term "inland waters" includes the River St. Lawrence, but he has given a definition. He says the expression "minor waters" includes all other inland waters. There cannot be any other inland waters. When the hon. gentleman gives a definition it ought to be broad enough to include everything. But it does not do that. He says the minor waters of Canada shall mean all other inland waters. How can that be?

Mr. TUPPER. I will let that clause stand, and go on with the rest.

Mr. BURDETT. The arms of inland waters would be minor waters. Across these there might be a ferry established for the convenience of the people, and I think it is not necessary to subject the master of the ferry boat to an examination. I think the Minister should have power to grant certificates, where a proper case is made out, for a ferry boat of that character.

Mr. EDGAR. Under the clause before us, Lake Ontario is not a minor water. That is clear. The Bay of Quinté is certainly part of Lake Ontario, and it is the Bay of Quinté that my hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Burdett) wants to have declared a minor water.

Mr. TUPPER. We say "Lake Huron, including Georgian Bay," which shows that we do not include the Bay of Quinté in Lake Ontario, as it is not specially included.

Mr. EDGAR. The Georgian Bay is a large lake, and there are other large lakes, such as Lake Nepigon and Lake Simcoe. Is the Bay of Toronto part of Lake Ontario, or is it a minor water? If it is part of Lake Ontario it is not a minor water.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I am sure the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) does not intend to speak seriously when he says that the Bay of Quinté is part of Lake Ontario. Every school child in the province is taught that the Bay of Quinté is a distinct water from Lake Ontario.

Mr. EDGAR. What about the Bay of Toronto?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. That may be taught in Toronto, but it shows that the hon. gentleman has forgotten what he has learned when he contends that the Bay of Quinté is part of Lake Ontario. A comparison between the Bay of Toronto and the Bay of Quinté is about the same as a comparison between a mouse and an elephant.

Mr. MULOCK. You are at sea.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Certainly the Bay of Quinté is not a part of Lake Ontario.

Mr. BURDETT. There are certain arms of Lake Ontario which might well be considered minor waters, such as what are called the East and West Lakes. There was a boat running on the West Lake from Wellington to what is called the Sand Bank. No one would want a master for that boat who would be competent to manage a sea-going vessel, the distance being only a mile or two miles at the outside, and any man who was sober and in his right mind would be able to manage a vessel of that kind, with the assistance of a proper engineer. Of course, the Bay of Quinté cannot be considered part of Lake Ontario. You might as well say that the Atlantic Ocean is part of Lake Ontario because the waters of Lake Ontario flow into it.

Mr. BOWELL. The East Bay and the West Bay are parts of Lake Ontario, and the most dangerous part of navigation is in those places. It is true that, towards Weller's Bay, there was a sand bank, but it has been washed away, and now, as the hon. gentleman knows, the water is 15 to 20 feet deep. The crossing of these waters would not require a certified master in the ordinary way, but in a storm it is more dangerous to navigate there than in the middle of the lake, and requires masters who understand navigation more than if they were navigating from Toronto to Kingston.

Mr. BURDETT. I am only giving this as an example. I think the Minister of Marine should have power given by the statute to give certificates for a master for a particular place, and he should know the facts as to the dangerous nature of the water and grant the certificates accordingly. I think the Minister should have power to grant certificates according to the danger of the water.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I agree with the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Burdett) that the law should be more elastic, and that it should not be bound down by these expressions, which the Minister cannot change after this becomes law. The Minister should have the power to change the certificates according to the difficulty of navigating in East or West Lake, or in the Bay of Quinté, or in Lake Ontario or Lake Superior. All these Acts in regard to masters of vessels are being made too strict and iron-bound, and they prevent the Minister from making them applicable to different parts of the country. I agree with the hon. member for East Hastings in that respect.

Mr. EDGAR. I do not think it is desirable to set up the Minister of Marine or the member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) as an authority on geography for all time to come. We ought to settle this question here. The member for Frontenac says the Bay of Quinté is not a part of Lake Ontario.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Your friend from East Hastings (Mr. Burdett) says the same.

Mr. EDGAR. Then I should like to know if the harbour of Toronto, the harbour of Hamilton, and other harbours all along, are part of Lake Ontario or Lake Erie, or what they are? I think we should try to make an exception in this case, and make this not a minor water, but to have a certificate either of service or of competency of a higher grade for Lake Ontario, than, for example, Lake Simcoe. Let us, if we can, put in some clause which provides that the bays, arms and harbours on these lakes shall not be deemed to be part of such lakes.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think we had better have a committee to make some geographical definitions. We seem to be very much at sea, and I must say that I think my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) is a better authority on military matters than on naval matters, so far as he has spoken of naval matters to-day. The contention that an indentation or arm of a body of water, such as the Bay of Quinté, leading into Lake Ontario, is not a part of the water of that lake, seems to me to be rather absurd. It must be classed as a part of the water of Lake Ontario, as Thunder Bay is a part of the water of Lake Superior.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Then, on that theory, the River St. Lawrence, which flows into the Atlantic Ocean, is part of the Atlantic Ocean.

Mr. CHARLTON. No.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Yes; it flows into the ocean in the same way. The Bay of Quinté runs 70 miles inland; it is a distinct and different body of water, and is not properly a part of Lake Ontario, as we usually mean when we speak of that lake.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Amazon is not a part of the Atlantic Ocean, the St. Lawrence is not a part of the Alantic Ocean, or a part of Lake Ontario. The St. Lawrence is a distinct strait or river connected with other larger bodies of water. But the Bay of Quinté does not connect Lake Ontario with some other body of water; it is simply an arm of Lake Ontario.

Mr. BOWELL. No; it empties into Lake Ontario.

Mr. FRASER. I do not see any necessity for an Act of this kind at all. It seems to me an absurd idea to go to the trouble of examining a man and giving him a certificate to sail on every little pond such as this Act is supposed to apply to. Coming from the sea coast as I do, I cannot understand it. I can see a smile on the face of the Minister himself. I think he has introduced this Act to satisfy the prejudices of people who live near lakes and ponds. We are spending a lot of time about an Act which should be withdrawn. For my own part, I can see no necessity for it. I should suppose that any person who wanted to sail on ponds of this kind; would be allowed to do so without a certificate.

Mr. TUPPER. I think we might go on with the rest of the Bill. The only change in the next

section, as the Committee will see, relates to these minor or inland waters. I confess I did not give any critical examination to this clause, because I supposed it was based upon existing regulations.

Mr. LISTER. I would ask the Minister whether he intends that Lake St. Clair shall be considered one of the minor waters?

Mr. TUPPER. I am not going to constitute myself a court any longer.

Mr. LISTER. I want to say to my hon. friend from the sea (Mr. Fraser), that I have a great respect for him, but I cannot conceal the fact from myself that a great many of those gentlemen down by the sea are not acquainted with our inland seas up west. If he will come up west he will see ships that over-top the little craft they send out from Nova Scotia. These lakes up west are oceans.

Mr. EDGAR. The hon. member from Frontenac can tell us whether Lake St. Clair is an inland water or not.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. These inland waters have not been defined in the Act yet, I think?

Mr. TUPPER. Yes; in the two first clauses, (*h*) and (*i*), which have been taken out of the regulations. They have been in the regulations, but never in an Act of Parliament.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I think, if my memory serves me right, you define in your regulations what minor waters are. You define the Bay of Quinté by a line drawn across Red Wolfe Island. In some certificates you define particularly what minor waters are, and you prevent any person, without a certificate, from sailing on Lake Ontario west of a certain line.

Mr. TUPPER. The only change is the words "on the minor waters."

Mr. EDGAR. I dare say it is a very good thing to require that persons should be domiciled in Canada for at least three years who intend to become masters or mates of sea-going ships, or perhaps of inland ships. But why is it necessary to apply that same rule to the masters and mates of these two-penny-ha'-penny little inland ferry boats on little bays or inland lakes?—for that is the way the Act is drawn.

Mr. TUPPER. That is the original Act.

Mr. EDGAR. No; it is an amendment.

Mr. TUPPER. It is in the original Act.

Mr. EDGAR. The Minister applies the amendment concerning the minor waters to the original Act, which requires three years domicile in Canada for every master or mate. Now, I think that should not be made to apply to these small inland waters. It may be all right for sea-going ships.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I objected to this clause when it was first proposed by the late hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby), and I see no reasons to support it now. It says that a party must be domiciled in Canada for three years before he can undergo his examination and engage in his particular business, although as a resident of a foreign country he may have pursued it for a greater portion of his life. Why should a Norwegian, for instance, who has sailed a vessel in his own country for a quarter of a century, and who becomes a resident of Canada, be required to reside three years in this country before he can pursue his ordinary occupation and means of livelihood, any more than a man who comes out here for the purpose of cultivating the soil? If you were to adopt such a rule, and say that a man must reside in this country three years before he can engage as a farm hand, before he can engage as a mechanic, or a labourer, why, you see at once the monstrous and absurd character of such a proposition. I say that in a democratic country like this we ought to know no distinction, we ought not to make any classification of the population in this way. We assume that a man who engages in any calling or profession, if he is honest, if he is industrious, ought to be regarded in the eye of the law as respectable as any other, and if a man may come here without any disability being imposed upon him as an ordinary labourer, as a farmer or a mechanic, why may he not engage as a master of a ship, if he is competent to undergo an examination and to take charge of a vessel? If it is his intention to become a British subject, or if he intends to remain in the country, I see no reason why this should not be the case. This attempt to create close corporations or guilds, with a view of excluding men from this, that or the other guild, for which they may be qualified, I think is a policy that ought to find no place in the legislation of this country, and the sooner we get rid of the influence of that spirit the better it will be for us. Why, Sir, I have known myself men coming from Germany, standing high in the medical profession of that country, being run out of this country and going to the neighbouring Republic, and taking hundreds with them, where they may have the liberty of practising their profession. It seems to me monstrous that we should adopt a policy of this sort. Every calling or profession should be free for every man to engage in who is qualified, and who can take his examination, and it is not our business to enquire how he obtained his knowledge, or how long he was in obtaining it; if he possesses it, that is sufficient for our purpose, and we should allow him to engage in whatever calling or employment he pleases.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is mistaken when he says this proposition was brought forward by Mr. Colby last year. The Bill Mr. Colby had before the House related to steamboats; the principle is practically the same. This principle was adopted by this House as far back as 1883, and it is not a new suggestion. I merely threw it out to the Committee; of course, I expected the Committee would criticise it. It is not a proposition that affects any substantial change whatever. The Bill is long, and there are many suggestions that may occur in the direction of a reform of the present Act. But that is a matter by the way. There is a reason for maintaining the principle which the hon. gentleman criticises. The hon. gentleman says we should have practically free trade in these certificates, and that any one should be admitted to take charge of our vessels. In connection with the coasting trade, the hon. gentleman knows that the position is this: that each nation is very jealous in respect to the control of its coasting trade, and the only occasion on which this country has offered to reciprocate in these privileges or extend these privileges to foreigners is when foreigners extend them to us. We are situated in this position: that our neighbours to the south have regulations in re-

gard to their inland waters, and they do not permit our citizens to go to their country and obtain certificates to command their ships, and until they do so I think the position we hold is quite proper, especially as they refuse to reciprocate with us in regard to coasting privileges. While they refuse to recognize our citizens, although properly qualified to obtain certificates, without becoming naturalized citizens, just so long will we maintain our rights, without offence to them, but with justice to our people. The large number of our own people who hold certificates, qualified by their citizenship, by their domicile, by their intention, and the fact of remaining in this country, have a right to the protection at our hands which this legislation affords them, and that, at all events, they shall not be called upon to meet the competition of citizens of a neighbouring country until they are at liberty to go into that neighbouring country and compete with them. That would be an entirely different position. Of course, there is much to be said, as there always is in these propositions, on both sides; but as this Bill is introduced for a simple purpose, it is desirable to adhere to the original proposition as far as possible.

Mr. FRASER. I see a good deal of force in what the Minister says. There is, however, a difficulty in regard to the three years. I know many young men who have gone to sea and been absent for some years, and yet such men on their return could not go up for examination.

Mr. TUPPER. If British subjects.

Mr. FRASER. The very fact that every master and mate must be a British subject should be sufficient, without this declaration as to three years. I know many cases of young men who have gone to sea and afterwards engaged in other employments. If they want to go up for examination they must remain home three years before they have an opportunity to secure a certificate. That is evidently unfair. While I see good reason for saying that a man who has just come into the country should not be allowed to come up for examination, still the fact that those obtaining certificates must be British subjects should be sufficient, and this provision respecting three years will exclude such young men as I have referred to.

Mr. TUPPER. No; a certain service is required, but so long as the service is shown to have been performed that is all that is necessary. Moreover, British subjects going abroad in foreign vessels, or domiciled for three years, are included.

Mr. FRASER. The wording is "present serving," not having served.

Mr. TUPPER. The provision does not say others shall not be, and British subjects serving on foreign vessels will be admitted. It means men having served. It will be deemed to cover not only men residing in Canada, but men who are British subjects sailing in any part of the world.

Mr. FRASER. The person must have served three years at some time. I submit this provision is too stringent.

Mr. TUPPER. That is a delicate question, on which I cannot give advice, for it is the result of rules framed by the Imperial Board of Trade. The moment we depart from the principle of those rules, and from the qualification on which certificates are given, that moment the understanding now had with the Imperial Board of Trade, under which they recognize our certificates, falls to the ground. We have been guided by their rule.

Mr. LISTER. I think the Minister of Marine misunderstood and misapprehended the statement of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) when he spoke about free trade in certificates, and the Minister has not stated the position of affairs existing between the United States and Canada so far as masters' and mates' certificates are concerned. I may say to the hon. gentleman that a Canadian going to the United States and seeking the position of master on American vessels is entitled to one, on the declaration of his intention to become an American citizen. It is quite possible he may never complete what he commenced, and never become an American citizen. All that is required is that he should declare his intention to become such, and upon doing that, so far as the laws of the country are concerned, he is entitled to the position. I do not see why there should be this provision, this residence, before a man is entitled to hold a position or receive a master's certificate. I suppose our people can be protected as fully and as completely as it is necessary to protect them by simply declaring, as the law now declares, that before they receive certificates they shall be British subjects. There is no danger of Americans coming here and taking these positions, because they must be residents in this country for three years before they are entitled to certificates under this Act—that is, before they make themselves qualified to become British subjects. If foreigners, they must be resident in this country for three years before they are entitled to certificates. But this provision should not exist in regard to our own people. It should be sufficient if they are British subjects and resident in this country at the time.

Mr. TUPPER. There are local certificates, and it may well be that a candidate who receives a certificate for a certain locality, not having the high technical training required for general navigation, thus gives a guarantee of his knowledge of the locality, because he has been domiciled for three years. There may be that element.

Mr. LISTER. It is possible there may be that element, but this may be ground for refusing a certificate altogether.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I have not been able to understand why the hon. gentleman should insist in every case upon the three years limit. I think the hon. gentleman is wrong in stating that a man cannot get employment as master or mate in the States unless he becomes an American citizen. As the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) states, if a person takes the oath of allegiance and passes the examination he is entitled, in the United States, to become a captain, mate or engineer, although, as a matter of fact, he does not become an American citizen. I know from my own experience that the Canadian law as it formerly stood has worked a great deal of injury in certain portions of Canada, and it will continue to work that injury if not amended. Last election, in the town of Goderich alone, I found no less than forty-five Canadians, some of whose residences are in that town, employed as captains, mates or engineers on American vessels. I am informed by them that all they require to do is to express their intention of becoming American citizens, take the oath of allegiance and pass the

qualifying examination. I know, as a matter of fact, that some of those were offered employment on British bottoms in Canadian waters, but under the law as it formerly stood, and as the hon. Minister proposes to continue it, they could not present themselves for examination unless they had been three years in the country. This is a direct discouragement to our citizens who have gone to the United States to come back to Canada again, and if it is proposed to be continued it is not in the public interest. Many of these men never did pass an examination in Canada, but I have no doubt that they could well do so, and would prefer living in Canada, as their friends nearly all live here. If the hon. gentleman would strike out that clause providing for three years' residence it would effect a very good purpose; for, as far as I can see, the law provides that a man who goes up for examination must be a British subject, and if he is, whether he is in the country for six months or for three years cannot make any difference. To pass the law as it now stands would appear to me to be a great hardship.

Mr. TUPPER. That is the law now.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I know it is, but it is a bad law, and it has worked badly, and why should we not amend it?

Mr. TUPPER. It has not worked badly.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). It has worked badly, and I have given an instance of this. I could give the names of several of my constituents in the town of Goderich who would be willing to come back to Canada, but the law stands in their way, and it is an obstacle to their coming back to Canada. If we passed a bad law ten, fifteen, or twenty years ago, it is no reason why we should not repeal it, and this is the time to make the law perfect, when it is proposed to consolidate and amend it. It is no argument to say that because we have passed a bad law that we should continue that bad law. Let the hon. gentleman now make the law perfect in this Bill.

Mr. TUPPER. Perhaps I have not made myself sufficiently explicit. The master or mate must, in addition to his qualification, have put in service, and we say that it must be service in a registered ship of Canada, or a British ship, or if he is a British subject his foreign service will count. For instance, when a citizen of this country goes to the United States and ships on a vessel there, and comes back to pass an examination here, he cannot count his foreign service on a foreign ship; he must have served on a British ship or on a Canadian ship. This is not altogether a matter of sentiment. I have alluded several times to the Imperial Board of Trade, and they only sanctioned our dealing with certificates in a direct way on the undertaking that we would maintain their principles and rules. This matter comes under the discipline and the regulations of British ships and of colonial ships regulated by the British Merchants Shipping Act, and by our own regulations in connection with the certificates to masters and mates, and it gives a better guarantee on behalf of the applicant for a certificate of having put in good service, and his vouchers are easier to trace, and the certificates of that service are safer to depend upon. I would hesitate, without the gravest consideration—and hon. gentlemen will see the reason of that hesitancy is well founded—to make such a radical change as that in the principle of the main Bill when we only propose now to make certain slight alterations. The proposition that has been made by the hon. gentleman would require the most careful consideration on the part of those concerned in the technical portion of this work in the Dominion, as to whether there could be sufficient safeguards placed around such a practice as the one proposed. It would not be right that a man might come from any foreign country in the world and say: I served on a ship and I can give you my word, or I am prepared to make an affidavit to that effect. We cannot trace the service of this man, and it stands to reason that on our own ships or on British ships we can do so much more safely, for we know and we have the guarantee that on these ships dicipline is maintained by virtue of rigid rules and regulations. Whatever can be said as to the ships of the United States—and we need not regard that country alone, for the principle is wide, and covers every foreign nation—we are unable to say whether there is that same rigid adherence to regulations and that careful regard to discipline on board these ships as is known to obtain on our own ships. This question of service comes in in that way. It is not merely that a man shall have lived three years in Canada—that is, domiciled in a British ship in Canada, or being a British subject on a foreign ship—but he must show, in addition to that, that he is able to answer questions on nautical subjects, and by the regulations he is required to prove service as well.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). You don't rely on the service; you rely on the examination.

Mr. TUPPER. Partly on the service.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). A man has got to present himself and be examined.

Mr. TUPPER. Three years' service is absolutely obligatory, as well as the examination.

Mr. MULOCK. Where does that provision appear in the Act?

Mr. TUPPER. It appears in the rules and regulations under the main Act.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman is confounding two distinct things in one section. Part of this clause deals with the examination.

Mr. TUPPER. Section 5 of the main Act says:

"The Governor in Council may, from time to time, make rules for the conduct of such examinations and as to the qualification of the applicants, and such rules shall be observed by all examiners."

Under this section regulations have been made.

Mr. MULOCK. If the section we have under consideration has to deal with the examination, then the rules which are made under this main Act meet the whole case. I quite agree as to the wisdom of the Government in insisting upon the candidate having an acquaintance with the waters in which he is supposed to sail, but here you are comfounding two things. As far as this section is concerned, if there is no subsequent legislation, or no regulation passed under subsequent legislation, then under this particular clause a man who has never set foot on a ship can go up for examination.

Mr. TUPPER. But the hon. gentleman will see that he must read this section of the Bill with the section of the main Act which I have just read. A

man cannot pass his examination and get his certificate unless he has service and complies with the other sections of the same Act.

Mr. MULOCK. If the other section meets the case, you do not require this section in the Bill at all. If the other section determines the conditions to which a candidate for examination must be subject you do not require to say anything here about domicile at all. What you want by an examination is to see that the candidate is a proper person to receive a certificate. It does not follow because he is domiciled in Canada that he is fit for it, or because he is not domiciled in Canada that he is not fit for it. This is an unnecessary provision. You could meet the case quite as well by a regulation, and you would avoid having a statutory provision which might operate hardly. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) has referred to the case of persons who live outside of Canada, having ceased to be domiciled in Canada, and who, under the provisions of the law at present, would not be able to come back and present themselves for examination for certificates. If you do not intend to exclude them, remove this provision, and then you will be free to deal with their cases by Order in Council.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. If those Canadians to whom the hon. member for Huron alluded were over three years in Canada they would be domiciled. The Act does not say that they must be domiciled for three years immediately preceding an examination.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. Minister a short time ago argued in favour of this clause as a sort of protective measure to Canadian labour—to those who have remained in Canada, not to those who have turned their backs upon it. "Domiciled" means those who at the time of presenting themselves for examination are domiciled in Canada, and if a Canadian becomes domiciled in the United States he is not eligible for examination. If this provision is for the protection of Canadian labour let that labour be protected by some distinct proposition applicable to labour of all kinds. We know that people do not require to be domiciled in Canada for three years in order to enter the Civil Service; nor does a man require to be domiciled in Canada for three months in order to be eligible to a seat in Parliament if he is a British subject. You do not need this clause at all to secure what is aimed at—an efficient examination.

Mr. TUPPER. This has been the law since 1883, and the case mentioned by the hon. member for Huron is not in any degree affected by it. I am informed that ever since this has been the law there has not been a suggestion of any hardship from its working in respect to the question now raised, so that I do not see the necessity of changing it. A change might destroy the validity and value of our certificates, because not merely is three years' service required, but it is required under circumstances that will admit of no abuse under proper discipline, and under the supervision of the Board of Trade in England, and our own Marine Department in this country, and there is a great deal in that. It would be very dangerous to interfere with the safeguards of the certificates.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. Minister says that under this Act a Canadian who has once been domiciled in Canada but has left the country may, without subsequent domicile come up for examination.

Mr. TUPPER. If he has put in his three years' service.

Mr. MULOCK. Very well. If he means that, I would suggest that he insert after "domiciled" the words "at any time," so as to remove any doubt.

Mr. TUPPER. I have just been reminded that last session this Parliament, after full investigation, took the very opposite view to that advocated by hon. gentlemen opposite. Mr. Colby, then acting for me, introduced a Bill to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, in which Parliament, after full discussion and consideration, specially provided with regard to an applicant for a certificate of steamboat engineer:

"Such applicant, if not a British subject, shall only be entitled to a certificate if, in addition to the qualifications required by this Act, he has been domiciled in Canada for at least three years. And service as engineer of any class upon any steamboat, ship or vessel registered in Great Britain or Canada shall be deemed to constitute a domicile in Canada while so serving."

Here we have the principle confirmed in 1890 which Parliament adopted in 1883.

Mr. MULOCK. Does that mean just prior to coming up for examination?

Mr. TUPPER. No; he must be able to show that he has been domiciled.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But the hon. gentleman must bear in mind that domicile does not mean residence.

Mr. TUPPER. I am quite aware of that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then it could hardly be said that a person is domiciled in Canada who has his residence outside of Canada, or who intends to reside outside of Canada. The clause says the examination may be instituted in Canada for persons domiciled in Canada. Domiciled when? Why, at the time of the examination. Settled in Canada with the view of remaining in Canada? For what length of time? Evidently at least three years. Clearly, that refers to three years immediately preceding the examination, and cannot mean anything else. If the word "residence" were substituted for "domicile" the Minister might argue as he has done, but under the definition of domicile he will see it requires a residence, not at any indefinite period long passed, but at the time of the examination, and for three years immediately preceding, with the intention of remaining.

Mr. KENNY. We are legislating for Canadians and not Americans, and in the clause under discussion it is distinctly stated that domiciled means serving three years on board a British or a Canadian ship.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). When?

Mr. KENNY. The hon. member for Guysborough, who referred to the minor waters of Canada, also told the Committee that we in the Maritime Provinces are concerned in such legislation in connection with the larger ships; and, as the Minister of Marine has said, it is desirable that our maritime population, in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, who are engaged as sailors, should have opportunities of

obtaining certificates within their own country, and it is necessary to keep up the standard of these certificates as well as their validity. I have listened most attentively, and with that respect which a layman should always pay to the arguments advanced by lawyers, on perhaps a technical question; but from the standpoint of the ship-owners, I think we are wasting a great deal of time in the further consideration of this clause.

Mr. LISTER. This matter only applies to inland waters.

Mr. KENNY. And to coasting.

Mr. LISTER. Well, coasters are small vessels that always keep in sight of the shore.

Mr. KENNY. Coasting means from Nova Scotia to British Columbia.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. Minister should expunge a portion of this section. If he will put it this way it would answer: "The examinations may be instituted for persons who intend to procure certificates"—eliminating from the word "domicile" to the word "who." Surely it can be of no consequence whether a man has been a resident or not, so far as the certificate is concerned, provided he is a British subject, and has served upon a Canadian, British or foreign vessel. If he has the proper qualifications, surely it will make no difference whether he has been a resident of this country or not. To be a British subject is all you require. So far as the seamen on the inland waters are concerned, if it were not for the employment they receive on American vessels the merchant marine in the inland waters would be very small indeed. Our purely Canadian shipping is comparatively small and the American is very large. The seamen who are adapted to become masters of vessels in nearly all instances become so adapted by service in American vessels. Still, if they have become qualified by such service and live in the United States, without ever having surrendered their allegiance to Great Britain, we should not prevent their coming back here and qualifying. It is a matter of no consequence what is being done in England, so far as our inland waters are concerned, because the men holding certificates on these waters are not entitled to sail ocean-going vessels. We are now legislating for the inland waters of Canada pure and simple, and that legislation should be such as to meet the necessities of the people principally interested.

Mr. EDGAR. I am rather surprised that the Minister of Marine should make such a strenuous fight in favour of the principle of domicile, when not very long ago he made an equally strenuous fight against that principle when it was proposed to attach it to the right to vote. However, let us assume for a moment that he has convinced himself, if not us, that it is right to maintain the three years domicile. I would draw his attention to the fact that either he or his draughtsmen have made a mistake in this clause. They have introduced the words "or service" into this clause. That makes the domicile of three years apply to examinations and to the granting of certificates of service.

Mr. TUPPER. Certainly.

Mr. EDGAR. That is a change in the law.

Mr. TUPPER. No.

Mr. EDGAR. Under the present Act, section 8 of the law, as it is to-day, provides that certificates of service may be given under special circumstances without any condition of domicile whatever. So, unless I read the Act altogether amiss, the Minister is introducing a very radical and serious change here which he did not know he was introducing.

Mr. TUPPER. No; I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon.

Mr. EDGAR. If the Minister can show the Committee that, under section 8 of the Revised Statutes affecting this matter, three years domicile is required, I shall be surprised.

Mr. TUPPER. It is not under section 8; but under section 5 the hon. gentleman will see that the regulations in regard to qualification, and so on, are provided for by Order in Council.

Mr. EDGAR. Very likely that is what the hon. Minister intended, but it is not what the Act says. The Act reads:

"The domicile for three years is necessary for certificates of competency or certificates of service, as hereinafter mentioned."

That means, "as hereinafter mentioned" in the main Act, and these certificates come under section 8 and nothing else, and there is no provision requiring domicile, so that, inadvertently, the draughtsman has included the words "or service," which should not appear here.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will see that the satisfactory service required must be on a British ship, and this section says that that constitutes a Canadian domicile. The hon. gentleman has not read that carefully. He will see that it does not make any difference whatever whether these words are there or not. Under section 8 the service must be the service laid down, that service must be satisfactory, and to be satisfactory it must be for three years, and that three years' service must be on a British ship. This Bill says precisely the same thing.

Mr. KING. What will the effect of this Bill be in regard to St. John River?

Mr. TUPPER. No change will take place as to the St. John River. I have been careful to avoid any changes. I have already impressed upon the House that one of the principal reasons for this Bill is to make valid what was supposed to be the law of 1883, but which has been administered on all the waters of Canada under rules and regulations when, on investigation, it appears an Act was required.

Mr. CHARLTON. I believe that the principle established in this Bill requiring three years' domicile in Canada, without any reference to qualification, before a man can appear for examination, is a wrong principle. The Minister of Marine, some minutes ago, cited the example of the United States as a justification of the course taken by him on the present occasion. Whatever may be the example of the United States, whether the United States adopts the same principle as that which is adopted here or not, is, in my opinion, entirely foreign to the question. It is not customary for hon. gentlemen opposite to avow that they are following the example of the United States, although we know that they do follow their example. We see that they profess to have adopted this plan, they have

adopted their fiscal policy, and they seem to be slavish imitators of the policy of the United States; but the policy of the United States is not what the hon. gentleman has stated in this matter. A seaman there has only to declare his intention to become a citizen, and, I believe, to take the oath of allegiance, before he can get a certificate; but domicile for a term of years is unnecessary. If he is living in the United States and declares his intention to become a citizen, if he passes the examination he can obtain his certificate. Our law is much more illiberal. According to our law, he must remain in this country for three years before he can pass an examination. The question of residence has nothing to do with his fitness for the position of master of a vessel. He may be a Norwegian, a Swede, a Dane, a Greek, or may come from any maritime state, and may be fully qualified to take charge of a vessel, and yet, unless he remains three years in this country, he cannot fill that position. The question which should govern the Government should not be, Where does the man come from, or whither is he going; what is his religion, his creed, his height or his colour? but, What are his qualifications—is he a safe man to entrust the care of a vessel to? If he has those qualifications it is absurd to say that he must have lived here for three years. I would suggest that this clause be amended by striking out the words "for at least three years," so that the clause will read:

"Examinations may be instituted in Canada for persons domiciled in Canada who intend to become masters or mates of ships, etc."

I knew a case of a Canadian by birth who was the master of a vessel which was sold by the owner about two years ago. This threw him out of employment, and he went across the line and became the master of an American vessel, which he sailed for one season. He had not left Canada, but when he came back here, having been the master of an American vessel he was unable to take a position similar to that which he had occupied here before. He had declared his intention to become an American citizen. He had probably taken the oath of allegiance, though he said he had not, but when he came here, having been the master of a Canadian vessel before, he could not become again the master of a Canadian vessel, unless he lived here for three years. That was a case of hardship. I am sure my hon. friend does not intend by this Bill to make it difficult, or even impossible, for Canadians who have gone to the United States to come back here and enter upon the same avocations which they previously pursued; but that would be the result in such a case. I think the Bill would be much more in consonance with fair principles and fair play, and more in the interests of the ship-owners, as it would give them a wider scope in the selection of their officers, if these words were eliminated as I propose.

Mr. KENNY. I would not like the Committee to be under a misunderstanding. I do not know what happens in the inland waters of Canada, but I know as a fact that Nova Scotians who sailed as masters, and who had formerly qualified and obtained a certificate entitling them to sail a ship as masters in Canada, have subsequently commanded American ships. I assume that when they did that they had to take the oath of allegiance to the Government of the United States.

Mr. CHARLTON.

Mr. CHARLTON. Suppose they did, if they wanted to come back again.

Mr. KENNY. That has been done. These men came back to Canada, and had no difficulty in the world, on the production of their English certificate, in resuming command of an English ship; so that the argument as regards a foreign country, which the hon. gentleman has advanced, does not hold. I assure the hon. gentleman that it is not the case.

Mr. CHARLTON. I assure the hon. gentleman from Halifax that I know the circumstances of the case to which I alluded. It is true this captain got employment again, but the question as to whether he had taken the oath of allegiance was kept in abeyance, it was not examined into at all, and if it had been examined into, and if it had been found that this captain had taken an oath of allegiance, he could not have got a certificate. I know this.

Mr. KENNY. It is an imaginary case.

Mr. CHARLTON. No; it is an actual case. I know the owner of the vessel, I know the captain, I know the circumstances; I visited the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and know all about it.

Mr. EDGAR. I do not think the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will agree with the member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) in thinking that can be done.

Mr. FRASER. I can understand that the case mentioned by the member for Halifax might occur through ignorance, but not otherwise; because he knows very well that in such a case, if it was known that he was an American citizen, although he may have had an English certificate, if the ship was lost at sea the owner could not collect the insurance.

Mr. TUPPER. The Committee ought to understand that if we emasculate this Bill we leave as law all that hon. gentlemen are now opposing. That is the law of the land now, and if we cut off this clause we will fail to do what every ship-owner in Canada desire us to do, that is, to make the law what they have supposed it to be since 1883. That is one reason why I urge the Committee that we should not go so far afield and discuss general reforms, when all that was required was merely to make the present law more workable. The amendment suggested by the hon. gentleman will make this clause ridiculous. If we take out the words "for persons domiciled in Canada for at last three years," then the section reads, "Examinations may be instituted in Canada for persons who intend to become masters or mates," and so on.

Mr. CHARLTON. No; that is not what I suggest. My amendment is that the words "for at least three years" be struck out, and the clause then reads: "Examinations may be instituted in Canada for persons domiciled in Canada who intend to become masters."

Mr. TAYLOR. I understood the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to say that if a Canadian goes over to the United States and declares his intention of becoming a resident, and applies for papers, they will be granted. Now, I do not think such is the case.

Mr. CHARLTON. I know it is the case.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think that papers are only granted to men who are citizens of that country.

Mr. LISTER. Not at all.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think I am correct. I have been so informed by vessel men, and I think I am right if I accept the statements of American gentlemen sailing vessels into our own ports. I think the statement of the hon. gentleman is not correct. The applicant must first be a citizen of that country.

Mr. LISTER. I can say to the hon. gentleman, that I speak of what I know when I say that sailors who go over to the other side can take charge of steam or sailing vessels upon a declaration of intention, and they are entitled to receive a certificate upon doing so.

Mr. CHARLTON. The statement I made was based upon an actual occurrence. I know a case where a Canadian captain, who the previous year had sailed a Canadian vessel, and for many years had sailed Canadian vessels, went to the city of Detroit to take the mastership of an American vessel, and after having declared his intention of becoming a citizen he sailed an American vessel as master for the last season, and then came back to Canada this year, wishing to resume his position as a Canadian captain, and he had the difficulties that I referred to. I recited this as an actual occurrence under the American law.

Mr. LISTER. In addition, I know a master who went from the County of Bruce, having sailed a Canadian steamer last year, and, upon going to the the States, declared his intention, and he is sailing an American vessel there this year.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the member for North Norfolk give the name of the gentleman he refers to ?

Mr. TUPPER. There seems to be a considerable difference of opinion on a very important point. My recollection of the United States law is that a man wishing to obtain a certificate as master has to sign a declaration of his intention to become a citizen. I am not positive, however, on that point, and I would suggest that this clause be allowed to stand over, and I will obtain information.

Mr. LISTER. That has no bearing upon this clause, because it is of no consequence whether it be declaration of intention, or whether papers for naturalization are actually issued.

Mr. TUPPER. It is the basis of the argument.

Mr. LISTER. Your Bill provides that the man shall be a British subject ; there is no declaration of intention. The law itself prescribes that the man shall be a British subject. It is only a question of residence here.

Mr. TUPPER. I will ask that that clause be allowed to stand.

Mr. BURDETT. I think the suggestion of the Minister of Marine ought to be adopted, as there seems to be a difference of opinion as to what the law is on the other side. I would ask him if he proposes to consider the two amendments I sent across the floor to him. I think they are just, and at least would do no harm. Cases have occurred in the County of Hastings that would be met by these amendments. Of course, it leaves power absolutely in the hands of the Minister. I understand that this Bill does not make any radical change in the existing law, but you are simply taking power to issue certificates.

Mr. TUPPER. As we have all alluded several times to the practice in the United States, I would ask the Committee to allow that clause to stand until we obtain definite information. I will be very glad to consider the amendments the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Burdett) has sent to me. However, I think the first one would not properly come into this Bill at all ; that would come into the Steamboat Inspection Act. I will see whether any provision in that direction can be introduced as an amendment to the Steamboat Inspection Act, and on the Order paper now there is a proposed amendment to that Act. I think great objection can be taken to the other point taken by the hon. member. An extreme case was stated, and extreme cases can always be put in connection with the imposition of penalties. Perhaps a case may occur in which the offence may not be so severe as to come within the extreme provisions of the Act ; but the political head of the Department of Marine would be greatly embarrassed if appeals from judicial decisions were permitted. Such an appeal would be made in every case, and great difficulty would be experienced in dealing with it. The court would have dealt with the case, judgment would have been pronounced, and suspicion would always attach to the Minister in dealing with those cases. Pressure of all kinds would be brought on him to remit the penalty imposed by the judge, and the action taken by the Minister would, at all events, in this country, be liable to suspicion. I do not think it is safe to adopt that course. Another objection to that course is, that it would be making a very large departure from the present system. We have endeavoured to follow the principles laid down and sanctioned by the Imperial Board of Trade. We have adopted the results of their experience, and they do not interfere with decisions given by the courts. While cases may occur in which the penalty may seem too severe, the better course to adopt is to adhere to the Bill as it stands, and to leave the infliction of penalties in the hands of the court, and not in the hands of the Department of Marine.

Mr. BURDETT. I suggest that certain discretion should be left with the department in regard to remitting penalties in cases where it was recommended by the judge.

Mr. TUPPER. I will consider that point.

Mr. BURDETT. Under the criminal law as it now stands there are many cases where the judge allows a prisoner to go under suspended sentence, but under this Bill the penalties are set out, and no discretion is left to the court.

Mr. EDGAR. I hope, in considering this matter, the Minister will not make an appeal to himself from the judge's opinion. I would rather leave in the hands of the judge some discretionary power.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has changed the proposition from the one I dealt with, and it is now suggested that where a judge recommends that special circumstances deserve consideration as regards the punishment to be imposed, in those cases fines might be remitted by the department.

Committee rose and reported progress.

CHIGNECTO MARINE TRANSPORT RAILWAY.

Mr. FOSTER moved second reading of Bill (No. 97) to amend the Acts respecting the granting of a subsidy to the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company (Limited).

Motion agreed to; Bill read the second time, considered in Committee and reported.

INDIAN LANDS.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 100) for the settlement of certain questions between the Governments of Canada and Ontario respecting Indian lands (from the Senate).

Motion agreed to; Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. EDGAR. I presume this has been arranged between the Governments?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes; the agreement we have arrived at is embodied in the schedule.

Mr. EDGAR. I suppose the Provincial Government passed legislation concurrently?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think so.

Mr. MULOCK. I would suggest this clause should stand over until the preamble of the Bill is discussed. The reason I suggest that is, that it gives power to the Government to sanction any stipulations that may hereafter be arrived at. It is rather a wide power to give.

Committee rose; and it being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 18) respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.—(Mr. Montague.)

Bill (No. 37) to amend the Act respecting the New Brunswick Railway Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 38) respecting the Central Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. McLennan.)

Bill (No. 36) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 51) to incorporate the Vancouver Dock and Ship Building Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

Bill (No. 62) to enable the Victoria and North American Railway Company to run a Ferry between Becher Bay, in British Columbia, and a point on the Straits of Fuca, within the United States of America.—(Mr. Earle.)

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 107) to incorporate the Burrard Inlet and Westminster Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Corbould.)

SAFETY OF SHIPS.

Mr. TUPPER moved second reading of Bill (No. 44) to amend chapter 77 of the Revised Statutes, respecting the safety of Ships.

Mr. TUPPER.

Motion agreed to; Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. TUPPER. The inspectors of steamboats have been reporting to the department for some time that the dangerous practice is attempted of late of stowing away explosive materials, such as dynamite, nitro-glycerine, &c., and in some cases in large quantities, in passenger ships. Sometimes they are hidden in the life-boats, sometimes in the purser's cabin, and in other places. There is a law to prevent that, both in the United States and in Great Britain, but in Canada there is at present none. The object of this Bill is to prevent that practice, and in this clause I have named dynamite, nitro-glycerine and any other dangerous compounds. The Act of the United States defines a great many of these dangerous compounds, while the English Act is not quite so explicit, and we have followed more the lines of the English Act.

Mr. EDGAR. As far as I can see, the English legislation has been followed in regard to the marking of dangerous material, but I have been unable to find this clause. I do not say that it is bad because it is not in the English Act, but it seems to me it is going further than the English Act.

Mr. TUPPER. We adopted the English Act in regard to the marking of goods on freight boats, where they have to be marked and be stowed and taken care of in accordance with the provisions of the law, but the English Parliament went further, and prohibited the carrying of explosives on passenger ships entirely. In the United States passenger ships are only allowed to carry gunpowder and cartridges made of gunpowder, rockets, signals, blue lights, and so on, all for the purposes of navigation, for which we provide in the second subsection of this Bill.

Mr. EDGAR. What is the effect of section 5

Mr. TUPPER. It is intended to prevent an attempt being made to put these goods on passenger ships by marking them. These sections are permissive, allowing ships, if they follow certain regulations, to carry these articles.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman intend this to apply simply to Canadian registered ships sailing to and from ports in Canada?

Mr. TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That was my impression, but the first section does not say to or from what port in the world these ships are sailing, and I presume he does not propose to legislate for vessels sailing from England to Brazil or between any foreign ports. I would suggest the insertion of the words "to and from any port in Canada."

Mr. TUPPER. Certainly this is intended only to affect ships clearing from our ports. I think these words will meet the hon. gentleman's point, "from any port in Canada."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes; but suppose you wanted to prevent her from carrying glycerine or other explosives to an English port?

Mr. TUPPER. That comes afterwards.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Not with respect to a Canadian registered ship. The latter part of the section relates exclusively to ships not Canadian.

I think you will have to put in these words, "to and from any port."

Mr. TUPPER. I think the word "from" would be better there. Vessels coming into Canada could not clear from England or from the States.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If it is your object to prevent them carrying it out of Canada, well and good. But suppose the vessel goes to one of the South American Republics and brings back a cargo composed partly of explosive materials, she would not be liable to any penalty.

Mr. EDGAR. The clause as it stands refers only to ships carrying passengers between any place in Canada, or from any place in Canada, to a place out of Canada. I suppose that is what is meant to be applied to ships of Canadian register.

Mr. MULOCK. I would ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries whether it is intended to apply these penalties to any one in command of the vessel, as well as to the shipper?

Mr. TUPPER. The penalty would apply to any person who sent: that is, the shipper, or to any person who carries.

Mr. MULOCK. You want it to apply to those in control of the ship, do you?

Mr. TUPPER. Certainly, both to the sender and to the carrier.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it would be better to add a few words, because, when you read the two lines as they stand to-day, it might be held that the only person liable is the shipper: "Every person who knowingly sends or attempts to send, or who carries or attempts to carry." I would, therefore, suggest that you put in, after the word "carries," the words "or permits to be carried," to make it applicable to the master or to whoever controls the freight of the vessel?

Mr. TUPPER. The master certainly carries. He takes the ship and carries the stuff.

Mr. MULOCK. I doubt it. That is limited to persons shipping.

Mr. TUPPER. That is the language of the English Act. It is pretty safe to follow it.

Mr. MULOCK. We are improving on the English Act.

Mr. TUPPER. I do not think we can improve on their drafting.

Bill reported.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 14), with respect to certain matters affecting the Administration of Justice.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That Bill stood over for the purpose of enabling me to draft a clause to make a portion of it retroactive. I propose to reconsider section 1, and I move that the following be section 1:—

The jurisdiction of every county court judge shall extend, and shall be deemed to have always extended, to any additional territory annexed by the Provincial Legislature to Canada, or to the district for which he was or is appointed, to the same extent as if he were originally appointed for the county or district including such additional territory; providing that nothing in this section contained shall in any way affect any litigation now pending in the course of which any question has been raised as to the jurisdiction of a judge beyond the limits of the county or district for which he was originally appointed. In the next clause I propose to insert the word "competent" instead of "it shall be the duty."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman mean to make it voluntary on the part of the county court judge?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think that the word "competent" is adequate. The only question raised was, whether the Local Legislature had the power to tell a county court judge, who was appointed under commission for a particular county, to discharge the duties of a judge anywhere else. Mr. Adam Wilson, when Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench, inclined to the opinion that the Local Legislature had such power. The present Chief Justice of Queen's Bench has taken the very opposite view, and I do not suppose this House will be disposed to go further than to declare that it shall be competent for a county court judge to discharge the duties in any county where he might be called on to exercise his functions as a judge. If we go further, and declare it shall be his duty to do so, we are really interfering with the function of the Local Legislature in constituting the court. It is for the Local Legislature to say what the function of the court shall be, the extent of the authority, and where that authority may be exercised. They can still appoint the judge to act where they please, so long as this Parliament says it shall be competent for him to exercise those duties.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). These judges of the county courts are appointed by this Government to discharge duties in given counties, and each judge so understands it when he is appointed. It was proposed by the present Bill as drawn, that the judges should be compelled to go elsewhere. I object to that proposition. It is not fair to the county court judges, whose salaries are not very large, and who in some counties have very important duties to discharge. It is, therefore, unfair to compel them to leave the counties to which they are respectively appointed and discharge judicial functions elsewhere. It should be left discretionary with the Government and made competent for the judges to go elsewhere.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It strikes me differently. It seems to me that the object of the Bill will be defeated altogether if this suggestion is adopted. We do not attach any additional pay to the county court judge for discharging the additional duties which he is asked to perform, and if it is left open to him to perform them or not in nine cases out of ten he will respectfully decline. It may become a perfect farce to vest power in the Provincial Government to request county court judges to perform duties which must be discharged, and to leave it in the power of the judge to say that he declines to perform them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). As I understand it, the case is this: Our County Court Act in Ontario, an Act passed by the Local Legislature, provides for the constitution of the court and the appointment of a judge for each particular county. The Governor, on the advice of his Ministers here, appoints the county court judge. The Local Legislature creates the court, but it has no power to make the appointment. The judge was ap-

pointed under the law which authorized him to discharge his duties as a judge in a particular county, and did not extend them beyond that county. So far as the jurisdiction of the county court judge, acting as a division court judge, is concerned, the courts have held that any other party may be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor. So he may discharge the duties of a division court judge in another county than the one to which he was appointed as county court judge. It has been held by some, that a county court judge cannot act as such, except in the county to which he has been allotted. What we should do here, is to amend the law so as to make it competent for the county court judge to do so. It is for the Local Legislature to say, by its legislation, whether he shall be under any obligation to act elsewhere than in the county to which he was appointed. We have gone as far as it is necessary to go when we say it shall be competent. It is for the Local Legislature, under the authority given by the Provincial Act, to say that a judge who has been appointed for one county shall, under special circumstances, be called upon to perform the duties of a judge in another county. It is the function of the Local Legislature to constitute the court. If, in the first instance, the Local Legislature provided that a county court judge appointed in any county shall, under certain circumstances, undertake to discharge the duties of a county court judge in any other county, I have no doubt in my own mind that it would be competent for it to do so; and that if a judge had been appointed to discharge the duties of a court so constituted his functions would have been limited by the provisions of the law in force at the time his appointment was made. But when the Legislature had provided for appointment to a particular county, and for the discharge of certain duties and for a certain jurisdiction in that county, and His Excellency the Governor General, upon the advice of his Ministers, appoints a judge in that county to discharge the duties marked out by the Local Legislature, I suppose it might be well doubted whether he could undertake the discharge of these duties anywhere else but where his patent would warrant it, and whether his proceedings as judge would be valid elsewhere. I think that when we say by this section that it shall be "competent" for any county court judge to do so, and the Legislature imposes that duty upon him, the defect in the law will be adequately met.

Mr. WELDON. I quite agree with the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that the Bill of the Minister of Justice will render very good service in settling a constitutional point of some nicety. In addition to the cases cited by the hon. member for Bothwell from the Province of Ontario, we had a case in the Province of Nova Scotia some years ago on the very point that underlies this Bill. The Supreme Court held, with some hesitancy however, that the provisions of a local Act which empowered a county court judge to go beyond the district named in his commission were competent as being within that clause of section 92 of the British North America Act which gives the local authorities power to deal with the administration of justice. But much doubt was expressed as to whether that other clause of the Act which gives to the federal authorities the power to appoint county court judges was not in conflict, and did not override this section of the Provincial Act. In the case I have referred to the court decided that the Act of the Local Legislature was valid, and that under the section I have alluded to the provisions of the County Court Act of the province were also valid. I remember, however, to have read somewhere the opinion of Mr. Edward Blake to the contrary. It was not expressed with perfect certainty, but it showed that the leanings of Mr. Blake's mind were strongly in the other direction, namely, that when any county court judge was commissioned by the federal authorities to try cases in a certain county, it was a part of the appointing power that he should be a judge in these counties, and if he went beyond these counties he was beyond his power. At all events, this seemed to be the leaning of Mr. Blake's mind: that the last section of the British North America Act, which gives to the Federal Government the appointing power, was the controlling section in this matter. I think the Bill of the Minister of Justice will do very good service, and will have the effect of placing this complicated question at rest. I quite agree with the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that enough has been said when the word "competent" is used.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I quite acquiesce that the word "competent" is the proper word if the object of this Bill is solely to remove what is said to be a doubt as to the power of a county court judge to act judicially in another territorial district. I do not understand that to be the object of the Bill; I understood the object of the Bill to be to aim at the removal of a defect in the administration of justice. It may happen that if a county court judge dies, some judicial act will require to be done in another county, and the Lieutenant Governor of the province in Council seems to me to be the proper authority who might be authorized to require the county court judge to discharge these duties. The law provides that it will be competent for a county court judge to discharge the duty if he pleases, and I quite conceive that the hon. gentleman's argument is conclusive if the only object is to remove a doubt existing as to the power of the county court judge. If I remember well, the Minister of Justice, when acting as judge in the courts of Nova Scotia, explicitly decided this point the other way. There might have been doubt, and it is perfectly proper to remove that doubt, and so far as it is desirable to remove it the substitution of the word "competent" for "duty" would accomplish that object. If, however, the hon. gentleman has in view a higher and better object he fails to obtain it by eliminating the words "the duty of the county court judge," and substituting "the will of the county court judge."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would ask the hon. gentleman, if you insert the word "duty," are you not constituting a court of justice that is not within the jurisdiction of the Local Legislature?

Mr. EDGAR. I agree that the word "competent" will meet the requirements of the case, but what I would like to know is: what necessity is there for the clause in this section requiring the order of the Governor in Council in addition to the request of the Lieutenant Governor. I think it could very properly be made an Order in Council of the Lieutenant Governor, and that you could leave out the provision requiring the order of the

through that examination again if we had taken out our certificates some years ago and wanted it Governor in Council as well. It seems to me that when we are placing the matter in the hands of the provincial authorities to deal with, we need not bring in the roundabout machinery of the Ottawa Government to authorize this course. I would suggest, if the Minister of Justice does not see some reason against it, that the words in the fifth line of the second section, requiring an order of the Governor General in Council, should be struck out.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In so far as we have jurisdiction to deal with this matter we are dealing with the appointing power, and providing that the appointing power shall be satisfied by certain things being done. I think it would not be becoming that we should entirely part with the control over that branch of the subject; but besides that, by giving the control altogether to the local authority we may be raising a new question, and that is, as to the validity of our own statute. If really the transfer of the judge from one county to the other is the appointing power we have no right under the British North America Act to say that the Lieutenant Governor of the province shall do so. I think it is safer to leave the provision as it is.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

ADMIRALTY JURISDICTION IN CANADA.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 13) to provide for the exercise of Admiralty Jurisdiction within Canada in accordance 1890."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman intend to proceed with this Bill to-night? It is a very important one, and I should hope he would with "The Colonial Courts of Admiralty Act, not do so.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Some such Bill must be passed and assented to by the 1st of July, if possible, and I should like to make some progress with it to-night. If there are any sections which members desire to consider further, I would be willing to let them stand over.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) One or two of my hon. friends with myself have been considering this Bill very carefully——

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will not ask the House to take the committee stage to-night.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION.

Mr. TUPPER moved second reading of Bill (No. 85) further to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act.

Motion agreed to; Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. EDGAR. I think the definition of the word "passenger" here may have a very curious effect, because under it every person who happens to be out on a boat, unless it is expressly a pleasure yacht, is a passenger, and the boat that carries him is liable to all kinds of penalties. It is a very sweeping definition. I should think a passenger might be defined as a person who is carried on a boat for hire, or something like that.

Mr. TUPPER. We found, in the operation of the Steamboat Inspection Act, that it could be evaded, and was evaded to a most serious degree, in consequence of the very absence of a definition of a passenger. The instruction given was, that a passenger was a person carried for hire, as the hon. gentleman has suggested; but the difficulty of proving that was so excessively great, that, in several cases which came before the department, the law was successfully evaded. On examination, we found that the definition in this Bill is that contained in the Imperial Act and in the Acts of the different colonies, without exception. The case which the hon. gentleman puts, I think, will be covered by a subsequent provision of the Bill.

On section 2,

Mr. EDGAR. Why is this section of the Act repealed?

Mr. TUPPER. This is a re-enacted section, with the exception of the words which are necessary to exempt ships with a British register and holding outstanding certificates of inspection; in other words, so that we may not be compelled to enforce the Act in its strict terms where there is no necessity for it. Without this provision, we should be obliged to compel a British steamer engaged in our coasting trade to pay double inspection fees. She may have come from England with a Board of Trade certificate, and when she entered our port we would be obliged under the old Act to stop her, unless she went to a totally unnecessary inspection and paid double fees. That is at any rate the information that we have received.

On section 3,

Mr. TUPPER. This is to repeal an unnecessary clause, referring to an examination which it has been found does not exist.

On section 4,

Mr. TUPPER. In the original Act, there was no provision by which we could obtain the penalty for a steamboat going beyond the waters for which its certificate was granted, and this section is merely to supply that omission.

On section 5,

Mr. TUPPER. This is intended to give engineers some relief in the event of the board not sitting. The board of engineers, taken from the different parts of the country, cannot sit all the time, and though the applicant has passed the necessary examination and his papers are all satisfactory, it is impossible to give him other than an interim certificate. This is not satisfactory, and, as a rule, the engineers wait until there is a meeting of the board and they can get their regular certificate. I think the safeguard in that direction is ample to prevent any abuse.

On sub-section 6, section 42,

Mr. TUPPER. That sub-section has become unnecessary. Its object is included in the last amendment.

Mr. EDGAR. I dare say my hon. friend and myself might find it very difficult to pass our examination for admission to our own profession, and I think it would be a pity to call upon us to go

exchanged for an inferior certificate. Under the old Act, those who had second class certificates could exchange them for third class without examination.

Mr. TUPPER. This is to guard against possible abuse. The parties may, through want of practice, have become unskilful in their work, as it is of a delicate nature and requires a good deal of experience. The examination they require to pass is only of a practical nature, excluding that in scholastic matters, such as mathematics, to which the engineers objected.

On sub-section 7,

Mr. TUPPER. We have found this difficulty: Notice comes to us that a steamer is running contrary to the Act and that there is danger to life, and we could not stop that steamer, in some of the unsettled districts west, unless we can utilize the services of customs officers. In many cases these could not be had on application, and we propose to give our inspector the power.

Mr. EDGAR. These words which are in the old Act are left out: "or by the inspector who has made such report," and the Minister thus takes the sole power himself.

Mr. TUPPER. I have no objection to inserting the words of the old Act: "or by the inspector who has made such report."

On sub-section 2, section 50,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is your idea of having two sub-sections?

Mr. TUPPER. That is the draughtsman's idea, and I think it reads better.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Under one section the inspector cannot seize the steamer unless he is authorized by the Minister, but under the subsequent section the collector of customs can seize, whether he has the authority of the Minister or not. Why should this power be given to the collector of customs?

Mr. TUPPER. The collector is charged with the duty of seeing the law carried out, and he must stop any contravention of it, but when we send an inspector we give him special authority to seize.

Bill reported.

FISHERY BOUNTY.

Mr. TUPPER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient that an annual grant of one hundred and sixty thousand dollars be made to aid in the development of the sea fisheries and the encouragement of the building and fitting out of improved fishing vessels, and the improvement of the condition of the fishermen.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Perhaps the hon. gentleman will take this occasion to explain why the increase has been asked for?

Mr. TUPPER. There is a necessity either for an increase such as is proposed or for a reduction in the amount received by the fisherman as at present given him, and the amount asked, $160,000 a year, is but $10,000 in excess of the present statutory provision, but it is by no means in excess of what has been actually paid to the fishermen notwithstanding that Act, and, consequently, my predecessors have had to come to Parliament on several occasions, and Parliament has not begrudged the grant of a supplementary vote. Instead of pursuing that course, it occurred to me that it would be better to make the provision a fair one, or a more generous one if you like, and the amount of $160,000 is very little in excess of the average that has been paid since we first commenced to make these payments. The total average per year has been $156,840.76, and consequently, as I have said, application has had to be made to Parliament from time to time for the over expenditure. The amount of $160,000 is not quite 4 per cent. on the principal upon which this payment was originally made. It will be remembered that the proposition to Parliament was based on the claim that the fishermen could fairly put forward to a share of the amount of $4,500,000 paid to this country for the use of the Atlantic fisheries during the time of the Washington Treaty. I will give a table to the House showing the basis of each year's distribution, and the House will see that we have endeavoured to keep the expenditure down as far as possible; but, fortunately, the increase of the earners of this bounty has gone on from year to year, and that is of course a very good thing for the country. The ships that now put to sea from our provinces are beyond comparison with those that went into this business before this bounty was paid. I do not attribute the improvements to the payment of the bounty altogether, but no one can dispute that that bounty has had a very healthy influence upon the labours of our fishermen, and that, together with the healthy rivalry with the splendid ships that set out from Gloucester, has produced such a state of things that there are many ports in our provinces which send out as fine ships as those which go to the Banks of Newfoundland and elsewhere from the New England ports. The basis on which the distribution has taken place is as follows:—

Year.	Vessels, half to Owner and half to Crew.	Boats.
1882	$2.00 per ton.....	$5 per man—one-fifth to owner and four-fifths to fishermen.
1883	$2.00 do	$2.50 per man—one-fifth to owner and four-fifths to fishermen.
1884	$2.00 do	14 to 18 ft. keel, $1 to $1.50; 18 to 25 ft. keel, $1 to $1.50; 25 ft. upwards, $2, and fishermen, $3 each.
1885	$2.00 do	Same as in 1884, except that boats of 13 ft. keel were admitted to participation.
1886	$2.00 do	Same as in 1885.
1887	$2.00 do	do
1888	$1.50 do	do
1889	$1.50 do	All boats at $1 each to owner, and fishermen, $3 apiece.
1890	$1.50 do	Same as in 1889.

If we were to be kept within the limits of the Act, the reduction would have to go on. I think we will

be able to make the present appropriation cover all the legitimate claims. I may say that the strictest supervision is being maintained over the distribution of this bounty. It is open to a great deal of abuse. It is a most difficult thing to administer, and there have been complaints made in Parliament in regard to it, and I appreciate the force of those complaints because I know myself of attempts which have been made to claim this bounty when there was no right to it. In all cases where a fraud has been committed, or an irregularity attempted, I have done the utmost to bring the person to justice, and to have an example shown in order to prevent a recurrence of that practice. To that end, as was mentioned a short time ago, I asked advice from all quarters, and, I think, that, by strict supervision and by having these declarations of such a character as they are now, solemn declarations properly drawn up, and the enforcement of the criminal law where false statements are made, we will be able to keep the expenditure where it should be, for those who earn it by the exertions that our fishermen have to undergo.

Mr. KAULBACH. I am pleased to find that my hon. friend, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, has conceded to the request to increase the bounty to our fishermen, and to add $10,000 to the original amount, as this resolution provides. This is very satisfactory and encouraging, and I contend the best expenditure, as respects the object, the Government could have made, as by it they are fostering, encouraging and promoting the greatest natural industry that Canada possesses—that of fishing. But I must say I would desire to see the amount still larger. When the bounty to fishermen was first mooted and encouraged, and an approach made the Government for a grant of money some years ago by the late member for Gaspé, myself and some few others, it was in view of the fact that a large number of fishermen of the Maritime Provinces, more particularly from Nova Scotia, were migrating to the United States to prosecute the industry of fishing in vessels belonging to Massachusetts, built of a superior class expressly for the business, and equipped and provisioned better than our own, This migratory movement had been going on previous to the treaty known as the Washington Treaty. During said treaty, and after the fishery clauses of the Washington Treaty were abrogated, and to prevent that exodus, and to keep them at home and at the same time encourage two growing and important industries, that of shipbuilding and fishing, it was considered advisable to offer a bounty, to be divided equally—half to the owner of the vessel, and the other half to the fishermen. Recognition of the interests of the fishermen in this way, on the part of the Government, has been looked upon by the fishermen with very great favour, and has had a very salutary and beneficial effect throughout the Maritime Provinces, notably in the County of Lunenburg, which I have the honour to represent, where can be seen, as a result, the handsomest fishing fleet in the world, and, without exception, the bravest and best of fishermen. All the fishermen complain of is, that the sum or grant of money is too small, as it leaves when divided up—the apportionment—very little for each man. Hence the great pleasure I have in expressing my delight at seeing this $10,000, although small, added to the usual grant, and I sincerely hope that another year the hon. Minister may see his way clear to still further increase the amount, and thereby encourage this great and important industry so justly meriting our advocacy and attention.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I do not propose to open the question at all of the propriety of these bonuses given to the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces. I am quite aware that differences of opinion already exist as to whether as much material benefit is derived from the distribution of this money, as was imagined at one time would be derived. Those who are conversant with the facts know that a great deal of fraud is connected with the payments of these moneys in the elections, and when one considers the time wasted over the small bounty which is paid to an individual fisherman himself, the time wasted by him in obtaining it, the great expense to the country in the distribution, and the numerous frauds which seem to be inseparable from its payment, there is no use denying the fact that a question could be reasonably raised whether we receive the full value of our money, or whether the principle is a good or sound one. I am not going to raise it to-night, but I wish to remind the hon. gentleman who has just spoken that he need not congratulate the Minister upon any change of policy, or upon any increase of bounty, because such is not the fact. There is no increase of bounty to the individual fisherman, to the ship-builder, or to anyone engaged in the fisheries, nor is there an increase in the total amount supposed to be paid now over that which has been paid heretofore. The same amount will continue to be paid, and the Minister adopts this mode, as I understand it, of simplifying the authority for paying $160,000, and preventing the necessity of his coming down year by year and asking a supplementary grant. The amount of money paid *in toto*, and the actual sum paid to the fishermen individually, will continue to be the same heretofore as it has been in the past, and will not in any way be altered by the present resolution.

Mr. KAULBACH. The hon. member will see that the usual grant has been $150,000, and the increase of $10,000 is to be apportioned among the fishermen under the present arrangement. Therefore any amount that would be remaining over and above the cost of distribution, would certainly go to the fishermen.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman surely heard the explanation of the Minister. He does not propose to increase the sum total granted, or the sum paid, to the individual fisherman, but inasmuch as his predecessor had to ask for a supplementary grant when making up the sum paid to the fishermen, he proposes to adopt this mode of paying them as the sum *in toto* and the sum individually.

Resolution reported.

TRINITY HOUSE, MONTREAL.

Mr. TUPPER moved second reading of Bill (No. 95) further to amend the Act 36 Victoria, Chapter 61, respecting the Trinity House and Harbour Commission of Montreal.

Motion agreed to; Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. TUPPER. I may explain that this is a very harmless Bill. It is introduced in consequence of legislation abolishing tonnage dues on shipping in the port of Montreal, and I am venturing my hand on a gerrymander of a simple description. The present Bill substitutes the entry of tonnage, or clearances of tonnage, at the port, for the dues that were formerly paid. I may state to the House that this Bill has been submitted to the Board of Trade and Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, and is approved of in this form.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

TRADE MARKS AND INDUSTRIAL DESIGNS.

Bill (No. 101) further to amend the Act respecting trade marks and industrial designs, was read the second time, considered in Committee, reported and read the third time and passed.

BILLS OF EXCHANGE.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 104) to amend the Bills of Exchange Act, 1890.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Would the Minister please explain the amendments to the Act?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There are none of them very material; they are to remove certain defects in the Act of last year which was rather complicated as the hon. gentleman will remember. In the passage of that Bill through this House a number of amendments were made, and in the two or three cases which are mentioned in sections 1, 2, 3 and 4 the amendments which had been made in the Bill in some parts required amendments to be made in other parts and these were overlooked. That is the sole object of the first four sections of the Bill.

On section 5,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It will be remembered that the Bill as introduced altered the law as to the payment of a forged instrument if it were payable to order, and threw the burden of the loss on the drawer. That was, however, altered. The object of this sub-section is to preserve the right of recourse which the person paying the forged cheque has, and it puts him in the position of an innocent holder for value, which enables him, therefore, to exercise the right of recourse for the recovery back of the amount so paid from any endorser who has endorsed the same subsequent to the forged endorsement. This is right; because on the forged endorsement, by reason of its forgery, the title had been endorsed and guaranteed by the subsequent endorser, and, therefore, it is only right that the person who is thus deceived into paying should have due recourse against the person who by endorsing after the forgery guaranteed the Bill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is on the principle that every endorser has guaranteed the genuineness of the Bill.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It means simply that the bank, which in most cases is the place upon which the cheque is drawn, pays that cheque, and when it finds there is a forged endorsement, it has the right to recover against the person paying the cheque into the bank, or against any other endorser on the bill subsequent to the forged one. I approve of that. If it is necessary to give the bank that right by legislative enactment, it ought to be likewise necessary to go a little further and give the right to the endorser who has to repay the money to the bank—it should give a similar remedy against the person who endorsed to him. For instance: if A gets a cheque upon which there is a forged endorsement, and he transfers it to B, and B takes it to the bank, by this section when the bank discovers that one of the endorsements is forged it can make either B or A repay the money. Suppose they make B repay, what remedy has B got against A who endorsed it to him? He should have the same remedy against the previous endorser as the bank has against him. If it were not thought necessary to have this provision in the Bill I should imagine that he would have recourse under the common law, but if it is necessary to give this remedy to the bank, it must be equally necessary to give it to the endorser of the forged instrument.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think it is only necessary in consequence of section 24 of the Act to which this is to be added.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). American courts have always held, and I suppose the same rule prevails here, that an endorser without recourse is always bound to guarantee the genuineness of the instrument he endorses. That rule, I think, is a sound one, and it ought to be made perfectly clear. If a party endorses a forged instrument and presents it to some one else, the first endorser ought to be liable.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is just the view of the law I hold myself; but if that is the law, then the drawee that pays the bill to the man who presents it has the common law remedy against him, because the man who gets the money endorses the bill and guarantees its genuineness. But if it is necessary to insert this clause and give the bank this right, then *a fortiori* it must be equally just to follow up the endorsers until you reach the man who first endorsed the bill.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will let the section stand, but I think the common law right is affected by the section itself.

Committee rose and reported progress.

ADJOURNMENT—THE POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. LAURIER. I expected that the hon. Finance Minister would give us an opportunity to-day of bringing before the House the question of which I gave notice yesterday. As he did not do so, may I hope that on Tuesday he may give that opportunity.

Mr. FOSTER. On Tuesday I intend to go on with the Budget.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman has a good memory, and I understood that he told us he would give us the opportunity to-day.

Mr. FOSTER. I asked the hon. gentleman if he had a motion in amendment to going into Committee of Supply. He said he would let me know if he had a motion, and added the remark: "I suppose you will go into Supply to-day?" I said, I supposed we would, and I expected a notice of his amendment, but we did not receive it.

Mr. LAURIER. I said I would take the opportunity to-day to bring that question before the House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman did not state any question.

Mr. LAURIER. Oh, yes. When the hon. Minister of Public Works yesterday made a statement of the policy of the Government, I stated directly that I would take the first opportunity of discussing that matter.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman's statement was not like that. He said he had no doubt that the Government intended to pursue the policy of Sir John Macdonald, and that he would take an opportunity of discussing whether we were doing so or not. That is certainly not the usual intimation given across the House as to the kind of amendment to be brought up. It conveyed not the slightest conception to members on this side of the House what the nature of his amendment would be.

Mr. LAURIER. I thought my intimation was sufficient. I will try to be more explicit another time.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 22nd June, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE FARMERS' BANK OF RUSTICO.

Mr. WELDON moved that Bill (No. 40) respecting the Farmers' Bank of Rustico, be placed on the Orders of the Day for consideration this day, immediately after Private Bills.

Motion agreed to.

TRANSFER OF PROPERTY TO THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 111) to authorize the transfer of certain public property to the Provincial Governments. He said: This is substantially the Bill relating to the foreshores, which was introduced last session, with some modifications in the provisions.

Mr. AMYOT. Is there any correspondence about it between the Federal Government and the Provinces?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. AMYOT. Has it been laid before the House yet?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There has been no correspondence since last session, but there has been some consultation, at the meeting which I referred to, the other day.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

VOTING IN THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. DAVIN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 112) to amend the Act respecting the representation of the North-West Territories. He said: This Bill is intended to relieve the conscience of some voters in the North-West. We found in the last election that a man who had been out of the territories for a couple of weeks, thought he could not swear that he had been a resident of the territories for the twelve months preceding the day he was to vote; and this Bill changes the form of voting so that instead of a man's swearing that he has been a resident for twelve months, he swears that he is a resident of the North-West Territories, and that his domicile has been in the district for twelve months past. It will also provide that the members of the North-West Mounted Police shall not vote. The leading men on that force, and numbers of constables, have expressed to me a desire that they should be relieved of the privilege of voting, because in the last election, pressure was placed upon them to vote in a given way; some voted contrary to the course indicated, and a persistent attempt has been made to persecute them and oppress them.

Mr. BOWELL. A very serious charge.

Mr. DAVIN. It is very necessary. Officers have asked me to have them relieved from the privilege of voting.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman having stated that a portion of this force having been persecuted by somebody to induce them to vote contrary to their consciences and convictions, he should not stop there but should tell the House who are the miscreants who committed so great a crime against the liberties of the subject.

Mr. DAVIN. I have no objection to tell the hon. gentleman. He is a gentleman in whom my hon. friend took a great interest, Commissioner Herchmer. Commissioner Herchmer got directions, and proper directions, from the Dominion Government, or more properly from Sir John Macdonald, that he was not to interfere one way or another; and the way he carried out these instructions was this: he sent a letter round to the officers of the posts in the constituency in which I stood as a candidate, saying: "The police are at liberty to vote (this is the very wording of the letter which was to be read out on parade to members of the force) how they please, but I am in favour of Mr. Tweed." Of course, with his enormous power and well-known character, it was equivalent to a menace.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has he been dismissed?

Mr. DAVIN. I do not know.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ALBION MINES SAVINGS BANK.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce a Bill to continue the Acts respecting the Albion Mines Savings Bank. He said: This is a savings bank brought under the General Act of 1885. Its charter will expire on 1st July, 1891. The object of the Bill is to continue for a sufficient time the powers of the Local Legislature to enable the bank to continue its business so far as it can under the authority given by this Legislature. It is not a bank which issues any notes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How does this Bill happen to become a public Bill? I know several other Bills almost similar in character which were introduced as private Bills. Why has this Bill, which is essentially one dealing with a private corporation and asking for privileges which I have no doubt it is proper for the House to give, been introduced in this way? I call special attention to a Bill in which I am interested, and which comes from my province, a Bill for the extension of the Farmers' Bank of Rustico, which is as much a public institution as is the Albion Mines Savings Bank, and it was introduced as a private Bill, and the fees duly paid.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a quasi-public Bill. I think there are precedents for the introduction of such Bills by a Minister of the Crown. This Bill, however, is urgent, because the charter will expire on 1st July, and, unless legislation is had by that time, the bank will go out of existence. If I did not introduce the Bill in this way, it would have to go through the form of petition, &c., and it could not be introduced this session. I may say to my hon. friend that I had intended to take the same course in regard to the Bill to which he has referred, but, before I observed it, the Bill had already been introduced and all due notice given, and there were no forms to be waived.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) With that statement coming from a Minister of the Crown, the fees unwittingly paid will be remitted?

Mr. FOSTER. That is for the House to determine.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I confess I do not understand on what ground the Minister has introduced this Bill as a private measure. Of course, a Minister may introduce a private Bill as any other member may do, but I do not know any reason why the fact that a Minister introduces a private Bill should make it a public Bill. This Bill, judging from the title, is in the nature of a private Bill, and the reason given by the Minister for introducing this as a public Bill, that the charter would expire if not introduced and hurried through Parliament, is one without force. It was a question for the directors of the corporation to consider, whether they would allow their charter to lapse through carelessness, in not giving proper notice. I do not think the explanation given by the Minister is at all satisfactory.

Mr. EDGAR. No doubt the proper course for the Minister to adopt was to introduce a petition, which would be considered by the Committee on Standing Orders, and if that committee chose to recommend that the notices be dispensed with in that particular case, it would be done. I do not know whether the Minister has done so or not. Other hon. members have to adopt that course, and this Bill should not be considered by the House in this way. It should be introduced as a private Bill, and go to the Banking and Commerce Committee. I really think it is entirely out of order.

Mr. FOSTER. If the House strongly objects to this course, I must submit. I had no idea except to facilitate the Bill being passed through the House and going into effect before 1st July. Probably the precedents I have mentioned, to which I have reference, are not on all fours with this case, although they have great similarity to this Bill. My error, if I have committed any, was committed in my wish to prevent the bank from being placed in an unfortunate position. If the objection is pressed, I withdraw my Bill.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not object to the Bill, but to the very serious precedent which will be established. I do not for a moment see why a distinction should be made between Bills of a like character. As regards the present Bill, I would do anything to facilitate its passage through Committee, but it is a very serious step to establish a precedent to be acted on hereafter.

Mr. McDOUGALD (Pictou). There are precedents in regard to the chartered banks of the country. The extension of the bank charters was not made by means of a private Bill, but by a general Bill, and the private corporations stand in the same position. Another precedent is the extension of the charter of the Montreal City and District Savings Bank. In regard to a Bill of this kind, which only continues for a period of ten years, and where the Government intervenes and reduces the time, and where the operating of the institution is regulated by the Government, the time may be extended by a Government Bill.

Mr. MULOCK. The first point to determine is whether this Bill is a public or private Bill. No hon. member is at present able to form an opinion on that point, and Mr. Speaker alone is able to give us any information. If it is a private Bill, of course it has to comply with the standing rules of the House: but, I presume, if it is a private Bill and, therefore, cannot be so introduced, it will be quite possible for the Minister to introduce a public Bill having to do with all the banks generally, not naming this bank in particular, which will get over the difficulty. The first point to determine is, whether this is a private Bill.

Mr. LISTER. There is no difficulty about this matter. If it is a private Bill, it can go before the proper Committee and pass the House before 1st July. The difficulty is, that if a Minister is allowed to introduce a private Bill as a public Bill, simply because he is a Minister, the treasury will lose the amount of the fee.

Mr. LAURIER. I have no objection to the principle of this Bill, but to the ground on which we have to deal with it, that of urgency. If it is not urgent, there is no precedent for it.

Mr. FOSTER. Probably the better way to settle it would be for me to withdraw this motion, and for the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. McDougald) to move for leave to introduce the Bill. Then

the rules of the House could be suspended, to which, I imagine, the House will consent.

Motion withdrawn.

Mr. McDOUGALD (Pictou) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 113) to continue the Acts respecting the Albion Mines Savings Bank, and that all rules in regard to private Bills be suspended so far as they relate to the said Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read first time.

THE POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of moving the adjournment of the House. I take this extreme course in order to bring to the attention of the House at once the discussion which the formation, the situation and the principles of the present Government naturally invite—not only invite, but even demand. I take this extreme course because I had expected, but found that I had vainly expected of the Government, that they would have afforded me an opportunity, at an early day, namely, on Friday last, of bringing this question before the House and testing the opinion of the House on the same in even a sharper manner than I can do so on the present occasion. The House is informed of what took place on Thursday last. My hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, crossed over at an early part of the sitting and asked me if I intended to move an amendment, on his moving the House into Committee of Supply on the following day. I told him I would be in a position to give him an answer in a few moments. At that time I thought the Government would lay before the House the policy which they intended to follow. And a few moments afterwards the hon. Minister of Public Works read a paper to the House stating what the policy of the new Administration would be; and thereupon I stated that I would take occasion on the following day to discuss the question before the House. In the innocence of my soul I thought that the hon. Minister of Finance had notice enough, when I made the statement which I did before the House; but it appears that I was mistaken, and that he expected that I would cross over and whisper in his ear what I had just stated. I must object to the hon. gentleman thus depreciating his own intellect, and I can come to no other conclusion than at that time the Government were averse to coming to close quarters on the question, and rallying their forces to support them. However, be this as it may, I will deem it advisable on future occasions, if my hon. friend comes to me to ascertain what my intentions are as to going into Committee of Supply, not to trust his understanding, but to confine myself to such notices only as are required by the rules of the House. Now, Sir, the House must agree that the new Government which we have before us to-day have been, from the first moment of their existence, very reticent as to the manner in which they came into life. They have been extremely parsimonious in giving information—so parsimonious, indeed, as to justify the belief that in their own estimation silence was gold, that the least said the better for them. The first statement they read to the House was as meagre, as empty as human ingenuity could make it. Only as much was said as was unavoidable, but a good deal was reserved that should have been said. Luckily, indeed, the statement then made has been supplemented since in various ways. It has been supplemented, first, by the statement read a few days afterwards as to the policy of the Government; it has been supplemented by the explanations given by the Prime Minister in the other branch of the Legislature; and last, though not least, it has been supplemented also by more suggestive communications made in the press from a member of the present and the last Administration,—and by articles no less suggestive, which have appeared in a newspaper published in the city of Montreal, which is not only a ministerial organ, but which is understood to be the personal organ, and, if I am correctly informed, to a large extent the personal property of the hon. Secretary of State. Thus, bit by bit, gradually and reluctantly, the present authorities have given us information which at last enables us to judge where we stand and to review the situation somewhat as it is. I was not astonished the other day when the hon. Minister of Public Works, speaking for himself and his colleagues, declared that the policy of the new Government would be to stand by the well-known policy of the Conservative party, or rather the policy of Sir John Macdonald—because the policy of Sir John Macdonald was the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party. For this I was prepared, and I am further prepared to believe that it will be the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite to endeavour to live as much as they can after the custom of their departed leader. I am prepared also to believe that to all the worst features of that policy they will adhere; but from the better and nobler features of the policy of Sir John Macdonald do I see a wide departure in the composition of the present Government. If there is one thing for which, in my judgment, the career of Sir John Macdonald especially deserves commendation, so far as I read the history of the last forty years, it is that he ever endeavoured to maintain an equilibrium between the different sections of this country, not only with respect to the passions and prejudices which struggle within the bosom of this young nation, but also with respect to the great powers which in a new community like this will rise, and have already risen, to gigantic proportions. In this respect I see already a wide departure from the policy of Sir John Macdonald. We have among us a huge corporation which has accumulated wealth already amounting to hundreds of millions, a creature of our own making, but which threatens to become stronger than its maker; I refer to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. To-day the hon. gentleman who is at the head of the Government, the Prime Minister of Canada, is a man of well known and very great abilities; but it is also a well-known fact that the abilities of that hon. gentleman have been exercised for the last ten years or more, not in the service of the country, but in the service of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Mr. Abbott has been from the inception of the company its legal head, its adviser, its thinker. He has framed all its measures, all its laws, all its contracts, all its agreements; he has favoured all its schemes. He has been, I will not say the captain of the craft, but its pilot, and he has piloted it from the day it was launched to the present day. Now, this is the gentleman who to-day is the Premier

of Canada. I will not say that in this the Government of the country has been handed over to the Canadian Pacific Railway, but I do not hesitate to say, and speak with a full knowledge of the responsibility attaching to my words, that, indeed, the Canadian Pacific Railway has been given an undue preponderance in the councils of the nation. I will be told that Mr. Abbott has no longer any connection with the company, that he has sold all his stock. But supposing he has. Suppose he has sold out all the pecuniary interests he had in that company, do you suppose he has thereby severed the moral interest he has always had in it? Do you suppose he has cut the strings of his heart, and that his heart has ceased to beat where it used to beat up to yesterday? It is admitted that the services of Mr. Abbott to the company have always been priceless. That fact has been stated, time and again, by presidents of the company, by directors of the company, and by its shareholders; and it is equally well known that his services have been paid for at fabulous prices. I do not mention this as a reproach, but simply to show that Mr. Abbott's services to the company were always of the greatest possible value in the eyes of the company itself. Yet, after he has severed his connection with it, and despite that fact, the stock of the company is to-day going up, and not down, in the markets of the world. What is the meaning of this? It is simply that every shareholder of the company, every investor, in the world at large, understands that though the Premier of Canada to-day has no pecuniary, no material interest in the Canadian Pacific Railway, still the fact that he is the First Minister of Canada, gives to that company a greater hold on the Government than it ever had before, and makes its stock all the more valuable. Suppose that, a few years ago, when the late Sir John Macdonald was head of the Government, Mr. Abbott, who was then the adviser of the company, had suddenly withdrawn his services from it and given them to another corporation, say, for instance, the Grand Trunk Railway Company, what would have been the result on the stock market? The result would have been that the stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway would have gone down and the stock of the Grand Trunk Railway would have gone up. Now, however, though Mr. Abbott has severed his connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, though it is acknowledged that his services, when connected with it, were invaluable, the stock, instead of going down, goes up, showing that the danger to Canada, which may be the profit to the Canadian Pacific Railway, is really well understood by the public at large. I do not say this in any sense of hostility to the company; I will not say a word of disparagement of the company or of the unwise course they took, in my estimation, when they interfered in the last elections—for I hold that such companies are always of benefit to the country when their powers are exercised in their proper sphere—but the unanimous consensus of opinion has always been, with regard to such companies, keeping in view their immense wealth and the immense power they wield, that they should be kept strictly within the line inside of which they may be of benefit to the country and beyond which they may be a danger to the country. In so far as the Canadian Pacific Railway is concerned, so strongly was this opinion held, at the time of the contract and of its organization, that it was made an organic disposition of our law, if I remember rightly, that no one connected with it could be a member of Parliament. This wise provision has been since removed, if I remember rightly, but at all events, as I said a moment ago, though the influence and power of the company, in Sir John's time, had assumed alarming proportions and tendencies, still the majority of the people believed the hand of the master was over it. Now, however, I do not hesitate to say, there is a feeling spread abroad that the hand of the company is over the Canadian Government; and we can well understand why the magnates of that company, during the last contest, put forward such efforts to favour the party then in power. Events have shown that they were wise in their generation. They foresaw that Sir John Macdonald could not live very long. He was not merely advanced in years, but in poor health, and therefore they foresaw the day when, after his death, there would be jealousy and turmoil among the rival factions fighting for rival claimants, and that then would be the moment when they could put into the scale the weight of services performed, and services expected. And so it proved to be the case. I am sorry that on this occasion, the rulers of our country did not go to the neighbouring Republic, where they could have found an example which they could have imitated with profit. In 1869, when General Grant formed his first Administration, he called to the Secretaryship of the Treasury, the celebrated New York merchant, Mr. A. T. Stewart. Mr. Stewart accepted the office, but the appointment was not ratified by the Senate. It was found there was an old law, dating from the first days of the Republic, which prohibited anyone connected with the importation of merchandize from being Secretary of the Treasury. Mr. Stewart at once offered to put the whole of his immense business into the hands of trustees and to devote the whole revenues accruing from it to charitable purposes; but the good sense of the party then in power would not admit that, and they ruled, I believe, that such a removal from business, merely to qualify for office, though it might be within the letter of the law, would not be within its spirit. And so, I say, this withdrawal of Mr. Abbott from his connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, though it may satisfy the letter of the original law, cannot satisfy its spirit, and cannot satisfy the spirit of what ought to be the ruling principle in such a matter. Now, I look before me and see those who were the companions-in-arms of our late First Minister, those who fought his battles, not only on the floor of this House but all over the country, and I ask where, at that time, was the present First Minister of Canada? I ask, where was Mr. Abbott to be found in those days? Was he to be found standing by the side of Sir John Macdonald? Was he to be found fighting by the side of his party? Was he to be found attending to the business of the country? No; in those days Mr. Abbott was attending solely to the business of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and never gave to his country but the crumbs of his intelligence and energy. He was called to the Senate four years ago, and has been the leader of the Government in that Chamber since then—an important office, I admit; but still, after all, not a very onerous office. In fact, the complaint we always hear from the Senate is that

there is nothing for that body to do, and the great source of the congratulations showered by them on Mr. Abbott lay in the fact that henceforth there would be more legislation in that body than there had been. In the days of which I speak, as soon as the session of the Senate was over, Mr. Abbott went back to the service of the company. Under the circumstances, is it to be presumed that Mr. Abbott will cease to be what he was hitherto, and that henceforth his energies will not be given to the company with which he has been associated so long and in the services of which he has amassed a large fortune? For my part, I do not believe it; and I believe there are men on the other side who think, as we do, that it was both improper and dangerous to place the supreme command in the hands of a man who never gave his best energies to the cause of his country, but devoted them to that of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, however, when we will have, as we are bound to have, important interests at stake in the country, affecting the Canadian Pacific Railway, we have reason to feel that on all occasions the scale will be turned in favour of the company, at the expense of the country. What is the reason, therefore, I ask, that Mr. Abbott was selected, and not some of the companions-in-arms of Sir John Macdonald? The reason is party exigencies. The situation was such that the country had to be sacrificed or the party, and the country was sacrificed. History repeats itself. When Alexander the Great was on his death-bed, he was asked to whom he intended to leave the great empire he had built up. His answer was: To the most worthy. Further than that he would not say; he would not say who was the most worthy to succeed him, of all the generals who had helped to conquer and build up the great empire which acknowledged his supremacy. Was it Antigonus? Was it Lysimachus? Was it Ptolemy or Seleucus? The rival factions which surrounded these men would not allow the question to be solved. The empire ceased, but the rival factions did not suffer anything. History repeats itself here again, Sir. Alexander the Great is dead, and the question arose, who was the most worthy of all his lieutenants to be his successor. There was a conference as to whether it should be Ptolemy or Lysimachus or Seleucus or Antigonus, but the rival factions between Antigonus, and Ptolemy, and Seleucus, and Lysimachus could not agree. So, Sir, Mr. Abbott was sent for. This is the why and wherefore of the appointment of Mr. Abbott, and I am justified in so saying because Mr. Abbott himself has acknowledged it. Speaking in the Senate a few days ago Mr. Abbott said that he was merely a compromise; a compromise of what, Sir? A compromise of principle was it? Surely these gentlemen will not say that they were already wrangling about principles. If not a compromise of principles, then, Sir, it was a compromise between rival claimants, and Mr. Abbott himself says so in so many words. This is his language:

"The position I occupy to-night is far beyond any hopes or aspirations I ever had, and I am free to confess beyond any merits I have. I am here because I am not particularly obnoxious to anyone, something on the same principle on which gentlemen are sometimes elected to the presidency of the United States, not because they are able, not because they are clever, but because they are harmless and have not made any enemies."

Now, the only objection which I have to the statement of Mr. Abbott is that it is altogether too modest. Mr. Abbott could not repute himself as one of those men to whom he has referred, but apart from that he certainly spoke the truth when he said he was the dark horse of the party. The party was in that condition which we have often seen in the case of a national convention of the United States, called to choose a candidate for the presidency. They agree upon the policy, they agree upon the principles, they agree upon the platform, but when it comes to the question: Who is to be the standard-bearer of that policy? Then the fight commences, and the rival factions of Antigonus, and Ptolemy, and Seleucus, and Lysimachus will not allow any one of the four candidates to come to the front; and so they selected Mr. Abbott as a compromise, as Mr. Abbott has himself informed us. With the internal dissensions of the Conservative party at large I have nothing to do, but what I complain of is that the House of Commons in this matter has not been dealt with in the same frankness that the other branch of the Legislature has been dealt with. The statement which was given to the House the other day of the policy of the Government was very meagre indeed. Thus it ran:

"It was felt by His Excellency that the state of public affairs did not necessitate the formation of a new Cabinet until the grave had closed over the late Premier and the last honours had been paid him."

Now, Sir, it seems to me that this statement is disingenuous in the extreme. I do not believe it is fair, I do not consider it fair either to this House or to His Excellency, for I am quite sure that unless there were reasons of state His Excellency would not have thought himself justified in waiting four or five days before calling a successor to Sir John A. Macdonald. That is not the practice followed in England. Her Majesty, when she lost the services of Palmerston, did not wait until after the funeral of Lord Palmerston to call his successor; but immediately, the very day after the death of Lord Palmerston, Her Majesty sent for Lord John Russell. I am sure His Excellency would have felt himself bound by such a precedent as this; but there may have been reasons of State to the contrary. Yet, His Excellency did not think himself justified in following that precedent, he felt himself justified rather in departing from it, and if there were reasons of state for this course, these reasons of state should have been given to the House. I do not put the blame upon His Excellency, not that I believe the King can do no wrong, but there are the advisers of His Excellency who say that His Excellency had good reason not to call immediately upon a successor to Sir John A. Macdonald; and if there were good reasons why His Excellency should not call immediately upon a successor to the late Premier, I call upon the advisers of His Excellency to state these reasons, and unless they state these reasons I believe they are not treating the House fairly, or in that manner in which the House has a right to be treated. Then the statement goes on to say:

"On the morning following the funeral, His Excellency, exercising his constitutional right, applied to the Hon. Sir John Thompson for his advice with respect to the steps which should be taken for the formation of a new Government."

Again, Sir, it seems to me that we have not been given the whole truth with regard to that statement. What are we to infer from the language which is given? We are simply to infer that His

Excellency had just enough confidence in Sir John Thompson to call upon him to instruct him and advise him as to who should be his Prime Minister, but had not confidence enough in him, at the same time, to ask him to be his Prime Minister. His Excellency had just confidence enough in Sir John Thompson to call upon him as the best of all the Privy Councillors with whom he could consult, to give him the best advice as to who should advise him, but His Excellency there stopped short of confidence and would not have Sir John Thompson as his adviser upon anything else. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this is not the construction that we should put upon the action of His Excellency. It is not, at all events, the construction which has been put upon the language of His Excellency by *La Presse* newspaper, the organ of the hon. gentleman opposite. *La Presse* says:

"From the statement furnished to the House the other day by Sir Hector Langevin in the name of the Prime Minister, it appears that Sir John Thompson was first called to form a Cabinet."

If that is so, we should know it, and if it is not so, let us hear it. But I object that any doubt should be cast upon this subject, I object that a repetition should take place of what did take place a few years ago when the Government of the day attempted to put the blame of their action upon His Excellency the Marquis of Lorne, who was then the Governor General of Canada. Mr. Speaker, what I complaint of is that we should not have in this matter a frank, and open, and candid statement, instead of something which is very ambiguous. If there were any difficulties within the Conservative party, the Conservative party should bear the blame, if blame there is, and not any other person. But there is more than this; there is reason to believe, and I invite the special attention of members on the other side of the House to this—there is reason to believe that we have not been given the whole truth with regard to the negotiations which took place in reference to the formation of a Government. There is reason to believe that something has been concealed from the House, and if anything has been concealed from the House, it is the duty of the gentlemen on the Treasury benches to stand up and tell us that these statements are untrue which we see in *La Presse* and elsewhere. Sir, not later than Monday, a week ago to-day, there was an interview published in the Montreal *Herald* between a reporter of that paper and a prominent member of the Administration, the Secretary of State, and Mr. Chapleau is reported to have spoken as follows:—

"Before Sir John Macdonald died he told me that he intended to resign his portfolio and that I should have it. Our beloved Premier is gone, but I remember his promise, and beyond that I also remember that, by seniority, I am entitled to the position of Minister of Railways and Canals and I must have my rights."

Mr. Chapleau says "he must have his rights." Then he was questioned by the reporter:

"When do you propose to return to Ottawa?

"I have had a carriage ordered and have made arrangements to be taken back to the Capital to-night, so that I shall be on hand to receive Mr. Abbott's answer to-morrow.

"Answer to what?

"To a question. I must be told my position at once; in fact, we must all know immediately what is going to be done."

Now, Sir, this is simply a newspaper article, and I would not attach much importance to it under ordinary circumstances; but I attach importance to it because it is known to men, and it is known to school boys as well, that the ambition of the Secretary of State for years has been to handle the portfolio of railways, and, therefore, this language is consistent with the language he has always held. But there is more. There is a newspaper which I have already quoted, *La Presse*, of Montreal, which is not only the organ of the Government, but is the personal organ of the Secretary of State, and in this newspaper we are told, not once or twice, but day after day, that the present arrangement is not the true one, but that there are other arrangements by which, at a later day not far off, the Secretary of State is to be made the Minister of Railways and that certain heads which now adorn the Treasury benches are to be cut off. In *La Presse* of the 17th June, we find this:

"The Hon. Mr. Drummond, Sir John Thompson and the Hon. Mr. Chapleau had together a long conference, the result of which has not been known definitely, but everywhere it is assured that the Conservatives of the district of Montreal and of the Province of Quebec generally have consented, for the sake of harmony, to tolerate for the moment a state of things which they deplore, but on this condition, formally stipulated, that Sir Hector Langevin and Sir Adolphe Caron bind themselves in writing to hand in their resignation immediately after the present session."

Who says that? Is it the *Globe* newspaper? Is it any other organ of the Opposition? No, Sir, it is an organ of the Government, it is an organ of the Secretary of State, it is a Conservative newspaper. Well, it may not be true. I do not say it is. But still there are evidences that there is something in it, after all. The Prime Minister was questioned as to all this the other day in the Senate. What answer did he give? He would not answer at all. He spoke first of all in answer to Mr. Scott, and this is what he said:

"Of course, my hon. friend will understand that I have already mentioned to the House all the advice which the Ministry has thought proper to tender to His Excellency on the subject of the formation of his Cabinet, and what advice the Ministry may give in the future, I am unable to disclose."

Then the question was put by Mr. Scott:

"Then I assume that no pledge has been given to Mr. Chapleau that he will be Minister of Railways and Canals at a future period?"

Then, Sir, what would you imagine would be the answer, if there was nothing at all in these rumours published in *La Presse* and other newspapers? If those rumours were untrue, you would expect that the Prime Minister would give them a denial, but what was his answer to Mr. Scott? Mr. Abbott said:

"I have already told my hon. friend that I am unable to state what advice the Government will give to His Excellency on the subject."

Of course the Prime Minister was quite within his rights when he stated that his Cabinet had not come to a conclusion as to the advice to be given to His Excellency, but, on the other hand, if, as here stated, there had been an agreement made which was kept from His Excellency, kept from the House, I say it was the duty of the Prime Minister to state whether that agreement existed or did not exist. It did not become him to shield himself behind the rights of his position. The moment it was alleged that there was an agreement made, as we understand there was, it was the duty of the Prime Minister to say so or to deny it, and I call upon his colleagues here to say whether it is true that there is such an agreement and whether

it is contemplated—nay, not contemplated but determined—that certain heads are to be cut off after this session and certain others promoted to these positions. I object to all this. This is not parliamentary government, it is not constitutional government. Our Government is to be carried on in the light of day. I do not appeal to the majority in this House. I know what party spirit is. I do not complain of it, but there are limits beyond which party spirit ought not to go. Party spirit ought not to tolerate any means whereby a powerful corporation may become more powerful, or by which any Star Chamber arrangements may be made which will not bear the light of day. Therefore it is for those who believe in true British parliamentary principles, to stand by them and condemn this conduct by vote, by action and by speech.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I can assure the hon. leader of the Opposition that, if the remarks which he has made to the House this afternoon on the motion to adjourn have not been as loudly cheered on this side of the House as on his own, it is not for want of appreciation of the elegant diction in which he has addressed the House, or because we have had less pleasure in listening to him, but it is owing altogether to our regret that, in dealing with important matters of state, he is so frequently misinformed. Before discussing the various points to which the hon. gentleman called our notice, I want to direct attention to what is obviously a misunderstanding either on his part or on ours as to what took place on Friday afternoon, because I should exceedingly regret that the good understanding existing between the Government and the Opposition by which business is always facilitated, should be interrupted. Without any intentional want of courtesy on his part, I think that on Friday he failed to do that which he usually does. On the previous afternoon, after calling upon the Ministers to make a statement of the policy of the Government, he made the assertion that, while gentlemen on this side of the House had no doubt intended to carry out the policy of their late leader, they had departed from it in at least one point, and that he intended to call attention to that on the following day. That statement might indicate a resolution aimed at the policy of the past Government, at the general policy of this Government, or at the constitution of the new Government, or it might be aimed at any individual who sat on the Treasury benches. It was impossible to perceive what the scope or purport of his resolution would be, and we placed full reliance upon the conversation which took place between the leader of the Opposition and the Minister of Finance, when the leader of the Opposition intimated that on the following day he would indicate to the Minister of Finance the nature of his resolution. That may have been a misunderstanding on our part, but certainly we relied upon it, as we have been accustomed to rely upon the hon. gentleman's statements in the past. I will state briefly to the House, to prevent any misunderstanding, what the practice on this point has been. The Government are not called upon by parliamentary practice to announce, the evening before a Government day, what business they will take up on the following day. If we chose to treat the hon. gentlemen on the other side, when we are asked what business will come up on the following day, in the spirit indicated this afternoon, by the leader of the Opposition, we might simply state that we propose to take up the Government Orders, but that is a course we never adopt. We indicate what particular orders we propose to take up, and whether we intend to go into Committee of Supply or not. Surely, when hon. gentlemen opposite have received that information and intend to avail themselves of the right which parliamentary practice gives them, to move a resolution in amendment to the motion to go into Supply, they should, in like manner, indicate the scope of the resolution they intend to move. They have followed that practice with great courtesy, and it has facilitated the operations of this House during the last few years, at any rate ever since I had an opportunity of observing the practice of this Parliament; and I state here that if that practice should be discontinued, it will be the fault entirely of the hon. gentlemen opposite, and with no unwillingness on our part, with no indisposition on our part to give the Opposition the usual information, for there was no such intention on Friday last. What were we to infer from the observation which the hon. gentleman made on Thursday afternoon, that we had already made an important departure from the policy of Sir John Macdonald? Here was the occasion for him to have stated it. He claims that his notice was so explicit that we should have understood it on Friday afternoon. I claim it was so vague that we cannot understand it yet, although we have been listening to the hon. gentleman with delight, and waiting patiently for an hour for him to tell us wherein we had departed from that policy. If his intimation was vague on Thursday afternoon, we are lost in mystery now. The hon. gentleman's own indication this afternoon that we had departed from the policy of Sir John Macdonald, was the criticism that he put before this House with regard to the choice of Mr. Abbott as Prime Minister. I will answer the particulars of that charge in a moment; but when the hon. gentleman tells us that that is a departure from the policy of Sir John Macdonald, does he expect us to forget, if he is willing that his own followers should forget, that Sir John Macdonald made Mr. Abbott not only one of the Ministers, but leader of the Upper House, and entrusted him with most important governmental duties? I was rather struck with the change of attitude which the hon. gentleman assumed this afternoon. He accuses us of having deserted the policy of Sir John Macdonald. He has deserted his own policy, for he undertook to deplore this afternoon the alleged departure from the policy of a statesman whose policy he has steadily opposed ever since he came into public life. This new-found admiration of Sir John Macdonald's policy, this new alarm at the so-called departure from that policy which this Government has evinced, are created solely by the sight of the united ranks on this side of the House to sustain the policy which has been upheld by the people from one end of this country to the other, and which the hon. gentlemen who sit on this side of the House were sent here to uphold, and intend to uphold. The hon. gentleman was astonished at Mr. Abbott having being made Prime Minister, not because he had a dollar of pecuniary interest in the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, not because he held any office of trust or responsibility in the Canadian Pacific Railway Com-

pany, but, forsooth, because his "heart-strings," of which the hon. leader of the Opposition has a wonderful knowledge, are tied in some way to that great organization. Why, Sir, for four years, at least, Mr. Abbott has sat at the head of the Government benches in the Upper House; for four years he has led the business of that House unchallenged as to business ability or accuracy by the hon. gentleman's associates in that House; and with their compliments and plaudits at the close of every session, without a word of rebuke from the hon. gentleman or any of his followers, during that time it was not his heart-strings that tied him to the Canadian Pacific Railway, but it was his ownership of shares, the sale of which, as the hon. gentleman has just said, has made him wealthy. He was more than a shareholder then: he was a director of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The hon. gentleman could stand all that, but he cannot stand Mr. Abbott's heart-strings being tied to the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, Sir, let us look at what this criticism involves. It is true, as the leader of the Opposition stated, that great corporations possess great influence in this country, and need the controlling hand of the Government to prevent possible encroachments. His proposition is, that a member of such a corporation may assist to guide the destinies of the Government, may assist in making the policy of the Government, but, after he ceases to be interested in the operation of the company, he shall be forever ineligible for any office in the Government. If it be improper that any person connected with an organization of that kind should be a member of the Government, or Prime Minister, how, forsooth, is he to rid himself of his interest and qualify himself to serve his country in any office to which his party, or the desire of his Sovereign, may call him? Surely any man of common sense, any man looking at the matter from a business point of view, would say, by ridding himself of his interest in the corporation, by immediately resigning any office which he holds there, and setting himself as free as the hon. gentleman and myself—for, I fancy, we are both free from the entanglements of riches of that kind—setting himself entirely as free as we are to serve his country, or to serve his Sovereign. But the doctrine which the hon. gentleman proposes that this House should affirm, is that there is no way in which he can set himself free if he has once put his hand to such an enterprise. Beneficial to the country though it may be, calculated to develop the resources and advance the material interests of the country, though it may be—he is forever incapacitated from serving his Sovereign, or his country, in the councils of the nation. Why, Sir, Parliament has taken a different view of the case in the very instance which the hon. gentleman put forward. What was that instance? There was a restriction, that, during a certain period, when this company was in the position of a contractor with the Government, none of its members were eligible to sit in this House. But, Sir, on a certain day Parliament passed an Act repealing that restriction. In vain, says the hon. gentleman, because, even if they have sold their stock their heart-strings are tied to the company still, and they ought never to be allowed to sit in this House. I can point him to that very action of Parliament repealing that restriction, as indicating that the time might come when even gentlemen possessing interests of that kind, might sit as members of this House, and sit in the other House, and as a consequence assist in controlling the affairs of the country as members of the Government. The hon. gentleman has put us to the disproof of a set of facts all of which are assumed in his own imagination, namely, that the stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway has been affected by the choice of Mr. Abbott as Prime Minister of Canada. Where does he get that information? On what market did he learn it? What proof has he brought forward to support it? The hon. gentleman's proof is a series of interrogatories to us. He asks us why this increase? He says Mr. Abbott's influence, and his counsel, and his wealth were a great means of strength to the company. One would think, to have heard the hon. gentleman's statement of all that Mr. Abbott was to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, that he was the company himself, that he was at least its president, and its solicitor, and leading director. But the fact is, that for some years past Mr. Abbott has been, it is true, a director of that company, not its president, not even its solicitor; and when he held that office, as I said before, he was far more disqualified than he is to-day for being a member of the Government, and to-day, when he assumes the head of the Government, he is absolutely free from any such disqualification. The hon. leader of the Opposition offers a great deal of sympathy with us who, he says, were the companions-in-arms of Sir John Macdonald. I appreciate highly—at its true value—the sympathy which laments that we have not higher office, but is accompanied by an attempt to drive us out of the offices we have. But let me say to him, that we who were the companions-in-arms of Sir John Macdonald have not been his companions-in-arms in vain. We followed his fortunes, and we endeavoured to the best of our humble abilities to fight by his side or in his ranks, because we believed in the policy which he upheld, and we learned this, both from his precept and example, that the welfare of this country was largely bound up in the success of the party which he led, and that the first duty of any man who sought either to lead or to follow that party was to abase his own interests and his own advantage for the common good and for the good of the country at large. The hon. gentleman tells us that something had to be sacrificed, and that the country was sacrificed. The hon. gentleman has failed to tell this House in what particular the interests of the country have been sacrificed or are in danger. The hon. gentleman goes so far as to tell us that on the stock market the danger to Canada is realized. Has the hon. gentleman indicated any way whatever in which the interests of the country were subverted to the interests of that company? Is there a single measure likely to come, or possible to come, which can receive the approval of the Government, and by which this country is in any way affected, which can be ratified with the assent and approval of this Parliament? It is here that every such measure must come, and when a measure comes here indicating that we have made an unfair surrender to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, it will be time enough for the leader of the Opposition to tell us that somebody's heart-strings are tied to this company although somebody's purse is not. When he tells us that there were rival factions

in the Conservative party, and when he points to a parallel, as he represents it, in Alexander's empire, he forgets two things, or is greatly misinformed upon them. One is that there were no rival factions within the Conservative party on Sir John Macdonald's death, and the other is, that there was no disposition to divide the empire, as he calls it. But I think that, without very strong eyesight, I can see a set of men who are not only skilled in the arts of faction but are ready to divide the empire at a moment's notice. It is true that in another place the leader of the Government made a statement which—I agree with the leader of the Opposition—was all too modest, when he said that he himself was not selected on account of his eminent talents or conspicuous public position, but rather that the choice was in the nature of a compromise. I am not aware why the modesty of Mr. Abbott impelled him to make this observation, but if his remark is to be understood, as the hon. leader of the Opposition understands it, as implying a compromise between rival aspirants to that office, rival claimants as he calls them, for once I must differ from my leader and tell him I do not agree with him, for among the ranks of his followers, and the hon. gentleman can cross-examine each or take us as a whole as he pleases, there was no rivalry between any of the members of this House who were connected with Sir John Macdonald, for the leadership of the party. If anything, there was a disposition on the part of those whose names might be mentioned, to avoid the serious toils and responsibilities which had broken down the greatest statesman this country ever possessed. But I agree with the leader of the Opposition that Mr. Abbott was altogether too modest in the statement of his own claims for promotion, and that he might have, perhaps, to his own advantage, assumed a very different position from that which he did take in the debate that afternoon. I find on looking through the record of that day's proceedings, when the transaction came fresh to the members of the other House, when it was not a question of asking across the House: what policy do you intend to adopt, and then giving a vague unmeaning indication of terror to come to-morrow, or of moving the adjournment of the House to raise an academic debate on the question, but, when the transaction was fresh before them, the trusty lieutenant, who is in the habit of speaking for the leader of the Opposition and his party in the Senate, used these words with respect to Mr. Abbott:

"I may be allowed to conclude with a few observations as to the hon. gentleman who has been made leader. As to that hon. gentleman's qualifications for the position to which he has been appointed, we here in the Senate have no question. The hon. gentleman has, during a long life, been tried in a great many different capacities. I do not propose to speak of any of them but one; but hon. gentlemen know that this Senate was led for many years with singular skill and ability by a gentleman of great natural talents, who passed half a lifetime in this House; and hon. gentlemen who were here when Sir Alexander Campbell left the Senate will remember that the general feeling amongst the members of this House was that they could get no one who would take Sir Alexander Campbell's place. I say that was the feeling. The hon. gentleman was not appointed immediately on the retirement of Sir Alexander Campbell; but within a few weeks after the appointment of the present leader of this House hon. gentlemen felt that they had been mistaken, and that a man had been found who was able, with a comparatively limited experience, to fill the position successfully which had been so long filled by Sir Alexander Campbell."

Was this—let me paraphrase the hon. gentleman's expressions—from the *Empire?* Was this from the *Gazette?* Was this from an organ of the Government? No; but it was from a gentleman chosen by hon. gentlemen opposite to speak for them in the other House. The hon. Senator continued:

"The hon. gentleman who is now leader of the Government is not a man who generally poses before the public to any very great extent; but he has done a great deal of valuable work, and has done it in a quiet and unostentatious way. We know him now; we did not know him before he came; and knowing him, we believe him capable of discharging the important duties of the office to which he is now appointed in such a way as will surprise the people of the country and will, I regret to say, delight the Conservative section of the community. People outside will in a little while begin to look upon the hon. leader of the Government much as we now look upon the leader of this House; and I may be allowed to express the belief, and also the hope, that as long as this country shall be afflicted by a Conservative Government—which I hope will not be very long—that undoubted evil may be mitigated by the fact that that Government will be led by the hon. gentleman——"

Wherever his heart-strings may be. There is a little more I desire to read. The hon. Senator continued:

"I wish to make a remark which is perhaps not altogether a remark to make on the floor of this House, but I think, with regard to the hon. gentleman himself, it must be gratifying to him to know that his appointment is so cordially received by those who know him best, and also—which is perhaps the most gratifying circumstance—that the appointment has come to him, not through any seeking or expectation of his own, but has come like Dian's kiss, "unasked, unsought"—the office has come to the man, the man has not sought the office; and that the hon. gentleman owes his appointment solely to the fact that those who knew him best knew he was the best man for the position."

We are not accustomed to applaud prophecy which comes from our opponents, because our experience of the past has not filled us with the utmost confidence in its realization. But, to the prophecy which I have just read, we say Amen, and we have full faith that the prophecy made there will be realized in a very short time. Mr. Abbott is Prime Minister of this country, not because there were rival factions which had to make a compromise, not because there were claimants whose claims had to be satisfied, but for the very reason that the hon. Senator from whose speech I have just read gave, namely, he was the best man for the position. Let me say this one word, and I would say more upon this subject of Mr. Abbott's relation to the Canadian Pacific Railway if I felt that my position and my office permitted me to say what, perhaps, is under the seal of confidence; but I am free to say this much: that in the experience I have had of Mr. Abbott as one of Her Majesty's Privy Councillors for Canada during the past four years, I have learned to esteem him, more than anything else, because he never allowed in the slightest degree, to the slightest extent, any measure touching an interest which affected his pecuniary fortune, to be discussed in his presence. If a feeling of that kind gave us confidence in him, we were no less impressed with the abilities which have been admired on the other side in the Senate Chamber, and, Sir, knowing that much of him I can feel that when he has rid himself of the shadow of a pecuniary interest in the great corporation to which the hon. gentleman has referred, I can trust his heart-strings, as I tried him and knew him at a time when, not his heart-strings only, but his whole fortune were involved in the success of that company. The hon. the leader of the Opposition has said a great deal about

an interview which is alleged to have taken place in the city of Montreal, and the hon. gentleman has declared that we have not told the House the whole truth upon this subject. With what seemed to me to be singular inconsistency, the hon. gentleman stated that the hon. the leader of the Government had been far more candid to the Upper House than we had been to this House, but before he had finished reading the Premier's speech in the Senate, the hon. gentleman stopped to tell the House that Mr. Abbott did not tell the truth in the Upper House at all, and he attacked his veracity. The hon. gentleman based that singular comment upon a statement which appeared in *La Presse*. Without in the least degree disparaging the influence of the press, or its value as an auxiliary, I have this to say: For my own part, and I think I may say also for my colleagues, that we are not in any way bound by the statement which appeared in *La Presse*, or by the opinion, either, which appeared in that journal. I am not in the least degree bound by what appeared in *La Presse*. Although I esteem in the highest manner the gentleman who, I understand, conducts its editorial columns, I am not bound by what he may say on public affairs, and I may say that the Secretary of State is equally independent while he equally esteems that worthy gentleman. But when the hon. the leader of the Opposition undertook to read statements, and admissions, and confessions alleged to be made by the Secretary of State and published in a newspaper bitterly hostile to this party and to this Government, he forgot for the moment, or he would surely have stated it to this House, that the Secretary of State had publicly and distinctly repudiated that interview as false. I shall not detain the House longer than to refer to a few personal points to which the hon. gentleman made reference. The hon. gentleman was good enough to refer to myself, and to challenge the statement which appeared in *La Presse*, and in respect to which he thought that the leader of the Government had not been entirely candid in the Upper House. While, as I have said, I am not responsible for what appears in *La Presse*, I have no hesitation to avow and defend, if it should be impugned, the policy which I have pursued with regard to this subject since important responsibilities happened to be laid upon me, and I am not disposed to be at all uncandid to the House as to the feeling which I had with regard to them. I was honoured by His Excellency's request that I should advise him on the course which should be pursued as to the formation of an Administration to succeed that which had unfortunately been dissolved by the death of Sir John A. Macdonald, and I was honoured with His Excellency's request likewise, that I should undertake the task of forming an Administration. As I have stated to the House this afternoon, I believed that the best interests of this country were bound up in the success and permanence of the Liberal-Conservative party, and immediately, and without any attempt to take upon myself the responsibility of His Excellency's commands, I begged that His Excellency would lay his commands in more worthy and able hands than mine. The closeness with which, since I have been in this House, I have followed the policy of Sir John A. Macdonald, the closeness with which I have followed his fortunes and endeavoured in a humble way to assist in fighting his battles, taught me the great responsibilities and the great labours which will devolve upon any person who undertakes to conduct an Administration at this phase of public affairs, whichever party he may belong to. Reflecting upon the whole situation as I did, and knowing that while I might safely count upon the continued loyalty and united support of the Liberal-Conservative party, yet I believed in my heart that throughout this country there were many of the electors who would have more confidence in the leadership of a man who had been, not five or six years in the Federal politics of this country, but nearer forty years, a man who had, as the leader of the Opposition in the Senate said, served this country in many capacities and proved himself worthy in all, and who was my senior in many years by age, and my senior vastly in public experience and wisdom likewise. That is all that I have to say to the hon. gentleman with regard to my own position in the matter, and that is the answer which I have to make as to the deduction which he has drawn from the columns of *La Presse*. With regard, however, to the other point on which the hon. gentleman has challenged and demanded an answer, namely, as to whether there is not an agreement that certain members of the Government shall be decapitated at the close of the session and certain others promoted, I may tell him there was no such agreement ever entered into, or ever contemplated, except by the imaginative genius of a Grit editor. I tell the hon. gentleman that when the leader of the Government applied to his old colleagues to ask them if they would assist him in discharging the delicate and important task which His Excellency had laid upon him, the answer came from one and all to say: Yes, we will assist you either by serving under you or leaving your Government, whichever you prefer; and the leader of the Government knows that the men who sit with him around the Council Board to-day are just as ready as the day he made that appeal to us to serve him in office or out of office, just as ready as the men who sit on these benches are determined, in office or out of office, to sustain the policy they were sent here to sustain. There is just one other word. The hon. gentleman required that we should explain the delay which occurred in the formation of the Ministry. The hon. leader of the Opposition was inclined to think that there were some reasons of state which deferred the formation of a Ministry, and that Mr. Abbott had not been at all candid in giving to the senators as the reason, that a proper tribute of respect to the memory of the late leader required that the grave should close over him before his successor should be chosen. The hon. gentleman said that he would assume that His Excellency desired to be guided by English precedents in this connection; but, pointing to us, he declared in thrilling tones that he would hold His Excellency's advisers answerable. Well, I do not know that there is a great deal to answer for, because I do not know that any calamities have befallen the state in that short interval of mourning which was given to us. But I do know this, that the hon. gentleman will not hold His Excellency's advisers responsible, because during that period His Excellency had no advisers whatever.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, if anything could show more clearly than another

how very well justified my hon. friend was in demanding explanations from hon. gentlemen opposite, it has been the concluding paragraphs of the statement of the hon. Minister of Justice. That hon. gentleman has shown in the clearest possible way how correct my hon. friend was in saying that a very important detail had been kept from us: for this House has heard him state now, what was entirely omitted from any of the declarations made hitherto either in the other Chamber or in this, that he himself was originally called upon to form a Ministry, and declined the task. Now, Sir, I am not here to judge of the propriety of the hon. gentleman's action: but I am here to say that that important fact should, in my judgment, and in accordance with British precedents, as well as in accordance with all former practice in Canada, have been communicated to the House on the very first occasion when a statement was made by the nominal leader of this House in his place. The hon. gentleman has gone a good deal further than the present Premier did on the floor of the Senate, in declaring emphatically, as I understood him—and I desire if there is any misunderstanding that he should correct me—that there was no agreement, verbal or written, direct or implied, made with the hon. Secretary of State. He did not say, the House will note, that there was no demand by the Secretary of State, but that no agreement of any kind had been made with that hon. gentleman whereby he is to receive what it is perfectly well known to every member on both sides of this House he has long claimed and clamoured for, the post of Minister of Railways in the present Administration. That, the hon. gentleman tells us, was not promised; he does not tell us that it was not asked. Sir, I think in some important respects the remarks of the Minister of Justice are a little like the present condition of the hon. Secretary of State—they halt a good deal in places; there are hiatuses and omissions. We are told perhaps the general results which have been arrived at; but, as we have seen, a good many steps in the progress have been carefully concealed from us. Now, Sir, the hon. Minister of Justice thinks that the fact that our excellent friend Mr. Abbott—whom I have known longer than the hon. Minister of Justice, and whom, personally, I very greatly esteem, —has been for many a long year bound up in every conceivable shape with the fortunes and destinies of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, that he has been their trusted adviser—that he has been until yesterday a director on their board—is no reason for supposing that the hon. gentleman's mind would be in any way biassed if a question came up affecting the interests of that great corporation in comparison with those of other great corporations. I say that is simply preposterous; it is absurd. On the contrary, it would be impossible under the circumstance for Mr. Abbott or for any man to hold the beam perfectly straight and fair between the Canadian Pacific Railway and—I will not say the interests of the country, but the interests of other parties which might come into contact with it—most of all, when it is known, as it is to every one of us, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company put forth to the uttermost its great power for the purpose of keeping these hon. gentlemen in their places—that its manager issued a mandate, for it was nothing less, warning every employé of the company at his peril to support the present Government; when it is known from one end of this country to the other that voters were brought in by tens of thousands to keep hon. gentlemen opposite in their places; and that, it is more than suspected, was not the only or the most substantial aid which was granted in the late struggle by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to sustain the present Government. And we are told that the man who guided that company through the greatest perils they ever encountered, the man who for many years was their chief solicitor and legal adviser, the man who, as I have said, till within the last few hours was a director on their board, is not likely to be in any way influenced by or to cast a favourable eye on the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Sir, the hon. Minister of Justice asked my hon. friend for proof of the fact which he stated, that when it was known that their quondam solicitor and ex-director was Premier of Canada, the stock market showed how thoroughly the situation was appreciated in England and elsewhere by the immediate and considerable rise in the stock of the company. Sir, the proof is to be found on every stock exchange where Canadian Pacific Railway stock is sold. The proof is clear and patent; it is known to every hon. gentleman who has taken the pains to read the columns of the London *Economist*, or even the Montreal *Gazette*, for that matter. There was a shock and a drop in Canadian Pacific Railway securities for a few days; but that was all regained and more, the moment it was known that Mr. Abbott was to be the Premier of Canada, and everybody knew the reason why, if the hon. Minister of Justice did not. In that rise is seen the best proof of how the public at large regards the appointment of Mr. Abbott as Premier of this Dominion as likely to affect the fortunes of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Sir, the hon. gentleman says he would like to know how it can affect them to know that they have a friend at court. Sir, before the Estimates are passed he will see that it may benefit them to the extent of hundreds of thousands of dollars, although, very likely, that benefit is not given in consideration of the appointment of Mr. Abbott as Premier, but for good, solid considerations formerly rendered by them, as evidenced by Mr. VanHorne's letter of a recent date, in the advancement of the interests of hon. gentlemen opposite in the last elections.

Mr. LISTER. The Postmaster General will tell all about it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He will do so, no doubt, when the Estimates come down.

An hon. MEMBER. And he can.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And he can. Sir, the hon. gentleman declares that there is no disposition on their side to divide the empire. Well, as regards the most of them, that is probably true enough. I think it is a case in which they find that it is as well for them to hang together as to hang separately, and so far I fancy their loyalty will not fail. Sir, unhappily we are not favoured here to-day with the presence of the hon. Secretary of State. I dare say, when he returns he will find or make an opportunity to reiterate for himself from his own place the emphatic contradiction which the hon. Minister of Justice tells us he gave —although I have not seen it, and the hon. Minister

did not quote it or say where it is to be found—to parties who allege that he desired the fulfilment of Sir John Macdonald's written promise, which he claimed to have, that he should be Minister of Railways at a fitting time and place. When he comes, we will hear that, or we will endeavour at any rate to hear that. For the present, the hon. gentleman, I suppose, may be said, in imitation of the great Richelieu, to be nursing his wrath until a fitting opportunity, and I may remind some of those hon. gentlemen opposite that peradventure they may yet discover that, as in the case of Richelieu, the Secretary of State is never more dangerous than when he is temporarily withdrawn by illness from public affairs. However, be that as it may, I think, if there were some others present whose faces I miss, that we might have a little valuable light thrown on the causes which induced the Minister of Justice, after four or five days serious consideration——

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I had not it under consideration.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend is too modest, he must have known he was going to be sent for, and he must have had, in the privacy of his own mind, four or five good days and nights too, to consider the situation. The hon. gentleman must not allow us to suppose that he was utterly insensible to the position he holds and the services he has rendered to the other side. He must have known that he would be sent for, and must have considered the situation; but, as I said, we are unfortunate. There is the Secretary of State, by an unfortunate accident, unable to be present and assist at this explanation, and I miss another familiar face, the face of one who, unless we are greatly misinformed, could likewise shed a good deal of light on the reasons which led the Minister of Justice to deny himself the proud satisfaction of becoming the Premier of this country. I allude to the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). That hon. gentleman's powers of locomotion are excellent, unlike those of the Secretary of State, and I believe he is at this moment a thousand miles away from us, leaving his bantling—the North-West Territories—to shift for itself, and unable, doubtless to his great grief, to redeem the pledges made by him on every hustings, that, come weal or woe, whether it suited the Government or not, no matter how it might affect the party, he, the member for North Simcoe, would have right done to the people of the North-West. Sir, his Bill is here, but the gentleman himself is absent. For five and six times over, he has had the opportunity of moving it, and now, with rare self-denial, when the moving of it might be specially inconvenient to his hon. friends, and especially to his hon. friend the Minister of Justice, the hon. gentleman is absent on the other side of the Atlantic. As to the general results, which my hon. friend did not particularly allude to, of this shuffle, well, my hon. friend has done justice, as he ought, to the high position which the ex-director of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and incidentally, the Canadian Pacific Railway, has attained in the councils of the Government. It may be permitted for me to sum up the results of the shuffle. Looking at them in a philosophical point of view, I may say that the general results of the late shuffle are these:—Maritime Provinces, first; Quebec, a very good second; and Ontario, nowhere. That, Sir, is the general result, and a result, I fancy, which is likely to predominate in the present state of affairs; and if it be true, as has been very currently reported, though I will not pledge my own individual knowledge of the matter, that the hon. member for North Simcoe saw this, and saw there was but one way of giving Ontario a fair show, and that was by making him the Premier of this country, and thereupon retreated; there is something to be said, after all, both for the proposition and the absence of the hon. member for North Simcoe. Now, as to the Premier, Mr. Abbott, I have known him, Sir, to the best of my recollection, about thirty-five years. Most assuredly, I have not always agreed with him, either as to his policy or methods, but I am perfectly well aware that Mr. Abbott is a decidedly able man. I agree entirely in that part of the remarks of the hon. gentleman, and the remarks made in the other Chamber. I do think myself that his long connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway was and is a grave objection, indeed, to his being made Premier of this country; but his ability I have never disputed, and I never intend to dispute. More than that, he has other special qualifications. It is known to the House, that of that little band of able men who once, in 1849, signed a certain remarkable document, Mr. J. J. C. Abbott is the only surviving specimen, and the ultra-loyal party, which, on all occasions raises the cry of dismemberment of the Empire, selects him for its Premier. Now, I will do justice to Mr. Abbott. I say that he is just as good and fit a person to wave the old flag as high and as long as any five-and-thirty percenter of them all. I believe that Mr. Abbott is, and was when he signed that manifesto, just as loyal a man as any one among them. I believe Mr. Abbott is perfectly capable, just as capable as any of them, to discharge his duty, notwithstanding what he may have said upon that occasion; and, for my part, I hold that those hon. gentlemen on the other side, by their policy during the last twelve years, by their policy now, whether they know it or not—and I am willing to accept the excuse that they act in ignorance for the most part—have done more to wreck and ruin the prospects of erecting an allied nation to Great Britain in North America than any body of men that have ever existed in Canada—by no meaus exceptiug the annexationists of 1849. We may fairly, on the present occasion, have a word or two to say as to the personnel of the Cabinet. The hon. gentleman has told us that they continue the old policy. Well, that may be likely enough if they know exactly what it is, because Sir John Macdonald was not altogether prone to take them always into his confidence. What the old leader's policy was on a good many important questions, and not alone on the question as to how far he would go in favour of reciprocity, not one knows. But those hon. gentlemen have chosen to do one remarkable thing. The First Minister has chosen to retain all his colleagues in their old places. Notably, he has chosen to retain the Minister of Public Works in his office, and to continue him as leader of the House. Now, to that last I have no particular objection. If it pleases the Minister of Public Works to act as nominal leader of this House and to move the adjournment until such time as he may, peradventure, be called on to commit hari kari, when the

summons arrives which will release him from the cares of office, I do not know that it very greatly concerns us, but, as I have said in my place before this Ministry was constituted, I believe it would have been far better for that hon. gentleman to have exchanged places with one of his colleagues until the present investigation was over, until his innocence was proved, or the reverse. And I think it was a grave error of judgment on the part of the Prime Minister and his colleagues not to have availed themselves, as they might well have done, of the present circumstances, to have relieved that gentleman temporarily, by an exchange of offices, and have placed him in a less awkward position than which he necessarily occupies to-day. I do not mean to say that the hon. gentleman may not serve a good purpose. I know it is convenient sometimes to have colleagues in office whose offices may not unreasonably be expected to become vacant, and I have known loyal patriots—and I think there are some loyal patriots on that side of the House—who are all the more likely to be kept loyal by knowing that a time may come when their services will find a reward; and it may be for the consolation of the Minister of Public Works to know that, when that time comes, he may not be alone, but others may keep him company on that occasion. On the whole, looking at the matter all around, I am inclined to regard the present composition of the Cabinet as a triumph on the part of the more respectable portion, comparatively speaking, of the Conservative party, and thereupon I felicitate them. Having the choice, to their credit be it said, that they have chosen the grey sheep instead of the black one, of whom they have their full and fair proportion. Now, as to the hon. Minister of Justice, I think I may say with some degree of truth that I am not given to indiscriminate laudation, or that, if I have erred in that direction, it has been unintentionally. Therefore, the hon. Minister of Justice may be assured that I am saying what I mean—neither less nor more—when I say that I am very glad to find he occupies a place in the reconstructed Ministry, and a very prominent and important place. I believe that, although his policy differs very materially from mine, he has conducted himself since he entered this House in a way that deserves our respect. I believe—and it is greatly to his credit, seeing the company he has kept——

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Please withdraw the compliments.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—I believe that the hon. gentleman is really a man of clean life and clean hands, and I believe that the hon. gentleman will continue—at least I hope so—to deserve the encomium—and it is not a light encomium—that I have passed upon him just now. I believe that His Excellency did very well to send for that hon. gentleman. I think, for my part, that the hon. gentleman did well for his party at any rate, if not perhaps for his country, in declining to assume office, but it speaks very ill for the party jealousies which, despite his disclaimer, we know exist, that they should prevent him from accepting the task His Excellency imposed upon him. When the Secretary of State returns to his place, we may perhaps hear a little more of this matter. When we get the despatches from Washington, which I hope to receive, as the hon. gentleman tells me I shall, before 6 o'clock to-night, there is another very important part of their policy which it will be desirable to discuss a little longer. Meantime, I say to the hon. gentleman that, as far as he is concerned, and, I hope, as far as his colleagues are concerned, we trust that we shall be able to get on reasonably and amicably with them, and that the Minister of Justice, at all events, will pursue the same upright course which has, I think, distinguished him during the time that he has occupied that office.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We are not surprised to find that hon. gentlemen on the other side find fault with the selection of the Hon. Mr. Abbott as the Premier of this Government. I suppose that any other gentleman who would have been selected would have been subjected to the same criticism. The fact is that, in the opinion of those gentlemen, nothing good can come from this side of the House, though the people of this country, by large majorities in four general elections, have declared otherwise. The appointment of the Hon. Mr. Abbott, notwithstanding the criticism of hon. gentlemen, has been well received from one end of the country to the other. That appointment will be found to be a very good one. The hon. gentleman who has preceded me says he has known Mr. Abbott for at least thirty years. I think I have known the Hon. Mr. Abbott for at least that period and a little more, and I know that the hon. gentleman has always shown himself worthy of the support that he has received from the people and from Parliament at different periods. He has won certainly the high position he holds to-day, and, when Mr. Abbott came to me and asked me to join his Government, I told him that I would not hesitate to do so, though certain newspapers that the hon. the leader of the Opposition referred to had coupled my name with the leadership. I told him that, in a crisis of this kind, notwithstanding the desire of certain parties to promote one of their friends, to put him forward, he should not for a minute hesitate to stand by his party, to sacrifice his own ambition or claims, and to support the man selected by His Excellency to form the Government. For my part, I have been for over thirty years a member of the Liberal-Conservative party. I always stood by my party, and it was not at this period of my life that I was to desert them. I have never been traitor to my friends; I have never been a traitor to my party; and I say to all my friends, whether we have had differences amongst us at different periods of our political life or not, we must, when the party requires it, when the country requires it, stand together.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Hon. gentlemen on the other side know that. We must stand together. We never see them deserting their friends. They stand together, and we must do the same, and must stand shoulder to shoulder. Hon. gentlemen are trying just now to sow division in our ranks. It is the old story. They have tried that for twelve or fifteen years and they have not succeeded, and I am sure they will not succeed to-day. For example, the hon. gentleman there, in his very polite language, speaking of the powers in the Government, or the representatives of the different Provinces, says: "The

Maritime Provinces first, Quebec a very good second, but Ontario nowhere." Well, Ontario is a great province; Ontario is a powerful province; Ontario is the most populated province of the Dominion; it is probably the wealthiest province in the Dominion, and it does not require even the advice of the hon. gentleman to take its own course. Ontario knows perfectly well its value, and, if Ontario had only one single member in the Cabinet, Ontario need not be afraid, because Ontario would know that the votes of Ontario are there and the power of Ontario is there also. As to Quebec, speaking for the Liberal-Conservatives of that province, Quebec will be true as always. We have always been true; we have stood by our leaders, and we will now. The hon. gentleman opposite has selected me for his criticism and his remarks, in a most unfriendly way. Of course, the hon. gentleman is not a friend of mine, but he is a colleague of mine, and has been so during several Parliaments. I do not complain of his criticism. He may call me a nominal leader. No matter what I may be, I am a member of this Government, and for twenty-four years I have been a member of previous Governments, and Parliament has supported me, though the hon. gentleman has always opposed me. Sir, the hon. gentleman has also taken upon himself to give me advice on the conduct I should have followed at the beginning of this session. I thank him for the advice, but I prefer to follow the advice of my hon. friends on this side of the House. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice has received compliments from the hon. gentleman. I do not know whether those compliments can be received by him any better than I can receive the remarks which the hon. gentleman has addressed to myself. At all events, whether those remarks about the Minister of Justice were sarcastic or not, we, on this side of the House, consider the Minister of Justice as one of those who have conferred the greatest honour on our party; and we consider that during the time he has been in this House he has shown himself a most able man, a most deserving Minister of the Crown, and one of those who have rendered the greatest service, not only to his party, but to this House and to the country. If that hon. gentleman is not to-day the First Minister of this country, we know, from what he said just now, that it was his own choice. He did not choose to undertake the task that was offered to him by His Excellency the Governor General, and it is not the first time that the same thing has been done in this country. Years ago I remember that an hon. gentleman was selected to form an Administration, and after considering the matter for twenty-four hours, he went back to the Governor and said: "No, I do not think I should undertake the task," and he recommended some one else. The Hon. Mr. Abbott, who is our leader, was a member of the Government of Sir John Macdonald, as you are aware. The hon. gentleman had been selected by Sir John Macdonald to form part of his Cabinet. When he was chosen he was a director of the Canadian Pacific Railway and a shareholder in that company, he was one of the leading men in that company. Did the hon. gentleman complain of that? Did he find fault with Sir John Macdonald for having selected Mr. Abbott as a member of the Government? No, Sir; but now when His Excellency the Governor General sends for him to form an Administration, after Mr. Abbott has resigned his directorship in the Canadian Pacific Railway, after he has sold his stock in that company and has therefore ceased to be a member of that company or to have anything to do with it, then the hon. gentleman begins to find fault, and says that the Canadian Pacific Railway is the real Government of the country. Well, Mr. Speaker, nobody will believe that. They say that we have taken a very important man from that company and have brought him into the councils of this country, that he is the head of the Government, and that it is a godsend to the company to have him Prime Minister of this country. Sir, my hon. friend the Minister of Justice went over the various points that the leader of the Opposition tried to make against this appointment. I shall not attempt to go over them again, but I must say that the selection which has been made is one that does credit—I should not use the name of the Governor General—but it is a credit to this country, and every one of us is pleased to be under his leadership. Mr. Speaker, the policy of Sir John Macdonald is not departed from, as the leader of the Opposition has stated to-day. We maintain the same principles, we maintain the same policy, and as regards our financial policy, the Finance Minister to-morrow will probably disclose it to the House, and I have no doubt that that policy, if it does not meet with all the support we should expect on the other side of the House, at all events, it will meet with the support of the majority of this House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Minister of Justice complained that my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition had stated that the Prime Minister in the other House did not disclose all the facts that transpired, or the negotiations that took place in the formation of the Government, but he himself, before he concluded the speech which he delivered a few moments ago, confirmed every observation in this particular addressed to the House by my hon. friend. The statement was that the hon. Minister of Justice had been sent for by His Excellency to advise him in reference to the formation of an Administration. That statement the Minister of Justice has shown was not strictly accurate. The Minister of Justice was sent for, not merely to advise His Excellency as to who should be called upon to form an Administration, but to assume that responsible duty himself. The Minister of Justice informs us that he declined the duty of forming an Administration, and that he advised His Excellency to call upon another party to undertake that responsible task. The Minister of Justice, however, did not inform us what steps he had taken to ascertain the feelings of his party, before he made His Excellency that answer, and it would have been an interesting fragment of present history if the hon. gentleman had taken the House so far into his confidence as to have imparted to us the information which, in this respect, he has intentionally withheld. My hon. friend beside me has spoken of a divided empire in the case of Alexander. Well, Sir, I do not think that the parallel was strictly on all fours, because it seemed to me that hon. gentlemen opposite became fully impressed with the notion that if there was anything approaching a division there would be no empire at all, and it was only by standing together that they would have even a

hope of maintaining their position upon that side of the House. It was because they will not stand together that the Minister of Justice was compelled to forego any ambitious inclinations he might entertain for the position of First Minister and to accept a less prominent position in the Government, of the President of the Council. The Minister of Justice has complained of the argument of the Opposition. He said the Government have not in any degree departed from the policy marked out by the late Prime Minister, that it is the same Government, that they have made a little progress; they have got from the National Policy to the Old Policy, and if they keep on perhaps they will be able ultimately to get through the alphabet. But, however that may be, the hon. gentleman said they adhere to the policy marked out for the Administration by their leader, Sir John Macdonald. The leader of the Opposition pointed out in what particular they had departed from the policy of the late First Minister. We have not, as the Minister of Justice has intimated, come to the defence of the general policy of the Government of Sir John Macdonald. We differ from that policy. We never believed it was, taken as a whole, in the public interest; we have deprecated it, we have resisted it on the floor of this House, we have opposed it before the electors. But there was one feature of that policy to which we did subscribe, and that was the determination exhibited on his part not to give to any one of the great railway corporations a dominant influence over the Government of this country. The position taken by him was that this Government should remain master of the railway corporations and that the railway corporations should not become masters of the Government. My hon. friend has pointed out that, in this particular, a wide departure from the policy of Sir John Macdonald had been made, and I think that the statements advanced in defence of that proposition were ample and convincing. Who is at the head of the present Administration? My hon. friend has pointed out that it was a gentleman who was chief adviser, who marked out the policy, who took every step necessary for the protection of the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the man upon whom that corporation relied more than upon all others put together. It is not by withdrawing from the corporation, it is not by selling stock, it is not by divesting himself of all pecuniary interest in the corporation that the hon. gentleman can wholly disassociate himself in fact or in the public mind from that corporation, and that he is not so disassociated is proved by the fact referred to by the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), that there was a sensible advance in the stock of that corporation since the acceptance of the Premiership by the President of the Council. The hon. gentleman says he is not responsible for everything that may have been done prior to the acceptance of office by this Administration. The hon. gentleman has laid down a novel doctrine—a doctrine that has always been repudiated by the Ministers of the Crown in the United Kingdom, that there could be any moment of time, or any act of state done by the Crown for which the advisers of the Crown were not responsible. Let me refer to the dimissal of Lord Melbourne. Sir Robert Peel was travelling on the continent and was in the south of Europe at the time. When he was called on to form a Government he was a thousand miles away. On returning, some days elapsed before an Administration was formed. Did he, when the House met, say he was not responsible for what transpired during the interregnum? Not at all. He admitted that for every act done by the Crown he was responsible, and if he did not approve of the dismissal he would not have undertaken the task of forming a Government. So when the Minister of Justice says the present Administration is not responsible for what transpired between the dissolution of the Government of Sir John Macdonald and the formation of the Government by Mr. Abbott, he is laying down a doctrine wholly at variance with the principles recognized in the United Kingdom, and which necessarily must govern wherever parliamentary government is established. Then the hon. gentleman has evaded in a large degree the question as to whether any pledge was given to the Secretary of State or any other person with respect to any future change in the Administration. I hold that the Government have no constitutional right to give such a pledge. The hon. gentleman should have been in the position to state to this House that not only was no such pledge given, but no such pledge could be given. Let me recall the case that occurred under Lord Grenville's administration, when it was understood that the disabilities with respect to the holding of office by Roman Catholics were about to be removed and when the King withdrew from the position and recalled the assent he had given to the proposed legislation of his Cabinet. He asked as a condition of their retention in office—he asked Lord Howick and others—that they would give some pledge that at no future period they would advise the removal of the disabilities from Roman Catholics holding office. What was the answer of the Administration? It was this: "We have sworn to give the Crown what we believe to be on all occasions proper advice, and we cannot in advance give any pledge that we will give certain advice at a future period; we must be perfectly free at all times to give that advice which our oath of office requires." So if the hon. gentleman has made such stipulation and come to such an understanding with the Secretary of State, that he is at some future period, near or remote, to hold some other office in the Administration than that which he now occupies, the hon. gentleman has given a promise which is wholly at variance with the duties imposed on Ministers by the office which they hold. The Minister of Public Works has told the House that he is going to stand by his party, that he is always going to stand by his party. I think that is a perfectly sincere statement; I am satisfied that the hon. gentleman intends to stand by his party. What troubles the hon. gentleman most is whether his party is going to stand by him. There is not much doubt that it will be possible for the party to exist either on the right or left of the Speaker, but, if the hon. gentleman does not stand by his party, or if his party do not stand by him, I am afraid the hon. gentleman will be like the party who was too long at dinner, he will have no chance of standing at all. It is, I think, pretty clear that the Government and their supporters have not been the happy family that the Minister of Justice would have us believe them to be. See how we brethren dwell together in love, says the hon. gen-

tleman. But if the hon. gentleman had been a little more candid and a little more full in the statement he made to the House, he would have been able to tell us that some of his heart-strings have been, after all, somewhat torn.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says "No." Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman is quite forgetting the past, he is forgetting the attempt made on his part to ascertain the feelings of his friends, and the purpose for which that enquiry was made;—those who call themselves Conservative; that diversified body so designated representing every different phase of political opinion from, I was going to say, extreme democracy to absolutism which were held together by the skill and ability of the late leader—the hon. gentleman found that this diversified body were not all disposed to stand by him. The Minister of Public Works did not seem altogether pleased with the commendable observations made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and the expressions of esteem for the Minister of Justice. He did as much as to say: You have pronounced upon him your good opinion, but you have said nothing in my favour. I think I may say, that upon this side of the House generally we have a high opinion of the ability and fairness of the Minister of Justice, and we are only sorry that the hon. gentleman is not in as good company as he might be found in. I am speaking now with regard to his political principles and opinions. I remember hearing some years ago a lecture delivered by Mr. Barnum, and he told about a wealthy farmer in Australia who had left two sons between whom he divided an immense flock of sheep. One divided the flock and gave the other his choice, and in the division he put a pet sheep that belonged to his brother whom he thought was not quite so intent upon worldly possession as he was himself; and when the brother was making the choice he looked at the flock with the pet sheep in it, which was not quite up to the quality of the other, and he said: "Good-bye, Bill, I will never see you again, I must choose the other flock, and I am very sorry for the company in which you are." And so we say to the Minister of Justice: We are very sorry for the company in which he is, for we would be delighted to see him acting more in accordance with his convictions and less in accordance with the principles of the party with which he is at the present time associated.

Mr. TUPPER. After the two speeches to which the House has just listened, that of the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and that of the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), one would almost feel that instead of there being any danger of dissensions in the family on this side of the House, there is serious danger of desertion on the other side, because these two hon. gentlemen have been so droll, so humourous and so unlike themselves, and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was so full of compliments and expressions of good wishes and good feeling, that the rather angry and exceedingly indignant speech of the leader of the Opposition stands out alone and unsupported. I have sympathy with the leader of the Opposition, who was compelled, through the supposed discourtesy of the members of this Government to bottle up for days, perhaps for over a week, that eloquent statement which he delivered in his usually pleasing, although somewhat unusually excited style to-day. We heard that a very serious question was before the House and before the country, and the leader of the Opposition took some pains to show that our minds were to be directed to a very grave question, indeed, connected with the constitution of this Parliament and this country. He dwelt for a considerable time upon the supposed great impropriety of the leader of the Government being placed in a position of at least terrible temptation, on account of a previous association with a great railway corporation of this country. He gave his attention seriously to the subject, and I must say that it is pleasing, considering the fears that he entertained, that his two colleagues, in an entirely different frame of mind from that which usually characterizes them, have treated the whole question as one of levity and an occasion for the interchange of pleasant sentiments. I cannot upbraid them for that, but at any rate these two gentlemen have taken a considerable weight off the shoulders of the people which had begun to listen and to expect an explanation of how far and to what extent the constitution of this country was imperilled. There is no doubt that some hon. gentlemen expected on the reassembling of Parliament that the Premier of this country was to be cursed, but judging from the remarks of the gentlemen to-day, he has been entirely blest. Such praise has seldom been heaped upon the leader of a great party in the country as has been bestowed on Mr. Abbott to-day, and I, as one member of the Conservative party, hail with pleasure the manner in which, taking it all around, encomiums have been heaped even in this House upon the head of that hon. gentleman, and with which he has already been favoured in the Senate Chamber. It must be gratifying to all of us to find that even the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has, as he says himself, a kindly sentiment and great esteem for the Premier of this country. A change has certainly come over the spirit of his dream, and I would be suspicious of this praise and of the complimentary sentiments expressed by some gentlemen on the other side, were it not that I find that throughout the whole country there is the same sentiment and that same high opinion entertained for the leader of this Government. In the Province by the sea, when the Minister of Justice who so worthily deserved the opinion expressed about him by the hon. gentlemen on the other side, whether sincerely or not;—when it was supposed in his native Province that the Minister of Justice had been selected by His Excellency to form an Administration and had accepted the trust and the great responsibility, all the more pain was produced, all the battle array was marshalled out, and the leading exponents of Liberal opinion in that Province proceeded to condemn the Minister of Justice at once. They criticized his appointment as injurious not only to the country but particularly to the Conservative or "Tory party," as they called them. The Halifax *Morning Chronicle* said that Mr. Abbott was the man who not only could hold the great Conservative party together, but Mr. Abbott was the man worthy, for instance, of the great esteem of the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and I must really call the attention of the House to the opinion of the leading Liberal organ of my

native province in regard to the present condition of affairs. There is no great breach of the constitution in the minds of the friends of the Liberal party down by the sea, and there are so few from that province in this House who can speak for the Liberal party that I may be allowed to say a few words on their behalf so far as Nova Scotia is concerned. Let me tell them that they should not be discouraged by this long-considered and carefully-matured resolution which has been sprung upon us to-day in such a sudden manner. The Halifax *Morning Chronicle* says:

"The Montreal *Gazette* and other influential Tory newspapers favoured the selection of Hon. J. J. C. Abbott, and among all the leading Tories Mr. Abbott would have been the most judicious selection from a Tory standpoint, as he is a gentleman not only of ability and long parliamentary experience, but of considerable tact, the exercise of which might have enabled him to check for a time the discordant elements now plainly perceptible in the ranks of the Tories."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TUPPER. "Hear, hear," say hon. gentlemen; and the hon. member for Bothwell says: "You are not a happy family." If these hon. gentlemen really thought we were, I think there would not have been this trouble about the political situation or this resolution, or this discussion which we have to-day. They think a chance has come to them at last of making a division in the Conservative ranks. They think the party is so weak, so broken, that by trading on petty jealousies of which they have had a great deal of experience in their own ranks for ten years past, and which they think have taken root in ours, they can suggest to this section of the Conservative party: "Would not this man have suited you better, or that man? Look how the Minister of Justice has been sat upon; you friends of the Minister of Justice should rush to join us, not out of sympathy for him, but for the real purpose of putting us on the Treasury benches, and putting the Minister of Justice out altogether." The Liberal-Conservative party are not altogether senseless. These hon. gentlemen, I grant you, have a poor opinion of that party; but their trouble seems to be that they cannot gain the sympathy in that respect of the majority of the electors of this country. The hon. member for Bothwell also deplores our departure from the policy of Sir John Macdonald, basing his argument on the statement that the present Cabinet has given a predominant influence to a great railway corporation. Why, in Sir John Macdonald's time the man whose name is now before the House, whose position is now under criticism, was a director of that great and powerful corporation, while to-day he has not one pennyworth of stock in the company and no connection with it. Certainly if it was right in Sir John Macdonald's time to take the leading gentleman from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and place him in the Cabinet, very little can be made of the argument that the hon. gentleman who is Premier and President of the Council to-day has no connection whatever with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. But the financial genius of our friend the hon. member for South Oxford was brought forward, and it was hoped that it would serve a purpose in this debate; but it was somewhat discouraging, although the hon. leader of the Opposition gave him the cue, to find him pointing out that it was not only the Liberal party that was disturbed, but, forsooth, the stock markets of the world as well; and that called for our serious consideration. Now, there is very little argument in that. It appears that the stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway of late has been fluctuating. It has been up to-day and down to-morrow; but though hon. gentlemen were plentiful in assertions, they did not state any specific facts on this point. While that argument was going on, I took the trouble to obtain the figures, and I find that on June 1, the stock in the London market stood at 78½; on June 2, at 79; on June 6, at 80½; on June 8, at 80½, and on June 16, at 81½.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. TUPPER. That proves the case, suggests the hon. member for Bothwell. He thinks that rise is extraordinary, showing that some influence must be at work on the public mind, and that these people on 'Change have high hopes of the influence of the Premier in the Government, or think that dishonest or dishonourable things may be done for the benefit of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Let me point out that in September, 1890, long before Sir John's Macdonald's death or Mr. Abbott's accession to the premiership, the stock reached 86 in the same market. I give that as one reason why the hon. member for South Oxford did not follow at any great length this suggested financial difficulty. Now, we have not only the encomium on the leader of the Government pronounced by the leading Liberal organ in Nova Scotia, but the leader of the Opposition in the Senate went out of his way——

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No; it was Mr. Power.

Mr. TUPPER. Surely, you will not deny the Maritime Provinces the credit of claiming him as a leader in the Senate. Certainly, that gentleman believes himself to be one of the leaders, and, I think, the Opposition in the Senate have as much right to a leader by commission, as the Opposition in this House. The Opposition in this House is not a happy family. I recollect when there was as much difference of opinion as to who was leader of the Opposition, in this House, as there is in the Senate. But, certainly, one of the leaders of the Opposition in the Senate went out of his way to heap compliments on Mr. Abbott, and to testify the esteem in which he was held, not only by his own friends, but he believed he could speak in that regard for the people of Nova Scotia; and his opinion was the same as that of the *Morning Chronicle*. In addition to that we had the eulogium of the hon. member for South Oxford. Surely, then, the position of the Government is such that we ought to believe ourselves a happy family on this side of the House. Surely, no one in this House will deny that we were face to face with a crisis in the middle of an important session of Parliament. A great and extraordinary leader was lost to a great and powerful party in the country. It was a peculiarly trying position, and no people knew it better than the hon. gentlemen who sought, whether right or wrong, whether in good taste or bad taste, to snatch a great party triumph from the condition of affairs. But, notwithstanding that that master-hand was suddenly removed from the direction of the councils of this nation, so skilfully had he educated his party, that its members have learned to look to principles rather than to men. Greatly

as they admired, honoured and loved him during his lifetime, you see to-day the finest testimony that could be given to the life-work of that great man. You see a united party—a party in which petty jealousies have never existed, or if they have, you see them utterly stamped out and suppressed. The Conservative party in this House stand together with a man at their head of whom every man can be proud—of whom the Senate is proud, and of whom, as a man, I believe every member of the House of Commons is proud. Yet we hear the miserable little insinuation made against that man with his splendid record, that his past connection with a great corporation may lead him to do something for it that will be against the interests of the country. Such opposition as this is pitiful, and it is hardly necessary for members on this side of the House to rush to the rescue of the hon. gentleman whose reputation is attacked, when the attack is carried on in this—if I may use the term—mealy-mouthed manner. Most of the arguments I have heard confirm the estimate of the Conservative party in the selection they made under trying circumstances. Now, it may not be in good taste to say anything unkind to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) who has made such an extraordinarily good-natured speech to-day. It would be in bad taste to do that, and I wish to congratulate him. I want to qualify the statement I made a short time ago, when I said I never heard him say anything civil of an hon. member on this side of the House or on that. He has broken the record; he has been civil to a man who deserves his civility, and certainly, if necessary, could command it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am always civil to those who deserve it.

Mr. TUPPER. One word more. He alluded to a gentleman for whom he has great esteem, and referred to him as a gentleman who once signed an annexation manifesto. Perhaps that is one of the reasons for those kindly sentiments. He would be a fortunate man, and I would not begrudge him those years, if he could live for forty years and then truthfully say that it was forty years ago when he held annexationist sentiments. I do not think that the crisis the hon. gentlemen opposite hope to bring on will be reached to-night.

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

After Recess.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The hon. member for South Oxford, in the speech which he made this evening, was complimented on the absence of that acerbity which usually characterizes his remarks in this House; but however just that compliment may have been, I have observed that in this, as in other speeches, no matter how much the hon. gentleman may endeavour to curb his natural propensity to evil speaking, he cannot help giving utterance to some sentiments of that kind. And so, in the remarks which he made with reference to the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), I am bound to say that, although I find no fault with him for making the observations he did, yet the tone of those observations and the manner in which they were made, justify the remarks I have just expressed. If the hon. gentleman thinks himself or desires to convey to the House or the country the impression that the hon. member for North Simcoe, or those who think with him on the question to which the hon. gentleman particularly referred, have any idea of departing from the position they have taken, he is altogether mistaken. The hon. member for North Simcoe has a right to deal with that question in the manner he deems most convenient and appropriate. That hon. gentleman is well able to take his own opportunity and to judge what are the best methods to carry out his own intentions; and I simply rise to state, lest there should be any misapprehension, that there is no intention on the part of the hon. member for North Simcoe, or of those who think with him, to depart from the course they have taken and the principles they have laid down, and should the necessity arise those principles will be advocated and pressed to their legitimate conclusion. But the hon. member for South Oxford says something about divisions on this side of the House. He does not seem to understand that a party can exist and yet have difference of opinion among its members. It would be indeed very extraordinary if in a great party, such as the Liberal-Conservative party of Canada, there were not differences of opinion among its members. But no doubt what excites the surprise of the hon. gentleman is that there should be hon. gentlemen on this side who have honest convictions and are not afraid to express them, even though sometimes they may thereby cause inconvenience to their friends or be a source of danger or damage to the party. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that the best way hon. gentlemen opposite can take to prevent those differences of opinion from causing any injury or mischief to the Administration, is to pursue the course they have been following during the past few years; and they will find, as long as they do, that the same results will follow which have resulted from their course during the last general election. The hon. gentleman and those who act with him will find that the hon. member for North Simcoe and his friends, however strongly they may feel upon matters which have been the subject of discussion during the last two or three years, yet are determined that they will not put themselves in such a position as to further the end of hon. gentlemen opposite, to the great detriment, not only of the commercial interests of this Dominion, but also of its position as a portion of the Empire. As long as hon. gentlemen opposite pursue a policy which would have such disastrous effects, they may be satisfied that whatever differences of opinion there may be on this side, we will be, as regards those questions on which our political existence and our commercial interests depend, in common accord.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The chivalry which has prompted the hon. gentleman from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) to defend his absent leader is only what we would have expected from him. On more than one occasion he has had the courage of his convictions, and I will do him the justice to say that I believe the convictions he entertains, whether shared by the majority of members on this side or not, are held by him honestly, and he has the courage to avow them. With regard to the absent leader, there are those on this side who entertain opinions in accord with those expressed by the hon. member for South Oxford, but we cannot complain if the hon. member takes this occasion, in a very few

words, to defend his chief. With regard to this debate on the important question of the formation of a new Administration, there is this to be said: that the time we have spent has been well repaid by certain information we have obtained. We should have other information, which the Minister of Justice could give, but which for reasons of his own, he chooses to withhold, but even for small mercies let us be thankful. The House certainly ought to be thankful to the leader of the Opposition for obtaining from the Government for the first time that which the House should have been told at an early period of the session, namely, the true facts with regard to the formation of the Ministry. It is well understood in England and in this country that on the dissolution of a Ministry and the formation of a new Government, the House of Commons is entitled to be taken into the confidence of the new Administration. It is entitled to know if more than one gentleman was called on to form the new Administration, and who were called on. We are entitled to know if His Excellency called on a member of the House of Commons to perform that duty and what his name is, and the reason he failed to accomplish it, if he did fail. The custom in England is to take the House into the confidence of the Government with regard to the formation of a new Ministry and the circumstances under which it was formed. How was this House treated? We were given by the acting leader of the House, on Tuesday, the 16th of June, a written statement in which, among other statements, appears the following:

"On the morning following the funeral, His Excellency, exercising his constitutional right, applied to Sir John Thompson for his advice respecting the steps to be taken for the formation of a new Government."

No doubt that contained the truth, but the gravamen of the charge made on this side of the House against the Ministry is that it did not contain the whole truth, that it withheld that which is the most essential part of the truth, and that, standing alone as it does, it not only fails to give a true relation of the facts, but contains a relation at variance with those facts. We know now, thanks to the frankness of the Minister of Justice—a frankness this House had the right to expect, and I am proud to see that the hon. Minister was equal to the occasion—that not only was he sent for by His Excellency to be consulted as to the formation of the Ministry, but also to be entrusted with the responsible duty of forming a Ministry. I would that that hon. gentleman had gone a little further; I think that this House is entitled to have him go a little further; I think the interests of the country required it, and the interests of good government required that he should have gone a little further. I think he should have told the House why he declined that offer. Was it that he declined it from any distrust of his own abilities? The compliments which have been showered upon him this evening from his own side of the House and from this would show the groundlessness of any such modesty on his part. I would ask the hon. gentleman whether it was in consequence of his interview with the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), the leader of my hon. friend who spoke a little while ago, that he found he could not expect to receive the cordial support of that hon. gentleman and his followers, and whether it was in consequence of that that he announced to the Governor General that he was unable to form an Administration. The House is entitled to that information. It was common town talk, it was published in all the newspaper press, and it has not been denied, and that fact, published as it was in all the newspaper press, affecting as it did so important a member of the Ministry at such an important time as that when the interview between the Minister of Justice and the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) took place, may be assumed to be correct in the absence of any denial. Is it true that the hon. member for Simcoe not only aspired to lead the Government himself—and I do not say anything against his aspirations, which are perfectly legitimate—but that he also declined to follow any Government of which the hon. the Minister of Justice was the leader? I fear that there are motives existing among a section of those who sit on the other side of the House, which are not very creditable or honourable to that section. They are motives which I am proud to say are not shared in on this side of the House. Hon. gentlemen know well that, so far as the Liberal party are concerned, when they seek a leader, they seek not to know what his religious proclivities are; they only look for a man whose political policy they approve of, and in whom they have faith and confidence. The time has not long gone by when the great Liberal party, bereft for a time of one of its leaders, was called upon to choose another. The presence of my hon. friend to my left (Mr. Laurier) is the best proof that could be given to the country that the Liberal party is not animated by passion or prejudice, but proceeds on those broad political lines which alone can ensure welfare to the commonwealth. I would like to know—not from mere curiosity, but from a higher motive—whether the Minister of Justice was forced to deline the high and responsible honour with which he was entrusted by His Excellency. I had placed in my hands to-night a newspaper which I read at the time it was published, and which is said to be published under the auspices and to be the organ of one of the members for the County of St. John, N.B. We heard to-night from the Minister of Marine, in his ringing tones, statements in reference to the union which prevails in the ranks of hon. gentlemen opposite. We heard that there was nothing in their ranks but loyalty to their chief, nothing but union, nothing but a desire to march forward shoulder to shoulder, with but one object, and that object the good of the country. Let me read the remarks of the organ of the member for St. John County, which were published at that critical moment in the history of Canada when the Minister of Justice was sent for to form a Cabinet. Was his position objected to on the ground of his want of experience? Was it objected to on the ground of his want of talent? Was it objected to on the ground of his want of tact? No, Sir; but that the House may be assured that I am not perverting the sense of the argument, I will read the words published in the St. John *Gazette* of 11th June:

"The situation might as well be fully understood now. The Protestant Conservatives of Canada will follow Sir Hector Langevin or any other Roman Catholic who may be selected to lead the party, provided that he was born in that communion, but they will not follow a man whose mind is of that cast, that after he has reached years of discretion, he abandoned Protestantism and joined the Roman Catholic Church."

These are the sentiments emanating from a newspaper said to be controlled by a gentleman sitting behind the Minister of Justice; and yet you tell me that party is united! I thank God that, on this side of the House, I have never yet discovered any such contemptible sentiment as that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is that cheering from the other side to be taken as an approval of the sentiments, the expression of which I have just read? If so, I challenge any hon. gentleman there to rise in his place and assert it. I observe that the Minister of Customs is a little restless. I hope he does not share these odious sentiments which I have read from that paper, which is said to be controlled by the member for St. John County.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not desire to be disorderly, or to violate the Rules of the House by mentioning the names of the hon. members. I have twice referred to the member for the County of St. John, N.B. One word more. I say that the hon. gentleman should have taken the House into his confidence a step further, and that, when he says he was sent for, not, as the official statement says, to be consulted as to the steps to be taken to form the Ministry, but for himself to form a Government, he ought to have stated to the House why he found himself unable to accomplish the task confided to him, and if he did so he would do a great deal to bring about a true union of those who have the interests of this country at heart, although he might exclude a few fanatics. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries was very jubilant as to the present position of affairs, and he was ready to prove by a quotation from an organ of the Liberal party, and an able one too, that the present Ministry was approved of by the Opposition press. But what did it amount to? It amounted to what we all admit, that Mr. Abbott had ability, that he had tact, and that he had experience. Who denies that? That proves nothing more than we all admit and know, for no one could have sat in this House, as I have had the honour of doing, with the present leader of the Government, as well as in the Banking and Commerce Committee, without knowing that he had very great ability, and very great tact and experience. But what did the paragraph go on to say? After stating that Mr. Abbott is a gentleman of ability, experience and tact, it goes on:

"The exercise of which might have enabled him to check for a time the discordant elements now plainly perceptible in the ranks of the Tories."

That is what we all claim. We acknowledge his ability, his tact and his experience, and that ability, tact and experience, combined with the love of office which animates some, though of course not many, on the other side of the House, may postpone the disintegration for a few months, and that has been the talk around the corridors of the House, and the talk all over the Dominion, for some time. Sir, that was the charge made from this side of the House, not that the new leader of the Government lacked any of these qualities, not that he did not possess the kind of qualities which go to make up a successful leader, but that his position for the last eight or ten years as the leading spirit of the Canadian Pacific Railway, ought to have been sufficient to prevent him from assuming the position of Premier of Canada. There is no sensible and thinking man on either side of this House but knows, and in his calmer moments will acknowledge, that one of the evils and one of the dangers in the near future with which this country has to grapple, is the over-shadowing importance and power of the great corporations which are growing up around us. We know that, Sir; we feel it; it is acknowledged by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House; and now at this time above all others, when the Canadian Pacific Railway soars over this country and has it almost, I may say, in its grasp, to take from it one of its leading directors, the inspiring spirit which has advised and directed the action of that great corporation for years back, a director receiving large pay—the man who, above all, after the Vice-President Van Horne, was the incarnation of that company—to take him from the company and make him the leader of the Government, is a step, I submit, fraught with possible danger to this great commonwealth. That is the utmost that my hon. friend went, and that is the position which I reassert. But, says the hon. Minister, he has sold his shares. Supposing that he has. Nobody who knows Senator Abbott would doubt that he would assume, nobody who knows the Minister of Justice would doubt for a moment that he would permit him to assume, the Premiership while he held on to the shares. The thing would be too flagrant a violation of every rule of decency. What I want to ask is this: Has the sale of the shares divested him of that bias—an unconscious bias, if you will—which necessarily must be present in his mind, from the long and consistent relations he had with that corporation? I say it cannot. I remember well, some years ago, being engaged in a very important trial, and the counsel for the defendant objected to the judge trying it because he held shares in the corporation that was the defendant. The judge rose from the bench and said: I will soon dispose of that matter, I will sell my shares out; and he sold them out. The counsel for the defence asked him: Does your lordship imagine that because you have sold the few paltry shares you had in that corporation, that you have divested your mind of that unconscious bias which is there, and which prevents you from trying this case as a disinterested judge? And there was not a man in the court house but acknowledged that the question required no answer, for it answered itself. The Premier cannot divest himself, by selling his shares, of that bias acquired by the experience of eight or ten years, during which that close connection existed between him and that great corporation. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to pause and reflect. We know that at this very session—and as it is whispered about the corridors, owing to negotiations which were carried on before the late elections beween the Postmaster General and the Canadian Pacific Railway—it is said that this House will be called upon to vote large sums of public money to that corporation; and I ask hon. members, I care not on which side of the House they are, whether they think that a gentleman who was a director of the corporation at that time, acting in the interest of the company at that time, is now fit to propose to this House and to Parliament to vote a sum of money to that corporation of which he was a director at the time he became Premier. Sir, the thing is preposterous, and will not bear investigation for a moment. But I was more surprised in this de-

bate than at anything else, at the silence concerning the hon. gentleman, the Minister of Public Works, whose claims to the position of the leader of the Government have been advanced very strongly by the press in his own province and out of it. Sir, he was here; and if he chose to submit to that indignity it was not for us to complain. But I wondered that the great lieutenant of the party, the man who has led them to victory on at least two occasions—it is true at an awful cost to the country—the man who twice has been telegraphed for and brought back from Europe to save this party from disintegration and destruction—I wondered that not a word, so far, has been heard on his behalf. I have not heard his name mentioned in the debate at all. "Yesterday he might have stood against the world, now none so poor as to do him reverence." Where is the High Commissioner? Where is the man that I am told the Maritime Provinces members, with but one exception, wished to become Premier? We have no detailed account of the steps which were taken—I do not mean to say by His Excellency, but by the party themselves, or by the gentlemen entrusted with the formation of a Ministry—to introduce the High Commissioner's name to His Excellency. Is it true that the revelations made in the debate which I am not at liberty to refer to, and which took place in this House a short time ago, had any effect in preventing that hon. gentleman from taking the position—a position, Sir, which we know he had a right to expect? Why, Sir, who was it that dragged the Tory party out of the mire in 1878? Who was it that for his efforts on that occasion was promised the reversion of the Premiership? Who was it that was silenced for the time being by the High Commissionership, and who it was understood should come back and take charge of the party when the old chieftain left? Now, Sir, he is treated with contumely and despised. Sir, I do not want to hear what the members of the Government think about this, but I want to hear what the rank and file think. We have not heard from them yet. We have not heard any of those hon. gentlemen who support the Government come forward and say they are thoroughly satisfied with the existing state of the Cabinet. Sir, it would be very satisfactory if we could find out their real feelings. I watched with some curiosity to see which of them were satisfied, at the period of the debate, before it was authoritatively announced that this was not a temporary arrangement but a permanent Government. There were those, I acknowledge, who were, perhaps, temporarily satisfied that that temporary arrangement should continue, but when it was announced by the hon. Minister of Justice that no agreement of any kind had been come to to decapitate the heads of even the smallest member of the Cabinet, and I thought, Sir, that I could see some very long faces drawn by hon. gentlemen who aspire to seats in the Cabinet. Why, Sir, there was the hon. member whose name has been so frequently mentioned, the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace). I do not know that he is going to take the floor to-night and tell us that he is thoroughly satisfied with the present state of affairs, now that the Government is announced to be not a temporary construction but a permanent one. Why, Sir, even the member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), who aspires, and properly aspires—he has a right, I frankly say it, to aspire to a leading place in the Government—I do not know whether that hon. gentleman will rise in his place and express the same feelings as those which animate the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I am perfectly satisfied.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I hope he will express his satisfaction with that particular phase of the speech of the Minister of Justice which tells him that this arrangement is permanent, and that none of the minor Ministers are to be decapitated. I shall be well pleased if he does so. Why, Sir, at an early stage of this debate, I noticed that the hon. and learned gentleman who sits for the nonce on this side of the House, because there does not happen to be an empty seat on the other side, crossed over and took the seat which he supposed to be his rightful place alongside the Minister of Justice, whence he beamed with complacency on this side of the House. He stood in the line of the Ministers. I was curious to know the effect upon him of this announcement from the Minister of Justice, and I watched the hon. gentleman leave his place and range himself on a bench beside the Minister of Customs. He felt the time had come. He had a right to aspire—I do not say it at all in joke—he had a perfect right. What man knows the North-West so well? What man is able so eloquently to expound the grievances of the settlers, or to press for the amelioration of their wrongs, as the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin)? I wonder if he is satisfied. I do not think he is. Sir, he told us last Session that this Cabinet of antiques should be dissolved; I do not think they have grown any younger since then. And what about the proposed new Minister of Agriculture who sits in the front row, and whose place is vacant just now? He (Mr. Sproule) is at this moment sitting in the seat of the Minister of Customs. No doubt he has long deferred claims, and, as it is hope deferred that maketh the heart sick, are these hopes to be deferred still longer? Is the hon. gentleman to have no chance of sitting in that seat, when he could discharge the duties of the Minister so ably and effectively and ask for large appropriations? There is no end to their number and claims. And above all there is my genial friend from Toronto. I have heard it said, and I do not wonder at it, that the hon. gentleman affects to be an authority in matters of finance. I have learned from listening to his speeches that he has a knowledge of that abstruse subject, and it is said he too feels as it is felt by the vast majority of the citizens of Toronto that they are not represented in the Cabinet. Is he prepared to rise and express the sentiments of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that every one is satisfied, everything is serene, and that the present Administration, as now constituted, will go on satisfactorily? It will be most interesting to hear the declarations that will fall from those learned and hon. gentlemen, and as I do not desire to weary the House or deprive it of the eloquence now in store from these hon. gentlemen, I will now resume my seat.

Mr. COCKBURN. I request my hon. friend, who has challenged me to speak, to give me his attention while I try to remind him of some points with which he is at present apparently unacquainted. I

must say that when the eloquent leader of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition rose to make his motion amid all the panoply and circumstance of parliamentary warfare, I did expect, before he finished, some grand discovery would have been made and given to the House which would have ended in the annihilation of the great Conservative party. When he was followed by the gallant knight from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and by my philosophical friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), I must say the fears I had at first entertained gradually dwindled down to something like a sense of growing satisfaction, and before my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) had resumed his seat they became almost a sense of gratitude. For what was the accusation which these gentlemen were bringing against the great Conservative party? It was simply this: that we had selected a gentleman who, on their own confession, was without his peer in this House, as the leader of that party. I will not appeal to my hon. friends on this side of the House as to the character of the hon. gentleman who now leads the Conservative party. I read his character and obtain it from the mouths and speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) assured us that when all was dark and gloomy, when blue ruin seemed to be hanging over the country, when the prophecies indulged in by gentlemen opposite seemed to be in the act of being realized, when all had lost hope, when all who had promoted that great enterprise, the Canadian Pacific Railway, were in the deepest despair, there was found the one man able to shoulder the responsibilities, who became their pilot and led them into a haven of rest; and that is the man we have asked to lead us in the great struggle for constitutional liberty and the upholding of those principles which our dear departed leader impressed on us. This is the man we have chosen for the task. But it is not sufficient to know that he is a man of the transcendent ability such as hon. gentlemen opposite have described him to be. He may have all those talents and abilities and experience, but the great Conservative party demand that their leader shall not only be an eloquent and able man, but also an upright and honest man. I have heard this afternoon, for the first time during the five years I have sat in this House, a glowing tribute of praise wrung from the unwilling lips of the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). As the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries said he had broken the record for once, and it was only because of the peculiar circumstances existing that this unwilling praise fell from his lips, and he told us there was no more honourable man, no man of higher aspirations and character than the present First Minister. I ask, in the name of common sense, if we, the great Conservative party, have been able to obtain as our leader a man who by their own confession has the highest talents, who overtopped the leaders of that great enterprise, the Canadian Pacific Railway, and was the only man who was able to guide them, a man who is also of the highest moral and irreproachable character, are we to be blamed for placing such a man at our head as leader of the party? Or, do hon. gentlemen opposite say that we should have appointed a man who did not possess those high qualities? It cannot be so; because, I see in their own leader a man whom I respect from the bottom of my heart, a man who is also without reproach, and I can therefore judge what the ideal of hon. gentlemen opposite must be as to what a leader should be. But, I ask hon. gentlemen opposite, in view of the fact that they possess in their own leader a man of irreproachable character, to be consistent enough, at least not to be so uncharitable as not to be able to imagine that we cannot have the same aspirations and the same high ideals to guide us. We have been asked: What does Ontario say about this Administration? and we have been taunted in this regard. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has said that the Maritime Provinces were a clear first, that Quebec was an easy second, but that Ontario was nowhere in the new Cabinet. He little knows Ontario if he thinks Ontario in any case can be nowhere. Ontario is fully conscious of its position. It knows that it pays more than half of every dollar contributed to the general fund.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. COCKBURN. Yes, I say. I say also that the district of Toronto, from which I come, contributes towards the inland revenue more than the whole of the Maritime Provinces, British Columbia and Manitoba combined. But in regard to the question as to who should guide the destinies of the country, we are not mere sectionalists. We do not consider this country is a mere federal union, but we regard it as a great Confederation, as a great Dominion, and so long as we find talent, industry, ability, integrity and honesty all combined in our hon. leader, we care not from what part of the Dominion he may come. These are our principles, and it would be well for the Opposition, if, instead of seeking to promote disunion and set province against province, they would follow the example and action of the great Conservative party, and try to realize that our conception is what their conception ought to be, a vast Dominion united and allied to the mother country, looking affectionately to the mother country as the source from which we sprang, and determined, if possible, to rivet more closely the bonds that bind us together, and to give no preference to any foreign country. We have been told that the election of Mr. Abbott as leader of the Conservative party was followed at once by the enhancement of the stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway; yet you have been shown here to-day that that enhancement had been only one per cent. Well, when we look at other stocks during that time, I find a much greater enhancement, and I am, therefore, entitled to come to the conclusion that, when Mr. Abbott was made Prime Minister of this country, it was felt on all hands that he would guide things so evenly that the Canadian Pacific Railway had no favours and nothing but bare justice to expect, and, accordingly, Canadian Pacific Railway stock went up only one per cent., while the other railway stocks, and the bank stocks, and the loan companies' stocks, appreciated to a much greater extent at the same time. If I am entitled to say that Mr. Abbott's election to the Premiership inspired such confidence in certain people that they were willing to pay one per cent. more for the Canadian Pacific Railway stock, what am I to say of the thousands of persons who were ready to pay 4 or 5 per cent. more for other stocks? Surely, I have a right to draw the conclusion, that such was the universal confidence in the ability, integrity and uprightness of this man, that the stocks of the

different financial concerns of the Dominion appreciated by several millions of dollars. The hon. leader of the Opposition has referred at some length to the historical fact that the Empire of Alexander became disintegrated, owing to the quarrels of his four great generals who each claimed part of the mighty Empire he bequeathed at his death. But I read the moral in this way: That if there were four able and heroic generals who were unable to control their passions, and so broke up the mighty Empire of Alexander, then the leaders of the great Conservative party of Canada showed a wiser discretion, inasmuch as, instead of like Alexander's generals each claiming his part of the empire, they united together in choosing one who can hold their empire together and who will hold that empire intact as long as he remains the leader of the Conservative party. As to the newspaper rumours which have been referred to, I do not consider that it is the duty of this House, nor is it consistent with the dignity of Parliament or of Cabinet Ministers to pay heed to every rumour which may have been circulated, for all we know, by the Opposition themselves. It is difficult to understand what is the object of the motion which has been made this evening, but, as far as I can see, it was made with a view of spreading disintegration in the ranks of the Conservative party. If that was the intention its promoters must be sadly disappointed; for what has been the effect? It has called my hon. friend the Minister of Justice to his feet to explain to us the circumstances under which he acted. Knowing that hon. gentleman as we do, and loving him as we do, we were not surprised to learn the sacrifices which he made in what he considered to be the best interests of the party. It brought to his feet the able Minister of Public Works to explain his satisfaction with everything that had been done; and as my friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) has alluded to Sir Charles Tupper, it brought to his feet that hon. gentleman's talented son who showed us at any rate that, so far as his father was concerned, his friends were perfectly satisfied with the present Premier. The only taunt left for hon. gentlemen on the other side was to ask: What does Ontario think of this? We have now heard the explanations from the Ministers, and I can tell the House that so long as the affairs of the country are well and carefully managed, consistently with the lines of the National Policy, and with that integrity and uprightness which has characterised the actions of the great Conservative party, so long will Ontario be content, and if at any time it is necessary for Ontario to rise in its might and to assert its rights you may rest assured that it is fully prepared and fully able to do so.

Mr. EDGAR. After the very direct challenge which was made by my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) to the member for Toronto Centre (Mr. Cockburn), I thought that hon. gentleman would not have forgotten while he was on his feet to have given expression to his personal satisfaction with the present constitution of the Cabinet. But the hon. gentleman forgot all about that; he told us a great deal about Ontario being satisfied, and about Toronto being satisfied, but he did not say that the member for Toronto Centre (Mr. Cockburn) was satisfied; and how could he be? Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman almost made my blood boil as a citizen of Toronto, and as a constituent of his own, when he pointed out to this House the vast extent of the material resources and the wealth of the Queen City of the West, which, he says, paid more to the inland revenue of this country than all the Maritime, and North-West, and Pacific Provinces put together. Well, Sir, what could he have thought of the intellectual character of the people of Toronto, or at least the Conservative portion of them, if they were to be satisfied with the present constitution of the Cabinet? He talked about Ontario being satisfied; has he ever made the calculation that in the present Cabinet there is not a single elected representative of the Province of Ontario, west of Belleville, and that there are not less than sixty-eight members in this House of Commons representing constituencies in Ontario west of Belleville who have not one single representative in that Cabinet. There are more members sitting in this House from that central and western portion of Ontario than there are from the entire Province of Quebec, and yet they have no representative in the Cabinet. As a matter of fact at the last election there was only one Minister of the Crown who presented himself for election in a constituency west of Belleville, and that Minister was defeated. I wonder that my friend from Toronto is satisfied with Ontario's position. One would suppose from the self-congratulatory speeches that we have heard from the Government to-day that they had just returned as a triumphant Administration fresh from an appeal to the people. Why, Sir, is that the Cabinet that appealed to the people in March and which snatched a very doubtful victory at the polls? I say it was a very doubtful victory indeed, when the Administration, with all the power they had at their back and all the advantages in their favour, had to return to this Parliament in a distinct minority from the old Provinces of Canada. However, such as their victory was it was not won by this Administration. Was it Mr. Abbott who led that Government in March? Was it the Minister of Justice who led it? Was it the Minister of Finance? Why, the Minister of Finance does not know to-day, and he will not know until the election trial comes off, whether he was elected himself or not. Was it the Minister of Customs who gained the victory for the Government; a Minister whose majorities used to be in the thousands and which were at the last election down very low, indeed, in the hundreds? It certainly was not the Minister of Agriculture, the late member for London, who has not a seat in the House at at all now. There is no use disguising the fact, for we know it, and the country knows it, and the Ministers know it themselves, that what carried the last election was the name, and the prestige, and the power of their great leader who is gone. Now, Sir, the strength of the Cabinet that is left has had nothing added to it, and if to-day we want to find out what that strength is, it is not a sum in addition but a sum in subtraction which we must do. To find out their strength you have first to take from them the strength of Sir John Macdonald. That is a very large deduction to make, and what is left is the remnant of his cabinet such as it is. That the old Cabinet that went to the country was a complicated structure I admit, but it was bound together and supported by one great central beam; all the other members of the Cabinet leaned upon

that. That beam has been taken away, and what has been put in its place? Absolutely nothing: not a single piece of new timber in the whole structure —not even a change in office. They are there, a remnant of the Cabinet that went to the country. As a Cabinet they are certainly no stronger; they are weaker. The only change is a rearrangement of one office. A gentleman who was leading in the Upper House is leading in the Upper House still; and he has taken an office in the Cabinet that was lost in the election. This is all the change that has been made. Looking at the Cabinet as a whole, it is no stronger. Looking at it in detail, it is a very marvellous structure. There is the hon. Minister of Public Works; he does not seem to hear me, for he is taking a little rest, as one of his colleagues, I believe, recommended that he should. The Minister of Public Works had, I admit, very strong claims, some of which he himself put before the House to-day, to the succession. He said some newspapers and friends had recommended a certain party for the position of First Minister, and he modestly refrained from telling us that that party was the Minister of Public Works. But he said that the party, however much he might feel his claims entitled to consideration, did not press them just now. Well, the hon. Minister of Public Works is the senior member of the Cabinet, the senior Privy Councillor, and he had great claims in that respect. He is also the successor of Sir George Cartier in the Province of Quebec, as he has often claimed to be; he is the leader of his race at any rate on the Conservative side of the House, and as such his claims were very strong. Then, if we look at his claims as an efficient departmental officer, just see how strong they are. He has been industrious—everybody will admit that; he has conducted the affairs of his department with very close attention. If anything has gone wrong there, he has known all about it. There were no tenders called for that he did not know all the particulars of; there were no contracts let that he was not perfectly familiar with; there were no extras allowed in any contracts that he did not scrutinize to the bottom; there were no changes made in contracts without his knowledge and consent. We will give him credit for that; everybody should. Then look at the great public works with which he has connected his name. Look at the great graving dock at Levis: his name is intimately associated with that great work. Then there are those extensive works in connection with the Quebec harbour with which his name is proudly associated; and in Ottawa we have the departmental block, which is called the Langevin block in his honour. Away off in British Columbia we have the Esquimalt graving dock, a very entensive work, for which the hon. gentleman no doubt takes a great deal of credit, as he knows all about it from beginning to end. There is also the Kingston dock, of which we have not heard much yet, but no doubt will hear more by-and-bye. There is another claim of his which I was forgetting. Some years ago, some of the leading members of his party, those contractors and others who came into most intimate relations with him in his department, subscribed to a testimonial fund to show their great appreciation of him as a Conservative leader; and why should that event be ignored on this occasion? Then, we know that he has taken an active part in legislation in this House in support of the Conservative party. I remember, when my hon. friend from L'Islet who formerly sat in front of me introduced session after session his Bill to prevent contractors contributing to election funds, the hon. Minister of Public Works consistently and patriotically opposed it on every occasion. Yet, Sir, in spite of all these efforts, which should have satisfied his party if anything could, we have lately seen it suggested by a colleague from his own province who knows him well that he would be better of a little rest. That is all the thanks he gets; and I think he will probably take the hint and take a rest before very long. Then, there is the hon. Minister of Customs; he is a senior in the Cabinet too. He fought in the days of the old guard on this side of the House; he has been fighting more or less ever since; and will anybody in this country deny that he has tremendously popularised the Department of Customs in this country? Does not everybody know that it is one of the most popular departments in the Government? Do we not know that he displeases nobody and pleases everybody who comes into communication with his department? I believe the importers are so fond of the playful ways of the Minister that they like it, as the eels are said, from habit, to quite like getting skinned. But there is this against the hon. Minister, we all know that he came into the Government as a specialist; he came in there as a famous rider of the Protestant horse. Well, some of his friends and dear brethren who sit behind him say, I believe, that his seat is getting a little unsteady on that horse, and that he should get off and let somebody else ride it; and so perhaps he will be asked to take a little rest too. I do not see the hon. Minister of the Interior in his seat; but I believe it is generally understood in this House that the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) if very urgently pressed, might be persuaded to take that portfolio; and even the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly), is evidently in training, and has very strong backing for the office. The hon. Minister of the Interior came here from Regina, where he had been exercising gubernatorial functions, and, they say, and I dare say it may be so, that we shall see him proceeding to take charge of Carey Castle in Victoria, as Governor of British Columbia between now and next session, so that he will probably be taking a rest too. Then there is the Postmaster General, who, I believe, considers himself a fair representative of the Ontario Conservatives, and I believe he is about right. I believe he will hang on to the mail bags until he is turned out. They say, however, that he requires rest, but as far as I have observed he takes a good deal of it where he is. I am sorry the Secretary of State is not here. He, I believe, has a lame leg from a recent political kick, in which he indulged. They say that when a boy he was trained in a football team, which accounts for his being so brilliant a kicker. We have not had any attempt, which is of record at any date, to rival his recent performances in that line, except a few years ago, when one of the members for Ottawa was running for the County of Russell, where, for a five dollar bill, he had a kicking match with Mrs. Macdonell.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. EDGAR. The older members of the House will quite understand my allusion without any

explanation. They do say the Secretary of State requires a short rest, and then, when his leg is better, he will kick harder than ever. I do not know whether that is true. Some of his team say he kicks foul; but I believe, on the other hand, his friends say that is the only way he can get promotion on the team. The Minister of Marine, I must say, has one great advantage over the rest of his colleagues. He looks more innocent than all the rest put together, and I only hope he is half as innocent as he looks. I do not think he is going to retire for anybody unless perhaps for the High Commissioner, and then, no doubt, he would naturally take the vacant position in London, so that no good thing would go out of the family. Now, the Minister of Finance came into this House, very much like the Minister of Customs, as a specialist, and he came into the Cabinet as a specialist, but the nag he rode was the temperance nag. From what I have heard lately, he has put that nag out to grass somewhere in North Lanark. Now, it is rather a slow beast, but still not to be despised. The Minister of Finance is out of practice in riding that animal, and moreover, I understand, he has lately been looking very carefully into the figures, and he finds it would cost altogether too much to feed it on rye and malt. It would ruin the revenue of the country if we fed it on rye and malt, so he is going to let it stay out at grass awhile longer. Perhaps he will be dropped, to make room for another specialist, one of these days in his particular line. Another ornament of the Cabinet is also from New Brunswick, my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue. Everybody will admit that he is probably the most unassuming statesman in this House. He hides his light habitually under a bushel. We scarcely know what is in him, but I think an opportunity will come before long. I believe that in his department, while he has been doing a good deal in the direction of making a careful inspection of whiskey, he has altogether ignored the inspection of ale and beer. But no wonder; he has been very much handicapped by having in the same Cabinet the Minister of Agriculture, and when the Minister of Agriculture leaves the Cabinet, as he is expected to do shortly, the Minister of Inland Revenue will have the opportunity, which I hope he will take advantage of, of bringing in legislation for a more complete inspection of bottled ale, beer and porter. The enemies of the Minister of Inland Revenue say that he was "born tired," but whether he was or not, like the Postmaster General, he takes his rest as he goes along. Now, the Minister of Agriculture—I am giving the House with perfect freedom very briefly my opinion of the strength in detail of this Cabinet—the Minister of Agriculture has been raised to the peerage by the electors of London. They say he is waiting calmly for the Ontario governorship, and I have no doubt that he will make a very efficient Governor, and be able to discharge all the duties required of him in that position, and, besides, the Minister of Inland Revenue will then have a fine opportunity to look into the manufacture of ale and beer. Then there is the Minister of War. In Gilbert & Sullivan's opera of H. M's. S. "Pinafore," we know that the attorney's clerk rose, by his industry and thrift, to be the ruler of the Queen's Navee. In like manner, my hon. friend from the solicitor's office has risen, through his own exertions and brilliancy, to be commander in chief of all the land forces, fortresses, and munitions of war of Canada. His appearance, we know, is warlike; and if he had ever been to the front, I believe he would have killed somebody. However, like all great soldiers in time of peace, when they have given up slaughtering men, he becomes a lady killer. I have no doubt he will retreat in good order some of these days upon Spencer Wood, and fill the bill there as Lieutenant Governor, to his own satisfaction and that of the people of the city of Quebec. We have heard a good deal to-day of Mr. Abbott. All I have to say about him is this: that I do not think it is right he should, as leader of the Government, hold his seat in the other House. It has been pointed out, I know, that Lord Salisbury, to-day the First Minister of England, holds his seat in the House of Lords, but the case is vastly different there. Do you think, Sir, that public opinion in England would allow Lord Salisbury, or anyone in the House of Lords, to be Premier of England, if seven-eighths of that House of Lords had been nominated to their positions by himself or his political friends? No, Sir; the case is entirely different. Constitutionally, of course, he has the right to be there, but I say that the First Minister of Canada should not shield himself from the criticism of the representatives of the people behind the breast-work of his own nominees. Mr. Abbott, I fancy, thought it would be a very easy thing to take up the remnants of the old Cabinet and put them together again. It was the same old lock, stock and barrel. But, Mr. Speaker, he did not know it was loaded. In fact, he found, I believe, that it was Chapleauded. And, Sir, worse than all, it went off, and it wounded perhaps fatally the Minister of Public Works, and it very badly scared the Minister of Militia. Now we have the Minister of Justice. I must admit that he is the brains of the combination. I believe that the Minister of Justice will shape the policy of that combination, and I say that, that being the case, the Minister of Justice should have assumed the responsibility for that policy which he knows, and they all know, he will shape for them. Perhaps it was the stupid wing of his party that prevented his assuming that responsibility. All I can say is that he will have his revenge on that stupid wing before he gets through with them, and he knows it. He will dominate them as Disraeli dominated the country squires in England without their knowing it. I congratulate the Minister of Justice on his followers and I congratulate them on their master. On the whole, I do not think any such combination as I have hastily sketched can change my politics or make me vote for the new Ministry.

Mr. HAZEN. I listened with a great deal of pleasure to the address which the hon. gentleman from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) delivered a short time ago. I always listen with pleasure to any of the utterances of that hon. gentleman, because he always speaks most eloquently and vigorously, and, in addition to those excellent qualities, the hon. gentleman possesses what is perhaps a still greater qualification for a debater, and that is a most vivid imagination. I understand that the hon. gentleman has been always vigorous in debate, no matter whether the subject at issue were great or small, important or unimportant. I believe, the same vigour has always characterized the speeches of the

hon. gentleman, but, during the present session, as I am informed, the hon. gentleman has been outdoing himself in the vigour of his remarks, and no doubt that is due to the fact that his position in the present House is different to that which he held in the last Parliament. We know that for some years previously there was some question between the members representing the Maritime Provinces as to who was their leader. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) aspired to that position, but he was not allowed to take it unchallenged. There was another hon. member who is not now in the House, who then represented the County of Halifax, who claimed that he was the leader of the Liberals from the Maritime Provinces. There was also my predecessor from the City and County of St. John who also was understood to have some claim to the position The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) has now come back as the undisputed leader of the Liberal party of the Maritime Provinces, depleted, decimated, thinned and reduced as their ranks have been in the election which took place in March last. Therefore it is, that the hon. gentleman has thrown into his remarks this session a vigour far greater than he did before. But he must not rest too secure in his ability to retain the leadership of that party, for, judging from the eloquent speeches which have been made since the session commenced by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), I think he may possibly dispute the title of leader with the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). I would give the hon. gentleman this advice, that, when he and his followers undertake to make the same quotation from Shakespeare in reference to Sir Charles Tupper, they should compare notes beforehand, and should be satisfied as to what the quotation really is. They seemed to differ in regard to that quotation. The hon. member from Guysborough quoted as follows :—

"Sir Charles Tupper might have stood against the world, now lies he there and none so vain as do him homage."

The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) tonight thought that was an admirable quotation, and so rising to the heights of the dramatic art, with his eloquence and his magnificent manner, he said :

"But yesterday the word of Sir Charles Tupper stood against the world : now lies he there, and none so poor as do him reverence."

I would suggest to these gentlemen that, before quoting Shakespeare in regard to Sir Charles Tupper—and it is wonderful how they love to abuse Sir Charles Tupper on every occasion, though nothing in regard to him is before the House—they should compare notes. If they cannot find any copy of Shakespeare in the library, where there are many, they might get out a new edition of their own, which would no doubt be of great advantage in the literary education of the people and a valuable book of reference. On Thursday last, when the leader of the Liberal party, with that graceful eloquence of which he is a master, after the leader of the House had stated the policy of the Government, said there was a departure in one important particular from the policy of Sir John Macdonald and that he would show what that departure was on the following day, I almost felt that the prophecies which have been made in the press for thirteen years were about to be fulfilled, that the Government was tottering to its fall, and that the Opposition were going to sweep down on the Liberal-Conservative fold and rout us as completely as Sennacherib's army were annihilated and routed in years gone by. I thought that, perhaps, when that attack was made, the Liberal-Conservatives would have to "fold their tents like the Arabs and silently flit away" to the seats at your left.

Some hon. MEMBERS. "Steal away." Quote correctly.

Mr. HAZEN. But, when the hon. gentleman rose to-day, and when I thought we would hear that the Government had violated some great constitutional principle, that they had made some great departure from the policy laid down by the grand old chieftain whose memory will live forever in the minds of a thankful people, who was loved by the great mass of Canadians, and in regard to whom the words of Horace might be used :

"I have erected a monument more lasting than brass and more enduring than the lofty elevation of the pyramids. I shall not all die, but a great part of me will escape the goddess who presides over funerals——"

I began to think the party had made a great departure from the policy of the great old chieftain who had led us to victory time and time again. I thought it might be, at first, that the ground of attack would be that it was not proper or constitutional that the Premier should have a seat in the Senate, but when I remembered that in Great Britain the Premier of Her Majesty's Government sits in the House of Lords, I came to the conclusion that no constitutional objection could be raised on that line. I then thought there must be some other ground. Judge of my surprise, when I found that the great violation of the constitution consisted in the fact that Mr. Abbott had been a director and had been engaged and interested in the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Now, while I would not for a single instant charge an hon. gentleman for whom I have such high respect as I have for the leader of the Opposition, with being insincere, it seems to me that when he made that a ground of attack against the Government and against the Premier, he could not have well considered the course that he was taking. Why, Sir, does he mean to lay down as a principle that no man is to be taken into the Administration, no matter how eligible he may be for the position, if he is connected with any public work that has for its object the advancement and the consolidation of the Dominion of Canada? Because that is practically what it amounts to. The hon. gentleman, it seems to me, should have reflected upon the harm such a course was likely to inflict upon his own party. Do hon. gentlemen opposite mean to say that a gentleman who is interested in the Canadian Pacific Railway has no right to a seat in the Government of this country, has no right to be the leader of a great party in this country? If they say so, then they must go to the Senate and remove from that body the leader of the Liberal party in the Senate, who is a paid official of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Sir, I think if you will look into the records of Lord Salisbury, you will find that he to-day is a director in the University Life Insurance Company, one of the largest life insurance companies of Great Britain. More than that, it is fresh in the memory of all present that a gentleman who occupied a very distinguished position for

years in the Liberal party of this country, and a gentleman whom the Liberals were at one time so anxious to make their leader, that, with undue haste, they deposed from that position the hon. gentleman who had led them in power and in opposition, in order that they might put their new leader in his place—we cannot forget that this gentleman whom they twice put forward as leader of their party, and whom they are fond of calling one of the leading statesmen of this continent, accepted from the Canadian Pacific Railway the largest retainer that has ever been received by any professional man in Canada. I say that these facts shows the insincerity of the hon. gentlemen opposite in objecting to Mr. Abbott's former connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway as incapacitating him from becoming Premier of this country. The hon. gentleman has taken that course, for the simple reason that he could find no better ground of objection against the appointof the Hon. Mr. Abbott as Premier of the Dominion and leader of the Liberal-Conservative party. Now, Sir, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) who addressed the House this afternoon spoke, as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has pointed out, in a very amiable manner, and I think he is to be congratulated on his change of tone. The hon. gentleman spoke of Mr. Abbott as a man of great ability; and I may here remark that both the hon. member for South Oxford and the leader of the Opposition have been furnishing His Excellency with admirable reasons for having selected Mr. Abbott as leader of the Government. I say that a gentleman who occupied so conspicuous a position in the management of the Canadian Pacific Railway, whom the leader of the Opposition said had been the head of that corporation, the adviser of that corporation and the thinker of that corporation—I say a man who had from his ability occupied that position and carried through to a successful issue the great Canadian Pacific Railway, which to-day is the admiration of the civilized world, is just the man, in point of ability and in point of energy, whom we wish to lead the Liberal-Conservative party of this country, the National party of the Dominion of Canada. But I was going on to say that although the member for South Oxford spoke in high terms of Mr. Abbott's ability and character, yet the ruling passion was so strong in the hon. gentleman that he could not take his seat without attempting, as he has been doing for years past, since 1878, to arouse sectional feeling in this country. The hon. gentleman did not refer this time to "shreds, and patches, and ragged remnants," as he did before, but he said that in this present combination the Maritime Provinces stood first, Quebec a close second, and Ontario was practically left out in the cold. Now, there was only one object the hon. gentleman could have in making that remark—he wished to create discontent in that great and progressive Province of Ontario, in the liberal-minded Province of Ontario, where, in a marked degree, the people enjoy the advantages of wealth and education, and have made great progress in political matters; he wished to convince the people of that province that they were being ruled by the minority down by the sea, and that they had but an insignificant place in the Government. Sir, I think it is deplorable that in this age, and in this country, hon. members should be so anxious to create the impression that one part of the Dominion is favoured at the expense of another. That is not the feeling that should prevail, if we are going to become one great homogeneous whole, united by the bond of sympathy, and united by the bond of national unity. On the contrary we ought to encourage the feeling that we are all equally Canadians, whether we live down by the sea, whether we live in Ontario, or whether we live on the prairies, or in British Columbia. The hon. gentleman, in making that remark, was true to his own instincts, to the instincts of a portion of his party, and when the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) followed in the same line, I could not help feeling regret that so great a wit, that a man who had such a wonderful fund of humour, should be wasting it on this House. It struck me that the hon. gentleman had better turn his talents to the publication of a comic almanac, and that such an occupation would be more advantageous to him than occupying a seat on the Opposition benches of this House. If the hon. gentleman had been sitting on this side of the House with his Liberal friends in power, he would, no doubt, have been in a more contented frame of mind, because we remember that in 1874, after his forced retirement from this House, he went on a mission to British Columbia for his Liberal friends who were then in power, for which he was paid a very handsome sum of money. The hon. gentleman from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) then went further, and he contended not only that the Dominion should be broken up into provinces, but that these provinces should be again subdivided, and he complained, forsooth, that Ontario had no representatives in the Cabinet west of the city of Belleville; that is a lofty and high-minded position for a statesman to take. Sir, it is absurd, it is utter nonsense, to talk about this part of a province or that part of a province, this part of the Dominion or that part of the Dominion, having no representation in the Cabinet. The main thing to consider is: Do the members of the Government deal out fair-play and even-handed justice to the different portions of the Dominion? If they do, I say advisedly that it makes no difference what part of the Dominion these men come from, so long as they show justice and fair-play to the different sections and provinces of the Dominion. Now, the hon. member for South Oxford in a portion of his remarks was very much astonished that the Liberal-Conservative party should have chosen as their leader a gentleman who, in 1849, had signed an annexation manifesto. I can readily understand the hon. gentleman would be shocked at anything which contained the word "annexation." Sir, we are not apt, in this country, to trouble ourselves about the views of men expressed 40 years ago. I am not going to trouble myself about views expressed by an hon. gentleman before I was born, and before many members of this House were born. All we want to consider is what his views are at the present moment. Are they such views now as we approve? Are they views that we think are right and proper? We know that the hon. gentleman has abandoned the views which he held in his youth, because, I think, he was only twenty-eight years of age when he signed that manifesto. He has expressed regret at having done so. We know that that hon. gentleman ever since has been a loyal citizen to Canada, he has been loyal to our British connection and to our mother country. That being the case I think the members of this

House and the people of this country will think very little of what his views may have been some forty years ago. But it strikes me as a very peculiar thing that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) of all men in the House, because the leader of the Opposition did not allude to it, should have referred to this matter. I am more concerned, and I think this House will be more concerned, with some remarks made by the hon. member for South Oxford less than twelve months ago, in the city of Boston. This hon. gentleman who exhibits so much surprise because Mr. Abbott signed an annexation manifesto some forty years ago, went to Boston only a few months ago and made a speech. He said:

"A line drawn from the north-east corner of Maine to Sault Ste. Marie, or to Duluth, would pass full 200 miles north of Toronto and Montreal, and nearly double that distance north of the southern portion of Ontario—in other words, not only is a large part of Canada absolutely imbedded in the United States, but the shortest routes from important portions of your territory to other important and growing sections lie directly across ours."

What Boston would gain by reciprocity with Canada was told by Sir Richard Cartwright in the following sentence:—

"In one word, given free trade with Canada, and you are with one stride from the position, in some respects, of a frontier city, with no great extent of trade territory secured to you, to that of a central entrepot, with the practical monopoly of a great region behind you, whose commerce no man can take away from you."

In other words, he told the men of Boston that all they had to do was to get unrestricted reciprocity with Canada, and Boston would take away from the cities of the Maritime Province, Halifax and St. John, and from the cities of Ontario and Quebec, the business they are now enjoying, and Boston would become the great entrepot of the Dominion of Canada. This subject has been referred to before, but it can be referred to again, because it is one that should be referred to when an hon. gentleman finds fault with and criticizes us because we are following a man who nearly half a century ago, signed an annexation manifesto in the heat of temporary excitement. It was no wonder that having delivered that great oration in Boston the gentleman presiding at the banquet should arise and say that the easiest way to bring about the result was for the hon. gentleman to deliver that speech as the senator from the State of Ontario. Then there was an hon. gentleman named Erastus Wiman, who is intimately connected with the leaders of the Liberal party. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and the Attorney-General for Nova Scotia, a leading Liberal of that province, who was the man who led the secessionist movement and wished to bring about the disunion of Canada, went about the country together with him and delivered speeches. We all remember the Quebec conference, held at the instance of Mr. Mercier, where it was decided that the whole constitution was to be broken into atoms, and we were to be provided with a new constitution, where it was decided that the Province of Quebec and other provinces were to get a large sum from the Dominion treasury. At that conference, attended by the leaders of the Liberal Governments of all the provinces, it was considered that the gathering would not be complete unless Mr. Wiman went there and addressed the conference on the beauties of commercial union. Commercial union, as we all remember, was not very popular. It did not sound well, so it was re-christened under the name of unrestricted reciprocity. Then Mr. Wiman and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) told the Province of Ontario and the Dominion at large what benefits would accrue to them, and Mr. Wiman hurried across the border and told the people of the United States what great benefits would accrue to them. I find that Mr. Wiman in a speech delivered in Newark, New Jersey, said:

"The total trade is about $200,000,000; two-thirds of it, it is supposed, can be secured by the United States by simply lifting up the line that now runs through the middle of the continent and stretching it around the continent. This would not only admit to more than half the continent all American manufactures, but it would create in their favour in one part of the British Empire a discrimination against the manufactures of another part of the British Empire. Can anything be more attractive to the average American protectionist than this advantage over the pauper labour of Europe?"

On the eve of the election we find Mr. Wiman, the author of commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity, going down to the State of Kentucky and declaring that the Liberal party had been twice defeated and that another defeat would be fatal to it and perpetuate in force a party whose policy was inimical to the United States. Therefore, said Mr. Wiman, it is of the utmost importance that every effort should be put forward to place the Liberal party in power at the approaching elections. While some hon. gentlemen might, with all honesty, criticize the course of the Liberal-Conservative party in following a gentleman who 40 years ago signed an annexation manifesto, yet it did not lie in the mouth of the hon. member for South Oxford to do so, and he was the last man in the House, considering his own public utterances and the company he kept in junketing around the United States, to throw that reproach upon the Liberal-Conservative party. Something has been said by several speakers concerning the Minister of Justice and his position at the present time, and I deeply regret that the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) has seen fit, without having any proof to substantiate his charge, to utter a gross slander, such as he has hurled against this side of the House, and to go out of his way to stir up in this House, and this country, feelings of religious intolerance. He in eloquent terms intimated, and he might have said it in so many words, that the reason why the Minister of Justice was not leader of the Liberal-Conservative party to-day was because the Conservative party would not support him in consequence of his religious faith. Standing here as one of the members of the Conservative party, I desire to say with all sincerity, and I think I voice the sentiments of every member of the party in this House, that if the Minister of Justice had accepted the position of Premier of this country, which was offered him by the Governor General, and which his modesty prevented him accepting, I, in common with every Liberal-Conservative in this House, would have given him our hearty, our loyal, our best support. The Liberal-Conservative party is not a party run on religious lines. It is a party that believes in national greatness, it is a party that believes that every man has equal rights, it is a party which believes that a man may worship God as he pleases; and if the Minister of Justice had accepted

the position of Premier, which he might have accepted—and I do not think there are hon. gentlemen opposite who aspire to be leaders of public opinion who, under any circumstances, would have declined such a position if sent for by the Governor General—we would have given him our hearty, loyal and undivided support. We would have been proud of him as a leader; we would have admired his great ability, his great parliamentary knowledge, his ability as a parliamentary tactician, and, above all, his spotless character and unblemished political and public reputation. So I wish to hurl back to the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) the base insinuation, the base charge which he made against the Liberal-Conservative party, and I wish to tell him that it does not lie in his mouth, belonging as he does to the Liberal party, to rise in his seat and say with such vigour that there were no divisions in the Liberal party, that they were united and rallying round their leader; and I am free to say that if that hon. gentleman happened to be a Conservative, on our side we would not be ashamed to rally round him either. But it does not sound well in the mouth of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) to say such a thing as that. I would not have referred to this matter to-night had not the hon. member tried to persuade this House that I and my colleagues in the representation of the city and county of St. John were responsible for an article published in a St. John newspaper. I will deal with that question in a moment, but I desire to say that the hon. member for Queen's is the last man who should make such a remark as that, sitting as he does in the front row of the Liberal benches, and if he casts his eyes to his left he will find sitting beside him a gentleman posing as one of the leaders of the Liberal party who, not very long ago, wrote with his own hand a letter, of which this is a copy:

"With a French Catholic leader, and under the manipulation of such machine politicians as J. D. Edgar *et al*, I have not the utmost confidence in the immediate future of the Reform party. Excuse my delay in writing you. I have been away from home, and very busy most of the time."

An hon. MEMBER. Who wrote that?

Mr. HAZEN. It is signed by "Yours very truly, John Charlton." I ask the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) if he thinks it was a statesman-like course, if he thinks it was a dignified course, or if he thinks it was a course warranted by the facts, that he should stand up in this House and make that charge directly generally against the whole Conservative party, but more directly against two of the members from the City and County of St. John. The hon. gentleman read an article from the *Gazette* newspaper of the city of St. John, and he asserted with all his vehemence that it was the organ of two of the members from the City and County of St. John, and the two members from that constituency are Mr. Skinner and myself. The member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) went further than that, for in addition to saying that it was the organ of the two members from the City and County of St. John he said that the paper was controlled by these two members. As far as I am concerned, and I think my colleagues will give me authority to speak for them in this matter, I wish to state most distinctly and emphatically, so that there can be no mistaking the meaning of my words, that that paper is not my organ and is not the organ of either of the hon. gentlemen who are associated with me in the representation of that constituency. I wish to say, further, that this paper is not controlled by me, nor is it controlled by any of my colleagues, and I further say that that journal is not indebted to us for one single dollar beyond my annual subscription, and perhaps a little advertising which we may give it from time to time. I think my colleagues will bear me out in this statement. Therefore, when the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) says that it was the organ of two of the members from the City and County of St. John, and that it was controlled by these members, he was stating what was not warranted by the facts, and if the hon. gentleman pursues the proper course he will rise in this House and apologize to us for the slanderous statement he has made.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I wish to accept the hon. gentleman's statement unreservedly. As far as he is concerned, I never intended to indicate that he had any connection, directly or indirectly, with the newspaper in question.

An hon. MEMBER. But you said it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will you be kind enough to hold your tongue for a moment? If the hon. gentleman's colleagues will make the same statement I will make the same unreserved statement on my part.

Mr. McLEOD. I may say that, for my part, I have not the slightest interest, either directly or indirectly, in the paper referred to by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. HAZEN. I am pleased that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) has taken this accusation back; but I think it is an improper thing for a gentleman who has a place in the front ranks of his party to base such a charge upon a newspaper article. I frankly admit that the newspaper to which he referred supported me most heartily during the last campaign and I highly valued its support; it supported the Liberal-Conservative party then, and it supports that party to-day; and if the hon. gentleman's mind is susceptible to any impression I would ask him to read the columns of the *Daily Sun* of St. John, another Liberal-Conservative paper, which he may with equal justice accept as the views of the members from that province. I may state also that the *Sun* supported me during the last election, but I have no interest whatever in that newspaper. On the 12th June, 1891, we find the following, published in the *Sun*:—

"One word may be said in these columns in respect to the report that Sir John Thompson is to be called, and to the allegation that, being a Roman Catholic, he is practically ineligible. There are many other elements in the problem which must be considered, but in respect to the objection mentioned this journal has only to reaffirm the position taken on previous occasions. No man, because he belongs to a particular church, should be placed in a position which of right belongs to another, and no man should, because of his religious belief, be excluded from a position to which he would be otherwise fully entitled. This sound doctrine applies as well to the Premiership of Canada as to any position of less eminence."

Now, Sir, if it was fair for the hon. gentleman to say that that article in the St. John *Gazette* represented my views and the views of the Liberal-Conservatives of that city it would be equally fair for him to say that the views of the St. John *Sun* also represented the opinions held by the Liberal-Con

servatives of St. John and by their representatives in this House. I desire to say most emphatically that so far as the representatives from the city of St. John are concerned, no narrow feelings of bigotry influence us, and I may also say that no member from the Province of New Brunswick would allow his religious views to interfere with his duty to his party for one moment, so far as regards the leadership of our party is concerned. If I recollect the political history of Prince Edward Island aright it occurs to me that the hon. member from Queen's (Mr. Davies) is probably the last man in this House who should stand up and talk about religious bigotry in the formation of a Government. Let me say, Sir, that I believe that in discussing this question hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have not been sincere in putting forward as a reason that it was because of the connection of Mr. Abbott with the Canadian Pacific Railway that he should not be Premier. It appears to me that the object of the party was to spread throughout the country the views which the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has expressed in this House. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) said that the Conservative party was not a happy party, and that it was a diversified party. I admit with the hon. gentleman that to a certain extent the Conservative party is diversified. It is not like the Liberal party to-day, whose representatives nearly all come from two provinces of the Dominion; it is not like the Liberal party, which has not a single representative from British Columbia, which has only one representative from the Nort-West and Manitoba, which has only a corporal's guard from the Province of New Brunswick, and a few followers from Nova Scotia and four from Prince Edward Island. The Liberal party to-day is a diversified party in the sense that it represents every section of the Dominion of Canada, and while there may be diversified interests in it, yet the party is bound together by the strongest possible link, it is bound together by devotion to the party, devotion to the country and devotion to the best interests of the land in which we live. The hon. gentleman has referred to the harmony that prevails among the hon. members who occupy the Opposition benches. If we listened to all the statements made in newspaper articles, as hon. gentlemen opposite do, we would be led to believe that the hon. member for South Oxford was not entirely acceptable to his party, and that they were demanding a change. I can only say on behalf of the Liberal-Conservative party that we trust that the time is far, far distant when the hon. member for South Oxford will cease to occupy the high position he holds to-day of first lieutenant in Her Majesty's loyal Opposition.

Mr. FRASER. I congratulate the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) on the admirable speech he has made on behalf of his party. Did his words represent the real state of affairs the Conservative party might well congratulate themselves on the happiness that exists among them; but when I saw the feigned eloquence by which he endeavoured to show that which does not exist I came to the conclusion that his speech was for the occasion, and did not proceed from his own conviction. He speaks about the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) raising the question respecting the hon. Minister of Justice. Now, who raised that question? The papers and the followers of the Conservative party. Who were the first to speak of it, and who will be the last to speak of it? Those very gentlemen. I believe the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) told the truth unwittingly when he spoke of the hon. Minister of Justice making a sacrifice in the interest of his party. That sacrifice was made at the instance of such papers as the St. John *Gazette*; and while the hon. member for Queen's was wrong in saying that that paper was controlled by two members, he was not so very far wrong, because it is controlled, in part at least, by one of the members. Therefore, all the assumed indignation of the hon. member for St. John is simply play-acting. With regard to the hon. Minister of Justice having been called upon to form a Government, I am sure that no man in this House will say that he was not in a position to do so, so far as his influence and his ability are concerned; and if there is blame anywhere for his not being Premier that blame exists among hon. gentlemen opposite, and not in the Opposition. Now, who raised this point? The papers in the country, and the religious bodies, some of them controlled in the interest of the party opposite.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. FRASER. It is well for hon. gentlemen to say "no, no." Who were the first to send delegates to speak of the matter? Hon. gentlemen opposite know. If the hon. member for Queen's raised that point he raised it on the authority of the papers supporting the Government. Are we to be told, because an hon. gentleman assumes an indignation for the occasion, that we are not to refer to that question? Decidedly not. The hon. gentleman spoke of Mr. Blake accepting a retainer from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The hon. gentleman has forgotten that Mr. Blake was not the leader of the Liberal party when he accepted that retainer; and if Senator Scott is retained by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, then all I have to say is that that fact detracted somewhat from the high compliment he paid to the Premier; I suppose a fellow-feeling made him wondrous kind. Now, was it wrong for Mr. Blake to accept a retainer while he was a member of this House? Does the hon. gentleman see no difference between a private member of this House accepting a retainer from the company, and a gentleman who has been in the employ of that company for a certain time becoming Premier? Even if Mr. Blake had been leader of the Opposition he would not be in so bad a position, because he had no control over the finances of this country, and would not be in a position to make any grants to the company. All I have to say of the present Premier is this, and I speak only for myself, that I should have accepted him with much greater pleasure had he not sold out his shares. If he could lead the Government party in the Upper House for four years as the solicitor of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company it does seem to me to be a little thin that now, when he is only accepting the position he holds as a make-shift to put the Government over the present session, he should sell his shares and give up his retainer for all time. I submit that he would have suited just as well if he had not sold his shares. But the hon. gentleman speaks of the old chief and the grand old party. It did not seem to me that the hon. gentleman had forgotten the circumstances which were crowded into the few days

during which his old and respected chief lay dying. Did the hon. gentleman think nothing of the cabalting which was going on for days before the late Premier was dead? Did he think nothing of the state of affairs which called forth that article in the Government organ in this city on indecent haste? Did he forget that that organ had to tell the party in plain words that the Conservative party can afford to be in opposition, but it cannot afford to strangle its principles or to sacrifice its honour simply to remain on the Treasury benches? Then it goes on to speak of the men who were seeking the position. Was it necessary to speak in such terms of men who were simply devoted to the old chieftain, and ready to accept anyone who might be called on to succeed him? We know as a matter of fact that these men have aspirations: they are worthy aspirations; nobody objects to them. But one reason why I oppose an arrangement like the present is, that it is a dual arrangement. There was a time when a triumvirate could exist in Rome, but this is no time for a diumvirate at Ottawa. Here is the way in which the Halifax *Herald*, the Conservative organ in that city, speaks of it:

"Political Situation--Much curiosity concerning the new Cabinet—Chapleau wants the Department of Railways—The nominal leadership in the Commons will doubtless be conceded to Sir Hector Langevin; but Nova Scotia's gifted son will be the actual and active leader of the party."

Now, is that a state of things that should exist in this country? Why, Japan did away with an anomalous state of things such as this in 1868. They had their Tycoon and their Mikado; but here we have the Mikado, the leader *de jure*, and the Tycoon, the leader *de facto*; and yet, were I a betting man, I would bet any money that the little Tycoon would get there before long. You cannot have two heads to any government; and when such a state of things was announced I thought: Oh for the man that this country has lost! Prospero's wand lies buried amidst the silence of Kingston. Two men are necessary now to do the work that he did, and then they cannot do it. That is why I object to the present arrangement. It will be found that just as at Rome, in the case of Cæsar and Bibulus, this dual arrangement will of necessity fall into the hands of one man. You will find that these two gentlemen, when they try to run the Government together, will find themselves in the position described in the verse:

"There was a young lady of Niger,
Went out for a ride on a tiger;
They returned from the ride,
The lady inside,
And a smile on the face of the tiger."

Who the young lady is and who the tiger I leave for events to demonstrate when they come to pass.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. FRASER. I will make no explanations, as I would not willingly place these hon. gentlemen in a false position. The explanation might of course satisfy myself, but not them. Does the hon. gentleman think that because Mr. Charlton wrote a letter the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has nothing to say? Does it follow that because one man in a party writes a letter, the party is bound never again to allude to the question about which the letter was written? If so, I commend him to the articles written by the newspapers in this Dominion, said to be controlled by members of Parliament, to show that what has been published in the St. John *Gazette* is thought, at least by many members in the Province of Quebec representing the Conservative party, to be true. Would the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) not be allowed to rise and denounce that kind of thing because these papers say it? I am not going to accept the views of the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) on this occasion. I believe the Government, judging by the little they have shown us of their policy for the future, are not acting in the interests of the people; and, notwithstanding the grand style in which Sir John Thompson spoke about the elections, I believe if we would subtract the influences which were at work, and by which the many people were deceived into voting for the Government, you would find that the great mass of the people are opposed to it. I believe that the elements in the present Government will not coalesce, that like oil and water they cannot mix, and that this dual representation—this double-headed system—is bound to end in discord and failure. Before anything can be done the Mikado has to speak to the Tycoon, and you will have division of authority and, what is worse, men throwing the responsibility on each other. Believing this, I am of the opinion that the present Government is not entitled to the votes of this House. But, be that as it may, let me say to the hon. member for St. John, to whose brilliant speech I listened with great pleasure, that, perhaps, he will not repeat again the same speech, for he has already delivered it in part at the opening of the House; and if the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) does not deign to answer the hon. gentleman now, as he did not before, the hon. gentleman should take the lesson and give us something new in the future. So far as the country's interest are concerned, the Liberal party are the true party in this Dominion. The people view with the greatest apprehension the fact that the man who was the consolidator of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the only man who could, as the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) said, lead it into a haven of rest, is the man in whose hands the destinies of the country are now placed. I do not believe in any power outside the people, and when any corporation, I care not how good their intentions—for the intentions of a soulless corporation are always in their own interest—has more than its legitimate influence, the country is bound to suffer. In the present instance of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the man who was bound to them by every tie of interest, is at the head of affairs, and that is a state of thing inimical to the best interests of the people. I believe in a Premier who has no friends to serve but the country: I believe in a Premier who can dare not to be friendly to any institution, be it ever so great or wealthy, even after it has reached its haven of rest, just because I feel certain that no effort of the present Premier to put aside his connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway can rid him of the desire to serve that company; I believe that the interest of the people will not be served by such a Premier, and, therefore, it is with pleasure I now support the resolution of the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. KENNY. It will be within the recollection of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House

that in the remarkable correspondence of Mr. Edward Farrer, which took the loyal people of Canada by surprise a few months ago, it was very prominently stated that when, in the course of nature, the leader of the Conservative party should pass away, would come the disruption of the party and the annexation of Canada to the United States. Hon. gentlemen on both sides have marked their great sense of regret at the demise of Canada's great son, and hon. gentlemen opposite are very much surprised to find that the prediction of Mr. Farrer has not been verified, and that the Conservative party have not crumbled into pieces, and that there is not the slightest danger of the annexation of Canada to the United States. Instead of any disruption of the Conservative party, they stand firmly together, so firmly together that the hon. the leader of the Opposition has had to resort to the extreme course of bringing a motion of censure against the Government which has recently been formed, by moving the adjournment of the House. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) during the course of the speech he made this afternoon stated that the Conservative party had felt that it was only by standing shoulder to shoulder that they could hold the Government of the country. I quite admit the correctness of the hon. gentleman's statement, and I beg to assure him and every hon. gentleman opposite that the gentlemen who sit on this side of the House are determined to make everything subservient to Canadian unity and the integrity of the British Empire, to which we ought all be proud to belong. I have been almost amused at the references which hon. gentlemen opposite have made to newspaper articles. All the arguments advanced by hon. members opposite, including the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), have been based on newspaper articles. Now, if we are to incorporate into our discussion every newspaper article, if members of the Cabinet are to be catechised upon what appears in the public press, I must take the opportunity of asking the leader of the Opposition whether it is true that His Excellency the Governor General sent for him, because I assure that hon. gentleman such a statement has appeared in a paper supporting him.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. KENNY. I quote from the Halifax *Acadian Recorder*. That newspaper may be published a long way from here, and may not be of much advantage to the hon. gentleman opposite and those who sit alongside him, who take every opportunity of belittling the people of the Maritime Provinces; but I assure the hon. gentleman it was so stated in one of the organs of opinion in the city of Halifax which supports the hon. gentleman's party. Therefore, if the time of Parliament is to be wasted at this season of the year in discussing what appears in the press, if Cabinet Ministers are to be catechised on these articles, we must be allowed to catechise hon. gentlemen opposite as to what has taken place in their ranks. As to any dissensions in the ranks of the Liberal-Conservative party, I say there never was more union amongst them than there is to-day, and they are simply following out the advice given to them by their lamented great leader when, speaking in Toronto some time ago, he said:

"I am satisfied that, whoever may be chosen as my successor, he and those who act with him will move in the same line, will be governed by the same principles and will be supported by the same party."

And, as the great son of Canada then spoke, it has been verified to-day. I have noticed that complimentary references have been made by hon. gentlemen opposite to Mr. Abbott. I have never had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Abbott in this House, and I think the majority of the members here now have not had that pleasure, but I have listened with pleasure to the great tributes which have been paid to his abilities by hon. gentlemen opposite. I noticed, however, that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright)—and I heard the same reference again from the other side of the House a few minutes ago—referred to a document which the Hon. Mr. Abbott signed more than forty years ago. I think that was before almost any member of this House had the honour of sitting here, but, while that transaction has been explained and condoned, and while we may forgive one transgression, it is hard for us to forgive an habitual sinner. I noticed, during the remarks of the hon. the leader of the Opposition, that he referred in eloquent terms and very delicately, to his fear that the equilibrium —I think that was the term he used—that was established and preserved by the late leader of the Liberal-Conservative party, had been destroyed. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), referred, no doubt, to the same idea, and he termed it paltry prejudice, but the idea has been elaborated by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), who has insinuated that the Minister of Justice did not assume the position of Prime Minister, because, on religious grounds, he would not be acceptable to a number of the Conservative party. That statement has been contradicted and denied, and it will be contradicted by every member of the Conservative party in this House and the great mass of the Conservatives in the Dominion of Canada. That suggestion could hardly have been brought in here to influence the members of this House, for I take it that nowhere in the Dominion of Canada, could you find so many gentlemen free from religious bigotry as the members of this House of Commons. Our very avocation as politicians brings us in contact with all classes of our fellow-citizens, and all the rough edges of isolated and individual training are smoothed off by friction with all classes of our fellow-citizens. Therefore, this could not have been brought in to do service here, because, these hon. gentlemen knew that the only transgressor in that respect, as pointed out by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Hazen) sits on their side of the House. Therefore, this was not brought in to do service here, but, I suppose that, in the disappointed condition in which hon. gentlemen opposite find themselves, recognising that the Liberal-Conservative party, notwithstanding the terrible loss it has sustained, is strong in Parliament and stronger still in the affections of the people of Canada, having been endorsed so recently by the people of the country, they must resort to some extraordinary expedient to try to make party capital, and, therefore, it is that we have this religious cry raised, and I must say that I am surprised that the hon. gentleman should have so inconsiderately raised such an issue. Then we have had from two or three of the speakers on the other side the sectional issue raised, and an attempt has been made to show the members of this House or the people

of the country that the Province of Ontario is not fairly represented in this Government. I am surprised that hon. gentlemen who pose as statesmen should attempt at the present day to raise such issues. I do not know what their standard of statesmanship may be. My own experience in politics is very short, but it appears that in some parts of the Dominion all that is necessary in order to be a statesman, in the eyes of hon. gentlemen opposite, is to say something against the present Government. If you say anything against the Government or against Sir Charles Tupper, your reputation as a statesman is made forever. These gentlemen have raised the sectarian and sectional cry, which, I think, is exceedingly to be deplored in the present stage of our history. Reference has been made to the fact that Mr. Abbott was connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and hon. gentlemen have gone into elaborate calculations to show that, although Mr. Abbott has ceased to have any connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, his present connection with the Government of Canada has had the effect of raising the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's stock one per cent. in the markets of the world. Now, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Toronto, if hon. gentlemen had taken the trouble to examine the prices of other railway stocks, they would have found that a very great advance had taken place, and that these advances had been attributed to one common cause. It would have been paying Mr. Abbott, it would have been paying the Government of Canada, it would have been paying the Dominion of Canada, a great tribute to say that all that advance which took place recently on the Stock Exchange in London, had been due to the fact that Mr. Abbott had been made Prime Minister of Canada. Now, Sir, these gentlemen know better; they know what the cause was. One of them must, because he has financed for Canada in England—not very successfully always, but, at all events, in such a manner as to bring him *en rapport* with the financiers of that monetary centre. These hon. gentlemen know that, within a comparatively recent period, the Bank of England rate has fallen from 4 to 3 per cent.; therefore, money has become more plentiful on the Stock Exchange in London, and stocks have all advanced, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company included, and that is the solution of the wonderful theory which they build up for themselves, that this stock advance was due entirely to Mr. Abbott's being made Prime Minister of Canada. Now, Sir, the Minister of Justice has explained the circumstances under which he was sent for by the Governor General, who asked him to assume the responsibility of forming an Administration. The hon. gentleman has told us that he declined, for reasons which he has reserved to himself. We all recognize that hon. gentleman's very great modesty; it is a very attractive feature in his character; but we all know, those who sit behind him in this House at all events know, that if he had accepted that position he would have received the unanimous support of every member on this side of the House. I listened with great pleasure to the eulogies which were passed upon the Minister of Justice by hon. gentlemen opposite. I almost regretted his modesty as I listened to those hon. gentlemen praising the Minister of Justice. I regretted that his extreme modesty had induced him to decline the position. But hon. gentlemen of the Opposition who have sat for many years in this House, and who have watched the career of the representatives from Nova Scotia, must have recognized that they are all imbued with a strong sense of modesty, in fact, Sir, our extreme modesty not only retards our personal advancement, but actually impairs our public usefulness. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), who is not in his place, referred to the fact that one member of the Cabinet, at least, was an innocent man. Well, I do not think that anybody in this House, after the remarkable speech that the member for West Ontario made, will ever accuse him of being an innocent man. The hon. gentleman says that certain members of the Cabinet were selected as specialists. Well, I think that forever after in this House, he will be known as a specialist, and if Barnum ever finds a successor, I should think he would be very much pleased to have such a specialist. Then, a tribute has been paid by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), to the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), but I will allow those hon. gentlemen to settle amongst themselves the statements he has made. I have been much amused at the astonishment that hon. gentlemen opposite have expressed that the Minister of Justice did not immediately accept the position of Premier of this great Dominion when it was offered to him by His Excellency the Governor General. As my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Hazen) has asked, I wonder really how many of those aspirants of the Opposition would have refused if they had been offered the position. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader of the Opposition invites this House to censure the Government which has recently been reorganized. I think that before he can expect any support from hon. gentlemen sitting on this side of the House he should give us better reasons than those that he has advanced to-day. We cannot forget that we have come fresh from the people; we cannot forget the importance of the issue which was then raised; we cannot forget that it has been recognized in this country and out of it, that the question on which the people of Canada expressed their opinion in March last, was the most important question upon which they have ever been called upon to express an opinion. Therefore, having come here to discharge our duties as members of this House, being actuated by a sincere and earnest desire to support the policy which was inaugurated by our lamented chieftain, we do not see much to fear from either the policy or the members of the Opposition.

Mr. AMYOT. I think we must be able to come to some conclusion as to the facts which have occurred only a few hours ago. There is a very important question at issue now, a question of fact, and we who sit here now in Parliament are expected by the people of this country to find out the truth, and to lay down the real basis of actual events for history. Is it or is it not true, as a matter of fact, that the best man on the other side of the House has been called upon to form an Administration and has refused, because he knew that he would not be accepted by a certain element? That is the question now before the country. There is no use trying to hide it. Is it or is it not the case?

Some hon. MEMBERS. It is not.

Mr. AMYOT. I do not expect that those who call themselves the Liberal-Conservative party will come before this House and before the country and say: Yes, we are guilty of that. I do not expect that they will say to the country at large: In our Liberal-Conservative party we are not liberal enough to allow a man to worship his God as he pleases; there are fanatics and bigots enough in our ranks to prevent the Liberal-Conservative party from choosing the best man on our side. I do not expect that. Mr. Speaker, what are the facts? Who was the oldest man in those ranks, who was the first man to be called from his age, from the number of years he had given to his country in the ranks of that party? It was the Minister of Public Works. He was not even called upon through politeness, he was not called upon as an old friend, he was entirely ignored. Some will say it is because there is an investigation going on affecting his reputation and his past record. But that has not been an objection to his being chosen as one of the Ministers under the actual Cabinet. Let us say for a moment that his old age precluded him from accepting the position to which his long services entitled him. Let us go to the next man who is looked upon, not only in this House but in the whole country, as the real debating power, as the lawyer, as the man really possessing the knowledge of history and of law and precedents in parliamentary practice, which was the Minister of Justice. There was not a stain on his name, there was no reproach on his character. Everybody said he was the best man in the ranks of his party. Was he called? Yes; he had conversations with certain parties who last year declared in this House that the French language must disappear, and after conversing with them, and as a consequence thereof, he had to say to the representative of Her Majesty the Queen that he could not form an Administration. His modesty makes him say that he was too young. Is the hon. Minister of Justice too young to rise at a critical moment, and, although he is not the old and ancient leader, to powerfully rise and defend his party in this House? Is he too young to give the real directions to his party upon any question, ? No. Is he too young to give himself and his talents, his reputation, his tactical ability and all those great qualities which entitled him to be called on by the Government to act in the position of Premier? He was competent, and yet he was not able to become Prime Minister of this Dominion. Why? I am not going to deal with newspapers, or with Mr. Farrer, or with the members of this House whose letters have been stolen and been published in the press. I take the solemn declaration of the leader of this Government. What does he say?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. AMYOT. Those who imitate the beasts should at least have their intelligence. The hon. leader says: "the honour came to me in the nature of a compromise." I address intelligent men, men who have gone to the country and been returned by majorities, and I ask them to explain that word "compromise." What does it mean? A compromise is when several parties do not agree together and they each give up part of their pretensions. What part of their pretensions have been given up? Some members, and this is most probable, and is in fact the only possible explanation, did not want one man because he was of a certain religion, or because he was a French Canadian, or because he was not from a certain province: and what was the compromise? It was a declaration that in this party with a majority of perhaps twenty-five votes, there was not one man fit to lead it, and the members were obliged to go into another chamber where the members are not responsible to the people, they made a compromise, and they said: Very well, we do not want a certain man because he is a Catholic, or because he is a Protestant, or because he is a French Canadian, or because he comes from a certain Province. Very well, they say, we submit to that humiliation: I give up my right as the oldest Privy Councillor, I give up my right as the best man in this House; we all submit to the humiliation because of the fanaticism and bigotry prevailing, but for the love of power, and not love of country, we will endeavour to keep our ranks together and retain power. That is the position. That is what the word "compromise" means in that case. It is said: Give me a written word from a man, and I will have him hanged. We have heard from the Minister of Justice to-day. It will be remembered that in his declaration before the Senate the present Premier declared that the Minister of Justice had been called upon for his advice. His Excellency the Governor General exercised his constitutional rights. I admit that theory, and when I speak of His Excellency it is only because I am obliged to name him, although he is under no responsibility to us, and I look to Mr. Abbott as being fully and entirely responsible for every public deed done by His Excellency since the demise of the late lamented Sir John Macdonald. Well, His Excellency, exercising his constitutional right, applied to Sir John Thompson for his advice with respect to the steps which should be taken for the formation of a new Government. He appealed to Sir John Thompson. He did not appeal to the Minister of Public Works. This is as if a man gave him a slap in the face, before the whole country. After that the hon. gentleman was afterwards asked whether he was prepared to sacrifice his own dignity and accept again his position as Minister of Public Works, and this after the Governor General had ignored the length of his service and had practically slapped him in the face, but the words were said: Come with me and be Minister of Public Works. The Minister of Public Works forgetting the rights of age, of his length of service, and of those who had attached themselves to him, and who looked to him as personifying the dignity of the constituency he represented, forgetting all that, the hon. gentleman said: I will stand being snubbed and insulted, and the announcement being made that my influence does not equal my capacity, yet I will serve for the love of party and of power. And the Minister of Justice who was called, and no one has a higher personal admiration for him than I have, made a real sacrifice. We have indeed no positive proof of what we suspect, of what is demonstrated by all the presumptions possible, that he knew he was not able to form an Administration because of his religion, although he was the best man of the party in this House. But the hon. gentleman waits for his hour to come; for the moment he saves his party and says nothing about the matter, but gives his powerful assistance to the new leader who was selected when this hon. gentleman should have been selected. But will

hon. gentleman tell me why Mr. Abbott, when he gave explanations, did not give all the explanations necessary? Why did he not say in the Senate that Sir John Thompson had been called upon not to advise His Excellency but to form an Administration, with himself as Prime Minister? The reason must be this—and you will admit there is a strong presumption in favour of what I say—because he was under the impression that it would be a calamity for the party if the real state of things became known, and he did not declare all the truth. One hon. gentleman does not speak like the other. The Minister of Justice spoke to-night and Mr. Abbott spoke the other day. You will tell me that Mr. Abbott has been an annexationist. I do not care for that, it was 40 years ago. You will tell me that he took a great share in the Pacific scandal. I do not care for that; it was about 20 years ago, in 1873. You will tell me that he was attorney for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and made an immense amount of money. That is his own affair. You will tell me that he had great influence with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, which committed the great wrong of throwing all the weight of influence in favour of one party, with a view to carry the late elections. That is a more serious matter. But there is one thing that cannot be denied, and that is that Mr. Abbott in one chamber, and the Minister of Justice in another chamber, did not make the same statements. Who is right and who is wrong? I prefer to accept the statement of the Minister of Justice, and I believe he was called upon, not to advise His Excellency but to form an Administration. And why has he not formed a Ministry? Because in the ranks of the Conservative party there is enough of fanaticism to prevent a Catholic from forming an Administration. I do not say that all the members of the Conservative party are actuated by these feelings; no, I know a great many of them who have got large ideas, and who understand what is freedom, and who respect the religious convictions of their neighbours, but there is fanaticism in that party, and that is the point I want to elucidate before the country, for it must be known, and it must be understood, and the facts are there. I do not expect that the Conservative party will make an admission of this, because its leading members are intelligent men. Well do we remember the fights we have already had on these very same questions, and to-day if I feel so much for the hardship of the position in which the hon. Minister of Justice is placed, it is because I know that he is the victim of his noble stand upon a question discussed here last year, which affected the future of this country. The Minister of Justice is now made a victim of this fanaticism, but if he suffers at the present time he will be great in the future, as he is great now in our hearts. I resent the treatment which he has received. I who am against him politically speaking, resent the wound which has been inflicted upon him as if it were inflicted upon one of my own brethren or upon myself. It is to be deplored that the Conservatives, the Liberal-Conservatives—by what right they call themselves Liberal-Conservatives has never been explained—but it is to be deplored that those who call themselves the Liberal-Conservative party have enough fanaticism and bigotry in their ranks to prevent the best man in Parliament from being Premier of this country. I prefer the party led by the Hon. Mr. Mowat in Ontario, who in the name of the constitution comes boldly forward and protects the rights of the minorities. I prefer that party which in this House selects to replace the Hon. Edward Blake, a French Canadian, because they look upon him with feelings free from all religious prejudices. What did we hear rumoured in this House but a short time ago? We heard it stated that there was not a man in this House able to lead the country and we heard that they were going to call in Mr. Meredith who is the exponent of bigotry and fanaticism in Ontario. Was not the atmosphere filled with these rumours which were boldly expressed but a few days since? Did we not hear an hon. Minister of the House, after having heard the admirable speech of our leader on a recent sad occasion which we all deplore, say: What a nice man Mr. Laurier is, I would follow him, only he is a French Canadian. Do not we know these sentiments exist here? I do not say they exist amongst all the members on the other side of the House, but there exists sufficient fanaticism in the ranks of the Conservative party to prevent the best man in this House from becoming the leader of the Government. Now, Mr. Speaker, I feel humiliated to see that the press which is looked upon as the organ of the French Canadian Ministers cannot be silenced. I am asked to believe that the hon. the Secretary of State, one of the greatest public speakers we have had in the Province of Quebec, says: I will support the Government, the Government will be good, its policy will be good, and I will devote all my energies for that Government, provided that I be Minister of Railways. I am asked to believe that a Minister of the Crown would lower his political ideas to that level. In what century are we living? Does the hon. gentleman say: I will build such and such a railway if I get that position. Does he say: If I get that office I will work such and such reform? No; but he is alleged to say: If I were in that position the country would be safe because I would have large patronage. I am asked to believe that, but I do not believe it. I do not believe there is a man with his head upon his shoulders who would say that. I do not believe a man of the ability and character of the Secretary of State would be guilty of such utterances, but I deplore that they cannot silence their press; the press that lives by them and which they feed every day. I deplore that this press should lower our French Canadian Ministers to that humiliation. What do we see occurring to-day? We see the Minister of Public Works, one of the oldest members of this House, ignored, put aside, slapped, punished, and after that they say to him: Come back we will endure you, you will prevent some of your supporters from kicking, come back humiliated, slapped in the face, come back to the Ministry, although you are openly and before the public, slapped, snubbed and injured. We are told that another of our Ministers is like a child who cries for a little piece of bread and sugar, and that a third one—his name has not been brought into the debate, and if I mentioned him this House might think I did so because of personal revenge. I will not speak of him now. There is no use in speaking of ourselves as a great united nation, for do you think seriously that the Province of Quebec will look upon the present Ministry as a Ministry which will

properly represent it? No, Mr. Speaker, we must see the end of such a system; there must be a time coming when we will not have to fight continually against a position which humiliates the Province of Quebec so terribly as these recent events in the Administration have done. We speak of the word "union" and we should understand its meaning and import clearly, for some people seem to forget the real meaning of the Confederation. These people speak of the Canadian nation as if it should be a unity instead of a union, but there they make a mistake. The essence of the Confederation is that each province remains entirely distinct from the whole body; there must be a union of all parts of the Confederation in matters which concern the whole of the provinces, but it must be understood that you cannot ask unity, for each province must preserve its laws, its customs, its language and its religion. That is not my own idea, for I have read it in Dicey and Bourinot and all the great authorities of the day, and any one who knows the constitution of the United Utates, of the German Empire, or of the Swiss Confederation can understand that properly. If we want our Confederation to last and to continue to be one of the elements of the strength of Great Britain we must respect the language, the religion, and the customs of each province, and we must protect the minorities as well as majorities. In doing this we will prove really loyal to the Queen of England. I may say that so far as loyalty is concerned we are all loyal to Canada. To those who tell me that the Hon. Mr. Abbott is not loyal, because some forty years ago in his youth he thought that annexation would be better for this country, I answer, that is an old affair and we cannot judge him from that, but I laugh at those who tell us that the Liberal party or the National party in this House is not loyal. I say to them: Go on maintaining fanaticism and bigotry in your ranks; go on taking from the minority their rights and privileges, and you will prepare the way for annexation. Prevent us being happy and free under the constitution, and you will bring about incitements to some popular movements which might have the effect of cutting the tie which binds us to the mother country. But give full play to the magnificent constitutional system which we enjoy, and under which we have lived side by side with our English-speaking fellow-countrymen on this continent; give us liberty and progress; give us the best men we have to rule the country, and we shall always remain what we have always been in this country, true and loyal subjects of Her Majesty. When you have a good man do not prevent him occupying the position which is his by right of his abilities and his standing. Mr. Speaker, I said a moment ago that the love of power seemed to be the rallying ground for the forces. For my part I shall not be accused of working to reach the Treasury benches. I used to belong to the ministerial party, but I left them when I found that they wanted to persecute a minority. I was also a partisan of the Local Government, but when I found that it was willing to be a tool in their hands I fought it also. Therefore it is not with me a question of the Treasury benches, it is a question of principle. The real position of the present Government must be understood to-day; the bed in which it was born is soiled by fanaticism. *Ab initio* the Government of the party opposite cannot withstand public opinion, because, whatever may be the personal qualities of the Hon. Mr. Abbott, it owes its existence to a sentiment which its adherents dare not confess openly before the people of the country. Like their societies they do their work secretly.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentlemen opposite, having missed the opportunity which they had on Thursday of criticizing the formation of the Government when the announcement was made, and no doubt being urged on by the taunts and sneers of the party behind them, and the press throughout the country, undertake to do so to-day, on a most extraordinary motion, for which I venture to say they will hunt in vain for a precedent in the annals of parliamentary history in Great Britain or in Canada—a motion to adjourn the House. Generally a notice of a question of this kind is given, and an opportunity is afforded to the Government to consider the question before debating it. When the hon. leader of the Opposition made the motion and the statement which followed it, that there should be a vote of censure on the Government, because they had taken an hon. gentleman from the other Chamber who had been a director and a solicitor of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company before he became a member of the Government. I thought it was perhaps the most harmless thing I had ever heard proposed by a leader of the Opposition in this House. The statement was made in this House that he had resigned his position in that company, that he had sold his stock, and that he was now no longer connected with it, and therefore that objection was removed. The only thing remaining was the statement that his heart-strings still clung to the corporation which he had lately left. Now, Sir, I do not think that is a sufficiently serious accusation against any member either of the Senate or the House of Commons to prevent him accepting the honour of the position of Prime Minister. The other members of this Government were members of the Government of which Sir John Macdonald was the leader. But the true reason for raising this debate was revealed when the Thersites of the debate, the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), got up and stated that Sir John Thompson was first called upon by His Excellency to form a Government. And let me say that the statement of the hon. Minister of Justice corroborates and is nearly the same as that of His Excellency which was presented to this House. When he was called on to form a Government, he then and there, as I understand, before going to consult his friends, refused to do so for the reasons he gave to this House, reasons which any hon. gentleman would accept as his true and only reasons; and Mr. Abbott was called on to form the Government. But the hon. member for Queen's has found another reason, namely, that it was on account of his religion, on account of the bigotry which the hon. gentleman who has just sat down charged against the Liberal-Conservative party throughout this country, that Sir John Thompson was prevented from forming a Government. I deny it as a member of the same Cabinet, for I know that I and every other member of that Cabinet would have given that hon. gentleman our most cordial support. I know also the feelings and opinions of the hon. members of this House who support the Government better than hon. gentle-

men do, and I have not yet met a single member of the Liberal-Conservative party in this House who, if Sir John Thompson were called on to form a Government, would not have given him the most cordial support. Now, why was this question brought into the House? It has been asserted here that the question was raised by the papers supporting us throughout the country. Those hon. gentlemen do not say anything about the expressions of the strongest papers in their own party. Why has nobody quoted the observations made by the Montreal *Witness* when the hon. Minister of Justice was called on to form a Government? Has a Liberal-Conservative paper in the country voiced such an opinion on behalf of any member of this House? Not one. Things would come to a pretty pass in this country indeed if a man, on account of his religion, or because he worshipped at a certain altar which he chose to worship at, should not receive political preferment or any office in the gift of the country. There is no Conservative bigoted enough to refuse to support any hon. gentleman who, by his talents and his position in this country, is entitled to his support. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite: Is there a single charge which they have raised that has not been disproved? Is it wrong for Hon. Mr. Abbott to accept the premiership of this country, having resigned his position in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and ceased to have anything to do with it? Not at all. Well, what then becomes of the motion? It is only pushed before this House for the purpose of introducing here religious bigotry and prejudice. There is a giant come into this House with all the wisdom of Nestor and Ulysses, the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) who commenced first at one portion of the Cabinet and went along until he reached the other end. Where did he, how did he become possessed of these great powers of discernment which enable him to soar so placidly and serenely over the rest of this community and to pass opinions upon his brother members as to their capability to fill the positions they occupy? What has he ever done in this country which entitles him to make predictions or pass opinions upon others? I have heard of him as a successful poet. I have heard his remarks about the Finance Minister who, he says, has a horse put out to feed in the pastures of the hon. member for North Lanark, and I suppose the hon. gentleman will soon occupy the position which Byron the poet described when he spoke of Cæsar eulogizing an ass. After that we had the speech of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), who came armed like an Ajax to the battle, and who charged against the Government of the country that one of the members of the Cabinet, forsooth, would have so much influence in the councils of the country that he would be able to influence perhaps the First Minister. Is that a crime for any member of the Council even if it were true? I say that the hon. gentleman who is Premier stands on an equal position with his colleagues, and it would not be a fault in him even if colleagues of his were possessed of sufficient power and influence in the Cabinet to influence his decisions. It would, perhaps, be a credit to the person who had such influence in the Council, and no discredit to the hon. gentleman. What other charges have been made against us,—that Ontario is not sufficiently represented in the Cabinet. The hon. gentleman, I suppose, feels keenly upon that point. The Government of this country appeared to be just within the grasp of hon. gentlemen opposite, but it escaped their grasp, and the hon. gentleman is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, a little disappointed in not occupying your position, for which, it has been said, he had a strong inclination. Those disappointments are bound to occur to hon. gentlemen opposite so long as they pursue the policy they have pursued in the past. The arrangement of the Cabinet of this country is a matter with which the Governor General, Her Majesty's representative, and the Liberal-Conservative party, who are the majority in this House, have to do. We have gone to the country, we have fought the battle, vanquished our enemies, and are entitled to the position we occupy; and we intend, as we have been returned with a majority of thirty, to keep power until the people decide otherwise. We are a party without divisions in our ranks, because no member of the party would go against the mandate which he received from the people, and our policy will be continued so long as the people decide in its favour. The present motion, I suppose, amounts to a vote of want of confidence. Did you ever hear, Sir, of such a motion being proposed in such a shape—a motion to adjourn the House! And on what grounds? First, on the ground that Mr. Abbott has been taken from the Senate, the unpopular branch, to be First Minister. But that is no constitutional objection; it is an objection heard for the first time. And the other objection is that my hon. friend the Minister of Justice was prevented from occupying the position of Premier owing to the intolerance and bigotry of the Conservative party. Now, I, as a colleague of the hon. gentleman voicing the opinions, as I know, of every man with whom I have had a conversation on the subject, declare that such a statement is utterly false. I declare that there is no man in this House or country belonging to the Conservative party, to whom the Conservative party of all shades of religion, would be more proud to give their support than the Minister of Justice. There have been no religious differences in the Conservative party on the subject of the Premiership; and with regard to Mr. Abbott, even if his position as director of the Canadian Pacific Railway were a disqualification—and the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) has stated it was no disqualification, but that he would rather have supported him all the more if he had not sold out his stock—Mr. Abbott has retired from the railway company and disposed of his interest in it. I repeat that the Liberal-Conservative party in this House feel proud of the leader they have chosen. We know he will lead us in the same path as we have followed in the past, we know that he will govern this country in the way it ought to be governed during the next five years, and we look with confidence at the end of that term to a reindorsement of our policy by the people.

Mr. DEVLIN. I will not detain the House very long, but I wish merely to call attention to the remarks which fell from the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) It has been said that bigotry lies on this side of the House, and I find it very strange that the threat which that hon. gentleman uttered here to-night should have passed unnoticed. He stated that there was no intention of abandoning the policy inaugurated by the hon.

member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy.) It is well to remember that all this warfare about which we have heard so much here to-night was not inaugurated on this side, but on the opposite side. Let me recall once more to the attention of this House the speech which was delivered by the hon. member for Simcoe in the town of Barrie during the campaign of 1887. At that time the hon. gentleman occupied a most prominent position in his party; he was then the president of the Conservative Union of Ontario, and, consequently, in harmony with his party. Well, what were the sentiments to which he then gave utterance? He said, after referring at considerable length to the French Canadian race: "The French Canadian race, there is the great danger to Confederation." He is the gentleman who has given utterance to the sentiment of which I complain, and he a prominent member of the opposite side of the House then and now, laid the basis of that lamentable spirit of warfare which has since unfortunately prevailed. We heard again to-night the hon. member for Muskoka tell us that although the hon. member for North Simcoe may be across the sea, still his spirit remains on that side of the House and not upon this, and we hear him state distinctly that it is the intention of every follower of the hon. member for North Simcoe to continue pursuing the policy he laid down. I suppose by that it is meant that the Catholic schools of the North-West Territories and the French language spoken there must soon become things of the past. Then I very little know the brave French Canadian members of this House, if they would ever tolerate this part of the policy of even a section of the Conservative party. I know that about a century ago a battle was fought, and that battle decided the fate of this country. Two heroes stood there face to face. We know they both fell on that field, fighting for their respective countries. We know the remarkable words uttered by those heroes when they fell. The one thanked God that his country was victorious; the other thanked God that he would not live to see the ruin of his nationality. If the latter could come here to-day he would see not 70,000, but over a million of French Canadians in this country, and yet we are to be told that the policy of exterminating that race, of closing their schools and putting an end to the language they speak is to be prosecuted, as we have been told by an hon. gentleman on the other side. I tell the member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) that he may come forward with his arguments and may stand up here with the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) on his shoulders, and they will get from this side of the House, and, I believe, from the people of Canada, such an expression of opinion as will crush that policy now and forever. As to the selection of a Premier for this country, the statement read by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), was not his own, but was taken from a paper published in the interests of the other side and controlled, I believe, by an hon. member of the House. These words of bigotry and hatred were not found in the mouth of any member of the Opposition, but were quoted from an organ of the party which has thrived and lived upon the policy of bigotry and hatred.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Shame.

Mr. DEVLIN. There is no shame about it. If you had a heart you would have cried "shame" when your leader said the chief danger to Canada was the great French Canadian race. You would have cried "shame" when the war of race was raised by your leaders and when an attack was made upon the rights to which we lay claim, and the rights which we will fight for and maintain as long as we have a right to live in this country.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I very seldom trespass upon the time of the House, and I do not think the present occasion requires a very long speech from me or any great amount of argument to prove that the motion of the leader of the Opposition was uncalled for to-day. One thing has struck me in this debate, and must have struck every hon. gentleman on this side of the House, not only those who have sat here for many years past, but even those who were elected at the last election. It must have been gratifying to hon. gentlemen who sit on this side to see the great change which has come over the spirit of those who sit on the other side of the House. I have heard the question asked what this motion covered. Some believed that the complaint is that the policy of the Conservative party is not continued because the leader of the Government sits in the Senate. I do not interpret the language of the leader of the Opposition in that way. After having declared the other day, when the policy of the Government was announced by the leader of the House, that he expected that the policy of the late lamented Sir John Macdonald would be followed, but that he would call attention to the fact that it had not been followed, in at all events one respect, on the following day he did not do that, but has now made this singular motion, and he says this is the ground on which he bases the charge that we have departed from the policy of our late leader. If that is the only ground I do not think the country will believe there is much to fear. The policy followed by the Conservative party for many years has not been very acceptable to hon. gentlemen opposite. It was not very much lauded by them, nor was our leader lauded by them before his death. It is a great satisfaction to gentlemen on this side, and it will be a great satisfaction to the Canadian people, to find that the hon. gentlemen who slandered him in his lifetime find themselves compelled to pay an honest tribute to his greatness now that he is dead. It is a compliment to that great leader and it is a compliment to us who followed him and supported him during his life. It is a justification of Sir John Macdonald, and it is a justification of those who supported him and of the electors who sustained him, notwithstanding the taunts of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) who, when he failed, election after election, explained the defeat by stating that the success of the Government was due to a demoralised electorate. I think we have reason to congratulate ourselves that the motion comes in this feeble way that it does to-night. But there is something behind this. There is a new platform to be laid down. Hon. gentlemen have often been accused of having changed their policy, and with truth; but there is one plank in their platform which they have never changed, and that is to attempt to stir up strife amongst the people of this Dominion, to set province against province, creed against creed, and nationality against nationality. In that they are perfectly consistent, and as long as they pursue

that policy they are likely to remain where they are.

Mr. LISTER. You are very sorry about that.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I am not like some hon. gentleman I might name. When I am sorry I express my sorrow, and when I do not feel any sorrow I do not express any. During this debate some expressions have been used which show that there is something behind all this. A great deal of sympathy has been expressed for the Minister of Justice. All at once hon. gentlemen opposite endeavour to vie with gentlemen on this side of the House in paying just tributes to that man's great ability. The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), who feels so deeply the injustice which has been done to the great ability of the Minister of Justice, gave as the only solution of the fact that the Minister of Justice did not form a Government that his religious principles were objected to by a wing of the Conservative party. Sir, which of the two gentlemen is this House and country to believe? The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) has a policy in that he wishes to go to the people like some of his colleagues, and they would like to create the impression that the Conservative party has within it elements so bigoted, prejudices so strong, that notwithstanding the great ability of the Minister of Justice he cannot be accepted as Premier of this country on account of his religion. But in going to the country with that statement, it will be accompanied by the statement of the Minister of Justice himself, who denies that, who says there was nothing of the kind operating against him in the formation of a Cabinet. The member for Bellechasse says, and other gentlemen opposite have said, that the Minister of Justice was prevented from forming a Cabinet because of his religious belief. I say that that statement will have to stand side by side with the statement of the Minister of Justice himself, and reiterated by every member of the Conservative party who has spoken.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) What was it?

Mr. COSTIGAN. He gave us his reason, and I do not wish to go beyond that. But I go further, and I say that the Minister of Justice is not of the calibre to stand anything like such an indignity, if it had been put upon him. He would have resented it, and I think there are gentlemen in this House who, if such an indignity had been put upon him, would sympathize with him and would also resent it. This is the cry that hon. gentlemen opposite wish to make in the bye-elections that are to come on. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) rose some moments ago in his seat and stated that he thanked God that no such prejudices existed in the Liberal party on that side of the House. Did he forget that I have sat here since Confederation, and I know the record of the Liberal party? Did he forget what has been the record of the Liberal party upon many occasions? Sir, I know all about the Liberal party professions, about their love for Catholicity, their love for the Irishman, their love for the Frenchmen. There are no men in the world more ready and more profuse in their professions when they are in opposition and their professions are worthless, but who are more niggardly of them when they are in power and have an opportunity of proving them. Do you want examples of it? Let the hon. gentleman opposite who is looking at me now recall the formation of Mr. Mackenzie's Cabinet, when Sir John A. Macdonald resigned in 1873. Was there any prejudice on that side of the House at that time? Were there any prejudices in the Liberal representation from New Brunswick? Does the hon. gentleman want to know why the Hon. Mr. Anglin did not form part of Mr. Mackenzie's Cabinet? He does not want me to tell him, because he knows; he knows that Mr. Anglin could not be accepted in that Cabinet because his Liberal supporters from New Brunswick declared that the province would be in a blaze if he were taken into it. We all know in this House that the Liberal party are to blame for fanning, in the past, religious strife in this country; they are full of professions in opposition, but they are niggardly of their relief when in power. Do they think I forget when I stood here struggling for separate schools in New Brunswick, the question to which the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Devlin) has referred, paying me a left-handed compliment? There is one thing certain, that as far as my abilities enabled me to do so, I represented the minority of New Brunswick on the schools question. The House knows that I represented that case during the time my friends were in power, and I remember the professions of hon. gentlemen opposite. I remember the assurances they gave to his Lordship Bishop Sweeney, who came here on that question. Why, they said, we could settle that matter in 15 minutes if we were in power, but in opposition we can only give you our sympathy; but let us come into power and we can settle it in a few minutes. Well, a change of Government took place; those gentlemen came into power, and what did they do? They reversed their vote of the session before, and voted that this Parliament should not deal with the subject, though the session before they had voted for the disallowance of the Local Acts. That is the contrast between the actions of those hon. gentlemen and their professions of sympathy for the much-persecuted Catholics, for the much-persecuted Irishmen, and the much-persecuted Frenchmen. It is all very fine when they are in opposition and they want to create a cry with which to go to the country, but when they come into power and have an opportunity of showing their sympathy for our people they fail to do so. But what did they do besides that? They all acknowledged that Mr. Anglin had contributed more to strengthen the Liberal party in the Maritime Provinces than any other man in that section of the country, and notwithstanding his great ability and his great services they excluded him from the Cabinet. But afterwards, at a very critical time, and for a particular purpose, they changed their minds enough to make him Speaker of this House. Why? Everybody knows that he and I were the only Catholics coming from that Province, and when they found that the abler half of the representation was against them on that particular question they utilized Mr. Anglin in order to strengthen themselves. And when he was in that position of neutrality, when it appeared that a majority would probably vote against the Mackenzie Administration on that question, they had to utilize the Speaker of that day to whip their friends into line and make them reverse their decision and vote my motion down.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Did you make him a Privy Councillor? You love your Catholic friends and you showed it.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I cannot love my Catholic friends, as much as the hon. gentleman professes to do. I may say to the hon. gentleman that, as an Irishman and a Catholic, I did feel on one occasion, with respect to religious matters and matters of nationality—I might have felt a little sorry to be an Irishman, and that was when the hon. gentleman was speaking upon that question and representing the Irish character.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I should think you would be ashamed; I knew you would feel ashamed.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Well, if I do, then I am capable of what the hon. gentleman is not capable.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That is your opinion.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I know the hon. gentleman does not like to hear that, but perhaps gentlemen who can appreciate the position as well as he can will be courteous enough to allow me to proceed without interruption. I do not trouble the House very often, and I avail myself of a privilege that no one can deny me, except the hon. gentleman who is making himself so officious just now. Then we had other proofs of the liberality of the Liberal party in the interest of our people. Mr. Anglin was defeated in New Brunswick. He was then induced to go to the great Province of Ontario, where that party is influential, and expected to come into power every day. His expectations, and the expectations of his friends whom he left behind him in St. John, were that he would get a constituency there. He never got a constituency. It is true they did tell him once they would provide a constituency, and when one was opened, and when the hon. member for South Oxford could find no other constituency, it was given to him as a pretty safe one. I believe the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), who criticized the members of the Government all round, was unfortunate on one occasion in the elections. He was considered a very useful man to the party, and therefore a seat was found for him. No constituency could be found, however, for Mr. Anglin, except that of Simcoe, a Conservative stronghold. They were so liberal as to say to Mr. Anglin: You have done a great deal for the party and assisted materially in defeating the Conservative Government in 1873; we cannot recognize your services on account of the bigotry of our friends in New Brunswick, but we do not forget these services; we have not a safe constituency for you, like that provided for the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), for the then hon. member for West Ontario, but there is up in Simcoe a regular Conservative stronghold; you can go there, and if you can take it you can have it. That was the action of the Liberal party towards one of their colleagues, towards the man who contributed more to their success in the Maritime Provinces than any man who came from those provinces. Therefore I say that hon. gentlemen opposite must not expect to make too much capital by throwing out insinuations such as they have been throwing out to-day. The Government has been formed, the policy has been announced, and that policy is consistent with the policy laid down at the general elections. The Conservatives in the country, and the members of Parliament in this House speaking for the Conservatives in the country, all appear to be satisfied with the present arrangement. It is true that hon. gentlemen opposite are not satisfied. Why? The day they have long expected has come, but the result they expected would follow has not yet followed. They have been looking forward for years—I do not desire to impute any improper motives to hon. gentlemen which might be thought offensive—to the death of Sir John Macdonald. That time has come, the sad event has taken place, when hon. gentlemen opposite expected to walk across the floor and take possession of the Treasury benches. They are not satisfied with the arrangement, with the reconstruction, with the Premier, with the policy. They profess now to admire the old policy so much that we must not depart from it one jot or one tittle. They are not satisfied with anything. We do not expect them to be satisfied, but we do expect that the policy laid down at the last election and previous elections, and adopted by the people—and it would be adopted by the people at the polls if we appealed to them again—will be carried out by the friends who follow in the steps of our late esteemed leader, and the gentleman who has been selected to form the Administration, and who is Premier to-day, will no doubt follow out the policy pursued by the late Sir John Macdonald. I have no desire to say more on the subject, but I thought these were two or three points deserving of a little attention.

Mr. LISTER. I scarcely thought that the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat would have at so early a date sought to make secure popularity and strength for his party on the death of his late leader. The insinuations he made were ungenerous in the extreme, and I could scarcely believe that an hon. gentleman who professed to be such a hearty follower of the late leader of the Conservative party would at this early date have given utterance to the remarks he made. I have not been in this House since Confederation, but I have been in this House for the past nine years, and when I heard the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat give utterance to the ardent feelings of admiration for his late leader, expressions as if he were one of his most devoted followers, my mind carries me back over a very few years, and I very well remember that hon. gentleman leaving the seat he now occupies and taking a seat on the back benches. There are such times, no doubt, in the life of a public man, and one of those times was the occasion to which I refer. His leader was then alive. He was a Minister in Sir John Macdonald's Cabinet, and if I recollect well the feelings to which he has given utterance to to-night were not then to be found in his breast. After the night he was a kicker he was ready to leave the Cabinet, and had to be coaxed back to his former place, and the reason of his action has never been made public to this day. I say it was a shameful and shameless thing on the part of the Government now led by Sir John Thompson, nominally led by the Minister of Public Works, to have advised His Excellency to take Mr. Abbott into the Cabinet as Premier of the country. His relations with the Canadian Pacific Railway for the past fourteen years—even for the past seventeen years—were such as ought to have precluded the possibility of his being Prime Min-

ister and *de facto* governor of this country. The Postmaster General addressed the House this evening. He told us that Mr. Abbott, having resigned the directorship and solicitorship of the Canadian Pacific Railway, having ceased to be counsel of that great corporation, having disposed of his stock, it was proper, right and unobjectionable that he should now be comethe leader of the Conservative party in this House and First Minister of this country. But looking at the record of Mr. Abbott, apart altogether from his annexation proclivities, which this country can well and fairly forget, looking at his associations with that great corporation from the moment it came into existence until the present, looking at the fact that he has been closely allied with it, that he has made enormous sums of money out of it, that he has been confidential adviser of the officers of that great corporation, that it has received untold wealth from the people, that it nas knocked at the doors of Parliament year after year for legislation—in view of all these facts it was highly improper that the hon. gentleman should have become Premier of this country. In view of the fact that many hon. gentlemen hold their seats to-day by reason of the power and influence alone of that great corporation, it is therefore disgraceful that this hon. gentleman should become Prime Minister. Is there a man living in Canada, from the Atlantic to the Pacific who believes that if the Canadian Pacific Railway had stood aside the Conservative party would have been defeated and the Government would have ceased to exist? There can be no more doubt of it than that I am speaking in this chamber to-night. They threw their great influence into that contest, a company that had received enormous subsidies from the people of the country, Reformers and Conservatives, a company that had received from the country money sufficient to fabulously enrich the men who were connected with it, men who would have remained in the ordinary walks of life except for the great favours they have received from the Government during the last 14 years. Those men not only exercised the influence which they possessed over the employés of that railway, and coerced them into supporting the Conservative party from Vancouver to the Atlantic coast, but I have no hesitation in saying that the company aided the Government in a more substantial way than that. If the Postmaster General would tell all he knows, if he would take this House into his confidence and tell us what took place between him and Mr. Van Horne immediately before that manifesto of Van Horne's was issued, we would understand how it is and why it is that these hon. gentlemen hold the Treasury benches to-day. They may thank that very corporation for it, and Mr. Abbott being a member of that corporation, a stockholder of that corporation, in its inner secrets, and knowing all that took place, I say that it is not decent that Mr. Abbott should occupy the position he does to-day. I say that in the case of a railway subsidized as that has been, one of its officers should never have been allowed to take a seat in this House until every transaction between it and the Government had been closed and ended. As has been stated in this House the men who now occupy the Treasury benches to-day are not the Government of this country, for the real Government of Canada is now the Canadian Pacific Railway. Upon the benches supporting the Ministry are to be found directors and men in the employ of that corporation in one way or the other. It was said that Mr. Abbott had qualified himself for his position by disposing of the stock which he held in that company, but will any sensible man admit that the disposal of his stock yesterday will qualify him to-day? Take the position that all men must admit, that if he were a stockholder in the company he should not have taken the position of Premier, and is it because he sold that stock yesterday that it is considered proper and right that he should occupy the position to-day? We know that the Postmaster General has not taken us into his confidence, for we are morally confident that the effect of the visit which he paid to Mr. Van Horne was a compact between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway, and a treaty to the effect: You support us and we will support you. The Government tried the same game with the Grand Trunk Railway; but because the Grand Trunk Railway refused to be a party to their schemes, and declined to become partisans in this contest, from that moment to the present time it has received the contumely and abuse of the Conservative party from the High Commissioner down to the most insignificant member in the ranks. It is of no consequence at all whether Mr. Abbott is an able man or not. Mr. Abbott's place was not the Premiership of Canada, because the man who was entitled to form the Government, and who ought to have formed the Government, was the gentleman whom the Governor General first called upon to do so, namely, Sir John Thompson. That gentleman not having formed an Administration we can only draw the inference that it was because of his persuasion, and because he was not satisfactory to a large number of the members of his party in this House. That can be the only solution that can be given of this matter, and because of that we have Mr. Abbott brought in as leader, and we are told that he has qualified himself because, forsooth, he has disposed of the stock he held in this company. That is an explanation which the people of this country will scarcely accept as correct. My hon. friend opposite says that his Government will hold the Treasury benches for the next five years. That will be the case, no doubt, because hon. gentlemen opposite feel that if this House were dissolved the Government would be defeated. They will hold on to the last minute of the last day, because they know if they again appeal to the country they will not be returned to power.

An hon. MEMBER. Chestnuts.

Mr. LISTER. Yes "chestnuts;" when I came into this House nine years ago the Government had 70 majority, in 1887 their majority was about 50, and in 1891 they have a majority of 23 or 24 and if it were not for McGreevyism, if it were not for the money they have received from the Canadian Pacific Railway, if it were not for the direct influence of the Canadian Pacific Railway, they would be in the minority to-day and they know that if Parliament were dissolved to-morrow the Liberal party in this country would be returned by at least 60 majority. Hon. gentlemen opposite will no doubt hold on to power, for self-preservation is the first law of nature, and so long as they can draw their sessional allowance for five years they will not do as the late Premier did, dissolve the

House a year before the time, but they will hang on for five sessions. Gentlemen, get all you can out of it now, because you won't get very much more after this.

Mr. CURRAN. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat closed his remarks with one of these prophecies which we have heard on so many occasions from the other side of the House, namely, if we could only have this House dissolved once more that would be the end of the Conservative party. It is not the first time that we have heard speeches of that kind not only in this House but throughout the length and breadth of the land. In fact, gentlemen on the other side have on more than one occasion deceived themselves to the extent that even after a general election was all over, and when we had what the hon. gentleman now says was a majority of 50, they claimed for themselves a majority of two. I do not intend to follow the hon. gentleman in that portion of his speech. He opened his remarks, however, by stating that the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue had, in the course of the few observations that he addressed to this House, sought to make capital out of the memory of the late great leader of the Conservative party. There is no need for any man who has followed that great leader in the past to seek to make capital out of his memory. That memory, the spirit of that great man is alive in this land. It is inspiring not only his followers, but it has extended its beneficent influence through every class of the people of the Dominion of Canada, and that memory is held sacred not merely by those who followed him, by the great majority of the people of this country, but that memory has been enshrined upon the other side of the ocean in the mother land, and Sir John A. Macdonald now ranks amongst the greatest men the British Empire has given to the world. It is not certainly in the mouths of gentlemen opposite that any such charge should be found, because if we have this motion before the House to-day it is not merely an attempt on the part of the hon. gentlemen opposite to make capital out of the memory of that great statesman, but out of the policy of that great statesman, a policy which they steadily fought and condemned, a policy which they have stigmatized, a policy for which he and those who followed him were hounded down and described as the greatest enemies of their country during the lifetime of Sir John Macdonald. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman, like many others, told us to-night that the solicitorship of the Canadian Pacific Railway had been resigned by the hon. leader of this Government and that he had sold his stock only a day or two ago in order the better to qualify himself for the position which he holds, and one hon. gentleman on the other side went so far as to say that even if Mr. Abbott still held that stock he would respect him more than because he disposed of it. We all know that it is not to-day or yesterday that the hon. the leader of this Government ceased his connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway as its solicitor. Four years ago, when he was asked by the citizens of Montreal to become the first magistrate of that city, he then resigned his position as solicitor of that company, the benefits of which amounted to something like $16,000 a year, and devoted his time, and energy, and talents to the service of that great city and all that concerned its prosperity; and after having occupied that position for two years, by the unanimous consent of the whole of his fellow-citizens, every man, whether French or English, Catholic or Protestant, holding up his hands for him, he once more assumed that honourable position. He finally retired from it, though solicited by everyone of his fellow-citizens to continue to occupy it. Yet we are told that he only resigned that solicitorship to accept the high position he now holds. Sir, this is on a par with all the charges made in this debate. But I wish to say that I extremely regret that my hon. friend the whip on the other side should have by any act of his interrupted the eloquent speech of the hon. member for Ottawa County (Mr. Devlin). Certainly that hon. gentleman did not stand up merely for the purpose of telling us something about the battle on the Plains of Abraham. My hon. friend certainly did not stand up to give us once more the quotation from the speech of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). He would probably have made still further quotations, and possibly, as an antidote to that quotation, or to equalize the case, knowing the hon. gentleman as I do to be a man of fair-play, he certainly would have offered this House something from the hon. gentleman who sits on his own side, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) who has distinguished himself on many and many a platform in the admirable essays he has delivered, and the eloquent efforts he has made on exactly the same lines as the hon. member for North Simcoe. So that, if we have certain gentlemen on this side of the House who entertain views that are extremely distasteful to my hon. friend, let him, if he desires to undertake a propaganda, begin where he is likely to be successful, among his own friends on his own side of the House; and after he has converted those who are there walking the path of error, then it will be time enough for him to come over here and endeavour to convert those whom I and others have not yet succeeded in converting on this side of the House. Now, the main object of the motion we are now debating is, as has already been said, to cause a feeling of discontent, to create disunion among a people who have chosen Canada as their home. I say so advisedly. I do not hesitate to state that the motion which is brought here to-day has no other purpose than that of creating in the minds of the Catholic people throughout the Dominion the belief that the hon. Minister of Justice was deprived of the position of Prime Minister of Canada on account of his religious persuasion. That has been stated here openly, in order that it might go abroad among the co-religionists of that hon. gentleman; but I am here to state that I am convinced from my inmost soul that there is not one word of truth in the charge. There is no man in this House who mingles more among all sections of the members, or who is more intimate with the members on the Conservative side of this Chamber than I am, and I can truthfully say that from one and all, from the moment that the great chieftain was laid low, from the moment the grand old man had passed away, there was but one cry, but one sentiment, but one motto in the mouths of the members of that party—"we will treasure his memory, we will stand by his policy, we will keep up the traditions of his party, and as one man we will support whomsoever His Excellency sends for." That was the sentiment felt

in every true Canadian heart, and expressed by the lips of every member of this party. Now, we see hon. gentlemen opposite seeking to implant the seeds of distrust in the hearts of the Catholic people of the Dominion with regard to a gentleman who, everyone knows, is losing double the amount of money he receives as his salary which he might earn in his profession. Does anyone believe that the hon. Minister of Justice, if he felt himself insulted or slighted, or if he felt for one instant that an attempt was being made to insult his co-religionists who kneel before the same altar, would consent for one instant longer to occupy a seat in this Government? Those hon. gentlemen talk about the esteem in which they hold the hon. Minister of Justice, his great learning, his magnificent career; and still they would have the people of Canada believe, from what is now proceeding in this House, that the hon. Minister of Justice is so craven-hearted, so mean-spirited, as to continue to occupy the position he does, after his people have been insulted and degraded as hon. gentlemen opposite allege. But more, we have the greatest commiseration expressed by these hon. gentlemen for the hon. Minister of Public Works. I am an old friend of that hon. gentleman; I have known, admired, respected and followed him, since the days of the late Sir George E. Cartier, when, as a boy of nineteen, I joined and fought for this party, which I have stood by ever since; and, Sir, if there is one thing that makes a man feel the hollowness of the pretensions of hon. gentlemen opposite, it is when they pretend to commiserate that hon. gentleman whose reputation they have sought to drag into the mire, whom they have held up as one not fit to occupy the position of Minister of Public Works of this country. A few short evenings ago in this House, they clamoured and clamoured that he should resign the position he holds. Such conduct was unworthy of parliamentary institutions, and, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to say that amongst those who now talk about insults offered to Catholics and to French Canadians, are the men who should have stood up then for the French Canadians. I admired the hon. Minister then; I believed in his purity then; I believe in his honesty and purity now; and all I have to say is that, if he is not the Premier of the Dominion, he has not so much to thank perhaps those who do not belong to his race as the men who are now raising a clamour in the name of French Canadianism, and who were the first to drag his name and reputation into the mire. I shall not say anything more upon that subject now, but will go back a little to the history of the past. The hon. Minister who spoke a few moments ago, told us something of that history, more particularly connected with his own Province, and he showed how those hon. gentlemen who are so loud-mouthed in their liberality while in Opposition, were equally scant of their liberality when in power. But I would like to ask, not merely with regard to one Province, but the whole Dominion, what has been the conduct of the Liberal party in the past? Who first raised in this new land the cry of bigotry and fanaticism? Who first strove to hunt down, in the Province of Ontario, the poor Catholics who to-day have so much sympathy from hon. gentlemen opposite? Do we not remember the efforts of the late Hon. George Brown, month after month and year after year? Do we not remember how our late leader had to fight him and the bigotry and the fanaticism which he sought to excite in the hearts of the people over whom he had influence? Had we not the testimony delivered only the other day in the Senate by the Hon. Mr. Scott, the leader of the Opposition there, that if the Catholic people of Ontario have any rights and privileges to-day, they owe them to the Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald and the party he led? But it is not merely in Ontario that we have seen this state of things. Let us go down by the sea. Let us travel to that beautiful island where the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) once occupied the position of First Minister. And what do we find there? We find there what never was seen before, and I trust never will be seen again. With half of the population of that Island Catholics, we saw that hon. gentleman form an exclusively Protestant Government, because he and his friends had trodden down the poor Catholics who were clamouring for their rights on this very school question. That Government lasted from 1876 to 1878, when the hon. gentleman pushed the thing too far. He then tried to induce the whole of that Government to throw all their influence with the Liberal party, in order to secure a Grit triumph—and that was too much for four of his colleagues, and they withdrew. During the existence of that Government it was not merely a policy of no Catholic need apply, but every one of that persuasion was ostracised, not even a Catholic charwoman could get employment. The hon. gentleman lays claim to liberality to-day; if he has improved he has learned his lesson from the Conservative party in this Parliament. But we have not to travel so very far. My hon. friend from Ottawa County (Mr. Devlin), who spoke so eloquently to-night in the short speech he delivered, and who spoke so eloquently upon another occasion, devoted himself almost exclusively to the terrible disasters which had been entailed upon the poor French Canadians and Catholics in Manitoba. Why, that is rather dangerous ground for the hon. gentleman to tread. I remember the time when Manitoba became a province of the Dominion. I remember its first Government, and the Government of Mr. Norquay, and I remember how this country looked upon that province with pride as one of those new lands where every man could enjoy his freedom and civil rights. During the whole course of Mr. Norquay's regime, was there one appeal made to prejudice or fanaticism? Was there one law against the French or English or Catholic schools or any man's rights? No; but the very moment these great Liberals, Messrs. Greenway and Martin, came in, then we had all the trouble. We know what they said in opposition. We know how they had flung out to the breeze the flag of liberality, and how, once they got into power, they showed the cloven hoof and trampled upon the rights of the people. It was then we had this brand of discord thrown, not merely into the Province of Manitoba, but among the whole population of the Dominion. It was then we had that province made the theatre of almost civil war; and we have had that war carried into every parish of the Province of Quebec. The fruits of that legislation are still apparent in the appeals of every kind to which it has given rise. And we have another proof, if it were necessary, of the utter hollowness and falsity of the professions of those gentlemen who have liberality on their

lips and bigotry and fanaticism in their hearts. There is nothing for those hon. gentlemen but appeals of this kind. They went to the country before with a separate cry for each province, and they are now trying to divide the people of the Dominion into two sections. They are now seeking to make of this country two hostile camps by setting Catholic against Protestant and *vice versa*. We all know, those of us especially who read the other day the interview with the Hon. Mr. Blake, who is now on the Pacific coast, that the salvation of this country depends on the existence and maintenance of good feeling, harmony, and good fellowship among the people who occupy it. We all know that, with our enormous extent of country and sparse population, if we have that population divided, if we have our people thrown into sectional and religious strife, there can be no prosperity for this land; and yet those hon. gentlemen who profess to be patriotic, who profess to love their country and to have its interests at heart, do not hesitate to trample upon all parliamentary precedent, and to spring upon the country to-day, when they hope the members on this side would not all be present, this motion, in order, if possible, to snap a verdict from the House. And they do all this for a mere party purpose. For that purpose they are prepared to have this country divided. The people of Canada have, however, frowned them down before, and will frown them down again. The people felt that the policy of the Liberal party is one of destruction to Canada, and condemned it at the polls. But now, on the threshold of a new Parliament, the Opposition come here again, not with a generous or a practical policy, but with one calculated to do mischief beyond all computation. And I feel that I would be wanting in my duty if I did not stand up here, and wherever my voice can reach or my words may be read with interest or with respect by any man in the Dominion of Canada, and place upon record the belief, as I do place upon record the belief, that the hon. Minister of Justice would not occupy the position he does in the Government to-day if the Catholic people of the Dominion of Canada had been insulted. I want to put it upon record that the Conservative party were ready to follow him if he had assumed the charge placed upon his shoulders by the Governor General of Canada. And, further, I say that if the day should come when that hon. gentleman should no longer feel that modesty which characterizes him, and which I hope he will overcome, and should accept that charge, the Conservative party from the Atlantic to the Pacific will rally around him, because he will hold in his hand the banner which has been so often carried to victory, and which, with him as the leader, will be carried to victory again. The people of the Dominion of Canada will frown down all efforts to create sectarianism in the politics of this country, and will record at the earliest opportunity, at the bye-elections, how thoroughly they disapprove of the attempt which has been made by the leader of the Opposition on this occasion.

Mr. SPROULE. The threatened wave has arisen; the rumblings of the thunder and the gathering of the storm have been coming gradually nearer; at last the lightning's flash is seen and the storm has struck the ship of State which, strange to say, rides on as calmly to-day on the billows as if nothing had happened. The hon. gentlemen who had been announcing to the country what great an event was going to take place soon, who had been marshalling their forces for this event, have forced on this storm. The cyclone has burst, and it has resulted in a motion for the adjournment of the House on the ground that the present Government have departed from the policy of their predecessors. In what particular have they departed from that policy? We expected to hear of some violation of the constitution or of some violation of principle followed by the late leader. In what respect has the policy been changed? Has it been changed in regard to the formation of a Ministry? Has it been changed because the Premier of to-day was taken from the Upper House? Is there no precedent in English history for that? Is it not the fact that the Premier in England to-day sits in the House of Lords in the same way as does the Premier for Canada? Is it not true that the leader of the Government in the House of Commons in England holds his position there in the same way as the leader of this House does here? Then we supposed that it might be shown that some change of policy had taken place because the representative of the Throne saw fit, after calling one gentleman to form a Government, and receiving the advice of that gentleman to send for another, to select another hon. gentleman to form the Administration. Have we not many incidents of the same character in English history? Have we not precedents to justify that in every respect? Then, it was thought that the accusation might be that the policy of the present Government was changed. How was it changed? Was it not announced in the Speech from the Throne at the opening of the session, before the death of our late leader, what the policy of the Government was? Was any attempt made to change the policy foreshadowed in the Speech from the Throne? Is not the great National Policy carried out as before? Is it in regard to the commercial policy? We have had no indication of any change in that. Is it in relation to the financial policy of the Government? The Minister of Finance will announce that later on. But up to the present time there was no justification for the leader of the Opposition saying that there was any change in the policy of the Government. Was it a change in the foreign policy or in the domestic policy? In none of these have we been able to remark any change in the policy of the Government. Was it any change when the Premier surrounded himself with the men he believed best able to carry on the policy of the country? There could not be any change there because he surrounded himself with the men who composed the Cabinet of the late lamented Sir John Macdonald. It was not on that ground that the leader of the Opposition justified a vote of censure. The same men are there who were there in Sir John Macdonald's time, and the same policy is there. What was the reason given not only by the leader of the Opposition but by his colleagues and supporters in the House to justify the motion he made to-night? It was because they believed there was discontent in the rank and file of the Conservative party. Did they get that information from any reliable source? They got it from their own papers representing their own views. There was an attempt made to prove that there is discontent in the Conservative ranks, that they are a

disunited party, and are not to be compared to the Conservative party of the past for cohesion. If there was anything the leaders of the Opposition would welcome to-night, it would be the existence of differences in the Conservative party, because then they would hope to cross to these seats for which they have so long been anxious. Their wish is father to the thought, and they endeavour to convince the House, or rather the country, for they cannot hope to convince this House, that there are discordant elements in our party. They have endeavoured to show from their own press that there are dissensions in the Liberal-Conservative party. They could give us the *Globe*, the Ottawa *Free Press*, the Montreal *Herald*, or the Montreal *Witness*, but are they authorities which are respected on this side of the House? Those papers are only voicing the sentiments hon. gentlemen would like to see exist, but which do not exist amongst us. One hon. gentleman I must refer to especially, because I find that he has referred to me. It is said that on this side of the House there are many kickers. Among the number a representation has been made that the hon. member for East Grey, who is now addressing you, is one. I am told, though I have not read it, that the *Free Press* states, as the *Globe* newspaper did the other day, that the hon. member for East Grey had protested against the Minister of Justice being called upon to form a Government in this country. I may say, and this is the first time I have spoken since the statement was made, that there was not a single, solitary word of truth in that. Neither is there in the assertion that is made to-night that the member for East Grey was at any time in the past, or is at present, a kicker or a dissentient in the Conservative ranks. I may say that those with whom I have conversed, coming not only from Ontario but from the other provinces, are all unanimous. I have failed to find a single hon. gentleman who is not prepared to-day, strongly and willingly, to support, not only the hon. gentleman who has formed the Government, but they would have supported just as strongly and as willingly the Minister of Justice if he had attempted to form a Government. Although it may be said there are dissentients in the ranks, I think hon. gentlemen always find out, when it comes to a vote, that these dissentients fail to materialize. Now, we are treated to-night with an anomalous resolution, a resolution to adjourn the House. It does not indicate any line of policy that the Opposition are going to propound to the country, and upon which they ask the House to censure the Government. It does not refer to any new policy, or any divergence from the past policy of the Conservative party. I do not think they will have the courage to ask for a division of the House after the debate is over, and I expect that they will ask to have the resolution withdrawn. But if they ask for a division, the leader of the Opposition will find that instead of trouble in the Conservative ranks, there is as great a unity to-day as there ever has been in the history of that party for the last twelve years. Now, the whole trend of the discussion to-night by hon. gentlemen opposite has been for the purpose of raising religious strife in this country. Scarcely a man has spoken on that side of the House who has not endeavoured, in a greater or lesser degree, to fan the flames. The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), and the hon. member for Ottawa County (Mr. Devlin), have used frenzied language regarding what they are pleased to call some interference with the rights of the Roman Catholic religion. Speaker after speaker on the other side has endeavoured to make it appear that some great wrong was being perpetrated upon the Roman Catholic minority of this country. But has the history of the Conservative party in the past justified that contention? No, Sir; we have always endeavoured to allay what might cause a conflict between the different elements of this country, what might be called differences regarding religious views, or different nationalities. The history of the Conservative party has always been one of conciliation, of an endeavour to bring these refractory elements together, to give fair-play to all. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) suggested that if they could only appeal to the country to-day, the two parties would change sides in this House. We have heard that prediction very often. We heard it in 1879, in 1881, in 1887, in 1891, but the Conservative party always came back with a respectable majority to control the destinies of this country. Hon. gentlemen opposite are very much like weather prophets—they are unreliable and most uncertain in their predictions. The hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), in a very facetious manner, referred to the merits of the different members of the Cabinet. It is only a short time ago that he was known as the poet laureate of Ontario, when he gave vent to those very significant lines in which he endeavoured to raise sectional feeling, to inflame the passions of the people against our French-Canadian compatriots, when he gave to the world those beautiful lines:

> "The despot's heel is on thy shore,
> Ontario, Ontario.
> Her torch is at thy temple door,
> Ontario, Ontario."

Now he is singing a different song, because he has a different purpose to serve. I dare say the remnant of that song may be found in his desk to-day, or, if not there, it may be found in Toronto. He is not endeavouring to inflame the passions of the people on that line to-day, but he is endeavouring, in a most ignoble manner, to inflame the religious passions of the people. It is unworthy of the hon. gentleman, who has sat as a representative of the people for so many years. I think he should be engaged in a better cause, and be employed in a nobler work. Now, I believe that when this storm is over and the cyclone has burst, the ship of state will be found riding on the top of the waves as calmly as it did before the elements gave signs of the cyclone that was approaching, and the same party will still wield the destinies of this country. The Conservative party will still continue in the endeavour to develop the resources of this country, to harmonize the conflicting elements of this country, to cement together the various provinces in one national unity, imbuing them with a national sentiment, carrying them on to a national goal, and building up a great country on this continent which shall be the right arm of the British Empire, a part and parcel of the British Empire, a party that will continue to educate the people, and inculcate a national sentiment, a sentiment of loyalty which will never allow traitors to pull down the flag that has so long braved the battle

and the breeze, with which we are connected so gloriously to-day, as we always have been in the past.

Mr. SKINNER. I acknowledge I was not in the Chamber to-night when the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) addressed the House, and consequently when I was asked to rise and say whether I was connected with a newspaper in St. John I did not at the time understand what was the point of the enquiry. I understand that during his expression of the opinion he stated that the representatives from St. John, some or all of them, were either connected with a newspaper or owned property in a newspaper in the city of St. John, that had opposed the elevation of the hon. the Minister of Justice to the Premiership of this Government. In reply to the member for Queen's, I think he must have drawn entirely upon his imagination. I do not think that he had any such information as would warrant him in making that statement. As a rule, such things are not stated unless they have some foundation—that is to say, such information is not given unless it has something upon which it can be based. Now, so far as relates to the newspaper referred to, I have neither a money interest in it, nor any connection with it in any way; therefore, so far as I am concerned, the statement is made entirely without any foundation, or even a shadow of foundation. I do not make this statement because I want to repudiate that newspaper, or make any comments upon it further than I shall make presently. That newspaper, I believe, is an entirely independent paper, conducted entirely by the editor who writes for it, and he is not responsible to any one except the parties who might employ him, and those parties are not in politics at all, so far as I know. In fact the whole of the newspapers published in St. John on the Conservative side are entirely independent of all gentlemen who are in politics, and they are conducted from the standpoint of their managers and express entirely their sentiments. The paper to which I particularly refer, and concerning which it was stated that I was part owner and exercised control, did make statements with respect to the elevation of the Minister of Justice to the position of Prime Minister, concerning which I state fully and frankly I do not approve. I will never be a party, so long as I am in public life, and I will retire from it rather than be a party to it, to the principle that religion or anything of the kind should ever enter into the consideration as to who should hold positions, whether that of Premier or any other position in the gift of the country or in connection with the Government. I say, and I speak the sentiments of the two representatives from St. John, who have already spoken on this matter, that had Sir John Thompson tried to form a Government and become leader of the party here, we would have given him our most hearty support and never asked as to his religion or anything of the kind. I make this statement, having understood what was charged with respect to myself, in order that there may be no mistake about it. I may say more. I happened to be in St. John at the time the Government was formed, and I believe it was the common sentiment of the Conservative party in the City and County of St. John, when it was telegraphed down that Sir John Thompson was forming, or was about to form a Government, or was taking part in the formation of a Government, that he should receive the unanimous and most loyal support that any party could give. I hope the statement I have made is full and explicit, and I am sorry that the member for Queen's (P.E.I.) made the remarks he did, for I think they were wholly without foundation in his own mind, and merely due to his political imagination, which stands so high in this House.

Mr. DALY. It was not my intention to have taken part in this discussion, and I would not have done so except for the religious phase introduced by hon. gentlemen opposite. I desire to say, as a member coming from the western portion of the Dominion, that so far as I am personally concerned I would be perfectly willing to follow the leadership of Sir John Thompson. Speaking for my colleagues on this side of the House from the Province of Manitoba and members from the North-West Territories and British Columbia, with whom I have conversed on the subject, I may say that every one of them would have been only too proud to follow the leadership of the Minister of Justice. I am glad to say that in the great country from which I come, where everything is of great proportion, we do not look on religious subjects and discuss them in the same manner as do the people in other provinces, particularly in Ontario. In Manitoba religious toleration has existed from the inception of the province. In that province we have a university which sets an example to the people of the Dominion. We have as its Chancellor, the Lord Bishop of Rupert's Land, as vice chancellor, Mr. Bernier, a Roman Catholic Frenchman, and upon the board of management we have representatives of the Roman Catholic Church, Methodist Church, Baptist Church, Presbyterian Church, and Church of England, and these men sit together, and they have sat together since 1871, when the university was established, to endeavour to educate the young in what I contend is one of the grandest principles, and that is religious toleration. It was not until the unfortunate occurrence took place in this House a few years ago, when the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) introduced a motion in regard to the Jesuit question that the subject of religious toleration ever arose in public discussion in Manitoba. The remark made by the hon. member for Ottawa County (Mr. Devlin) did not come with very good grace from him, for he must recollect the position of the Liberal party in Manitoba on the school question. He must remember that the Roman Catholics in Manitoba have enjoyed the right to separate schools since 1871, and that until 1891 the question as to their right to enjoy those schools under the Manitoba Act had never come into question and had never been discussed. It was left to a Liberal Government, at the head of which is Mr. Greenway, a gentleman who supported hon. gentlemen in this House before he went to Manitoba, who obtained the influence of hon. gentlemen opposite and who was supported by the sole and only Liberal representative west of Lake Superior, and for Mr. Martin, who was my opponent in the last election, to introduce the first and only question of religion ever brought into public matters in that province. I regret to say that although the Roman Catholics have enjoyed separate schools from

1871 until 1891, Mr. Martin saw fit, regardless of the rights those people have enjoyed and regardless of the fact that those were constitutional rights, to act in a very harsh and uncalled for manner. He did not wait to consult the people and ask their opinion. There was not a single petition laid on the Table of the House in regard to this question of separate schools; but, in order to carry out his own ideas and those of his colleagues, he introduced an Act to abolish separate schools. The consequence is that the Roman Catholics have taken up this question, and it is now before the Supreme Court, and no doubt judgment will be given on the matter in due time. Probably it is not becoming to discuss this question, as it is now before the courts; but I could not refrain from expressing my views, which are those of the people I represent, because on every platform Mr. Martin, my opponent, had as his chief plank this question of separate schools. He declared on several occasions in my hearing that if Mr. Laurier was returned—and he referred to the statement made by Mr. Rochon in the County of Ottawa that he had it from Mr. Laurier, that if he came into power he would disallow the Manitoba Act regarding separate schools and also the Act doing away with the dual language—and Mr. Laurier adopted such measures, he would go into Opposition. I do not know a greater calamity that could befall the Conservative party than that Mr. Martin should become connected with it; but I am satisfied that so far as the Liberal-Conservatives in Manitoba and the North West Territories and British Columbia are concerned, a true spirit of toleration prevails. Although I am a Protestant, I was taught to permit Roman Catholics to worship God according to their own views. I have endeavoured to educate my children in that spirit, and that spirit permeates our people. I ask hon. gentlemen who come from Prince Edward Island, whose minds have not been enlarged, to come to our western country and have their minds broadened on this and other subjects, and they will find prevailing there that spirit of toleration which should exist. I regret indeed that the leader of the Opposition has not adduced facts to bolster up his motion of want of confidence in the Government. The only charge against the Government is that Mr. Abbott, the present leader, was lately a director of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I understand the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) pursued in this case a different policy from that which he generally pursues, and he acknowledged, as well as other leading gentlemen on the other side of the House, that the integrity and honour of Mr. Abbott is beyond reproach. It seems to me very inconsistent that the rank and file of the party behind these leaders should have attacked Mr. Abbott when the prominent men of the party have acknowledged that he is a man of integrity and honour If he is a man of integrity and honour, as we believe him to be and as was stated by Mr. Power in the Senate, does it not follow that although he was a director of the Canadian Pacific Railway he can easily disassociate himself in every way from the company? I am glad to say that I have the honour of that gentleman's acquaintance ever since my infancy, and I rejoice to know from the press and from correspondence with my constituents that the people of Manitoba are well pleased in every way with the selection which His Excellency has made. I can say also to the Minister of Justice that if he had seen fit to comply with His Excellency's request and had formed a Government that hon. and respected gentleman would have received the same support from myself and my colleagues from the Province of Manitoba and west of Lake Superior as they will now accord to the Hon. Mr. Abbott. I will not take the time of the House further than to say that, so far as I and my colleagues from the west of Lake Superior are concerned, we will stand by the policy of our late revered leader, Sir John A. Macdonald. I want my friends on the other side of the House to understand that the Conservative members west of Lake Superior—and I take the liberty of speaking for them—have no dissensions in their ranks. They are not men seeking for office, and they are ready to stand firmly by the great principles of the Conservative party. They will stand by Mr. Abbott as leader of the Conservative party and if he should choose to come down from the high position which he now holds, and if the Minister of Justice should assume the responsibility of that office I tender to that hon. gentleman the same hearty support as we gave to the right hon. gentleman who is departed from our midst, but whose spirit and whose policy remain with us.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I did not intend to say anything in this debate had it not been, as the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) has said, that the religious phase of the question was introduced by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. But coming as I do, and coming almost alone as I do, from one of the greater portions of the Province of Ontario, I wish to say a few words, and these few words will be for the purpose of telling my French and Catholic fellow-citizens, and my fellow-members in this House, that the stigma which is sought by any member or members to be placed upon the Conservative Protestants of Ontario is as untrue as it is undignified, and as unnational as it is unkind. I come from a portion of the Province of Ontario which, at the present time, I am sorry to say, is largely represented in this House by gentlemen who see fit to hold political views different from those entertained on this side of the House. The population of that district is largely a Protestant population. It is true we have a large number of Catholics in the district, but the Protestant population is in the great majority, and coming from that district, and having had communication with a large number of the leading Conservatives, some of the most prominent Conservatives in the Province of Ontario, I may say to the House to-night, and I believe they will accept my word upon that point, that I have written assurances in my desk and under my hand from these leading Conservatives, that had either a French Canadian leader or an English Catholic leader been chosen to form the Government of this country, there would have been no more loyal supporters of him in the whole Dominion of Canada than those men who, although differing from such a leader in matters of church, would still look upon him and regard him for his ability and patriotism and for his position as a statesman of this country. I have no hesitation in saying that we are not bigots, I have no hesitation in saying that we are as broad-minded, that we are as liberal, and that we are as fair-spirited as

hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. I re-echo the sentiments as expressed by both sides of the House, the hope that the day has not come and I hope the day never will come in these ranks which followed once the great leader who is now gone, when we will reject any man because he happens to worship at another altar than that at which the majority of the people of Ontario worship at the present time. I do not intend to enter into a lengthy discussion on this question, but, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, coming as I do almost alone from that section of Ontario which is largely a Protestant section, I say that it is not the man or it is not the church that we consider, but it is the principles of public policy which he holds, it is his ability, it is his respectable character, and it is his eminence and his standing as a Canadian which will cause us to accept the leader of the Government in the present or in the future. I state here that whether the man chosen to lead the Government of this country be Sir Hector Langevin or Sir John Thompson or the Hon. Mr. Abbott, be he fitted for the place as these men and others are, we will rally around him to preserve that policy which the old man who has gone inaugurated and which I trust this country will pursue for many years to come.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to take the floor on this question; but the language used by the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue with respect to the Liberal party of 1872 and 1873, and the ingratitude which he shows for the support which he got from the Liberal party at that time, make me raise my voice in protestation in face of the accusation which he brings against the Liberal party, of having held in the matter of the rights of the minority, while in Opposition, certain opinions which they repudiated when in power. Let us see what took place in 1872 and 1873, about this question of the New Brunswick schools? In 1872 the hon. member for Victoria, who later became and still is the Minister of Inland Revenue, made efforts to bring about the disallowance of the law which deprived the Catholics of New Brunswick of their separate schools. In this work he was helped by the most eminent men of the Opposition. In 1873, a motion was moved which was adopted by the House. This motion was to the effect that the law officers of the Crown in England, having given as their opinion that the Act passed by the New Brunswick Legislature was within the attributes of that Legislature, it was proper that a decision of the Privy Council should be secured, and that in the meanwhile the Bill should be disallowed in order that the two parties may seek the courts to have the validity of the Act decided upon. Who were those who supported the hon. member for Victoria on that occasion? All the chiefs and almost all the members of the Liberal party. And who were those who opposed him? The members of the Conservative Government then in power and a part of their supporters. The motion asking for the disallowance was adopted, and the Liberal party would have been ready to go further, had they not been stopped by the hon. member for Victoria (the present Minister of Inland Revenue); he had gone to Fredericton, I believe, and had succeeded in convincing the bishops that it was in the interest of Confederation itself that the Bill should not be disallowed. Everybody knows what took place at that time, and I do not need to quote any higher authority than that of the Bishop of Three Rivers, who, in a letter recently written to the hon. Secretary of State, said that it is in the name of the federal pact that the abolition of the separate schools was confirmed in New Brunswick, and that the bishops did not accept the offer of the Catholic Ministers to resign, and permitted that that unjust law should not be disallowed. Here is a translation of the language of Bishop Lafleche:

"It was in the name of the Confederation Act that the abolition of separate schools was confirmed in New Brunswick a few years ago, and although Catholic Ministers who then formed part of the Federal Government, told the bishops that they would resign on this question, out of respect for the autonomy of the provinces, this unjust law was tolerated."

What was substituted for this disallowance which the House was ready to vote? A vote of $5,000 to carry the question to the Privy Council. This was accepted by the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue as well as by all the members who were sitting on the other side of the House. But when, in consequence of the Pacific scandal, a change of Government took place, the solution of the question, which had satisfied the hon. member for Victoria, while his party was in power, ceased to be satisfactory to him. It was no more the carrying of the question to the Privy Council, or a vote of $5,000 for that purpose, that was wanted. After having given up disallowance, the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Costigan) wanted an amendment to the constitution; after having abandoned a prompt, immediate, efficient means of obtaining justice which was offered him by the constitution and the majority of the House, he wanted to have recourse to ultra constitutional remedies. But his position was so false that he withdrew his motion, and did not even request a division of the House. To complete his inconsistency, the hon. Minister entered and remains in a Government composed of the men who supported the oppressive measures of which he so justly complained! Any serious man who will study the history of the Confederation will necessarily reach this conclusion: That in Canada, as in England, the Liberal party has shown itself to be the friend, the protector, the defender of the rights of the minorities; that this party alone has taken in hand the defence of the oppressed, alone has remained on constitutional ground. On another hand, the student of history will find that all the attacks directed against the national and religious rights of the minority, came from the Conservative camp; that all the measures of oppression and tyranny taken against the minority were promoted and defended by the Conservative party, save few honourable personal exceptions. In view of these facts, there is in the language of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, more than ingratitude; there is a crying injustice against which I think it my duty to enter an energetic protest.

Mr. SAVARD. (Translation.) In taking the floor at this late hour of the evening, it is useless to say that I do not intend to make a speech; but under the circumstances, I believe it to be my duty to my county and to the country, to give an explanation of the vote which I am to cast on this motion. Mr. Speaker, if the motion now before the House had not raised any discussion; if we had simply been called upon to vote on the adjournment

of the House, it is useless to say that I would have voted against the motion, for I consider that it would be inopportune to adjourn the House to-day; but after the discussion I see, with all the House, that this motion has a special object. The debate showed that the object was to record a solemn protest before the House and before the country against the formation of the Cabinet. Mr. Speaker, I have always been a Conservative, and I am a Conservative in principles, although my election was carried against one of Sir John A. Macdonald's Ministers. No political question was raised by me in my county during the election; I never attacked the policy of Sir John A. Macdonald. I only contended that it behooved the county to choose one of its inhabitants to represent it in Parliament. These are the circumstances under which I was elected. Since I have the honour of sitting in this House, I have so far taken the most independent position I could take; I have given no partizan vote on the questions brought before the House; each of my votes was given from principle and conviction. But to-night I have a declaration to make and will make it. I consider that the circumstances which have surrounded and followed the formation of the present Administration have been extremely unfortunate for the Province of Quebec, and especially for the French Canadian nationality. Mr. Speaker, if I rise to speak to-night, it is in order to protest against the injustice which was done not only to one but to two members of the Cabinet. There was in Sir John Macdonald's Cabinet a man who commanded the attention of the public and who deserved to occupy the important position of Prime Minister. I was expecting, and it was said in the whole country, that the one who should be called upon to become heir to the late Premier was the hon. Minister of Public Works. There is no man in this House, at least on the ministerial side, who had such a service record. He was Sir John Macdonald's first lieutenant; he had followed him in all and everywhere; he had been the leader of the Government whenever the chief of the Cabinet was absent. He was the one who commanded the attention, and who, according to my mind, should have been called upon to form a Cabinet. But past services, seniority, and constitutional usages were put aside, and there was preferred to him a man who is not responsible to the people. If the hon. Minister of Public Works, or the hon. Minister of Justice, had been chosen, either of them would have given satisfaction to the Dominion, because with either we would have had a constitutional Premier, a Prime Minister responsible to the people, while now we have Hon. Mr. Abbott, a man whom I am willing to regard as perfectly honest, perfectly respectable and able, but, nevertheless, a man whom I do not know, and whom many of us do not know, for his political career has not been as brilliant as that of the hon. Minister of Public Works or of the hon. Minister of Justice. Mr. Speaker, if I took the floor, it was only, I repeat it, in order to protest in the name of my county, in the name of the Province of Quebec, and in the name of the Dominion of Canada, against the injustice which I hold has been done to the House of Commons in the choice of another than a member of this House, and in the ignoring of one of the oldest members of the Cabinet as successor to Sir John A. Macdonald.

House divided on motion to adjourn (Mr. Laurier):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,
Allison,
Amyot,
Armstrong,
Bain,
Barron,
Beausoleil,
Béchard,
Beith,
Borden,
Bowers,
Bowman,
Brodeur,
Brown (Chateauguay),
Brown (Monck),
Burdett,
Cameron (Huron),
Campbell,
Carroll,
Charlton,
Choquette,
Christie,
Colter,
Davidson,
Davies,
Dawson,
Delisle,
Devlin,
Edgar,
Edwards,
Fauvel,
Featherston,
Forbes,
Fraser,
Gauthier,
Geoffrion,
German,
Gillmor,
Godbout,
Grieve,
Guay,
Hargraft,
Harwood,
Hyman,
Innes,
King,
Landerkin,
Langelier,
Laurier,
Lavergne,
Leduc,
Lister,
Livingston,
Macdonald (Huron),
McGregor,
McMillan,
McMullen,
Mignault,
Mills (Bothwell),
Monet,
Monsseau,
Mulock,
Murray,
Paterson (Brant),
Perry,
Proulx,
Rider,
Rinfret,
Rowand,
Sanborn,
Savard,
Semple,
Simard,
Somerville,
Spohn,
Sutherland,
Tarte,
Trow,
Truax,
Vaillancourt,
Watson,
Welsh,
Yeo.—83.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Adams,
Barnard,
Bergeron,
Bergin,
Bowell,
Burns,
Cameron (Inverness),
Carignan,
Carpenter,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Cleveland,
Coatsworth,
Cochrane,
Cockburn,
Corbould,
Corby,
Costigan,
Craig,
Curran,
Daly,
Daoust,
Davin,
Davis,
Denison,
Desaulniers,
Desjardins (Hochelaga),
Desjardins (L'Islet),
Dewdney,
Dickey,
Dugas,
Dupont,
Dyer,
Earle,
Fairbairn,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),
Ferguson (Renfrew),
Fréchette,
Gillies,
Girouard,
Gordon,
Grandbois,
Haggart,
LaRivière,
Léger,
Lépine,
Lippé,
Macdonald (King's),
Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Macdonell (Algoma),
Macdowall,
Mackintosh,
McAllister,
McDonald (Victoria),
McDougald (Pictou),
McDougall (Cape Breton),
McGreevy,
McKay,
McKeen,
McLean,
McLennan,
McLeod,
McNeill,
Madill,
Mara,
Marshall,
Masson,
Miller,
Mills (Annapolis),
Moncrieff,
Montague,
O'Brien,
Patterson (Colchester),
Prior,
Putnam,
Robillard,
Roome,
Ross (Dundas),
Ross (Lisgar),
Ryckman,
Skinner,
Sproule,
Stairs,
Taylor,
Temple,

Hazen,	Thompson (Sir John),
Henderson,	Tisdale,
Hodgins,	Tupper,
Hutchins,	Tyrwhitt,
Ingram,	Wallace,
Jamieson,	Weldon,
Kaulbach,	White (Cardwell),
Kenny,	White (Shelburne),
Kirkpatrick.	Wood (Brockville).—103.
Langevin (Sir Hector),	

PAIRS :

For:	*Against:*
Messieurs	
Frémont,	Ives,
Flint,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Scriver,	Stevenson,
Joncas,	Chapleau,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Foster,
Mackenzie,	Smith (Sir Donald),
Casey,	Reid,
Bernier,	Baker,
Legris,	Pope,
Préfontaine,	Burnham,
Bourassa,	Ouimet,
Gibson,	Wilmot.

Mr. TROW. The hon. member for Gaspé, the hon. member for Yarmouth, and the hon. member for Huntingdon, have not voted.

Mr. SCRIVER. I am paired with the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Stevenson).

Mr. JONCAS. I am paired with the hon. Secretary of State. It is almost needless for me to say that if I had voted, I would have recorded my vote in favour of the motion.

Mr. GUAY. The hon. member for Quebec County has not voted.

Mr. FRÉMONT. I am paired with the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives). I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Grenville has not voted.

Mr. REID. I am paired with the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey).

Motion negatived.

TRADE RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message as follows :—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, further papers relating to the extension and development of trade between the United States and the Dominion of Canada, including the Colony of Newfoundland.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 16th June, 1891.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 47) to amend an Act to incorporate the Collingwood and Bay of Quinté Railway Company. —(Mr. McCarthy.)

ADJOURNMENT.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 1.50 a. m. (Tuesday).

Mr. SAVARD.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 23rd June, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. DESJARDINS (Hochelaga) presented the second report of the Committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates.

SHIPMENT OF LIVE STOCK.

Mr. TUPPER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee, to-morrow, to consider the following resolution :—

That it is expedient to pass an Act respecting the shipping of live stock, and to provide that the Governor in Council may appoint inspectors under the said Act and determine the remuneration to be paid them out of the fees which the Governor in Council may establish to be paid on live stock shipped on any ships carrying live stock.

Motion agreed to.

RED DEER VALLEY RAILWAY AND COAL COMPANY.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to-morrow, to consider the following resolution :—

That it is expedient further to amend the Act forty-second Victoria, chapter four, intituled: "An Act to authorize the granting of subsidies in land to certain Railway Companies," and to provide that Dominion lands may be granted to the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company to an extent not exceeding six thousand four hundred acres for each mile of the said company's railway, either from Cheadle Station on the Canadian Pacific Railway, to its terminus at a point in or near Township twenty-nine, Range twenty-three, west of the 4th Meridian, a distance of about fifty-five miles, or from the Town of Calgary, in the District of Alberta, in the North-West Territories, to its said terminus in Township twenty-nine, Range twenty-three, west of the 4th Meridian, a distance of about seventy-five miles.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, in rising to move that the House go into Committee of Ways and Means to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, I desire to ask the indulgence of the members present for a very short time while I make a very brief, I hope a plain and pertinent statement with respect to the finances of the country, the operations of the past and present years, so far as the present year has gone, and some estimates with respect to the succeeding year. It may be stated that in two particulars Canada has not in the past years we have under review been so fortunate as we could have desired her to have been. The harvest, which gave good promise in the opening of the last year, did not fulfil the prospects which were formed with respect to it, and was, therefore, not so abundant as could have been wished, and not so abundant as we have had in some former years. The lumber interest of the country finds itself handicapped to a certain extent in the British markets, chiefly by the overcrowding and overstocking of that market, and to a certain extent as well in the South American markets, owing to the general disturbances which have taken place in some of those countries which were large customers for certain classes of lumber, as a result of

financial mismanagement and internal revolution and commotion. Outside of these two points in which we hoped that Canada would have had a more prosperous year than she has had, I think there is nothing to prevent us from congratulating ourselves in this House and in the country upon the general state and condition of our trade, our industries and our products. Our harvests, although, as I have said, not very abundant, were, taking the country all round, of a fair average, and the prices received for our agricultural products were probably a considerable amount higher than in the preceding year, so that the total net results for the country at large was not so unfortunate as might have been thought at first. For the present year, although we cannot, of course, tell what may happen as the months develop, the prospects, especially in Manitoba and the North-West and in certain parts of the older Provinces, are fair; a largely increased area, especially in our western country, has been placed under crop, and at the present time the prospects there are of the brightest. With reference to the foreign trade for the year 1889-90, I may say that the aggregate trade was some $14,000,000 in excess of its preceding year and marked one of the best years in the history of Confederation, being some $65,000,000 in excess of the trade in 1878-79, the last year of the Administration which preceded the present Government. The exports for the past year under review were $7,500,000 more than they were in the year 1888-89 and some $25,000,000 in advance of the exports for the year 1878-79. There was a gratifying increase of the trade between Canada and Great Britain of $7,000,000 over and above the year 1888-89, and our trade increased to a greater or lesser degree with France, Germany, Portugal, Italy, Holland, Belgium, China, Japan and Switzerland. There was a decrease of about $1,000,000 in our trade with the United States of America, a slight decrease in our trade with Spain, and somewhat larger with Newfoundland and with South America and the West India Islands. The decrease in trade with some of these countries was because of reasons which I have previously stated, and I may say as well in this connection that, carrying out the promise of the preceding year, the current year which we have now completed will show a gratifying increase of exports over the very large increase of the previous year. Our home trade, taking our country through, so far as it appears to one looking with a broad glance at it, is, on the whole, in sound condition. Some branches of our industries are flourishing, while others are not so fortunate in that respect. But taking it all in all, I think it is an opinion which will be borne out by financial men, that the trade condition of the country is a sound one if it is not a very flourishing one. Our inter-provincial trade, which year by year has been becoming more and more a factor and an incident of our development, has its steady increase, and although we have not at hand an unerring means of denoting by statistical records what the exact increase in volume of this trade is, yet from certain large indications that we get we are assured that it is a constantly increasing factor, and that it carries with it all that increased energy and life and prosperity which comes from such a field of activity. Aided by our railways; trunk lines which have been built and which are now in the best of running condition, and smaller and more circumscribed lines, but in their way not less important railways, which develop certain local centres and pour out upon the trunk lines their contributions to commerce, both of these conjoined are, year by year, under prudent and skilful management in the main, accessory to the development of the trade of the country in this respect. Last year has seen an increase, too, in the mining activity of Canada. The Government, by its regulations put in last year's tariff providing that mining machinery of a class and kind not made here should be admitted free of duty for three years, has aided in that activity. The iron bounty is having its results, and in some parts of our country there will be this year large accessions to the productive power of Canada in that respect by capital which is at present being invested in that industry. The visit of the British Association of Miners and Engineers, which was paid incidentally to this country in connection with their annual meeting, has been, I am assured, of great importance to the future development of our mineral wealth. The opinion of experts and the actual views in the country of men who were pre-eminently practical and scientific in this regard, is having its effect in making better known the large and important resources of the Dominion. I must not omit to mention the benefit arising from the labours of our own department, which is partially charged with that, nor ought I incidentally to omit referring to the good which has come from the Commission which was appointed by the Ontario Government, whose labours were very thorough and the information given by which was very complete and of great importance. The immigration of the past year, although it has not been so large in volume as some of the preceding years, has been of a class which is thoroughly satisfactory, I think, to this country. It comprises a class of men who have responsibilities, who have money, who have experience more or less in actual farming, and who come into this country prepared to make their home and stay here, and with a skill and knowledge which is necessary for the development of the properties into which they come. I am sure that the recent visit of the Farmers' Delegates, so thorough and general as it was, and which has been succeeded by one of the most practical and complete reports which I have ever had the pleasure of reading, will have the effect of awakening an increased interest in Great Britain and other countries of Europe, and will be followed by its fruits of an increased immigration of the class of settlers which we particularly desire to have in this country. Our moneyed institutions have, on the whole, stood well the trying crisis of the past year. Whilst in the United States of America bank after bank has fallen under the stress and stringency of the money market, whilst in Great Britain and in London, the centre of the world's money market, there has been great suspense and great trouble and great stringency; our banks in this country have pursued the even tenor of their way; a gratifying fact which is, I think, partly due to the good system of banking which we have in Canada, but which is, perhaps, chiefly due to the practical knowledge and prudent skill of the men who have our banking institutions in charge, and who take cognizance of the signs of the trade of the world as they appear from time to time and accommodate themselves in a skilful and prudent way to these necessities, and who also heed the warnings which are obtained in that way and so steer a prudent course.

Our credit abroad stands as in preceding years; and although the financial troubles which have occurred over the civilized world, and which have been especially felt in the money markets of Europe, have had the effect of depreciating our securities, as the securities of all other countries and all other colonies have been for the time depreciated, and even the British consols themselves, yet our securities stand in comparison better than those of our sister colonies, and, taking all things into consideration, they hold their own in every respect. I think we can congratulate ourselves upon the buoyant nature of the revenue of the past financial year, a revenue the largest in the history of this country, a revenue which did not come from increased taxation as a result of changes and additions to the tariff, but which is an evidence of the power of the people to buy, and consequently marks to a certain extent their prosperity and the soundness of their financial condition. I think we may congratulate ourselves, too, upon the balance which has been kept between the revenues and expenditures of the country, as will be more apparent when I take up those matters in detail. Altogether, Mr. Speaker, to leave this branch, which may serve as an introduction to what is still more germane and pertinent to the question in hand, I think we may say that we have a happy, a united, a progressive, and a right-minded people, who are glad to live in this country and under Canadian institutions, who have a hopeful outlook with reference to the future, and who are full of progress and activity at present. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the House will allow me, I wish to deal for a moment with some more general trade interests. It is within the memory of the members of this House that some two or three years ago I had the pleasure of introducing resolutions which looked to the formation of lines of steamship communication towards the West Indies, towards Great Britain in the matter of a more rapid and better equipped Atlantic line, and towards Australia, China and Japan in respect to improved and regular steamship communications on the Pacific Ocean. I am very glad to say, with reference to these lines, that two of them have been established, and at the present time, I believe, have been well established. Different lines of steamers to the West Indies were started in part as an experiment, and with a desire, if possible, to open up trade by couriers of a regular and more speedy kind, with the islands of the Carribbean Sea and some of the coasts of South America; and although difficulties have been met—very great difficulties, of which the House will know when we take up those particular subjects—I believe I may say to the House that these lines are now fairly well established, under conditions as good as we may hope to obtain at the present, and on a standing and a basis upon which they will be able to prove in the course of two or three years, I hope to the satisfaction of this House and the country, that there lie in those islands to the south of us possibilities of a large and remunerative commerce, as regards especially branches of trade which are complements of each other, and to which in neither country is there home competition, but only the competition from outside. With reference to the Pacific, I may state that the line of vessels which was subsidized by the British Government, and in part by the Canadian Government, has at length been established; and within the last two months the first of those well-built, finely-equipped and speedy vessels has been put upon the route, and passengers and mails have come from the far East across the Pacific Ocean, across our Canadian part of this continent and home to the old country in a space of time surprisingly short, which has elicited astonishment and comment of the most gratifying kind from the press and public men of Great Britain and the continent of Europe. We have, as a Government, put forth every possible energy to have the fast Atlantic line established as well. The House is cognizant of the history of that line up to the past year. During last year we entered into a provisional contract with a company which had very great financial strength, and of which Mr. Bryce Douglas was the agent on this side of the sea. Mr. Douglas visited this country and personally inspected the Canadian Pacific Railway and the ports upon the Pacific; and I may state that he was very enthusiastic both with reference to the prospects of this country and the prospects of a remunerative trade being built up across the country and across the Atlantic, sufficient to warrant the placing of vessels of the best style and equipment between our ports and the ports of Great Britain. A provisional contract was entered into, and, if it had not been for two reasons, one of which, and not the least important, was the disorganization which took place in the money markets at home, for reasons which are well known to hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, but, more especially, the sudden and lamented death of Mr. Bryce Douglas himself, who was the soul and the inspiring genius of the company, I think we would have been able to inform this House that a hard and fast contract had been entered into for a line of steamships equal in style and equipment to the best that plies between the ports of New York and the ports of Great Britain and the continent; but the death of Mr. Douglas, especially, and the disorganized state of the money markets, has postponed this project, and the Government has again to try its hand, with the aid of the liberal donation which Parliament has placed at its disposal, with the view of bringing about what both sides of this House have declared by their votes and confidence they wish to see accomplished. Since last year the McKinley Bill, which was under discussion when this House was in session, and the main features of which were thoroughly settled before we separated, has gone into active operation. That Bill was looked upon with much apprehension and much hesitation by large interests in every part of this country. It threatened some of our trade interests; it certainly pointed to a displacement and a diversion of trade in several important particulars. Canada has had some months of experience of its operation; and, so far as I can see, upon a fair and just retrospect of the months that have passed, and the industries that have been affected, the industrial interests of Canada have stood the strain well, being far less harmed than was anticipated when that Bill was under discussion and when it was about to be passed by the Congress of the United States. The people of Canada, whilst, in some respects, they deplored some features of that Bill, knew that, so far as the Governments of Canada had been concerned, from 1867 up, no fault could be attached to them if there was not a better basis of trade relations between the United States and this country than actually existed. They

knew that when, in 1866, the old reciprocity treaty was abrogated, that abrogation took place, not at the desire of Canada, but at the express instance of the United States, and they knew that, from that time up to the present, time and again, Canada has made advances, in a fair and honourable spirit, for the resumption of the old or the inauguration of new relations upon some fair and equitable basis. Looking back at the results which followed the abrogation of the old reciprocity treaty, the people of Canada, although they deplored some features of the McKinley Bill, did not think, viewing their past circumstances, present condition, and future prospects, that they had reason to become discouraged or be less hopeful than before. Looking back to 1866, and knowing that there was then found sufficient trade energy and skill and purpose in this country to convert what was then supposed to have been a great evil into what actually turned out to be a real good, inasmuch as it put Canadians upon their own mettle and energy and made them carve out for themselves fresh and remunerative channels of trade and commerce, they felt that, though they would fain have wished for better relations with the United States, they had ample resources, ample energy and a wide field about them; and setting to work, with that business energy and pluck which is characteristic of Canadians, they met the situation without grumbling or becoming despondent, and with a cheerful and hopeful facing of the future. Sir, that McKinley Bill had barely passed when, at the instance of a large interest in this country, I sent a skilful and practical man to Great Britain, who made a thorough investigation into one branch of trade which, it was supposed, would be seriously affected by the McKinley Bill, namely, the egg trade; and the investigations he made, and which have been since continued, by the High Commissioner, have resulted in a mass of information and a settled conviction, not only in this country but Great Britain as well, that for eggs and poultry there exists on that side a market of unlimited dimensions, in which home competition is at a minimum and the demand continually progressing, and in which, when we have studied and thoroughly mastered, as can be easily done, its wants and idiosyncracies, we may find a continual and unlimited market for the articles we may choose to raise and export. Statistics show, beyond a doubt, that in the United States market, the demand for our surplus eggs was becoming every year smaller, because of the home competition and the increase of the home supply. Statistics show, on the other hand, that in Great Britain the demand is constantly outrunning the supply, and that there is no probable time in the future when it will not be measurably greater than it is at present And what is true with reference to eggs is true, in part, with reference to poultry and live animals, and hay and other commodities. And I do not fear to assert and stake my reputation on the future turn of events, when I say it, that, just as that market which, for live stock, cheese and certain other commodities, was a few years ago very limited and has since expanded, until to-day it gives to our trade millions of dollars and the certainty of remunerative prices, so it will, in regard to these other articles, follow the same line and be productive of equal profit to this country. I am sure that no man in this House could wish for anything else, and all must wish for this result. And I see no reason, from past experience, after studying the conditions of the trade, to warrant me in making my statement less strong than I have made it. With reference to the West India trade, some attempt has been made in past years to foster the Canadian trade with these islands. Steamship companies were subsidized with that end in view, and last year, under the authority of Council, I had the pleasure of visiting those islands and of having conferences with their Governments, and merchants and people, in order to find out for myself something more intimately of the condition and the prospects of trade between our country and those islands. And what did I find there? I found, in the first place, the people of the British West India Islands most fairly disposed towards this country. They greeted with pleasure the interest which had been evinced by my visit to them. They had only the warmest feelings for their brethren further to the north and, without exception, expressed themselves as heartly in favour of all possible extension of trade between those islands and Canada. Just about that time, the McKinley Bill came into operation, with its diverse effects upon the people of the West India Islands, and this measure gave them much to think about before they could accept the proposition I was authorized to make, of a differential treatment of the products required by the one country from the other. Owing to the passage of the McKinley Bill, very grave thought and very serious consideration had to be given by them at that particular juncture before they could accept our terms or declare themselves in anyway with reference to my proposition. Sir, the mistake Canada made was in not putting steamships upon that route 12 or 15 years ago. If we had done that, we would have opened the channels of trade between both countries previously to the opening of the steamship lines between the islands and the United States, and we would have had already a trade in large part established with all the advantages that come from it. But while we were lying idle, not doing our duty, steamship lines regular and frequent had been sent from the ports of the United States, business channels had been opened, and business relations formed, and along these the lines of trade and interest ran until at present Canada has to introduce her wares in competition with an old and long-established business interest. But, Sir, I am convinced that, when careful thought has been given to this, and when the results of the McKinley tariff and the reciprocity clause in connection with it comes to be fully worked out, there is a great probability that the people of the West India Islands, who are so well disposed towards us and are so willing to trade with us in every possible way, will be willing, and not only willing but glad, to meet with us in order to arrange a mutually beneficial system of trade between their islands and this country. Sir, it may be—it ought not to be—but it may be a favourite pastime of some people to ridicule the idea of trade between Canada and the West India Islands. We ought not to do that. The West India Islands, inhabited, it is true, in large part by black people, have a large population which consumes very largely, and the aggregate trade of those islands to-day amounts to more than $75,000,000, nearly one-half of which consists of the import of articles

which are specialties of Canada, so far as their production is concerned. They consume those articles which are our natural products and the products of our industries which, when they are introduced into the West India Islands will, I am convinced, find a ready reception there. That this is the fact is proved by the result of the last year's work, and by the results which are just beginning to be apparent, of the exhibition which took place in Jamaica, where Canada made a most important and a most successful exhibit, where she disabused the minds of our island brethren of many prejudices and wrong conceptions which they had had in regard to us, where she displayed her wares and her goods to the best advantage, and where she proved to them that a mutually advantageous trade could take place, and laid the foundation for that trade in actual sales, in many orders, and in prospective trade, which those who had their exhibits there informed me speaks well for future commerce between that country and ours. Then, we have had, during the past year, an answer from the United States of America, different from any answer which has been received from 1866 up to the present time. The papers have been laid on the Table of the House, or at least a part of them. They will form a subject of discussion later on. Suffice it for me to say at the present moment that on an invitation given by Mr. Secretary Blaine—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER,—the delegates from Canada went to Washington for the purpose of having an informal conversation with Mr. Blaine, and talking over the possibilities of trade relations between their country and ours. They went there, and at the expressed desire of the United States, and, for their convenience and not for ours, the President of the United States asked us to postpone that informal conference which was appointed at that time, and to meet on his own invitation in a formal conference to be held in Washington in the month of October next. That is the state of things as it exists. In response to the offers which have often been made through the British Ministers and otherwise, that is the first time when the United States Government have intimated that they are willing to sit down with us and canvass fairly and freely the basis of a trade arrangement. It is not my business at present, nor would it be prudent for me to lay down the lines or go into details as to what will be the policy of the Government, when this meeting takes places in October. But I may say this, that the Government holds itself ready, as the Liberal-Conservative Governments have always done, to meet the United States on a fair and equitable basis and with the sincere and earnest desire to remove all differences that exist and to give the greatest freedom of trade compatible with the best interests of this country in its relations with the United States of America. Certainly no Government of a self-governing and self-respecting country should be asked to do more. Further than this, we can state that while we are willing to make all the concessions that on these lines can fairly be made, we are not willing to go so far as to injuriously shut ourselves out from the trade which we have with Great Britain and the other countries in the world, that we are not willing to forego, for a doubtful gain, the substantial advantages which we have enjoyed and expect to enjoy from our relations with the mother country, from which connection we have reaped so much in the past and from which we hope so much in the future. But, so far as is consistent with the best interests of this country and in the broadest commercial and national sense, having regard to our standing as a country forming a portion of the Empire, we are prepared to go as far as these considerations will allow us, and not one single step further. And the Government of the United States would not require more. The Government of no self-respecting country would ask for more, but would honour that country which would maintain the position of self-respect which we inevitably must take. I do not despair that, when our conference takes place in October, if disturbing conditions are not injected which might bring about a defeat, it may be found possible for relations to be formed which will place our intercourse with the United States on a more satisfactory footing than it is to-day, So much with regard to these general matters. Passing to another point, I wish to take up the change which has been made in regard to our Dominion Savings Banks. The members of the House who have followed the constitution of these banks, and the regulations under which they have been conducted, know that the rate of interest and the amount of the deposit have been frequently changed. On December 24th, 1877, the limit was placed at $1,000. In 1880, the limit was $3,000. In 1886, it was made $1,000; and in 1887, the maximum was placed at $1,000, with a further limit of $300 a year as the maximum for a yearly deposit, and in 1889 the rate of interest was reduced to 3½ p.c. Previous to making that Order in Council and subsequent to it, the balance which had heretofore existed upon the side of deposits, came to be changed, and from August, 1889, up to the present time, each month, almost without exception, has seen a withdrawal from the savings banks of the country, larger than the deposits which were placed therein. This is not wholly due to the change in the rate of interest, inasmuch as the withdrawals commenced in excess of deposits some months before the lower rate of interest came into operation. However, it has gone on, and for several causes which might be named, until we find that in the year 1889-90 there was a net reduction of nearly $2,000,000. This reduction, however, does not show a loss in the gross deposits of the country, and consequently in the earnings of the country at large, but rather a transference. As proof of the statement I make, I have here a table prepared as follows:—

DEPOSITS IN BANKS ON 31ST MAY.

	1889.	1890.	1891.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
In Post Office Savings Banks	22,132,854 19	21,357,554 67	21,130,429 26
In Dominion Savings Banks	19,214,227 95	18,498,290 34	17,114,889 84
In Chartered Banks payable on demand ...	55,165,595 67	51,440,101 67	56,522,473 82
In Chartered Banks payable after notice or on a fixed day.	68,795,851 55	74,629,147 67	84,679,400 27
City and District Savings Bank and La Caisse d'Economie.....	10,728,563 45	10,778,164 86	10,994,546 49
	176,037,092 81	176,703,258 81	190,441,739 68

From this it appears that the gross sum of the savings of the country and the deposits of the country in the different savings banks for 1889, amount to $176,000,000; in 1890, to $176,700,000; in 1891, to $190,500,000, thus showing that the total savings and deposits of the people of the country in 1891 had increased about $14,000,000; so that whatever withdrawal there was from the Government and savings banks, is not at all to be taken as a sign of lessened earnings or of lessened savings of the country. Part of it has been due, since the Order in Council was passed, to the change which has taken place in the policy of the banks of the country, the Bank of Montreal, and by other banks, having introduced savings departments or branches, in which they take sums as low as one dollar, and have been paying interest at the rate of 4 per cent. upon them, and this accounts in part for the withdrawal, I am sure, of some of the savings from our banks. However, in order to meet the withdrawals from the savings banks, and which is, in some respects, a redemption of debt, and in order to meet the redemption of debt which fell due from time to time instead of going upon the the market for loans, I have been, during the last year, obliged to have temporary loans negotiated by our agents with banks in London, in order to meet these withdrawals and these redemptions of debt. These loans are, as I have said, temporary; they run for twelve and six months, to expire on the first of July in the present year, when arraugements will be made and are now nearly completed, I believe, for their being carried on for six or twelve months longer. This is necessitated from the fact that the state of the London money market, and the state of securities upon that market, make it an imprudent thing for the Dominion of Canada, with a due regard to the high position that our credit has obtained, to go for any regular loans under present conditions.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman might as well state the amount of the loan, and the rate of interest paid?

Mr. FOSTER. The amount of the loan is £400,000, on the 30th June, 1890; and £600,000 in December, 1890, one running for twelve and the other for six months, the rate of interest being, the first 4 per cent., and the second 4½ per cent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that all, or did you borrow any more?

Mr. FOSTER. That is all we have borrowed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do you propose to borrow more?

Mr. FOSTER. We may have to borrow a little more. It depends largely upon the withdrawals which we have to meet. Turning now to the year 1889-90, the results may be tabulated as follows:—

	Estimates.	Receipts.	Difference.
Customs	$24,000,000	$23,968,953	−$ 31,046
Excise	7,000,000	7,618,118	+ 618,118
Miscellaneous	8,200,000	8,292,853	+ 92,853
Totals	$39,200,000	$39,879,935	$679,925

From this it is seen that while there was a slight falling off from my estimate in Customs, there was a large increase in both Excise and Miscellaneous, making the receipts in all nearly $700,000 in excess of the estimated revenue. It is, however, only fair to say that the large increase in Excise was due to the fact that on the 1st July of the current year, the law respecting the keeping of spirit in tanks for ageing purposes, for two years, came into effect, and that a large withdrawal, contributing duties amounting to $400,000 or $500,000, was thereby thrown upon that year, instead of coming, as it otherwise would, into the current year. Compared with the revenue of 1888-89, there has been an increase of $1,097,055, o which—

Customs gives an increase of	$ 242,170	or 1·02	p.c.
Excise gives an increase of	731,379	" 10·62	"
Miscellaneous gives an increase of	123,506	" 1·51	"
Totals	$1,097,055	" 2·90	"

The following is a list of articles from which we received increased Customs duties in the year under review. None of them are very large, the largest item being that of wines and spirits, which was partly in anticipation and to a certain extent the result of the higher duties which were placed on these last year.

Ale, beer and porter	$ 7,424
Animals, living	15,178
Arrowroot, biscuit, &c	22,359
Grain of all kinds	71,093
Cement	26,804
Coal and coke	96,486
Copper, and manufactures of	7,997
Drugs, dyes, chemicals, and medicines	25,955
Embroideries, N.E.S	4,639
Fish, and products of	4,212
Fruit and nuts (dried)	12,776
Fruits, green	12,598
Gloves and mitts	112,975
Gold and silver, manufactures of	7,616
Gunpowder and other explosives	10,486
Gutta percha and India rubber, manufactures of	29,716
Lead, and manufactures of	16,565
Oils, coal and kerosene	23,486
Oils, all other	26,003
Paper, and manufactures of	23,843
Paints and colours	2,878
Provisions	36,807
Salt	7,149
Soap	19,836
Spirits and wines	179,410
Stone	17,019
Molasses	10,012
Sugar candy	8,787
Seeds and roots	15,713
Tea	5,030
Tobacco, and manufactures of	12,912
Vegetables	21,337
Watches	10,315
Wool, and manufactures of	193,661
All other	254,535

In the undermentioned articles there has been a decrease in the duties collected as compared with 1888-89:

Flour and meal of all kinds	$ 25,586
Brick and tiles	6,215
Carriages	29,384
Cottons, manufactures of	60,988
Fancy goods	9,967

Flax, hemp and jute, manufactures of	$ 17,888
Furs, and manufactures of	11,693
Glass, and manufactures of	15,520
Iron and steel	35,218
Leather, and manufactures of	93,700
Musical instruments	26,248
Silk, manufactures of	38,311
Sugar of all kinds	824,176

I may mention that the largest article in the items of decrease is that of sugar of all kinds, which show a decrease of $824,176, showing that that year was not at all a normal year, the causes for which are variously explained. In Excise an increase has taken place in respect of every item upon which Excise duties are levied, as will be seen from the following table, in which it will be found that there was a large increase in Excise, explained, as I have stated; an increase not to a very large amount in malt, an increase in cigars, and a slight increase in tobaccos and snuffs. In Excise an increase has taken place in respect of every item upon which Excise duties are levied, as will be seen from the following :—

	1888-89.	1889-90.	Duty accrued, 1889-90.	Increase over, 1888-89.
	Gals.	Gals.		
Spirits	2,972,931	3,574,799	$4,617,643	$746,910
	Lbs.	Lbs.		
Malt	51,111,429	54,974,013	557,021	39,597
	No.	No.		
Cigars	92,579,570	98,802,951	593,710	40,008
	Lbs.	Lbs.		
Tobacco and Snuff	9,749,143	9,802,951	1,850,621	12,027
Total			$7,618,995	$838,622

On the whole, it cannot be said this shows a very great increase in the consumption of these liquors the country through, inasmuch as if you take the estimate I made with respect to Excise and the increase of population, the increase *per capita* shows no very great increase over the preceding years, and stands at the present time far less than it did on the average in 1867. This will appear from the following table :—

Per Capata Consumption of Liquors and Tobacco.

	Spirits.	Beer.	Wine.	Tobacco.
	Gals.	Gals.	Gals.	Lbs.
Average since 1867	1·168	2·664	·142	2·117
do 1888-89	·776	3·263	·097	2·153
do 1889-90	·883	3·360	·104	2·143

The expenditure in 1889-90 I estimated at $36,500,000, the actual expenditure was $35,994,031 ; that is, the actual expenditure fell below the estimate $505,969. On the other hand, the expenditure of that year fell below the expenditure of the previous year $923,803. So that, with a saving in expenditure as regards the estimated amount, a saving in the total expenditure as compared with the preceding year and an excess of revenue over what was estimated, there is a gain which accounts for the large surplus over and above what I had anticipated. Increases took place as compared with the expenditures of the previous year, as follows :—

Sinking Fund	$150,593
Civil Government	27,133
Legislation	231,017
Administration of Justice	23,978
Penitentiaries	30,403
Superannuations	22,831
Railways and Canals	25,529

And an increase of $309,603 in the services chargeable to Collection of Revenue. But, on the other hand, there were marked decreases in the following :—

Interest on Public Debt	$492,090
Charges of Management	15,940
Premium, Discount and Exchange	27,242
Immigration	92,408
Quarantine	17,807
Militia	36,538
North-West Mounted Police	76,608
Public Works	326,730
Mail Subsidies, &c	17,939
Ocean and River Service	154,052
Lighthouse and Coast Service	45,664
Marine Hospitals	10,603
Fisheries	26,702
Subsidies to Provinces	146,505
Miscellaneous	237,964

Taking, then, into consideration the fact that the revenue gave more than I anticipated, that the actual expenditure fell below the receipts, I am able to say to the House that on Consolidated Fund Account, after all the services for which appropriations have been made had been taken care of by the Government, there remains a surplus of $3,885,893 over the ordinary receipts. That is not, however, to say that we have the sum of $3,885,893 actually in pocket. There are capital expenditures as follows :—Railways and Canals, $3,419,132 ; on Public Works, $495,421 ; Dominion Lands, $133,832; North-West rebellion claims, $4,773, to which, if we add the railway subsidies, $1,678,196, and the transfer of the Cobourg debentures, $44,496, we have a total capital expenditure of $5,776,301. So that, Mr. Speaker, the account as a whole of expenditure and income stands in this way : That we took care of the ordinary expenses of the country out of the Consolidated Fund, that we laid up in the Sinking Fund against our debt and for the reduction of the debt, $1,887,237, and had a surplus of $3,885,893 which we placed over against capital expenditure, and came out at the end with an increase of debt of only $3,170. It, therefore, appears that the statement I made in this House three years ago, and which met with severe ridicule from hon. gentlemen opposite, comes out very nearly verified. I stated that I thought by 1891 an equilibrium ought to be had between expenditure and income, taking in capital expenditure as well as expenditure on Consolidated Fund account, and this has taken place with the trifling exception of $3,170, which is merely nominal. So that the net debt on 30th June, 1890, is $237,533,211, or within a few dollars of the sum it was one year previous. Sir, it may not be amiss to lay before the House the course of the finances during the last three years. The expenditure on Consolidated Fund in 1887-88 was $36,718,494 ; 1888-89, $36,917,834 ; 1889-90, $35,994,031. The revenue was, 1887-88, $35,908,463; 1888-89, $38,732,870 ; 1889-90, $39,879,925. The deficit in 1887-88 was $810,031, in 1888-89 the surplus was $1,865,035, in 1889-90 it was $3,885,893. The capital expenditure has kept almost the same for three years, being nearly an average of $5,500,000, the amounts being : 1887-88,

$5,464,502; 1888-89, $5,267,035; 1889-90, $5,731,354. The net debt had increased, in 1887-88, $7,216,583; in 1888-89, $2,998,983, and in 1889-90, $3,170. The rate of interest on the gross debt was, in 1887-88, 3·45; in 1888-89, 3·52; in 1889-90, 3·37, the lowest rate it has reached, with the exception of one year, since Confederation. The net rate of interest on debt was, in 1887-88, 3·12; in 1888-89, 3·07; in 1889-90, 2·99, the lowest point it has reached since 1867. The average interest *per capita* on the net debt, which is the burden of the debt on the people as shown by the payment for interest, was, in 1887-88, 1·79; in 1888-89, 1·74; in 1889-90, 1·65, or only 6 cents more per head than it was in 1879, before the Canadian Pacific Railway was begun to be built or the vast expenditure on canals made. Coming now to the present year, which is pretty near completed, and about which, therefore, we have fairly certain data, I may state that the estimate for Customs made last year was $23,500,000, for Excise $7,000,000, and for Miscellaneous $8,700,000, or a total of $39,200,000. Up to 20th June, 1891, the receipts amounted to $36,606,357, and if we receive the same revenue for the remaining ten days as we received last year, the total revenue will reach $38,858,701. So there will be a decrease from my estimate of somewhere in the neighbourhood of $800,000. The expenditure up to 20th June, 1891, was $30,249,329, and if we take the expenditure of last year as a measure for the expenditure for the remaining period of this year, which was $5,619,427, our total expenditure on that basis will be $35,868,757. But between 20th June and 30th June of this year there are extraordinary expenses which were not met in the same period of time last year, the items for legislation, for the census, and one or two others. Therefore we must add $345,000, which will make the expenditure in all probability about the region of $36,000,000, so that the expenditure for 1890-91, deducted from the income of 1890-91, will give for this year a surplus of about $2,100,000, which is again on the right side of the account. The capital expenditure for 1890-91 has been kept far below that of the preceding year. For Public Works we estimate altogether, with what we know has been actually spent, $500,000; Railways and Canals, $2,300,000; Dominion Lands and Railway Subsidies, $1,400,000, making a total capital expenditure in the neighbourhood of $4,200,000. If we take the Sinking Fund, $1,900,000, which again is laid up against our debt and is so much in reduction of debt, and the surplus of $2,100,000, we will find that as between that and the capital expenditure we will come out within $100,000 or $150,000 of being equal, whereas last year we came out within $3,071. This cannot be stated at present to a certainty, but it will not exceed the sum I have named. As regards 1891-92 I cannot make any well-defined estimate. There may be certain changes in the tariff, if the good will of this House carries out the intention of the Government which will affect to a certain extent any estimate which could be made; suffice it to say that the revenues for next year, upon what basis I can estimate for at the present time, will be in the neighbourhood of $37,500,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will you give the details?

Mr. FOSTER. The details I can scarcely give, but I think I will have a little more to say about that by-and-bye. So much, then, with reference to the condition of our finances. I now go to another and, may be, more interesting section of my subject. Last year the House will remember that we had a rather extended revision of the tariff. I am not one of those who believe that in a country like this, with a protective tariff which is based upon the condition of the industries which require protection, and the condition of industries in other countries and of the labour markets of other countries—I am not one of those who believe that there should be a cast-iron tariff for a stated period of years; conditions change, and with them, if we are reasonable and prudent, we must change the conditions of our fiscal policy. Neither am I, on the other hand, one of those who believe that it is best for the general interest of the country that too frequent tariff revisions should be made. This year I have had pressed upon me, not a very large number I must say, but still a considerable number of changes in the tariff, some of which possess great merit, and if I were making a general revision of the tariff I should certainly recommend them for the consideration of the House; but taking into account the fact that last year we had a rather extended tariff revision, that this is a summer session and is going to be a short and a hot one, and that we have commercial negotiations on foot between ourselves and the United States, I put these three considerations together as a very good reason, which I think the House will approve of, for the decision that the Government has come to, to make no general revision of the tariff this year. There is, however, one article which appeals to every man's palate and to most men's pockets, and which has claimed the attention of the people of this country for the last few months more largely than perhaps any other; I refer to the article of sugar. Sugar has always been looked upon in Canada as a large producer of revenue, and it has always been made to pay its tribute into the public treasury. Sugar, in one respect, is one of the best articles possible for distributing the taxation, the rich and the poor use it largely in proportion to their means, it is diffused through every section of the country and is used by every class of the people, and there is possibly no article upon which a part of the revenues of the country can be more equitably placed. For fear that some may have, as some have intimated to me, the idea that the Liberal-Conservative Government is the only Government which has put taxation upon sugar and levied large duties from it, I had a table prepared of the course of the sugar duties of the Dominion of Canada, since 1868, and I find that commencing in 1868 with a tax of 1 cent a pound, and 25 per cent. upon all over No. 9 Dutch standard, we have gone on consecutively raising the impost in 1878, 1879 and 1882—I think that was the last revision of the sugar duties, if I mistake not. Therefore a large proportion of the revenue of the country in all these periods from 1868 up to the present time has been obtained from the article of sugar. The course of the sugar industry has been a remarkable one in this country; upon it two parties have had their policies clearly and sharply defined, and I have prepared the following table for insertion in the Official Debates of the House on this subject:

SUGAR ENTERED FOR HOME CONSUMPTION IN CANADA DURING YEARS NAMED.

Year ended June 30.	Quantity.	Value.	Duty Collected.	Rate of Duty.	Cost per lb. of Sugar.	Duty per lb. of Sugar.	Per cent. Raw Sugar.	Per cent. Refined.
	Lbs.	$	$	p. c.	Cents.	Cents.		
1878	109,463,915	6,186,226	2,595,074	41·95	5·65	2·37	6	94
1880	116,847,050	3,404,287	2,026,692	51·93	3·35	1·73	68	32
1881	136,406,513	5,110,993	2,459,142	48·00	3·74	1·80	78	22
1882	135,329,697	4,846,066	2,999,761	47·50	3·59	1·70	88	12
1883	152,729,569	5,091,530	2,467,730	48·00	3·33	1·61	94	6
1884	173,742,477	5,509,429	2,609,509	47·36	3·17	1·50	94	10
1885	200,011,541	5,100,478	2,544,920	50·00	2·55	1·27	95	5
1886	177,897,735	4,573,574	2,303,397	50·30	2·57	1·29	94	6
1887	200,466,072	4,862,042	3,167,528	65·20	2·42	1·58	93	7
1888	201,839,821	5,154,143	3,433,334	61·50	2·55	1·70	92	8
1889	223,841,171	5,837,895	3,675,724	62·96	2·60	1·64	95	5
1890	174,045,720	5,186,158	2,851,547	55·20	2·92	1·63	94	6

In 1878, under the regime and policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, this country imported and took for home consumption 109,000,000 pounds of sugar at a value of $6,186,000 paid to the outside producer, with a duty of $2,595,000, the rate of duty being 41 per cent. That sugar cost 5·65 cents per pound, the duty upon it was 2·37 cents per pound, and the extraordinary fact—not extraordinary, but remarkable fact which I wish noted is that of this sugar, only 6 per cent. was raw while 94 per cent. was refined, and had been refined by the labour and the capital and within the confines of other countries than our own. What I want to note in that is, the small consumption of sugar, the very large price paid to the outside world for it, the high cost per pound as payment to the outside world, the high duty per pound, and the almost total absence of the refining industry in this country. Well, Sir, in 1879, another policy was introduced; that was the policy of refining the sugar in our own country. That year had its results, and, in 1880, 118,800,000 pounds of sugar was taken for home consumption, costing $4,000,000 instead of $6,000,000, with a cost per pound of 3·35 cents instead of 5·65 cents, and a duty of 1·75 cents per pound instead of 2·37 cents, and with the other result, that the percentage of raw sugar imported rose from 6 to 68, and the percentage of refined sugar fell from 94 to 32. And so has gone on the history and progress of the sugar question until 1889, the last normal year, when, without disturbance of McKinley Bills, prospective or actual, the consumption of sugar in the Dominion of Canada reached the enormous amount of 223,841,171 pounds, more than twice the quantity consumed in 1878, the cost of that quantity being $5,000,000 to us as regards the outside world, as against $6,000,000 in 1878 for less than half the amount—2·60 cents per pound being the cost and 1·64 cents per pound the duty, whilst the amount of sugar brought in raw, and refined in this country, rose to 95 per cent., and the refined sugar brought into the country fell to 5 per cent. This table will be for the members on both sides of the House to see and to criticize. What I want to draw the attention of the House to is the fact of the decreased burdens represented in the reduced price we have paid for sugar to the outside world, in the cheaper sugar itself, in the lower duty per pound, in the increased consumption, due, in part, to greater cheapness, and to the growth of the industry of refining in our own country, amounting at the present time to 95 per cent. of all the sugar that we use in this country, and a further accompanying result, the enlarged trade with the native sugar-growing and producing countries. So that, whereas in 1878 our sugar was bought, refined, entirely from Great Britain and the United States, almost none coming from the countries of production, now it is mostly all from countries of production, and an increased trade takes place between ourselves and them as a consequence. Now, Sir, at this particular juncture of circumstances, it becomes necessary for the Government to look over the whole question and to consider its policy with reference to this question of sugar. The amount which was consumed in 1889, the last full year, was 223,841,171 pounds, from which a duty was collected of $3,675,724. If the Government yield to the demand for free sugar, it has to face the reduction of the duties in a normal year of pretty near $3,675,000, because the most of that is upon raw sugar, very little being refined sugar. Taking the last three normal years, we will say roughly that the amount of the duty which has accrued, has been $3,500,000 per year, and it is a difficult question for a Government to face, considering, on the one hand, its desire to give cheap sugar to the masses of the people, and on the other, the imperative necessity for maintaining a fair balance between expenditure and revenue. But the Government has looked over this whole question, and on two conditions, it has come to the conclusion to sweep away, from the burden of the great mass of the people, with one stroke of the pen, $3,500,000 of taxation; and I venture to say, Sir, that never in the history of Canada, either before Confederation or since Confederation, has any Government come down to the House with such a large reduction of taxes as is involved in this proposition.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Now let us hear your conditions.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman asks for my conditions. I shall present them to the House in all kindness, and yet with all the emphasis pos-

sible. They are two—first, that we shall assent to a greater economy in public expenditures.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Good; hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. I am glad to know that I have the assent of hon. members opposite to that proposal, and I know, and knew previous to this, that I would have the assent of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House; and I promise them and the House that if this Government continues to supervise the expenditures—as we intend to do despite the different motions for adjournment which may, from time to time, be moved—we shall practise this economy in no niggardly spirit, but we will, while giving cheap and free sugar to the people, give them as much as the country ought reasonably to ask for the public works and services and improvements of the country. The other condition is that there shall be compensating duties to a certain extent

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. Hon. gentlemen must not say "oh" yet. You must not expect to have all the sugar without having something bitter to mix with it. The compensating duty will not be to the full amount of the burden of taxation of which the country will be relieved; for, while we propose to take off $3,500,000, we propose to ask the House to allow us to put on $1,500,000, and the question is, where can that be put? It has been urged that we should put a duty on tea and coffee, and if we followed the example of hon. gentlemen opposite, an example which in the main is bad, and which in this instance I do not propose to follow, we would clap a duty of 2 and 3 cents a pound on coffee, and 5 and 6 cents a pound upon tea, and thereby invade the poor man's breakfast-table afresh. Instead of doing that, we propose to make the breakfast-table a freedom in reality—to keep the coffee free, to keep the tea free, and to give the sugar free as well; and we look to a different source for raising the $1,500,000, a source from which we think it can be raised most easily, with the least burden upon the great masses of the people, and we hope with the least dissatisfaction to the country at large. I propose to ask that the House consent to the imposition of 1 cent per pound additional on malt. Malt has, up to the present, with few exceptions, borne a duty of 1 cent per pound, and this addition will add, according to my calculation, 3 cents in cost to every gallon of beer; and I ask the brewers, the maltsters, the wholesale sellers and retail sellers, and, if need be, the drinkers, to divide this 3 cents among them and make a cheerful and pleasant face over it. This, on the basis of last year's consumption of malt, will give a revenue in the neighbourhood of $500,000. For fear there should be any jealousy in this matter, I propose to ask the distillers to consent to the imposition of a slight increase in the Excise duty upon distilled spirits, which will add but very little, 20 cents per gallon, to the cost of that article; and if it is necessary, I want to ask the distillers, and the wholesale sellers, and the retail traders, and the drinkers as well, to divide this equitably among them and make a pleasant face over the operation. That increase will give, upon the basis of last year's output, about $600,000; and then, that we may all have our luxuries put on an even basis, I am going to ask the tobacco men to submit to 5 cents per pound upon tobacco as an Excise duty, and a similar amount upon the import, which will figure up to $400,000. All these, added together, will give $1,500,000; and with the imposition of $1,500,000 taxes in these ways, which I think the great mass of the people will approve, when we take into account the large relief given to them, we propose to remit the sugar tax of $3,500,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are the sugar duties to be absolutely and totally abolished without reserve?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman must understand me to mean, as I have no doubt he does, that when I have said that the duty upon raw sugars amounted to $3,500,000 and that it is remitted, it is the duty of course upon raw sugar which is remitted.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. Hon. gentlemen opposite would even violate the precious example of the United States, when all along they have been asking us to imitate their example and be guided by them in all our commercial policy.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman's proposition, as I understand it, is to leave the duties on refined sugar as they are and free raw sugar.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman must wait until I get through, when, I trust, all will be made plain. I hold in my hand a list of the resolutions which I propose to ask the House to go into committee upon after the hon. gentleman has replied, and I will briefly run over the recommendations which I propose to make to the committee. A change will be made in the molasses duty, which at present is 1½ cents per gallon. The change that will be made is that all molasses between certain degrees, 40 and 56, which takes in all fairly good and extra molasses, shall pay the duty they now pay of 1½ cents per gallon, but when they test over 56 degrees, they become in reality of the consistency and value of sugar, and come in free, as does all raw sugar. When they test less than 40 degrees, they approach that perilously narrowed margin beyond which lies the mass of stuff which is sometimes imposed upon the people for molasses, but which is simply rubbish, with, coming down to certain degrees, scarcely a percentage of saccharine matter in it at all. I propose that the duty shall be 1½ cents per gallon below 40 degrees, and one-quarter of 1 cent per degree additional as it grades below, in order to protect consumers from the stuff which is known as "black strap" or something worse, being mere washings, and doctored products, which no man ought to put in his mouth and think he is taking molasses. In addition to the foregoing rates, I propose to keep up what is in the present tariff, a specific duty in all cases of 2½ cents per gallon, when not imported direct without transhipment. Upon all cane sugar and beet root sugar, and so on, not over No. 14 Dutch standard in colour,—that is, the raw sugar which comes in free—upon all that kind, when not imported direct without transhipment from the country of growth and production I propose to keep the same duty on as at present—the same relative duty, I mean. There was charged on this before, 7½ per cent. of the duty, and what I propose to put on now is 5 per cent. of the value, which is as near as can be equivalent

to 7½ per cent. of the duty. There is also a provision that in all the cases of cane sugar produced in the East Indies and exported therefrom *viâ* Hong Kong, such rate of 5 per cent. *ad valorem* shall not be exacted, if the sugar is transhipped at Hong Kong. A trade of large prospective growth is opening up between us and the East Indian sugar-producing countries by way of Hong Hong and the Canadian Pacific Railway Steamship Line and railway lines, and for the benefit of the western coast especially and Canada as a whole, I propose that sugar so imported shall not be subject to the duty of 5 per cent. Now, then, my hon. friend will get his answer. The duties now upon raw sugar, which the refiner has to pay in order to make his better grades of sugar, it being so much per pound and so much per degree over 70 degrees, amounts to about 2 cents per pound on granulated. The amount of protection that the refiner has at present on refined sugar amounts to about 3 cents, so that there is a difference in the neighbourhood of 1 cent between what he has to pay on his raw material required to make a pound of refined sugar and the pound of refined sugar that he competes with. All those sugars which come in under that head are to be not free, but to bear a duty of eight-tenths of 1 cent per pound. That is the duty upon refined sugars and upon all over No. 14 Dutch standard. Under the old tariff, glucose or grape sugar came under the general rate. As we have changed the tariff in regard to the rest, we have placed the duty on glucose or grape sugar at 1½ cents per lb. Cut tobacco, which is now 40 cents and 12½ per cent., is to be 45 cents and 12½ per cent. Manufactured tobacco and snuff, which is now at 30 cents and 12½ per cent., is to be 35 cents and 12½ per cent. Ale, beer and porter, when imported in casks or otherwise than in bottles, which is now at 10 cents per gallon, becomes 13 cents per gallon; and ale, beer and porter, when imported in bottles, which is now 18 cents per gallon, becomes 21 cents per gallon. That is, that what is added to the cost of malt liquors by the addition of a cent a pound on malt, is added to the imported articles in order to make the equivalent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You might state what the equivalent is?

Mr. FOSTER. 3 cents a gallon. The House will recollect that I have asked that 20 cents be added to the Excise duty. Last year I raised the duty on imported spirits and wines, while I made no change in the Excise duty, and it was argued by some hon. gentlemen that I had disturbed the proper proportion which should exist and that some addition should be made to the Excise duty as well. After looking over the whole question, I have come to the conclusion to restore pretty nearly the former equilibrium by adding 20 cents on Excise, while making a smaller increase on the imported article, so that the relative position of the two is brought back to nearly the position they previously occupied.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Did you take account of that in estimating for the million and a half?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. In regard to the import duties, I do not look for much increase. The increased duty is small and it may have the effect of reducing the importation, and I have made no estimate for any particular increase in that branch. There is another article in which we have decided to make a change, and that is the article of salt, which is now at 10 cents and 15 cents per 100 lbs., and which we propose to reduce one-half, making it 5 cents and 7½ cents. This we have been impelled to do because we considered that, owing to the protection which was given and certain combinations which have been entered into, a monopoly has been created, and it is a wise and prudent thing for us to meet that state of things by reducing the duty one-half. It will also be observed that it is provided that these resolutions shall take effect on and after the 24th June, 1891:

"Provided, however, that nothing herein shall be construed as excepting any sugars now held to be in bond for refining purposes in any bonded premises connected with or occupied in whole or in part by any sugar refinery, which may be found on examination of the stock in such premises to have been removed therefrom, from payment of the duty properly payable thereon under item No. 419 in schedule A to the Act, chap. 33, Revised Statutes, which shall continue in force as regards such sugars, until proper entry thereof and payment of duty thereon has been made."

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does that cover sugar in bond in merchants' bonded warehouses?

Mr. FOSTER. It covers all the sugar put in bond by the refiners, no matter where they may be.

Mr. BOWELL. It covers everything in bond.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The wholesale men have lately been allowed to hold sugar in bond.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, it covers that.

Mr. FOSTER. There is another matter to which I will refer. Certain members of the House have been aware that during the last ten or fifteen years a great change has taken place in the world in reference to the production of sugar. Whereas, a few years ago, a very small proportion of the world's consumption of sugar was other than cane sugar, within the last ten years, in European countries especially, a great change has taken place. The cultivation of the beet has been encouraged, and beet root sugar has been manufactured under Government bounties; and this has been so successful under that system that at the present time a little more than 65 per cent. of the world's consumption of sugar is made from the beet. For the last twelve or thirteen years we in Canada have had more or less spasmodic or continued attempts to introduce the culture of the beet in order to make sugar therefrom. The attempts have been to a large extent experimental, and I do not think, from what information I have so far, that the results can be said to have been successful. However, I am not here to-day to argue that question *pro* or *con*. I have my own opinion in reference to it. I am not here to say that I believe that, by the introduction of the bounty system in Canada, it will be possible for us, under fair conditions and without undue impositions on the people, to make the cultivation of beet in this country successful, with our climate, our soil, our prices of labour and all the attendant circumstances, but I am not unmindful of the fact that in the Province of Quebec there are one or two beet root sugar factories whose promoters have gone in good faith into the enterprise of the manufacture of beet root sugar. They have their machinery there, they have made their investments, they have sowed their beets, and they are now, through the farmers,

raising the crop for this year, and to take off all the protection they had when they commenced the season's operations would appear to be a hardship, and I think will so strike hon. members of this House. So that I have this to recommend, that for one year, this season only, whatever beet root sugar is made wholly from the beet in the Dominion of Canada, shall be paid, out of the finances of the country, a bounty equal to the protection which it would have enjoyed if the tariff had remained for the year as it was when the farmers planted their beets and went into that industry. When I make this statement I also wish it to be accompanied by the emphatic statement, that this proposition does not commit me or the Government to the principle of bounty with reference to the culture of beet root sugar in this country ; we do not propose to commit ourselves to that principle, and the legislation we ask for now is for this season only, and solely upon the grounds which I have mentioned to the House, and which I believe will approve themselves to the fair sense of the House.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does the hon. gentleman know the amount of bounty per pound?

Mr. FOSTER. I will read the resolution :

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that, under such regulations and restrictions as may be by the Minister of Customs deemed necessary, there may be paid to the producers of any raw beet root sugar produced in Canada wholly from beets grown therein between the first day of July, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-one, and the first day of July, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-two, a bounty equal to one dollar per one hundred pounds, and in addition thereto, three and one-third cents per one hundred pounds for each degree or fraction of a degree of test by polariscope over seventy degrees.

This will apply to the present season only, when the farmers have distributed their seed and are looking forward to the season's operations, and it secures to them the amount of protection which they would have had under the tariff as it was at the time when they sowed their seed.

Mr. SCRIVER. What about maple sugar?

Mr. FOSTER. Maple sugar remains just as sweet and just as good as it was, without any bounty. I have another resolution which I will read on behalf of the Minister of Customs :

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the Act, Chapter 32, Revised Statutes, intituled "An Act respecting the Customs," by repealing section 94 thereof—respecting the refining in bond of sugar, molasses or other material from which refined sugar can be produced.

Now, of course, that the Government has taken the duty off from raw sugar, there needs to be no regulation, or no law upon which regulations can be based, for the refining of sugar in bond. Mr. Speaker, I thank you, and I thank the House, for their kindly indulgence in the remarks I have made, and their kindly reception of the conclusions which the Government, through me, have been able to announce. I beg leave now to move that the House resolve itself into Committee of Ways and Means on the following resolutions :—

1. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to amend the Act, chapter 33, Revised Statutes, intituled : "An Act respecting the Duties of Customs," by repealing the items numbered 9, 10, 400, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423 and 431, in schedule "A" to the said Act; and to amend the Act 50-51 Victoria, chapter 39, intituled; "An Act to amend the Act respecting the Duties of Customs," by repealing the items numbered 126, 127 and 128, under section 1 of the said Act; and to amend the Act 53 Victoria, chapter 20, intituled : "An Act to amend the Acts respecting the Duties of Customs," by repealing the items numbered 148, 156, 157, 158, 159, 165 and 166, under section 10 of the said Act,—

and to provide otherwise by enacting that the following rates of duty be substituted in lieu thereof :—

1. All molasses and (or syrup N.O.P., including all tank bottoms and) or tank washings, all cane juice and (or concentrated cane juice, and all beet-root juice and) or concentrated beet-root juice, when imported direct, without transhipment, from the country of growth and production.
   (*a*) Testing by polariscope, forty degrees or over and not over fifty-six degrees, a specific duty of one and one-half cents per gallon.
   (*b*) When testing less than forty degrees, a specific duty of one and one-half cents per gallon and in addition thereto, one-fourth of one cent per gallon for each degree or fraction of a degree less than forty degrees.
   (*c*) And in addition to the foregoing rates, a further specific duty in all cases of two and one-half cents per gallon when not so imported direct without transhipment.
2. All cane sugar and or beet-root sugar not above number fourteen Dutch Standard in colour, all sugar sweepings, all sugar drainings or pumpings drained in transit, all melado and or concentrated melado, all molasses and or concentrated molasses N.E.S., all cane juice and or concentrated cane juice N.E.S., all beet-root juice and or concentrated beet-root juice N.E.S., all tank bottoms, N.E.S., and concrete, when not imported direct without transhipment from the country of growth and production, five per cent. *ad valorem* : provided, however, that in the case of cane sugar produced in the East Indies and imported therefrom *viâ* Hong Kong, such rate of five per cent. *ad valorem* shall not be exacted if transhipped at Hong Kong.
3. All sugars above number fourteen Dutch Standard in colour, and refined sugar of all kinds, grades or standards, and all sugar syrups derived from refined sugars, a specific duty of eight-tenths of a cent per pound.
4. Glucose or grape sugar, glucose syrup and, or corn syrup, a specific duty on one and one-half cents per pound.
5. Cut tobacco, forty-five cents per pound and twelve and one-half per cent. *ad valorem*.
6. Manufactured tobacco, N.E.S., and snuff, thirty-five cents per pound and twelve and one-half per cent. *ad valorem*.
7. Ale, beer and porter, when imported in casks or otherwise than in bottles, thirteen cents per gallon.
8. Ale, beer and porter, when imported in bottles (six quart or twelve pint bottles to be held to contain one gallon) twenty-one cents per gallon.
9. Spirituous or alcoholic liquors, distilled from any material, or containing or compounded from or with distilled spirits of any kind, and any mixture thereof with water, for every gallon thereof of the strength of proof, and when of a greater strength than that of proof, at the same rate on the increased quantity that there would be if the liquors were reduced to the strength of proof. When the liquors are of a less strength than that of proof, the duty shall be at the rate herein provided, but computed on a reduced quantity of the liquors in proportion to the lesser degree of strength ; provided, however, that no reduction in quantity shall be computed or made on any liquors below the strength of fifteen per cent. under proof, but all such liquors shall be computed as of the strength of fifteen per cent. under proof, as follows :—
   (*a*) Ethyl alcohol, or the substance commonly known as alcohol, hydrated oxide of ethyl or spirits of wine ; gin of all kinds, N.E.S.; rum, whiskey, and all spirituous or alcoholic liquors, N.O.P., two dollars and twelve and one-half cents per gallon.
   (*b*) Amyl alcohol or fusil oil, or any substance known as potato spirits or potato oil, two dollars and twelve and one-half cents per gallon.
   (*c*) Methyl alcohol, wood alcohol, wood naphtha, pyroxylic spirit, or any substance known as wood spirit or methylated spirit; absinthe, arrack or palm spirit, brandy, including artificial brandy and imitations of brandy ; cordials and liquours of all kinds, N.E.S., mescal, pulque, rum shrub, schiedam and other schnapps; tafia, angostura and similar alcoholic bitters or beverages, two dollars and twelve and one-half cents per gallon.
   (*d*) Spirits and strong waters of any kind, mixed with any ingredient or ingredients, and being known or designated as anodynes, elixirs, essences, extracts, lotions, tinctures or medicines, N.E.S., two dollars and twelve and one-half cents per gallon, and thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

(*e*) Alcoholic perfumes and perfumed spirits, bay rum, cologne and lavender waters, hair, tooth and skin washes, and other toilet preparations containing spirits of any kind, when in bottles or flasks weighing not more than four ounces each, fifty per cent. *ad valorem*; when in bottles, flasks, or other packages weighing more than four ounces each, two dollars and twelve and one-half cents per gallon, and forty per cent. *ad valorem*.

(*f*) Nitrous ether, sweet spirits of nitre and aromatic spirits of ammonia, two dollars and twelve and one-half cents per gallon, and thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

(*g*) Vermouth and ginger wine, containing not more than forty per cent. of proof spirits, seventy-five cents; if containing more than forty per cent. of proof spirits, two dollars and twelve and one-half cents per gallon.

(*h*) In all cases where the strength of any of the foregoing articles cannot be correctly ascertained by the direct application of the hydrometer, it shall be ascertained by the distillation of a sample, or in such other manner as the Minister of Customs directs.

10. Champagne and all other sparkling wines, in bottles containing each not more than a quart and more than one pint, three dollars and thirty cents per dozen bottles; containing not more than a pint each and more than one-half pint, one dollar and sixty-five cents per dozen bottles; containing one-half pint each or less, eighty-two cents per dozen bottles: bottles containing more than one quart each shall pay, in addition to three dollars and thirty cents per dozen bottles, at the rate of one dollar and sixty-five cents per gallon on the quantity in excess of one quart per bottle, the quarts and pints in each case being old wine measure; in addition to the above specific duty, there shall be an *ad valorem* duty of thirty per cent.
11. Salt, coarse, five cents per one hundred pounds (not to include salt imported from the United Kingdom or any British possession, or salt imported for the use of the sea or gulf fisheries, which shall be free of duty).
12. Salt, fine, in bulk, five cents per one hundred pounds.
13. Salt in bags, barrels or other packages, seven and one-half cents per one hundred pounds, the bags, barrels or other packages to bear the same duty as if imported empty.

2. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that there be added to the schedule "C," to the Act, Chapter 33, Revised Statutes, as being exempt from Customs duties, the following, viz.:—

All cane sugar and, or beet root sugar not above number fourteen, Dutch Standard, in colour, all sugar sweepings, all sugar drainings or pumpings drained in transit, all melado and, or concentrated melado, all molasses and, or concentrated molasses, N.O.P., all cane juice and, or concentrated cane juice, N.O.P., all beet root juice, and, or concentrated beet root juice, N.O.P., all tank bottoms, N.O.P., and concrete, when imported direct without transhipment from the country of growth and production, Free.

3. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to amend the Act, Chapter 32, Revised Statutes, intituled: "An Act respecting the Customs," by repealing section 94 thereof, respecting the refining in bond of sugar, molasses or other material from which refined sugar can be produced.

4. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide, that under such regulations and restrictions as may be by the Minister of Customs deemed necessary, there may be paid to the producers of any raw beet root sugar produced in Canada wholly from beets grown therein, between the first day of July, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-one, and the first day of July, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-two, a bounty equal to one dollar per one hundred pounds; and, in addition thereto, three and one-third cents per one hundred pounds for each degree or fraction of a degree of test by polariscope over seventy degrees.

5. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to repeal so much of sections 130, 192, 177 and 258 of the Act 49 Victoria, chapter 34, and of any Acts amending the same, so far as the said sections or amendments thereto determine the Excise duties to be levied upon the respective articles hereinafter mentioned; and to provide that the Excise duties thereon shall hereafter be as follows:—

1. Upon spirits, as described in sub-section (*a*) of the above first cited section, one dollar and fifty cents.
2. Upon spirits, as described in sub-section (*b*) of the said section, one dollar and fifty-two cents.
3. Upon spirits, as described in sub-section (*c*) of the said section, one dollar and fifty-three cents.
4. Upon malt, as described in sub-sections (*a* and *b*) of section one hundred and ninety-two, for every pound, two cents.
5. Upon fermented beverages, made in imitation of malt liquor, as described in section one hundred and seventy-seven, on every gallon, eight cents.
6. Upon tobacco, as described in the first five paragraphs of section two hundred and fifty-eight—for every pound, twenty-five cents.

Except that cut tobacco when put up in packages of one-twentieth of a pound or less, shall, on every pound, pay forty cents.

7. Upon cigarettes, as described in the sixth paragraph of the said section—two dollars per thousand.
8. Upon snuff, as described in paragraph nine of the said section—on every pound, eighteen cents.
9. Upon snuff, as described in paragraphs ten and eleven of said section—on every pound, twenty-five cents.

6. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that the foregoing Resolutions and the alterations thereby made in the duties of Customs and Excise on the articles therein mentioned, shall take effect on and after twenty-fourth day of June, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-one.

Provided, however, that nothing herein shall be construed as exempting any sugars now held to be in bond for refining purposes, in any bonded premises connected with, or occupied in whole or in part, by any sugar refinery, which may be found on examination of the stock in such premises to have been removed therefrom, from payment of the duty properly payable thereon, under item number 419, in Schedule "A" to the Act, Chapter 33, Revised Statutes, which shall continue in force as regards such sugars, until proper entry thereof and payment of duty thereon, has been made.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, so far as regards what I may call the more mechanical portion of the Budget, that is to say, a fair and reasonable presentation of the several financial facts with which we are tolerably well familiar through the Trade and Navigation Returns, also through the Estimates laid on the Table, and the Public Accounts, I have no fault whatever to find with my hon. friend opposite. But I think it will strike the House as somewhat curious, after the various declarations we have heard from time to time from that hon. gentleman and his associates, of their desire to retain complete and absolute independence of the neighbouring Republic, of their determination to go their own path unchecked and untrammelled by any American legislation, to observe that by far the most important change which he mentions to-day, and by far the most important act that was done during recess by the Finance Minister, has been done, I may say, in obedience to, and at the dictation of, the United States Government. Why is it, Sir, that the hon. gentleman has come down to-day and has proposed to abolish, not the duties on sugar, as I shall presently show the House, but the duties on raw sugar? Is it because the hon. gentleman had been convinced that it was in the interest of the public to do so? Not a bit of it, Sir; it is solely because the United States Government had taken similar legislation about a year ago, and our hon. friend, in humble obedience and subservience to the United States, has followed suit. Now, Sir, during the late recess, another most important alteration in the policy of the loyal and independent set of hon. gentlemen opposite, took place. A year or two ago, with great flourish of trumpets, for the sake of protecting our forests, for the sake of encouraging our lumber manufacturers, those gentlemen had determined that it was in the highest degree necessary, in the interest of the people of Canada, that an export duty should be placed on logs. Sir, the Government of the United States told these hon. gentlemen: You must abolish that duty at your peril, or we will

tax the timber coming into this country from Canada; and straightway, during the recess, our friends scarcely waited until the ink of the President's signature to the McKinley tariff was dry, when, in obedience to this dictation from Washington, they straightway abolished the export duty, and set another example of subservience to American tariff legislation. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman—and perhaps therein he was well advised—said very little indeed about certain facts to which I will call your attention, which disclosed themselves in the Estimates which he has recently submitted. I think he might well enough have said a word or two about that. It was rather a curious omission on the hon. gentleman's part, that he did not think fit to go over the Estimates which he has submitted to us. I do not much object to that myself, because they are in the hands of every hon. gentleman, who can see them for himself. But I can fancy, Mr. Speaker, why it was that my hon. friend did not care to call our attention in particular to those Estimates which he has recently submitted. I have glanced at those Estimates a little, and I would say, after looking at them, that they are, to my mind, very suspicious, in fact I do not think those Estimates are the Estimates originally submitted by my hon. friend to Council. They look to me very like Estimates which have been taken and hacked, as I may say; they look to me very much like Estimates which have been prepared or doctored for a particular purpose and emergency. There is one very remarkable thing about them. On the whole the decreases and the increases in the Estimates for 1892 very nearly balance each other; but the House will do well to notice one thing curious about them, that whereas, on the face of them, the reductions the hon. gentleman has made are in their essence purely temporary reductions which it is very unlikely he will be able to maintain (although I can assure him that we will do our best on this side to encourage him in his new-born zeal for the reduction of the expenditure on public works) these reductions, as the House will see, are all purely temporary in character, but the increases, Mr. Speaker, one and all, are there to stay. Sir, we look at Public Works and we see a reduction of $624,135, and it is not for me to say, in view of certain recent developments, that the hon. gentleman and his colleagues are not perfectly right in thinking that the smaller the sum put at the disposal of the Public Works Department, the better for the morals and good government of this country. The second item, I notice, is this: The hon. gentleman has reduced the supplies for destitute Indians by $119,731.

Mr. FOSTER. They are getting more self-sustaining.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They are said to be so, I know; but the Governor General's warrants we have seen on a great many occasions remind us of the means by which the hon. gentleman, if it be found necessary, as I fear it may be, may increase the expenditure. I should be very glad indeed if that reduction becomes a permanent one; but for years and years we have seen that kind of reduction attempted, and year after year we have found under Governor General's warrants or under supplementary estimates the sum ordinarily expended re-demanded and re-voted by this House. And so that, also, is one of those items which I would not advise the hon. Minister to build upon too much. Then I see, and this makes up, let it be remembered, the bulk of all these reductions, that the hon. gentleman proposes a reduction in the subsidies to the ocean steamship service, of $126,000. How does he pretend to tell us, in view of what we know was pledged by the High Commissioner at Quebec, and in view of his own statement, that he expected to have a fast line equal in all respects to the fastest line now plying between New York and Liverpool, that that is to be looked upon as a permanent reduction? On the contrary, if we take the hon. gentleman's estimate we might strike our pens through the item and place plus $500,000 instead of minus $126,000, and if the hon. gentleman thinks himself in the slightest degree bound by the statement made not long since at Quebec by the High Commissioner, instead of $500,000, we will have $750,000, as the annual expenditure to which this country is now pledged. But when I turn to the other side I find, as I have said, the increases are there to stay. First, we find that the Post Office, which, including the charges for its head department, now costs us over $1,000,000 more than the annual expenditure, demands a further sum of $274,110. Does the House want to know why, when there is a deficit of well nigh $1,000,000, we are asked for an additional sum of $274,110 annually, forever? The reason is this: By a most curious coincidence, I do not say it is anything more, by a sequence of events, the Postmaster General visited the President of the Canadian Pacific Railway a few days before a certain interesting letter appeared, which a good many hon. gentlemen heard of in their constituencies, and now we find the first instalment of that arrangement I speak of in the shape of an addition to our expenditure for the Post Office service of $274,000. I find that our public works, which are such a credit to us, the management of which, and I include our railways as well as our ordinary public works, has reflected such infinite credit on the people of this Dominion, demand for the current year $401,768 more. This is an increase which has come to stay. That is a proof of the wise discretion with which our public works have been administered, a proof of the wisdom of aiding cut-throat lines for the purpose of adding to the enormous deficit which we have incurred on our Intercolonial and other railways. Sir, looking over the hon. gentleman's speech as a whole, there are two things which are very clear to me, there are two things which I think will be very clear to the House, and one of these is this, that the hon. gentleman, whatever his qualifications for his office may be, is at present very ill-acquainted with the conditions of large and important sections of the country. Were it otherwise, the hon. gentleman would most assuredly not have indulged in the statements he made respecting the general prosperity of our people. Although the hon. gentleman in his time has been a professional philanthropist, nevertheless I have never believed he was at bottom a cruel-hearted man, and, therefore, I think it is ignorance on his part which has induced him to describe the present condition of this country as one of considerable and even of great prosperity as what he called a united, a happy, a prosperous, a right-minded, a progressive people. He described our prospects as of the brightest, the condition of

a sound one, and everything was going well. Sir, I take issue in the strongest possible manner with the hon. gentleman. I do not mean to say that to-day in Canada we have reached the last stage of trade degradation in which large bodies of the people are in actual need of food.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So far as moral degradation is concerned, hon. gentlemen opposite have tried hard to drag us there, and have succeeded only too well, as certain investigations are proving, and as their past history from 1873 shows, too. But the hon. Minister, I believe, spoke in ignorance. I tell the hon. gentleman and those around him—and there are plenty of hon. gentlemen who can corroborate everything I say—that, to-day, in large sections of the country, among the most prosperous portions in former times, there are a great many men who, day after day and hour after hour, are finding it harder to make ends meet, who are having to contend with daily depreciation in the value of their farms, who have to look forward, unless some change, and a great change, too, is brought about within a reasonable period, to seeing themselves sink from the condition of prosperous and independent yeomen to that of mere day labourers on the farms which they once owned, or, what is almost worse, who find themselves with highly-mortgaged farms, utterly unable to extricate themselves from the clutches of the usurer. That is the condition to-day, I tell the hon. gentleman and his friends, of a large number of our fellow-countrymen in what were formerly the most prosperous portions of Canada. That is one thing which the hon. gentleman has not understood, which the hon. gentleman has not appreciated, but which, before the end of this debate, I think the country at large will be made to appreciate and understand.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). In what portion of the Dominion does this condition prevail?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. From one end of Ontario to the other, in what were the most prosperous portions of Canada.

Mr. McNEILL. What about free trade England?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There are provinces in which the hon. Minister can hardly show one county in ten where the rural population to-day is not absolutely decreasing in number, and he cannot show one in fifty where the farms of the people are within 25 or, perhaps, 33 per cent. of the value they were twelve years ago. That is clear. The hon. gentleman does not understand the condition of the large mass of his fellow-countrymen to-day. Another thing which is at least equally plain and equally clear in every syllable of the hon. gentleman's speech is, that he does not at the present moment entertain the slightest hope, and I fear if the truth was known, the hon. gentleman and his colleagues do not entertain the slightest real desire, to obtain a reciprocity treaty of any form, kind or shape, from the people of the United States. I do the hon. gentleman the justice to say that when he spoke on this question he spoke with bated breath and whispering humbleness. He did not absolutely despair of obtaining a reciprocity treaty; he thought it was just possible it might be obtained. Well, he could not well have said less, and, knowing what he does, he could not well have said more as to the prospects of obtaining a reciprocity treaty under his guidance and management, and on the conditions which he lays down as those which alone he would accept. But, Sir, after all said and done, why should our hon. friend desire reciprocity so long as the Government has funds? So long as the till is full that is all that the hon. gentleman feels bound to regard. It is no concern of his, it is no concern of his colleagues, it is no concern of his colleagues' paymasters and bottle-holders, how the mass of the people fare. This policy of excessive taxation, I grant you, suits certain interested parties, and suits them well; these persons control the Government of Canada, these sustain the Government of Canada; the thing is a fair equation, as the hon. gentleman would say; the Government gives these interested parties the power to plunder the people and in return they are always ready, and why should they not be, to tithe the plunder for the purpose of keeping the hon. gentleman and his friends in power. And so, Sir, with cash on hand, plus Gerrymander Act, plus Franchise Acts, Railway Subsidies, Quebec Harbour Works and all that depends thereon, everything goes merrily as a marriage bell in the hon. gentleman's opinion; and to quote Mr. Lowell:

> "Each sturdy protectionist gets what he axes,
> And the people: their annual soft sawder and taxes."

Now, Sir, what is the real condition of things here in Canada? The real condition of things here in Canada is this;—and the hon. gentleman knows it well, and the census which is about to be taken, and as to which we are about to get information if it be fairly and honestly taken, will confirm every statement that I make—the actual condition of things in Canada, which ought to be one of the most prosperous and progressive countries on the face of the earth, is: that of every male born in Canada within the last fifty years, probably to-day one man in three is to be found a denizen of the United States. Our condition in Canada to-day is that after twenty years have come and gone, after $100,000,000 of the capital of the people of the country at large, and nearly half as much more from private sources have been sunk in an attempt to develop our North-West; after we have incurred an annual charge of nearly $7,000,000, over and above all we get from that country, which is an annual dead loss to the older provinces, we have this result: that to-day in our fertile belt which ought to be able to sustain 30,000,000 or 40,000,000 of people; after twenty years, after spending $100,000,000, after charging ourselves with $7,000,000 a year, we find, Sir, that we have got scarcely one family to the square league as the fruit of all our exertions. We find that according to the returns of the Province of Ontario—and the same thing is true of Quebec, as my hon. friend from that province can testify—as regards the rural districts of that province, we find, as I said just now, that in almost all our counties the farm populations have absolutely retrograded; that there are fewer men engaged in agriculture to-day from one end of Canada to the other, as far as the older provinces are concerned, than were engaged in it a few years ago. And we find more; we

find that if we take the actual taxation—not the nominal taxation, but the sum which is wrung out of the people's pockets, part of which, and part only, goes into the public treasury, the balance going to those gentlemen who, as I said, sustain and control the Government—we find, Sir, that we are approaching the position of being among the most heavily-taxed countries in the world, if we look to the real and not the nominal taxation. With that condition of things staring us in the face we are told that it is disloyal, that it is treasonable, that it is positively indecent for us to call the attention of our people to the way in which their resources have been squandered, and in which their burdens have been deliberately increased by hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, Mr. Speaker, there are a few little things which the hon. gentleman might have noticed. The hon. gentleman might have gone, I think, a little more into the effects of the McKinley Bill; however, I will not enter into that subject now, for I hardly have time, but I will treat of it later on. But, Sir, when the hon. gentleman was good enough to enlarge on the increase of trade which we have obtained within the last year I think the hon. gentleman might have remembered- he surely must have known what used to be said from that side of the House by his own predecessor as to its being the primal function of the National Policy to restore the balance of trade. We were told we would have an equilibrium between our exports and imports, but what is the fact of the matter? According to the Trade Returns of last year we exported $96,749,000 worth of goods and we imported $121,858,000 worth: the balance of trade was dead against us to the tune of $25,109,000. Now, I do not attach, and I never did attach very much importance to that, although bearing in mind that Canada is to a very great extent a tribute-paying country it is not a thing to be entirely overlooked. But, Sir, what has the hon. gentleman and his friends to say now? Why, they used to deafen our ears talking of the mischiefs that were going to result to Canada from the heavy balance of trade that subsisted against us from year to year, and yet our Minister of Finance has not one word to say in explanation of the fact to which I call his attention, that to-day there is a balance of trade of over $25,000,000 against us. The hon. gentleman dealt very gingerly, and I do not wonder at it, with the reduction which took place in our Savings Banks deposits. In September, 1889, we had $43,202,000 deposits in the savings banks, and in April of this current year our savings banks deposits had fallen to $38,398,000, or, in other words, we have lost $4,804,000. I can recollect well that the hon. gentleman and his friends would cram it down our throats that there was no proof so perfect and so complete of the progress of the country as the fact of the increase of the deposits in these Government savings banks. Now you have lost $5,000,000, and it is hardly a circumstance worth mentioning in the mind of my hon. friend. I pointed out then, and I recall the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact, that the thing on which he plumed himself was entirely a fallacy and a mistake. He and his friends were paying at that time 30 per cent. more for money than its worth in the open market; they were disturbing trade; they were artificially raising the rates of interest and doing a good deal of harm; and, moreover, instead of following the wise example of the English Government of treating money obtained in this fashion as it ought to be treated, namely, as trust funds to be invested in Government funds and not otherwise, they were using that money for permanent investment, with the result which the hon. gentleman has just pointed out to the House, that when our savings banks deposits began to diminish, straight away he must borrow in England at 4 or 5 per cent. to the tune of $5,000,000 or $6,000,000 to make up the deficit in these deposits which under that unwise and improper system of financing had been invested in permanent works. Neither, Sir, has the hon. gentleman, and I do not much wonder at it, one word to say to the House as to the enormous increase in the deficits on the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways. It was bad enough the year before, for we had then a deficit of $300,000, but what is the deficit to-day? I find that the total receipts of the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways for the last year were $3,204,000 and the total expenses were $3,846,000; being a dead loss under the wise Government opposite of $641,000, and an admitted dead loss of working expenses over receipts, (without allowing one penny for the loss of interest) on the cost of construction incurred within the last year, and incurred mainly, as I pointed out a little while ago, by the suicidal policy of subsidising out of the pockets of the people a cut-throat line to destroy a property in which we had invested $50,000,000. Nor, Sir, had the hon. gentleman a word to say about what he well knows is going on in every part of Canada: he had nothing at all to say about the continuous exodus of the people of this country——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT,- which has been going on ever since the introduction of this National Policy in a ratio two or three hundred per cent. faster than ever occurred before. Hon. gentlemen opposite exclaim at this. Have we not got our own North-West Census returns taken four or five years ago, which show that notwithstanding a most profuse expenditure we had succeeded in placing perhaps 9,000 families in the North-West and Manitoba in five years, as against a reported immigration by the Department of Agriculture of about 130,000 strong. There was another very extraordinary omission made by the hon. gentleman. He boasts of having maintained, and I dare say he desires for his own part to maintain, the expenditures and receipts at an equilibrium. I have said, and I repeat, that our best sympathies are with him in his endeavours to control his colleagues in that matter; but it is extraordinary that the hon. gentleman had not a word to say about the vast mass of contingent liabilities to which he and his colleagues have committed themselves. But, perhaps, he thinks that ante-election promises do not count, and are not to be taken into consideration by a prudent Finance Minister. Sir, we have a vast mass of promises made as to undertakings of all kinds—for Trent Valley Canals, for Prince Edward Island tunnels, for Quebec bridges; the municipalities of Ontario and other Provinces are preferring claims, which the past conduct of hon. gentlemen opposite will render it very difficult for them to resist. Then the hon. gentleman knows that knotty questions regarding

provincial subsidies are likely soon to engage our attention; but about all these he had not one word to say. Nor did he say anything, though he admitted the fact, as to the drop in revenue which took place between this time last year and the present, amounting to about a million dollars, which certainly does not indicate quite that condition of prosperity to which the hon. gentleman alluded. Sir, I hope and trust that the anticipations of the hon. gentleman as to a good harvest may be fulfilled. I hope and trust that all over this country there will be a good harvest, although I am bound to say that the accounts which have reached me do not entirely confirm the statement which I understood the hon. gentleman to make. Doubtless we all desire to see a good harvest, for never did any community stand more in need of a good harvest than does the greater portion of Canada to-day. But on the question of general prosperity, I take issue squarely and directly with the hon. gentlemen. He was good enough to tell us that under existing circumstances—which I suppose meant in view of the threatened loss of the American markets—it was necessary and desirable to search for new markets. I entirely approve of that. The object was excellent; nothing could be more desirable. Whether we succeed in regaining the American markets or not, I hold that we should obtain new markets wherever they are to be found. But while I approve of the hon. gentleman's purpose, I cannot but think that the methods he pursued during his somewhat celebrated West Indian trip, were open to a little criticism. I shall be very glad indeed if, when we meet again, or at any time, the hon. gentleman is able to report to us that we have secured large and valuable markets either in the West Indies or elsewhere. But, Sir, according to the recorded statements of the most influential men in the West Indies who have spoken of the hon. gentleman's trip, I am sorry to find that not only, as the hon. gentleman prudently and cautiously put it, are they likely to take a great deal of time in making up their minds about the advantages of dealing with us, but the concurrence of opinion among them, whether he is responsible for it or not, appears to be that it is much more to their advantage to deal with the United States than to deal with us; and if I may venture to make the criticism, I might say that it was not wise in the hon. gentleman to speak in public on the subject as he did in those various places. I think it was not wise, for two reasons. In the first place, it was his duty to have ascertained privately and quietly what could be done; and in the next place, the fact to which I have alluded, that many of those people have already declared their preference for the United States market and for treaties with the United States in preference to treaties with us, is likely to place him at a very serious disadvantage when he goes to Washington for the purpose, as he hopes, though very faintly, of obtaining extended trade relations with the United States. I fear, from what I have seen, that, if the hon. gentleman tells those people that if they refuse to treat with us he will find new markets elsewhere, we may be competitors of theirs in other countries wherein they have hitherto held the monopoly. I fear, Sir, that this very trip of his, and the very statements made by those with whom he has been carrying on negotiations, will be very likely to rise up against him, and that the United States Government will say to him: You have been to the West Indies, you have seen the authorities there, you have made your proposals to them, and they have told you that they do not want to treat with you.

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

After Recess.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There was one declaration made by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance which demands my most hearty sympathy, and with respect to which I can beforehand pledge him the sympathy and assistance of every hon. gentleman on this side. That was the declaration he made, that now, in his judgment—and I might add, in mine long ago—the time had come when we should call a halt in the profuse expenditure we have been indulging in for this many a year. The hon. gentleman's intention is most excellent. I commend it, although I cannot help recollecting the fate which has befallen many other good intentions of many other equally good men; and I might tell him also that we, on this side, cannot very well forget how often we have been promised reductions in expenditure, how often we have been vainly promised, for example, enormous returns from our new territory in the North-West, notably by one of his predecessors who was good enough to assure us that in a very few years we should be exporting 640,000,000 bushels of wheat from the North-West, and by another, now no longer here, who worked out in elaborate details the prediction that on the 1st day of January of this current year last past, every cent we had expended on the Canadian Pacific Railway would be back in our coffers in cash or securities better than cash. I will give the hon. gentleman all the assistance in my power to keep down the expenditure, but I must remind him that the record of his party and of himself on that subject is a very bad one indeed. Twenty-four years ago, the total expenditure of this country was $13,500,000. In six years, under the administration of the hon. gentleman's friends, between 1867 and the autumn of 1873, our annual expenditure had risen from $13,500,000 to $23,316,000, nearly $10,000,000 in six years. Then, from 1874 to 1878, there was indeed a halt in the expenditure, and in those five years our expenditure rose—what? From $23,316,000 to $23,519,000. Then, from 1878 to 1890, hon. gentlemen opposite, returning to their old tricks, succeeded in raising the expenditure of Canada from $23,500,000 to, as nearly as possible, $36,000,000, being a further addition of $12,500,000; so that in two periods of about seventeen years, those hon. gentlemen are responsible for an addition of $22,500,000 to the annual expenditure of Canada. I say their record is not an encouraging one, but we will do our best to aid the hon. gentleman in his good intentions. Sir, within a period of twenty-four years, or, more strictly, I should say within the two periods of six and of twelve years, while our population has increased, if it has increased, by barely one-half, our expenditure has been nearly trebled. Our expenditure, therefore, has increased in that interval exactly six times as fast as our population. Undoubtedly there is cause to call a halt. What reason did the hon. gentleman allege on various

occasions during the late election for this increase of expenditure? His pleas were these two: First of all, he stated, and has repeated here to-night, that it was necessary to construct great and expensive public works. Next he alleged it was necessary to acquire new territory, and in acquiring new territory, we had incurred enormous expenses. I will treat of these two pleas in succession. First, as to his plea that our expenditure is sufficiently accounted for by the fact that we had to construct very expensive public works, I would like to know, when the hon. gentleman and his friends take credit for that, what value they attach to those assets. Now I have here a statement from the hon. gentleman's own Public Accounts showing the sum of money that was expended in 1890 in maintaining our railways and canals; also showing the receipts therefrom, and the expenditure the hon. gentleman proposes to incur during the present year. It is instructive. It sheds a light on the enormous value, as an asset to Canada, of those public works, in consequence of which, says the hon. gentleman, this enormous increase in our expenditure is justified. I find that in 1890, under the head of public works, railways and canals, we spent $4,362,000, and under the head of railways and canals, chargeable to income, we spent $214,000, and for the department over which the Minister of Public Works presides, a charge of $62,783 is made, and for other items connected with public works, $186,000. On these public works, be it remembered, we have expended all told about $50,000,000 for canals, about $50,000,000 more for railways, being $100,000,000 of capital sunk. These public works cost us in 1890 for their maintenance $4,825,000, and our total receipts were $3,800,000, according to the Public Accounts. We have sunk $100,000,000 of capital on which we do not get one copper of interest and never will, and, more than that, not merely have we got these unproductive public works costing us $100,000,000 for which we receive no return, but we are absolutely unable to make both ends meet by at least $1,025,000 a year, and I perceive that for the year 1891-92, the hon. gentleman proposes to expend on the maintenance and keeping in order of these same works and on the other items I have enumerated the sum of $5,214,000, so that, if these receipts remain as they were before, our public works which justify this enormous increase of expenditure, according to the hon. gentleman, will be a dead loss to us for maintenance of $1,414,000, over and above the annual charge of $4,000,000 a year for interest on the sum they have cost. Sir, if that were, in my opinion, an accurate statement of the necessities of the case, I would say that our position was a very bad one, but for my part I do not believe that this enormous disproportion between receipts and expenditure is justified. I do not believe that this dead loss we sustain is the cost of the maintenance of public works properly administered, but I believe it is the cost of maintaining a radically corrupt Government. Now, the House will remember this, I hope all my hon. friends will remember this, and I hope our press will take occasion to make the statement ring from one end of the country to the other: the nominal expenditure is not, under our protective system, any measure at all of the burdens of the people. Sir, every intelligent protectionist, if there be such a thing as an intelligent protectionist—there are intelligent men who, for their own party purposes and their own personal interest support protection, I grant you—but an intelligent protectionist is an anomaly yet to find—an intelligent and honest protectionist. Now, if there be an intelligent and honest protectionist, capable of discussing the question from a fair and honest standpoint, that man never will deny, never can deny—be protection right or wrong, be it wise or foolish according to his idea—that under any protective system you choose to imagine, in all human probability the very minimum of taxation taken out of the people is twice as much as the sum which goes into the treasury. In a great many cases, that is far too small a proportion. In many cases—and I am going to give the House a very notable example presently—for every dollar that goes into the treasury, $3 or $5, or even $10, are taken out of the pockets of the people. There are cases in which an enormous sum of money is taken out of the pockets of the people, and not one cent goes into the treasury. I have said that the hon. gentleman had given us a most admirable instance of how the protective policy works, and he could not have selected a better one than what he chooses to call the boon he is going to give to the people of Canada in the reduction of the sugar duties. The hon. gentleman had a great opportunity, and he has thrown it away. Had he come down to the House to-night and said: Gentlemen, the Government of Canada have decided, in view of the fact that they have a considerable surplus, in view of the action of the United States, in view of the burdens which the people now have to bear, to give the people of Canada free sugar, I would have frankly applauded the action of the hon. gentleman and I would have said it was a very good one as far as it went. But he has done nothing of the kind, and he has had the effrontery, I was going to say,—at all events he has had the boldness to state that the Government propose to restore three millions and a half of duties to the people of Canada. They do not propose to do anything of the kind. They propose to substitute one million and a half for another million and a half. What, then, do they propose to do with the other two millions? They intend to present them to their friends, Drummond & Co.

Mr. FOSTER. That must be a fortunate man.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, he and his friends are fortunate. It is well known that these gentlemen have for years been running branch Custom-houses for their own private advantage. It is well known that the sugar refiners, who are headed by Mr. Drummond, have been the largest subscribers to the corruption fund of hon. gentlemen opposite. Verily, they are wise in their generation, and verily they have their reward. Thus we have the maximum of loss to the revenue, the minimum of advantage to the people, and the maximum of advantage to these monopolists, the refiners and their friends opposite. They profess to give a free breakfast-table, forsooth. They do not give it at all. On every pound of sugar which the poorest man consumes, according to the statement of the hon. the Finance Minister himself, he will have to pay, not into the public treasury but to the sugar refiners, eight-tenths of a cent. The hon. gentleman told us that the normal consumption of sugar in Canada is 224,000,000 lbs. And that will represent about $1,800,000 of taxes, of which, according to the hon. gentleman's own

statement, not one cent is to go into the treasury of Canada. The people of Canada are to be taxed to the extent of nearly two million dollars for the benefit of an industry which has been of great assistance to hon. gentlemen opposite and their friends. That is the boon which the hon. gentleman has brought down to this House. Here is a case in which the people are to be taxed nearly two million dollars, and yet, according to the statement of the hon. gentleman himself, he does not expect that a penny of that will go into the treasury. I do not object in the least to his substitution of taxes on tobacco, whiskey and beer, although I remember the time when some of his colleagues would have raised a great objection to the tax on the poor man's beer, but it appears that since one hon. gentleman has been translated to upper regions, his influence is not what it used to be. I do not object to the substitution proposed, but I do object to the hon. gentleman telling us that it is a boon for the people of Canada to have free sugar when we can see that they are not to have free sugar at all, but that we are called upon to pay nearly $2,000,000, not for the benefit of the public but for the benefit of those gentlemen who have endeared themselves, by methods to which I have already referred, to the hon. gentleman and his political friends. I could give another instance, and perhaps I may as well give it to the House now, as to the way in which this protective tariff works, as to the way in which it takes an enormous sum out of the pockets of the people without putting one cent into the treasury. The hon. gentleman says he has been imitating to some extent American legislation, and I will just quote to him an illustration lately made in the American Congress, showing how that system works there. They were discussing the duties on woollens and worsted, and one of the speakers said:

"For instance, in 1880, we consumed 193 million dollars worth of domestic-made woollens and worsted, and only 83 million dollars worth of imported. The same year, 335 million dollars worth of our iron and steel consumption was domestic-made, while only 35 million dollars worth was imported. Now, it is evident that, while a 10 per cent. reduction of tariff on these two items would reduce the Government revenues only some 7 millions (that is, 10 per cent. of the 33 plus 35 millions of these two imports), it would save the domestic consumer from paying this 7 million tariff duties plus some 53 million (that is 10 per cent. of the 193 plus 335 million of these two domestic products) of 'protection' to domestic monopolists, thus making a total saving of some 60 millions in these two items alone. Moreover, when duties are inordinately high, a reduction in them frequently increases the revenue, by increasing importations to the extent of more than compensating, at the reduced rates, the former restricted importations at higher rates."

That is probably an extreme case, but it illustrates the point which I want to make, that, if you want to arrive at the cost of a protective tariff, you must double and probably treble the amount that actually goes into the treasury. Take, for example, a very much smaller article than sugar. We imported of clean rice 2,861,000 lbs., on which a duty was paid of $35,773. Of unhulled or uncleaned rice we imported 23,076,000 lbs., on which a duty was paid of $38,365. That unhulled rice, I am informed, yielded at least 20,000,000 lbs. of clean rice, and, as we know, the price of that was regulated by the price of the clean rice imported. What, then, was the result? The amount lost, if the consumer paid the same for the one as the other, the receipts to the revenue being only $38,000 for this unhulled rice, was about $250,000, and that is a very fair illustration of the results of the present tariff in many cases. And what is true of rice, what is true of sugar is, to say the least of it, equally true of cottons, and of woollens, and of iron goods, and of a vast variety of other articles of general consumption, with this difference: that in all these cases under the system introduced by the Government, the system of substituting specific duties for *ad valorem* duties, the vice is intensified to a higher degree. The poor man, in all these cases, is compelled to pay enormously more than his richer brother; on the finer classes of goods, the tax, in all probability, averages 25 per cent. When you come to the coarser class of goods consumed by the majority of the population, you will find the tax under this mixed specific and *ad valorem* system rises to 40, 50, 60, aye, in some cases, to 70 and 80 per cent.; so that the poorer the man, under the system of which the hon. gentleman is the champion, the larger his family, the greater his needs, the more, in proportion to his income, is taken out of him under the specific duties of the hon. gentleman. Sir, is it any very great wonder that under this condition of things the increase of population in our country is lamentably slow? I believe that if an honest census were taken, if, for the miserable *de jure* system, which is conceived for the purpose of lending aid to fraud, an honest *de facto* system had been substituted, no doubt the truth would come out even more clearly; but even as it is, I have not the slightest doubt that the result of the present census, unless extreme fraud is resorted to, will show most clearly and distinctly what I have asserted, that there has been an enormous loss of population, both relative and absolute, in a very great number of the most important districts of Canada; and at the same time there has been an enormous displacement of wealth. Now, I admit for my part that this displacement was in part inevitable, for it arose from causes which neither I nor the hon. gentleman, nor any party could control. But I say that it is a grave crime, a grave offence against good statesmanship, for the Government to do as the hon. gentleman's Government has done, wantonly, wilfully, needlessly and maliciously, I might almost say, to aggravate those tendencies which a wise Government would have checked, or at least would not have increased. Sir, the whole policy of the Government has been to aggravate the evil; the whole policy of the Government has been to drive the people from our shores; the whole policy of the Government has been to increase the population and wealth of a certain small number of favoured localities at the expense of the great mass of the people. Sir, it is true, and I make the hon. gentleman a present of the statement, that under his regime there are ten millionaires, perhaps twenty, perhaps fifty, for one that existed under the regime of my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Mackenzie); but for each of these there are a thousand men who have been obliged to leave their country, and hundreds of thousands who, as I have said before, are in danger of sinking into a position a little better than serfs, by reason of the hon. gentleman's policy. Certain towns and cities have done well so far, although it is extremely likely they will speedily experience a check; but the vast majority of our cities, the vast majority of our towns and villages, and with scarcely any exception, all our country districts, are to-day stationary or retrograde. Our country districts,

as every man knows, have lost very heavily in population; scarcely one in five can show an increase in population equal to the natural increase, not to speak of the immigration that might have come. I tell the hon. gentleman that were an honest national balance sheet to be struck, were we to set on one side the additional national debt, the additional municipal debt, the additional provincial debt, the additional railway debt, the immense depreciation of farm property in all the older provinces of Canada, the immense depreciation in the value of real estate in almost all the towns and villages in Canada during the last twelve years, and were we to put on the other side all that can be imagined as to the growth of wealth in a few hands, and as to the growth of wealth in two or three pet towns and cities—if such a statement were made, the result would be a demonstration that we have made no progress at all during the last twelve years in national wealth; at the best we have been but marking time. The bulk of the people are poorer to-day than they were 12 years ago, although a few are much richer, but the aggregate of burthens has enormously increased. Now, Sir, I turn to hon. gentlemen's other plea. They justify the fact that the expenditure of Canada has increased six fold as fast has the population has done, by the allegation that the money has been well spent, inasmuch as we have acquired vast territories. Now, Sir, we are not dealing with what might have been, we are dealing with what is. Had those territories been well and wisely managed, were the hon. gentlemen able to-day, as with moderate good management they might have been able, to point to a population of a million, or even three-quarters of a million, in our North-West country and Manitoba, I am not prepared to say that I would have thought the money altogether thrown away. But if there be one thing clearer or more notable than another, if there be one fact more manifest than another, to every man who has paid the slightest attention to public affairs, it is this, that the so-called national development has resulted in the most pitiable failure in developing the North-West, and the Province of Manitoba in particular. I alluded just now to the fact that the late Sir John A. Macdonald, in 1880, had solemnly promised the people of this country that by the 1st of January, 1891, six months ago, or thereabouts, we would have had all expenses paid and at least sixty-nine millions in cash, and assets as good as cash, to pay for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Sir, I think nothing can give a better illustration of the difference between the promises and performances of those hon. gentlemen than the promise made by the late Premier and endorsed by the High Commissioner, as to what we should receive, and the actual facts as disclosed by these Public Accounts. We were promised a clear profit of sixty-nine millions on the 1st of January, and on the 1st day of July last our account stood: Expended in the North-West Territories, $6,043,000; received, $4,275,000; difference, $1,766,000. Promised sixty-nine millions plus, performance nearly two millions minus. That, Sir, is the way those hon. gentlemen have developed the North-West, and they have effected this result at a most enormous cost to the older provinces. I cast no blame on the people of the North-West; they are fellow-sufferers with ourselves, and fellow-sufferers to a great extent, for each and every one of them has cause to deplore the miserable mismanagement and the miserable mis-government that have left that great inheritance in the condition in which I state it to be. Still we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that an enormous proportion of our present expenditure is wholly and entirely due to the culpable way in which our funds have been expended in the so-called development of the North-West. I stated a little while ago that our annual expenditure there was, as nearly as possible, something like $7,000,000, That is to say, the older provinces of Canada to-day are expending out of their taxes about $7,000,000 a year more than they receive in the attempt to develop the North-West, and this is the way the sum is made out: In one way and another we have sunk at least $100,000,000 of public money in that country, the interest on which amounts to at least $4,000,000 annually. The charges for Indians in the North-West foot up to $940,000 a year; our Post Office service costs us $120,000 a year more than we receive; our Mounted Police costs us $753,000; our Dominion Lands cost us $90,000 more then we receive, and over above these items there is a vast mass of expenditure amounting in all to $1,450,000 charged to the North-West, against which we receive perhaps a sum of $924,000 all told. So that if you make an accurate estimate of the mode in which the present Government have conducted the development of the North-West you find there is a loss on capital account of $100,000,000 and an annual charge of $7,000,000 a year, and for a result there is perhaps in the fertile belt (capable of supporting in peace, prosperity, and comfort, twenty or thirty millions of people), perhaps, I doubt if there is that number, one man to the square mile. That is the way and those are the results by which hon. gentlemen opposite justify the expenditure of the enormous sums of money that are annually extracted from the people of Canada. I say this, that all of these details indicate scandalous extravagance. I do not say they necessarily indicate corruption, but they do indicate scandalous extravagance, and the practical result of all is this, that we have expended over $100,000,000 on the Intercolonial Railway and other railways and on our canals. We do not receive one penny in return. They cost us $1,000,000 a year more for working expenses, and the North-West costs $7,000,000 besides. I say nothing about extras. Year after year we are called on to provide hundreds of thousands of dollars charged to the so-called capital account of the Intercolonial Railway and to ordinary capital account millions and millions from time to time. But I do call attention to these two facts: I do call attention to the gross waste and mismanagement which must have existed when, with such wonderful resources in the North-West Territories, the results are such as I have just depicted. While this has been going on, what has been the position of the great mass of the people of Canada, notably what has been the position of the agricultural classes? It is plain to demonstration that the home market on which hon. gentlemen opposite profess to rely, which was to consume all our farmers could possibly raise, is quite inadequate to realize the conception formed of it. A vastly smaller number than those now engaged in agriculture could supply the needs of the home market. It is clear, on the other hand, that, with the exception of the United States, the foreign

market is an utter failure. The hon. gentleman talked to us before six o'clock of his hopes of obtaining markets for us elsewhere, and he went over a list of our exports to France, Germany, Spain, Portugal, Italy, Holland, and all the rest of them. I will take the years 1873 and 1890, and we will see what we have to hope from these foreign markets. Our population has increased, our means of communication are better and the cost of freight has been vastly lessened during these 18 years. What have we done to increase our exports to foreign countries during this period? In 1873 we sold to France $631,000 worth, in 1890 $278,000 worth; to Spain we sold in 1873, $25,000 worth and in 1890, $69,000 worth, an increase; to Portugal, in 1873, we sold $191,000 worth, in 1890, $207,000 worth; to Italy we sold in 1873, $177,000 worth, in 1890 it had fallen to $81,000 worth; to Holland we sold in 1873, $13,000 worth, and in 1890, $1,042 worth. To Newfoundland we sold $2,800,000 worth in 1873, last year only $1,185,000, a loss of $1,700,000 in our trade with that sister colony alone. To the West Indies collectively, and this is important, we sold in 1873 $3,988,000 worth; in 1890, under the fostering auspices during twelve years of the National Policy, we sold $2,719,000 worth, a loss of $1,200,000. During that interval the trade occasionally increased and diminished, but the grand result is this, that in 18 years, as these tables show too well, we have not succeeded in adding any appreciable percentage to our total exports to those countries, and that although our population is greater, although transportation is much easier and better, although freight is much cheaper, although under ordinary circumstances we ought to have enormously increased our exports. But what are they worth all put together, even multiply them by two or four or six, compared with the trade in which the hon. Minister of Finance takes no interest, for which he cares nothing, for which he hardly raises his hand to try to restore to us—the trade we had with the United States, which, in spite of all disadvantages, in spite of two hostile tariff walls, is to-day very nearly equal to the half of all our trade with the whole of the world? Now, Mr. Speaker, as I have said, our home market is inadequate, foreign markets out of the United States afford no tangible prospect of relief; but what is the condition of the agriculturists of Canada? Under existing circumstances we are called upon by the recent legislation in the United States to sustain enormous new and additional burdens. Sir, what will be the effect of the McKinley tariff? The hon. Minister of Finance disposed of it in a few half a dozen sentences. The hon. gentleman told us that the McKinley tariff is not going to cause any very great strain on the people of Canada; Canada, he says, has stood the strain well. If the hon. gentleman understood the situation, as I think he ought, he would have known that the McKinley tariff, or its effects up to date, were almost wholly anticipated before 1st October, that almost all the goods likely to be affected by it had been rushed across the border. It will be more than a year before we will experience the true effect of the McKinley tariff. The hon. gentleman was good enough to tell us that he has sent an exceedingly well trained commissioner to England, and that this gentleman tells us that we need not despair or be discouraged, for it is not going to affect us much. He says our egg market in England is going to prove quite as good as the egg market we lost in the United States. Well, the merchants who deal in that commodity to the tune of hundreds of thousands of dollars do not think so, the farmers' wives who have eggs to sell do not think so; and any man who has any practical acquaintance with the agricultural population of Canada does not think so. I heard the hon. gentleman actually declare that what was true as to the egg market was true as to the hay market also. He absolutely rose in his place to tell us that we can find as good a market for our hay in England as we can in the United States if the duty was removed. I commend that statement to my agricultural friends around me, and I think before this debate is concluded the hon. gentleman will hear from them their opinions as to the practical acquaintance with the interest of that great class of our people which is evidenced by the statement of the Finance Minister, that the people of Canada can find as good a market for their hay in England as they can in the United States. The actual effect is this: The farmer of Canada is to-day paying many millions of dollars of taxes to the United States Government in addition to the enormous tax which is levied upon him by the present Government under their protective tariff for the joint benefit of themselves and the Red Parlour. What is the total of these taxes we are called upon to pay? I will give the hon. gentleman a few details as to that, as he appears to regard as a matter of very small moment the amount of taxes the people of Canada are obliged to pay to the United States. According to his own Trade Returns last year, we sold to the United States 9,939,000 bushels of barley, on which the duty, the trifling duty, amounted to $2,982,000; of beans and pease we sold 710,000 bushels, on which the duty amounted to $284,000; of horses we sold 16,000, on which the duty was $566,000; of the article of eggs alone we sold 12,835,000 dozens, on which the duty amounted to $640,000; of hay we sold 101,000 tons, on which the duty was $400,000; of sheep we sold 251,000, on which the duty was $502,000; of potatoes we sold 1,053,000 bushels, on which the duty was $263,000. Now there is no doubt whatever that almost all that duty comes practically out of the pockets of the Canadian farmers. It is perfectly true, I have never denied and I do not deny it now, that the American consumer pays the duty likewise, but let the hon. gentleman and his friends lay this lesson to heart: while the American consumer pays the Canadian producer loses. That is the result of that tariff, and in our relative position that will always be the result of that tariff. The hon. gentleman's late chief knew that well, and stated it often as did many of his colleagues, and it is not unreasonable that it should be so in view of the fact that our total production is such a very small portion of the total consumption of the United States. But do not let the hon. gentleman suppose, and do let not the House suppose, that the sum of $7,000,000 or $8,000,000 which is paid to the United States is all that the Canadian farmer loses. Recollect that the price which he obtains for his surplus products in the United States affects the price which he obtains at home; not merely does he lose on what he sells to the United States but he loses, and loses enormously, on what he sells at home. True, that cer-

tain persons may make a benefit out of it, true, as I think was suggested by the Minister of Customs, that some of these people who live in the country and who are not particularly interested in the welfare of the farmers may make a paltry few dollars out of their distress, but in the meantime the Canadian farmer not merely loses the whole amount or vastly the greater part of the amount of the American duty, but he loses much more also. His home prices are cut down by reason of his being deprived of a market for his surplus production in the United States. Does the Government pretend, will there be found a man on that side of the House to pretend, with the facts now before us, that there is the slightest chance of our obtaining as good a market outside of Canada in any other country except the United States for many of the articles we have to sell? Are we likely to get as good a market elsewhere for our hay, or for our barley, or for our horses, or for our eggs, or for the thousand and one minor articles for which there is practically an unlimited demand in the United States? No wonder that in this state of things the farmers of Canada demand relief. They have a right to get relief, and there is but one way in my judgment in which that relief can be obtained, and that is by reciprocity with the United States; free and unrestricted reciprocity, the right to buy in that market as well as the right to sell in that market—unrestricted reciprocity in the fullest sense; that and nothing else is the only cure for the evils under which that great section of our population is at present suffering. I tell the Minister of Finance, who does not absolutely despair of obtaining reciprocity and who thinks that it is possible to obtain it, that this present Government cannot get it, that this present Government does not desire to get it, does not hope to get it and is not making any provision for it. I call the attention of the House to the fact that all through the Budget speech there is not any provision made, there is not any indication given that the hon. gentleman considers the obtaining of reciprocity with the United States within the limit of practical possibilities. He has lost his opportunity, he has dallied and delayed with the question, and if there is one thing touching reciprocity as to which he and his colleagues have manifested a general eagerness, it is an eagerness to find out arguments against it. The hon. gentleman told us this afternoon that he was going to Washington, and he alluded to the recent visit of himself and his associates, and if I did not misunderstand him altogether, the hon. gentleman intimated that he and his colleagues had been invited by the United States to go there, and he implied, if he did not exactly state, that the invitation came in the first place from the United States.

Some hon. MEMBERS. He said so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps he said so. I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that there is a most wonderful discrepancy between the letter addressed by the High Commissioner to Sir John Macdonald, in regard to that matter, from the statement made by himself. Sir Charles Tupper states in a letter under date 21st April, 1891:

"Mr. Blaine also said that he did not agree with the reference which had been made by Sir John Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper during the elections as to what took place concerning the initiation of the proposed informal discussion between the United States and the Dominion. I told Mr. Blaine that I wished in the outset to recognize the accuracy of the statement contained in his letter to Sir Julian Pauncefote, which I had seen, regarding the initiation of the negotiations respecting reciprocity arrangements between the two countries."

Who are to be believed? Are we to believe the High Commissioner?

Mr. FOSTER. You can believe both, so far as that is concerned.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Believe both? I was not able, last night, to get hold of the despatches from Washington; but I perceive this in the letter of Mr. Blaine:

"In view of the fact that you had come to the State Department with the proposals, and that the subject was then for the first time mentioned between us, and in view of the further fact that I agreed to a private conference, as explained in my minutes, I confess that it was a surprise to me, when several weeks later, during the Canadian canvass, Sir John Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper both stated before public assemblages that an informal discussion of a Reciprocity Treaty would take place at Washington after March 4, by the invitation of the Secretary of State. I detail these facts, because I deem it important, since the matter has been, for some weeks, open to public remarks, to have it settled, that the conference was not initiated by me, but, on the contrary, that the private arrangement of which I spoke was but a modification of your proposal, and in no sense an original suggestion from the Government of the United States."

Sir, I caution the hon. gentleman. We do not desire to see the representatives of Canada treated to another three-minutes conference at Washington. We do not desire to see the representatives of Canada compelled, as Sir Charles Tupper was compelled, to state before the British Ambassador that Mr. Blaine was right, and that the Canadian Cabinet had incorrectly represented—for what purpose I will not now stop to inquire—the so-called invitation to discuss a reciprocity treaty with Mr. Blaine; and I might remind the hon. gentleman that, before they went down there at any rate, they had, under Mr. Blaine's own hand and seal, the most explicit declaration that if all they had to propose was the sort of reciprocity the hon. gentleman indicated, they had much better stay at home. Sir, the hon. gentlemen have been beaten out of their first contention. It is not twelve months since we heard their avowed representative, a member of their Cabinet, the gentleman set up to answer my motion last session, formally declaring—and his colleagues did not dare to disavow it then—that the Government of Canada did not want reciprocity in natural products. They have been beaten out of that contention; for they now admit, or say, that it is desirable. I much fear that their conversion is half-hearted; at the best it is purely negative. We were told, Sir, by the leader of the House, that the financial and trade policy of the Government would be announced by the Finance Minister to-day; but that hon. gentleman, though he has been very careful to tell us the kind of reciprocity he does not want, is dumb as an oyster as to the sort of reciprocity he does propose to ask for or is willing to accept. I fear that my hon. friend beside me is right—that in their heart of hearts they want none; but they say they love reciprocity, and in proof of it, not merely here, but on every hustings, they have exercised all their ingenuity to conjure up objections to every practical scheme of reciprocity. Now, to-night I propose to discuss their three leading objections to it. They do not now for one moment pretend to say that it would not be an advantage; but their loyal

souls are appalled at the idea that if we had reciprocity with the United States we must necessarily, more or less, discriminate against Great Britain. Now, there may be, and probably are, some hon. gentlemen on the other side to whose minds that is a most grave and serious objection *per se*. I do not mean to say that I myself would not avoid that necessity if it could be avoided; but I may say that, as regards the greater number of hon. gentlemen opposite, there never was a more arrant piece of hypocrisy than for them to oppose reciprocity because, forsooth, it entails discrimination against Great Britain. What has their whole tariff itself been during these last twelve years but practical discrimination against Great Britain? What is their tariff to-day? Why, Sir, to-day we import about $43,000,000 worth of goods from Great Britain which we tax to the tune of $9,576,000, while we import $52,000,000 from the United States, which we tax $8,220,000. There if you like is practical discrimination against England. What is their whole tariff but an attempt to bar out manufactured goods; and what has Great Britain to send us except manufactured goods? Does the hon. gentleman pretend to tell me that any appreciable percentage of the goods which are admitted free consist of manufactured goods from Great Britain for general consumption here? All the goods manufactured in Great Britain the hon. gentleman severely taxes. What does he admit free from Great Britain? Well, he admits Australian wools free; he admits hemp for the benefit of the manufacturers; he admits railway iron for the benefit of some great corporations; he admits chemicals of most descriptions for the advantage of his friends, the protected manufacturers and possibly some other manufacturers; he admits tea and coffee from China and Japan; and he admits articles for the use of the Dominion Government; and these practically constitute the vast bulk of the free goods which come to Canada from Great Britain. In the whole lot, not one article manufactured in Great Britain and coming into general use in this country, is admitted free, but all such articles are taxed enormously—far more heavily in effect than articles coming from the United States. But, Sir, these hon. gentlemen, who twelve years ago turned their backs on the British fiscal system and deliberately adopted the American fiscal system, in spite of the warnings we gave them, in spite of the fact which we stated then and repeat now, that in so doing they struck a serious blow at British connection—these 35 per cent. loyalists are appalled at the notion of discriminating against the mother country. Sir, so far as her material interests are concerned, Great Britain is an investor in one way or another to the tune of eight hundred, perhaps a thousand millions, in British North America. It is of more interest to Great Britain by far that we should be able to pay interest on the vast sums we owe her than it is that a small paltry fraction of her insignificant trade with us—for insignificant it is, looking to her vast resources—should be interfered with. But the hon. gentlemen have no right to say that if Canada became richer, our trade with Great Britain would diminish. They assume that because the United States, which is—at least a great portion of it—situated in a totally different zone, do not import per head as much as we do, therefore our trade with Great Britain would be enormously reduced. I deny the inference. If these hon. gentlemen were able to show me that there is an enormous difference per head between our imports and the imports of those portions of the United States, whose climate and other conditions closely resemble ours, then there might be something more or less in their argument. I do not believe that if Canada became much richer the material interests of Great Britain would suffer at all, nay, I believe that, on the whole, they would be greatly advantaged. And there were other considerations to which I have often alluded. There is the consideration that it is in the highest degree a necessity for the material and political interests, and, I might add, the social interests of Great Britain, that she and her descendant, the United States, should be on the best possible terms, and free and full trade relations between us and the United States would be the very best means of bringing about that very desirable result. But even were it true that an injury was going to be done to Great Britain, though I would be sorry for it, I deny that any injury would be done her, but I cannot admit that that is a conclusive argument. I am not here to give advice to the British Parliament, I am not here to advise Her Imperial Majesty in her capacity of Queen of Great Britain. I am here as a Canadian representative, to advise the Queen of Canada what is best for the interests of the people of Canada, and if it is best in the interest of Canada, it will be her duty to take that advice. Let us understand this question and thresh it out. For my part I would rather see an ounce of loyalty to the people of Canada than a ton of this windy, worthless, spurious bastard loyalty of these thirty five per cent. loyalists. More than that, the hon. gentleman knows, every man who has studied the question knows, right well that reciprocity, from the very nature of the case, means, as against all other countries, discrimination more or less. We do not propose to discriminate against Great Britain *per se*, but we propose to enter into a treaty of commercial relations with the United States, whereby certain privileges will be given by Canada to the United States, and by the United States to Canada against all the world. That is what we propose to do. Does Great Britain hesitate to discriminate against us when it serves her turn? Look at her many commercial treaties, and you will find, Sir, that British statesmen do not consider whether a favourable commercial treaty for Great Britain may or may not tread on our corns, and I claim the right to do for Canada what British statesmen do for England. Then hon. gentlemen have a second objection, which, I must say, they ought to know and must know to be wholly unfounded in fact. They declare that it is the policy on this side to surrender control of our tariff. That is a most wilful misrepresentation. Hon. gentlemen know right well, for they have been told it times without number, that the distinguishing feature of our policy, the distinguishing feature of unrestricted reciprocity, is this, that both sides retain control of their own tariff. The United States do not propose to resign control of their tariff, nor does Canada propose to resign control of hers. Sir, the adjustment of the tariff, no doubt will require thought and consideration.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will prescribe when I am called in. Walk out of that side

and give us a chance, and we will do it; but do not imagine that I am going to interfere with another man's patient. More, I may add this, regarding this question of the tariff, that, if there be any truth in the indications of popular sentiment in the United States, there is a very strong probability that the United States are a great deal more likely to reduce their tariff than to raise it, and hence the difficulty which hon. gentlemen opposite fear, is likely, to a very great extent, to disappear in the course of the next few months, or, at furthest, in the course of the next year or two. Then comes up the vast difficulty that excited the fears of hon. gentlemen opposite—the question of revenue. Now, I do not mean to say that there will be no difficulty in making up the loss of revenue. I never contended that. There is a difficulty, and that difficulty is one directly created by the misconduct of those hon. gentlemen in increasing our expenditure from $13,000,000 to $36,000,000, in two periods of six and of twelve years. Sir, it is a very great impediment to our welfare, indeed, that we should have thus recklessly increased our taxes and our expenditure, at the very moment when the United States were largely reducing theirs. But these hon. gentlemen beg the question from the start. It appears to be a fundamental postulate of theirs that loss of revenue means loss to the people. Why, as I understand it, as my hon. friends on this side understand it, as every man of common sense will understand it, under a protective system, the loss of revenue is a gain to the people and doubly so in a case like ours. Now, the hon. gentleman and his friends want to know how we are to make up the deficit which may be caused by the loss of revenue on American imports. Well, Sir, that hon. gentleman boasts of a surplus. What better use can be made of that surplus than to employ it in giving the people of Canada this great boon? As I have hinted very plainly, the hon. gentleman is bound, or his successors would be bound to exhaust the economies, and they are neither few nor far between which might be exercised in carrying on the public business. I do not believe it will be necessary for an honest, a business-like, Government to spend every year $1,000,000 or $1,400,000 over the receipts as the hon. gentleman proposes to do in these estimates, in carrying on our railways and canals and public works. I do not think it will be necessary to spend, say, $1,000,000, if proper management were used for the maintenance of Indians in the North-West. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) did not find it necessary to do so. I do not think we require to spend the best part of $1,000,000 in maintaining the Mounted Police, and there are innumerable other cases in which useful and valuable economies might be practised. Then the hon. gentleman has told us that it is quite possible to increase our Excise and make a good deal of that. But what I particularly want to point out is this, that under our scheme there is no question of additional taxation at all. It is a pure question of substitution. It is a pure question, at the worst, after all the resources I have spoken of have been exhausted, of substituting a cheap mode of taxation, if it comes to that, for an expensive mode. Now, the hon. gentlemen, over and over again, have deliberately misrepresented the position of the Reform party on this question, and I desire therefore to restate what I stated in 1888, when this question was first introduced. What I said was that we intended to levy no poll tax, that we intended to add nothing to the burdens of the labouring man, the farmer, the artisan, the miner, or the fisherman—or the real productive classes. I said:

"Sir, I desire to say that, in my judgment, we ought not—I do not think that this Government would dare, I do not think any other Government would wish—to add by direct taxation one farthing or one penny to the taxes that now press most heavily on the agricultural classes, on the fishermen, on the miners, on the lumbermen, on all the great producing classes in this country.

"I shall be prepared to prove in some detail, at the proper place and time, that among the many faults with which our system abounds, perhaps the greatest is this; that under it the hard-working, industrious thrifty man is taxed enormously out of proportion to his earnings; and I say that with a system of direct taxation, if you must have recourse to it (although I doubt greatly whether you need, with proper economy, to have recourse to it) that crying injustice must be redressed, and the respectable, well-to-do, moneyed classes must be made to pay their fair proportion, no more should be asked, to the burdens of the country. This proportion they most assuredly do not contribute to-day and never will, under a system of purely indirect taxation."

And I went on to say:

"I dwell on that particularly, because I am aware that, at this very moment, there are certain persons, presumably in the interest of the hon. gentlemen opposite, who are losing no opportunity to impress upon the farmers of this country in particular, that if we get unrestricted reciprocity with the United States the federal revenues will have to be raised by direct taxation, levied in the same way as the municipal taxes are to-day. I, for one, will protest to the uttermost of my power against any such injustice; I, for one, declare here, speaking on my responsibility in my place in Parliament, speaking with a knowledge of the subject, that our present system is monstrously unjust to the poor man and too favourable to the rich man, and that injustice ought to be redressed, not by adding to the burden of the farmer, the labourer, the artisan, the mechanic, the fisherman, the miner, the lumberman, but by removing the burdens from these, and placing them upon the shoulders on which by right they ought to fall,"——

And not by taxing the people of Canada $2,000,000 a year for the benefit of a half a dozen sugar millionaires. Hon. gentlemen opposite are pleased to state, and have stated again and again, that our Customs revenue would be almost wholly destroyed if we adopted a system in any way resembling that of the United States. We do not propose to make our system a mere *fac simile* of theirs, but, for argument's sake, suppose we did adopt their system, suppose we did adopt a system by which we would collect as much revenue from Customs as the United States do, in proportion to our population, is there any reason to suppose that we would obtain less than they do? On the contrary, there is a strong probability that we would obtain more as being the inhabitants of the northern temperate zone. What do the United States expect to receive from Customs during the year 1891-92? After losing all their sugar duties, they expect to receive $190,000,000, and that amount may very probably be exceeded. Should we obtain a similar sum in proportion to our population, all we would lose would be the amount derived on the imports we now receive from the United States. But the Government and their friends wholly ignore this patent fact, that, if we were to obtain reciprocity with the United States, the wealth of this country would increase enormously and the population of this country would increase enormously. If the population of the country becomes more, and if it becomes richer, is it not perfectly clear and plain that that population will inevitably buy more luxuries and pay more taxes and add to the revenue in a thous-

and ways? Assail our fundamental proposition if you please; show if you can, what I do not think any hon. gentleman opposite will have the hardihood to attempt, that, if Canada obtains unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, we will not add greatly to our wealth, and in all probability be able to retain our own population here instead of losing them as we now do by the tens and hundreds of thousands in a decade. If you admit my fundamental proposition that unrestricted reciprocity means increased wealth and an increased population, your difficulty in regard to revenue vanishes into thin air, so that there is no need to be afraid of it on that ground, as the hon. gentleman opposite, when he called himself an independent member and sat on the back benches, was wont to say, when he advocated prohibition and advised us to sweep away all our Excise revenues by a stroke of the pen and trust to Providence for our income. If I thought our population was to remain stationary, I would still say this was by far our wisest course, but if you admit the increase in population and in wealth, there need be no fear, there need be no grave apprehension as to the difficulties we are to encounter. If there be any doubt that, if we had free trade with the United States, Canada would increase in wealth and population, it means to assert—and I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to do so—either that the country we inhabit is inferior to the United States or that the people who inhabit it are inferior to their people. Have not the hon. gentlemen opposite always insisted that our country was as good as theirs, and sometimes have they not asserted that we had the best half of the continent? Have they not always insisted—and they are right in that—that Canadians are in ability and intelligence the equals of any people on the face of the earth? There is another point to which I might call attention. One great vice of our system is that we have too large a governmental machinery for our present population. You are altogether too extravagant in that matter.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). Abolish the Locals.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have not the slightest doubt that, looking at those who control well and wisely and honestly the Government of Ontario, they are a thorn in the flesh of my hon. friend, and he would be glad to see some of his friends on the other side of the House controlling that province, which may Heaven forefend. I say that one of our evils is that our governmental system is out of all proportion to our needs, that it is too large and too expensive for our real wants. We are spending four or five times in proportion what the United States found it necessary to expend at a similar period of their existence. Our present governmental machinery is large enough for ten or fifteen or probably twenty-five millions, so that, if there was an increase of population in this country, there would be a large increase of revenue with a very small increase in expenditure. You might double the population of Canada and hardly add 5 per cent. to the cost of the Government as now administered. Then there is another consideration. We are threatened with grave financial difficulties. If we could stop the exodus from this country and if, instead of increasing at the rate of 50,000, we were to increase, as we ought to do, at the rate of 150,000 or 200,000 a year, which is no extravagant supposition, then within two or three years we would add several millions to our annual income and would add very little to our expenditure. But the real fact is that, in what we propose to do, the money would not be lost, the money would go into the people's pockets. In point of fact a great deal more would go into the people's pockets than now goes into the treasury. Now, what is the position of the farmers of Canada to-day? They pay a large taxation to the United States on the principal portion of the goods they have to sell; they pay taxes to the Dominion Government, and to the combines which are so friendly to it on almost everything they have to buy. If we had reciprocity with the United States, the farmers would save all three taxes. They would save the taxes which they pay to the United States; they would save the taxes they are compelled to pay to the Dominion treasury, and they would save the taxes they have to pay to our friends of the combines. At the very least calculation on the proposition which I advance, we would save $16,000,00 to the people, with a possible loss of $8,000,000 to the revenue, and I think that is sound political economy and ought to commend itself to every man in this country. Hon. gentlemen opposite are always using their own extravagance as a reason why we should not have reciprocity with the United States. It is a good rule of law that no man is allowed to plead his own wrongdoing, and these gentlemen ought to be estopped, on that ground alone, from contending that, because they have been monstrously extravagant, because they have frittered away our money by the hundreds of millions, they are unable to obtain anything like reciprocity with the United States on even terms. They tell the farmers of Canada that they cannot afford to endure a mere temporary disturbance, a mere substitution of one form of taxation for another, for fear the revenue would suffer. Sir, what would be the result if unrestricted reciprocity with the United States were obtained, so far as the farming population of Canada are concerned, so far as the population of the greater number of towns and villages is concerned? I take the one single item of stock, and I show the hon. gentlemen that on that one item, more would be saved by far to the farmers of Canada than would compensate three times, four times over, for any disturbance in the revenue. Last decade, in 1880, the farmers of Canada possessed a little over one million horses; I believe to-day the number has increased to something like a million and a quarter, although of that we have not full details. Now, it is known to every farmer that if we had free trade with the United States, he might add, at the very least, $30 more to the value of every horse that he possesses; on that one item of stock alone the farmers of Canada, by unrestricted reciprocity, would benefit to the tune of $30,000,000 to $37,000,000. In Ontario to-day, we have 22,000,000 acres held by farmers and under cultivation, more or less. Sir, it is not a matter of opinion with me but of knowledge, that given reciprocity with the United States, every one of those 22,000,000 acres would be worth, on the average, in the market $10 more than it is to-day; and I venture to say that I can produce from the richest agricultural districts in Ontario, not one, but four and forty good men and true representing those counties here, to back up every word of that statement. So that on that

item alone, and for Ontario alone, unrestricted reciprocity with the United States would benefit the farmers in the increased value of their farms, by $200,000,000. What it may be for Quebec, what it may be for Prince Edward Island, what it may be for the Maritime Provinces, I do not pretend to say; I have not the same knowledge. However, I well believe that at least an equal sum, particularly if you take into account Manitoba, will be added to the value of their property. Sir, beside me sits my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), and that hon. gentleman showed me, some time ago, a letter from a former fellow townsman, whom evil legislation and the National Policy had turned into a citizen of the United States, giving my hon. friend the right to draw on him, I believe, for $5,000, to invest in a farm in Prince Edward Island, if only he thought there was a chance of unrestricted reciprocity. Sir, I have not the slightest doubt that an enormous increase in value amounting to many hundreds of millions would accrue in the first place, to the farmers of Canada, in the next place to the lumbermen, to the fishermen, to the proprietors of lands and property in the towns and villages throughout Canada. I know of no class who would be endangered by it except those worthy gentlemen of the Red Parlour, who have fattened so long at our expense, and have feasted under the regime of the hon. gentleman. The reason why the hon. gentleman does not desire to get reciprocity, or that he is not able to get it, is what I stated at first. The hon. gentleman, in this matter, is not a free agent, he is not free to act as he thinks the interest of the whole country requires. Party exigencies and the necessity of providing party funds for party managers, are the real obstacles in the way of unrestricted reciprocity. It is three years now since the first motion was made in favour of unrestricted reciprocity in this House. What have hon. gentlemen done in those three years? Worse than nothing, Sir. They have prejudiced our case in every possible way, they have got themselves into such a position that it is doubtful, except by a very great stretch of courtesy, whether they can get a hearing in the United States. Now, it is clear that these hon. gentlemen propose still to refuse to get us reciprocity, and that being so, I for my part demand, speaking for myself, speaking for my friends here, the representatives of a great majority of the agriculturists of Ontario—and I believe the great majority of the agriculturists of Canada—I demand that the exorbitant taxation under which the people now labour shall be reduced, and that it shall be reduced in reality, that we should see a genuine and *bonâ fide* reduction, not a sham reduction such as that of which notice was given this afternoon. Sir, the need of reduction is extreme. The hon. gentleman may not know it, I do not suppose the hon. gentleman does know it; but all over Ontario, and I believe all over Quebec, I believe all over the Maritime Provinces, there are no facts better known than this, that on the one hand the value of farm property is depreciating, on the other, the number and extent of mortgages is increasing immensely. Now, if hon. gentlemen dispute the facts which I gave them last year, I challenge them to make use of the census, or of any other means they please for the purpose of obtaining real and correct information as to the true state of the mortgage indebtedness throughout Canada. Sir, the hon. gentlemen declined the challenge I gave last year. I am not able, therefore, as they did not choose to accept, to obtain that minute information which I would like to have obtained for the purpose of showing how grievously the condition of the agricultural population of Canada has depreciated during the last twelve years. But, Sir, the information which they would not get, has been supplied in part, at least, by some returns recently furnished to the Ontario Government. I have here a list showing the total number of chattel mortgages on farms undischarged in twenty-eight counties, on the 31st December, 1889, and I find that there were no less than 6,474 such chattel mortgages. If that proportion be extended to the other counties, it means that in prosperous Ontario, a country which, under good government, under honest government, ought to be among the most prosperous sections, not merely of North America, but of the world, one farmer in every twelve is reduced to the extremest distress, is hoisting what is a true equivalent to the black flag. I need not tell my agricultural friends that the very last thing that any farmer does is to give a chattel mortgage on his stock and implements; he must be reduced to the most extreme distress before he does that. I repeat here the statement which I made last year, that I believe, if the truth were known, it would be found that almost every second farmer in the majority of our counties is heavily mortgaged. I shall not go into details as to the amount of the mortgages, because I have given evidence enough to show how great it is, and because, as I said, when the hon. gentlemen refused my challenge, it was proof enough to all fair and impartial men, that they knew if that challenge had been accepted, the result would have been substantially as I have stated. Sir, we have here vast embarrassments among a great number of our farmers, we have great depreciation in the value of land, we have great arrest in the growth of population. As I have repeatedly stated to-night there are very few agricultural counties in Ontario in which the farm population is not retrograding, there are very few of our towns and villages able to maintain the natural increase of births over deaths. I have a curious incidental proof taken from the hon. gentleman's own Trade and Navigation Returns, showing how things are going on in that direction. I turned, the other day, to our exports of manufactured goods. There appeared to be a nominal increase to the value of $1,000,000 over 1878, no very large increase. But it is desirable to see what constitutes our exports of manufactured goods. Here are the principal items: Of leather goods we exported in 1890, after twelve years of the National Policy, $309,000 worth, as against $804,000 in 1878; of wood and manufactures, $850,000 worth; ships to the value of $442,000; lime, $175,000 worth; extract of hemlock, $161,000 worth, not one of these items being such as the National Policy could be said in any way to have protected, and almost all having been exported in quite as large quantities 12 years ago as they are to-day. There are two other items to which I call the special attention of the House. Under the heading of exports of manufactured goods, I find the item of ice to the value of $247,000—ice as manufactured goods under the National Policy—and for a concluding item, household effects, the effects of men leaving the country,

$818,000. I will admit there is one article of manufactured goods in which the increase has been most notable and extraordinary under the fostering care of the National Policy, and that is the item of household effects. Briefly, as I understand the case, our position may be compared to that of a man who owns a huge estate, but who is entirely cut out of the most profitable market for his produce. We have room in this Canada of ours, as I well believe, for one hundred millions of people, and perhaps for more, and yet we cannot keep, and have not been able to keep for the last 12 years, a decent proportion of our young men and women in our own country. Sir, we have resources of a great many kinds. Some of our resources, I believe, are calculated to give us a natural monopoly in various important articles, and yet for lack of markets, for the United States is really our only available market except Great Britain, we are quite unable to make use of them. This confederation is not twenty-five years old, and yet in those years we have contrived to weigh ourselves down with as heavy a debt in proportion to our population, with a much heavier taxation in proportion to our population, than most nations of 500 years of age. We talk of our glorious constitution, we prate of our chartered liberties. Why, we deny to our people the most common rights and liberties known to England and to English custom, the right to do the best we can for ourselves, to buy in such market as we please, and sell in such market as we please, without being fined for the operation. We have used our natural advantages with this result, that to-day in the great country we have obtained possession of in the North-West we find literally hundreds of people where there ought to be millions. The hon. gentleman and his friends boast of their loyalty. They declare they cannot, forsooth, do anything that may imperil their loyalty, but they do not hesitate to drive a million of Her Majesty's subjects into exile. They talk of their faith in Canada, mark that, and the way they show it is by demonstrating that they are afraid to allow our people to compete in open markets with the rest of the people on this continent. They declare, forsooth, that they have faith in Canada, and yet, the people of Canada in their view are such poor knaves that they are quite unable to hold their own in competition with the people of the United States. I maintain no such doctrine, no such belief. One redeeming feature of the vast emigration of Canadians to the United States is this, that wherever Canadians have gone, from one end of the country to the other, they have asserted themselves and occupied positions of responsibility and importance in a most unusual percentage in proportion to the number now settled in the neighbouring Republic. Sir, these hon. gentlemen allege that we are fleeing from one protective system to a higher protective system. A child would know better than to use such an argument. If there be one thing clearer than another it is this, that the position of the United States is such, the extent and character of their territory is such, the mass of population is such, that there cannot possibly be conceived a country in which the experiment of protection, the mistaken and mischievous experiment, I believe, can be tried with less risk to the inhabitants than in the United States; and *per contra*, and conversely, there is no country on the face of the earth of which I have ever read, heard, or seen, so utterly unsuited to try the experiment of protection as this Canada of ours. Sir, the measure of the mischief of protection is essentially the measure of the narrowness of the area, and by that I do not mean the geographical area alone, for the larger the extent and the greater the population the less the injury done. I will give an illustration which I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will understand. What mischief would follow if Europe and America enacted the most insane protective tariff which ever entered into the heads of hon. gentlemen opposite against the manufactures of Asia and Africa? No harm would result. And similarly in our case I tell the hon. gentlemen that to all intents and purposes the nearest practical approach to genuine and real free trade for Canada lies in unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. I propose to crystallize our views briefly. The twelve years of folly, fraud and falsehood which we have struggled against have to a great extent done their work. The hon. gentleman tells us that trade is on a sound basis. I tell the hon. gentleman that, if unhappily the present harvest should prove below the average, we would be within measurable distance of a great financial crisis, and he will find that view is held by men of the greatest experience in business in this country. The time is ripe for a change; and what change shall it be? Our National Policy is discredited. We see quite clearly in our present condition that we must obtain relief or continue to see our population diminishing under our eyes until Canada is becoming very little better than a breeding ground for producing citizens for the United States. Instead of that we offer a clear cut rational policy; we offer a clear cut rational, plain and distinct policy; we say the only way you can redress the mischief you have done, the only way you can give our people a chance, the only way to increase our population, the only way in which you can make atonement to the farmers for the overtaxation you have wrung from them for these many years, is by obtaining reciprocity with the United States and in order that the sense of the House may be clearly expressed on the question I beg to move:

That the Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that all the words after "that" in the main motion be struck out, and the following substituted therefor:

Resolved—That the situation of the country requires that the Government should forthwith reduce all duties on articles of prime necessity, and more particularly on those most generally consumed by artisans, miners, fishermen and farmers; and further, that the negotiations which the House has been informed are to open at Washington in October next should be conducted upon the basis of the most extended reciprocal freedom of trade between Canada and the United States, in manufactured as well as natural products.

Mr. FOSTER. I propose that we should follow the same course that we have done on other occasions, and go into Committee on the resolutions and pass them with what debate will be necessary, which, I hope, will not be very much at this time. Then we can concur in the resolutions in some future time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And then we can proceed with the debate afterwards?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course it is well understood that the fullest possible discussion will go on in future stages in the Committee.

Mr. FOSTER. Your motion will have to be withdrawn for the moment to allow us to go into Committee.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course this discussion cannot be possibly closed to-night, and, as my hon. friend suggests, it is of importance to the public service that these resolutions should be passed, so that under these circumstances I do not object to withdraw the motion for the present.

Mr. FOSTER. Very well, the resolution can be withdrawn for the moment and we can go into Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. gentleman shall have leave to withdraw the amendment?

Amendment withdrawn.

House resolved itself into Committee on Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

On resolution 1,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Probably as these resolutions are long, it had better be understood that their adoption now is purely *pro forma* on our part, and is intended not in the slightest degree to imply our concurrence in them, but is merely for the purpose of giving the Government an opportunity of putting them in force at once and preventing any fraud on the revenue.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the understanding.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). And that there will be perfect liberty to discuss or to object to any item hereafter?

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly.

Resolutions reported.

CHIGNECTO MARINE RAILWAY.

Mr. FOSTER moved third reading of Bill (No. 97) to amend the Act respecting the granting of a subsidy to the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company (Limited).

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand that full provision is made in the contract with this company that our subsidy is only to be paid to them so long as they keep the road in good working order. I desire to know from the hon. Minister of Finance if that is the case.

Mr. FOSTER. The Act remains exactly as it was. No change has been made in that clause.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is the case, is it?

Mr. FOSTER. That is the case, the schedule provides that.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time.

WINNIPEG AND HUDSONS BAY RAILWAY.

On the Order being read for the to House resolve itself into Committee to consider the following proposed resolution:—

That it is expedient, in order to enable the Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Railway Company to construct a railway from the city of Winnipeg to some point on the Saskatchewan River, to enter into a contract with such company for the transport of men, supplies, materials and mails for twenty years, and to pay for such services during the said term eighty thousand dollars per annum, such payment to be computed from the date of the completion of the said railway.

Mr. LAURIER. We are not prepared for the discussion of this important item this evening, and I do not think the hon. gentleman should take it up.

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is rather important for the parties interested that it should be taken up this evening. Some of the financial parties interested are sailing in the course of a few days, and are very anxious we should get it through, and if it does not go through to-day it will not for a couple of weeks.

Mr. LAURIER. There was a misunderstanding the other day as to what would be the business on Friday last. Nobody expected this evening that anything would be taken up except the Budget, and I submit that it would not be fair to this side that we should be unexpectedly called on to consider this important Bill.

Mr. DEWDNEY. No one expected the motion to adjourn yesterday.

Mr. LAURIER. Well, you might have expected it.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not usual to give notice of such items as this on a Government day, because they are always expected to come up on such a day, and hon. gentlemen are supposed to be ready for the discussion. As it is of great importance that this item should be passed, I think the House ought to go on with it.

Mr. LAURIER. This is the first time in my experience that we ever adjourned the Budget debate when it had but fairly commenced.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not adjourned.

Mr. LAURIER. It is not going on.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman's memory is at fault. There has never been a case but one, since I have been in the House, in which the course pursued to-night has not been followed. That case occurred the last time, or the time before, when the Budget ran over a week or ten days, causing great confusion in carrying out the law as proposed. In all other cases the tariff resolutions have been carried on the day introduced.

Mr. LAURIER. I think the usual course taken has been that the House immediately adjourned, and did not take up any other matters.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister of Customs will find that my hon. friend is quite right. We have repeatedly, in the interests of the public service, on both sides of the House, consented to allow the tariff resolutions to be put in force for the purpose of preventing manifest loss to revenue, but it has always been the custom to adjourn immediately, and, if I remember rightly, it was two o'clock before we adjourned last night.

Mr. DALY. I submit that this motion has been on the paper for some days, and that hon. gentlemen opposite have had every opportunity of enquiring into it. The Minister of the Interior is prepared to give certain information on the question, which, I understand, is all that is required, and I may say it is highly important in the interest of this work, which is of great moment to our people in Manitoba and the North-West, that this matter should come up to-night. There are

gentlemen interested in it who are desirous of sailing for Europe at the earliest moment, in order that they may have the opportunity of placing the scheme in the hands of their friends, before the financial year closes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We must have time to consider it. It is a question involving millions of dollars, and involving indirectly the question of the practicability of navigating the Straits, and we must have time to hear what has been said on the subject, and to consider the general policy.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The portion of the road for which we propose to ask assistance, although a portion of the Hudson Bay Railway proper, does not involve the consideration of the whole question. It is only proposed to assist in the construction of the first three hundred miles of the line, known as the Hudson Bay Road, as a colonization road, exactly in the same way as the two other roads built by the Canadian Pacific Railway to the Saskatchewan. It does not call into question the Hudson Bay route whatever.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Last evening, when the importance of having the resolutions about the Hudson Bay Railway advanced a stage was brought to our notice, we were fully impressed with the necessity of curtailing the Budget debate, if necessary, in order to make room for it. It was represented to us that the negotiations which will be connected with the enterprise, would be materially advanced if the resolution itself passed a stage to-night. There is no desire on the part of the Government to curtail the debate. Of course hon. gentlemen opposite cannot take up a question they are not prepared to discuss, but if they will let the resolution go forward a stage, I am sure great advantage will be gained by the enterprise itself. We can do nothing, under the circumstances, but appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite, and give them assurance that they will have ample time to discuss the measure.

Mr. LAURIER. Since it was determined by the Government yesterday evening that this important matter should be taken up to-day, I only regret that the rules, which the hon. gentleman said yesterday ought to prevail in the relations between the Government and the Opposition, were not carried out, and the Opposition not informed that this matter would be taken up.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is not my fault but my hon. friend; because when the proposition was made to adjourn he did not seek any information as to what business would be taken up to-day, otherwise we would have been prepared to tell him.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understand that we have only been able to stop the Budget debate and reach the present stage, by the consent of the leader of the Opposition to withdraw for the time being the amendment proposed by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) so as to enable the Government to make the necessary progress with the tariff resolutions. It would be rather unfair, to say the least, if after extending that courtesy to the Government, they should insist on springing on the House a resolution of this important character, on which some hon. gentlemen desire to speak. If we go into committee and report the resolution, there will be no adequate opportunity to discuss the matter at a further stage. The hon. gentleman might take it up the first thing on Thursday before going on with the Budget debate. We have no disposition to throw obstacles in his way, but some consideration should be shown the Opposition under the circumstances.

Mr. BOWELL. The only reason why I disapproved of the statement of the hon. gentleman was, that he said there was no other opportunity so favourable as this to discuss this question; but he knows that a Bill will have to be introduced, founded on these resolutions, and that will have to be referred to committee, so that the fullest opportunity for discussion will be given. The only difference is, that there will be two opportunities in that case, whereas there would have been only one now, for the discussion.

Mr. DEWDNEY. In view of the line taken by the Opposition, and seeing that not much progress could be made now, I think, if the Opposition will agree to take this matter up on Thursday, I will waive my objection.

DECK AND LOAD LINES.

Mr. TUPPER moved second reading of Bill (No. 106) to provide for the marking of deck and load lines.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. TUPPER. I stated on the introduction of this Bill that I intended, when it was read the second time, to ask that it be referred to a Select Committee, and I propose now that it shall be referred to a Committee composed of the following gentlemen:—Messrs. Borden, Flint, Gillmor, Welsh, Yeo, Davies, Langelier, Kaulbach, Kenny, Putnam, Tupper, Skinner, Burns, Adams, Wood, McDonald (King's), Curran and Desjardins (L'Islet).

Motion agreed to.

ADMIRALTY COURTS.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I was anxious to proceed with the Bill in reference to the admiralty jurisdiction, and I understood it was being examined by hon. gentlemen opposite. I would ask whether they are ready to go on with that now?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I hope the hon. gentleman will not ask us to go on with that now, as it was expected that the debate on the Budget would take the whole day.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. BOWELL moved second reading of Bill (No. 105) respecting the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the hon. gentleman should give us some explanation as to what railways this Bill is intended to apply.

Mr. BOWELL. The object of the Bill is simply to curtail the system of keeping the accounts. It refers to the main line of the Intercolonial, the Eastern Extension Railway, the Cape Breton Railway and the Windsor Branch Railway. At present a separate account has to be kept, and up to this year a distinct set of books has been kept for each of these lines, entailing a considerable amount of expense which will be removed by this measure. The object of the Bill is to make these roads form part of the Intercolonial, and that is the only ob-

ject, as I am informed by the Railway Department and the Chief Engineer. I asked him to make a statement as to the effect of this Bill upon the running of the road, and he assures me that it will have no effect whatever in that regard, but will simply consolidate the different branches which exist now as separate lines, and for which a separate account has to be kept.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the Windsor and Annapolis Railway was included?

Mr. BOWELL. No; the Windsor Branch.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is only one objection to this that I can see, and I suppose it is not of much weight. Under the present system, we have some opportunity of ascertaining what portions of the road are paying and what are not. Now, you have the Intercolonial proper, running from Point Lévis to Halifax, and from that to New Glasgow, and you have the expenditure and receipts on that main line. You have also the expenditure and receipts of the Eastern Extension, and you will have hereafter the expenditure and receipts of the Cape Breton Railway, as you now have the expenditure and receipts of the Prince Edward Island Railway. That enables one to judge of the portions of the road which are paying and those which are not paying. The only objection I see is that you will be unable to see which parts of the line pay and which do not pay, and it might be important to know that. I have never raised any objection to the construction of the road through Cape Breton, which has cost some $3,000,000. In view of the policy adopted by the Government in 1882, I never raised any objection to that, but I always had the extremest curiosity to learn what would be the effect of the running of that road. I have heard my hon. friends opposite frequently refer to the fact that the Prince Edward Island Railway was run at a loss, and no doubt that was true, and I have heard references to the possible results of the running of the Cape Breton road. Therefore, not from curiosity alone, but for the purpose of comparison with railways in other portions of the Dominion, I was anxious to know what would be the result of the construction of this Cape Breton Railway. We have the Eastern Extension, we know exactly what that costs; we have the Prince Edward Island road; we have the main line and the Windsor Branch. But when these are merged, all hope of attaining any result in that direction will be gone, and the general working of the road in the Island of Cape Breton will be merged in the general working of the Intercolonial Railway, and the House will have no opportunity at any time of determining whether that is a loss or whether it is a gain. My own impression is very strong that it will be a mighty heavy loss, but whether that impression is well founded or not, nobody will be able to judge hereafter. Of course, I am not able to say whether the necessities that the hon. gentleman speaks of, are such as to justify this change, and the loss which I can see we will derive in the matter of information. I dare say the hon. gentleman may be better informed than I am, but I can see great difficulties that will arise in the way I have stated.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). My hon. friend from Queen's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), I am sure will be very glad to learn that so far as we can judge up to the present time, there will be no loss in the running of the Cape Breton road.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) As it has not been run, I do not see how there can be a loss.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). The Cape Breton road has been run since January last, and in every month since it commenced to run there has been a large surplus over the running expenses. So far as I am concerned, as well as the other representatives from Cape Breton, I can assure my hon. friend that I will be very glad to see the accounts of the running of that road kept separate; but if the Government feel that these accounts can be more easily kept by having them kept with the other roads I can have no serious objection. But my hon. friend from Queen's will find out by experience, that the importance of Cape Breton is so much superior to that of little Prince Edward Island, that there will not be any loss in the running of that road.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think this is a very important Bill, for it is a very short one, and I think its importance has been plainly stated to the House by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies). The Opposition have continuously opposed the construction of many of those lines for the last ten years, on the ground, first, that they duplicated the Intercolonial Railway at many points; and, secondly, because they believed the roads would not pay the running expenses, let alone pay interest on the money invested. For I can easily see by the passage of this Bill, that it will free the present Government of all the responsibilities that they undertook, in the statements they presented to the House with regard to the earnings of the different lines. For instance, the Oxford and New Glasgow Line, which was built virtually to duplicate the Intercolonial road, will now be merged in the non-paying Intercolonial Railway, and many of the other lines in the same way. It is going to give the Government an opportunity of continuing the recklessness of which they have been guilty in the construction of those lines, and, it will prevent that investigation into the separate earnings of those portions of the Government railways that the country has a right to have, and as a simple matter of justice to the Opposition, that we should have in order to verify the predictions that have been made with regard to those lines. If the hon. gentleman gets this Act passed, the form of keeping the books of the whole railway system under the control of the Dominion will be altered; it will be treated as one line, and those lines that have been built foolishly, extravagantly, unnecessarily, will be merged into the whole system, and the country will be unable to learn, if ever that consolidation takes place, whether those lines are earning their own expenses or not. We cannot tell a single thing about them. Now, I say that it is wrong that that condition of things should be inaugurated, because the country has a right to know whether the predictions made by the Government at the inception of these different schemes have been realized with regard to the probabilities of their earning money sufficient to pay, not only their running expenses but some small interest on the investment. I suppose the acting Minister of Railways has begun to realize by past experience that if they are left open to criticism, as they are under the

present arrangement, their predictions with regard to them will no more be fulfilled than were their predictions with regard to the North-West and the export of grain, and the enormous receipts from lands and so on, in those glowing statements and grand predictions that were presented to the country by Sir Charles Tupper when he induced the House to grant a $30,000,000 loan to the Canadian Pacific Railway. Then we were to have so many inhabitants to go in there, we were to have so many hundred millions of bushels shipped from that country, and we were to have so many millions of money paid into the Dominion treasury by a certain time. Not one of those predictions has been fulfilled; we have not got ten per cent. of the amount promised. Now, we can well remember in what glowing terms, with what amount of eloquence the High Commissioner brought before this House his statements as to what would be the result of the building of the Oxford and New Glasgow road. He told us it was to open up an enormous extent of country, it would shorten the distance between the cities of Ontario and the cities of the east, it would be the means of bringing the trade of the Maritime Provinces to the doors of the people of Ontario, and it was an absolute necessity. He presented such a glowing picture to the House of the magnificent results that would flow from the construction of that line, that he induced many to believe that it would be the greatest boon that could be possibly achieved. But now we know perfectly well that in place of its being 45 miles shorter it was only four or five miles; in place of the grades being less, as he said they would be, in order to facilitate the bringing of New Glasgow coal to Montreal and other ports, the grades were actually steeper. We know that in order to meet the necessities of the party at that particular time, and to run the road from door to door in order to satisfy that particular section, the road was virtually spoiled. It was lengthened and run zigzag, to different points, and the result was to increase the grades and to leave them no better than they were on the line of the Intercolonial Railway. Now, that will be merged along with the Intercolonial Railway, along with all the rest of the lines. This Bill is short, but it is going to give the Government the power of burying up their past acts with regard to their reckless conduct in expending money in the Maritime Provinces in useless and wasteful speculations, not as a necessity, but for political purposes. The whole thing will be merged into one, and neither the people of this country nor the Opposition will ever be able to find out the exact earnings of the portions that have been built, and the country will be called upon to pay an annual deficit, as it has done for many years past, to keep these roads running, and it is going to enable the Government in that way to bury up the extravagance that has characterized their conduct in connection with the road during the last ten years.

Mr. KENNY. I think the hon. member for Queen's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), and probably other hon. gentlemen sitting on that side of the House, will remember that when the Intercolonial Railway expenditure was under consideration, either the past session or the session immediately previous, it was suggested, I think, by an hon. gentleman sitting on the other side of the House, that it would be more convenient if all these items were congregated together and we had one system of book-keeping. I am speaking now entirely from memory. I think the hon. member for Queen's was in the House at the time; he takes an interest in all these roads, and it was suggested by an hon. gentleman opposite that it would be more convenient for the public service if these expenditures were united together, that the system of book-keeping would be more perfect. I think I am correct in making the statement that the suggestion actually came from the other side of the House to make this change. But under the circumstances, I think we must admit that while there is great force in the argument presented by the hon. member for Queen's, it may not, perhaps, be so easy to find the details of each particular branch, yet in dealing with Intercolonial Railway expenditure, I think the Bill before the House will lighten the duties of the members of the House.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to know what is the expense of the present system of bookkeeping. The Minister of Customs, I think, rests his Bill wholly upon the ground of the saving of expense. The object, he says, is to save the expense of keeping separate accounts. There is a great deal of force in the arguments advanced by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), and there should be a balancing of arguments both ways. One can readily see that if this principle is to apply in future, every time there is an extension of the Intercolonial, or the Government chose to construct some branch railway, the parent line may have the financial success of the enterprise completely given to it. That is not the proper course to adopt. The Minister should be able to give the House the information we ask, and tell us how much will be saved.

Mr. BOWELL. I frankly tell the hon. gentleman I do not know. My connection with the railway department has only extended over a few days, and details such as have been asked I am not prepared to give at this moment. Nor am I prepared to accept the statement made by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), but I do not propose to discuss it. I can tell the hon. gentleman and this House that, so far as this Bill is concerned, it is introduced for the sole object of cutting down the expenses as far as possible in the management of that road. I know there is no desire on the part of the Government, or those connected with the department, to hide anything or deprive hon. gentlemen or the country of all the information they should have, and they should have all it is possible to give them. I fully comprehend the force of the suggestions or objections, if I may be allowed to so term them, thrown out by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). There is a great deal of force in what he says. What I suggest is, that if the hon. gentleman will allow the Bill to go through Committee I will not ask the third reading to be taken until I have had sufficient time to enquire from the department, and obtain the information which the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) asks, and such information as other hon. members desire. My own impression is, and I admit that I have very little know-

ledge of railway book-keeping, that there will be no difficulty in obtaining the information which the hon. gentleman suggests. I can understand that in running a train through from one point over the main line and returning, the cost of the coal consumed on one portion of the route might be difficult to ascertain. Still, there might be a *pro rata* mileage charged. To be frank with hon. members, I must say I am not sufficiently acquainted with the details to give the information requested; but I will make enquiries at the department and ascertain if the system of book-keeping would not enable the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) or any other member, who desires the information to obtain it as fully as if half a dozen sets of books were kept in connection with the different branches. I will also endeavour to find out what saving will be made in connection with this matter, as asked by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock).

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I have no desire to factiously obstruct the passage of the Bill, and I am not therefore going to offer any objection to the Bill going into Committee. The hon. gentleman will see that the Windsor Branch stands in a different position from the other branches. The Government maintain the way of the Windsor Branch and receive one-third of the receipts, while two-thirds of the receipts go to the Windsor and Annapolis Company. I cannot see very well how the accounts of the branch can be mixed up with those of the Intercolonial Railway, which is owned by the Government. I may say frankly to my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that I offer less opposition to this Bill, because at present the accounts of the Oxford and New Glasgow and Pictou roads are included in the Intercolonial accounts. The only roads the Bill asks to amalgamate with the Intercolonial Railway in this regard are the Eastern Extension and Cape Breton roads. My anxiety was to discover what the working of the Cape Breton road would be. The hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) has stated a fact not within the knowledge of members of this House, and not, I believe, contained in any official record, certainly it is not in the railway report or railway statistics or published in the *Canada Gazette*.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). If the hon. gentleman will ask for a return he will find the facts I have stated are correct.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I will take the opportunity to ask for a return. To avoid the necessity of obtaining a return, perhaps the hon. gentleman will kindly give the information.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). With very great pleasure.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell us in regard to the working of the Cape Breton road, which it is now proposed to amalgamate with the Intercolonial Railway, what have been the receipts and expenditures during the time it has been in operation? If the receipts and expenditures of the Oxford and New Glasgow and the Pictou Branch had been separate, I would have been disposed to maintain the objection made by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), but as they are contained in the Intercolonial accounts, the only thing we are discussing is whether the Eastern Extension and Cape Breton roads should be kept separate.

Mr. BOWELL. I can fully understand the objection, more particularly in view of the difficulty I have had in the Customs Department in coming to a correct conclusion as to the amount of drawback in the shape of Customs duties paid on articles used upon the road, and purchased in foreign countries by those who owned them. In the original charter obtained from the Province of Nova Scotia certain conditions were made and a perpetual exemption from Customs duties was given, and my difficulty has been to ascertain the amount chargeable to that portion of the road which belongs to the Intercolonial Railway, over which their engines, passenger and freight trains were run. To use a familiar expression we have had to "jump at it."

Mr. McMULLEN. The Grand Trunk Company operate a great many lines and keep separate accounts for each road. From the company's annual report you can trace the mileage and earnings of every line they operate. It must also be remembered that the Grand Trunk Company are operating far more branch lines than are the Dominion Government. I was not previously aware that the Windsor and New Glasgow road was operated as part of the Intercolonial.

Mr. BOWELL. Are not most of the branch lines of the Grand Trunk Railway Company leased roads?

Mr. McMULLEN. Some are not, and still the accounts are kept separately. It is highly desirable that we should have this information I ask, unless the item for book-keeping is going to be a very important one, as it is highly desirable that this country should be in possession of the facts with respect to the annual earnings of the lines; and to verify and substantiate that our fault-finding is necessary, we should be able to trace the annual cost of the different portions of these lines. I was pleased to hear my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. Cameron) say that the Cape Breton line was now paying running expenses and a little over. That is more than we expected; but we hope that it will do more than that, and if it does pay a small interest on the investment it is fair to Cape Breton that the rest of the Dominion should know that its railway is not a drain on our resources. If the accounts are not kept separately, the impression might prevail, without any possibility of setting it right in the future that the Cape Breton Railway was a drain on the country. When the hon. Minister presents his statement as regards the cost of book-keeping we will be able to decide whether it is better to have specific information as to the annual cost of each portion of this line than to save the paltry sum which might be saved by the passing of this Act.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I have no desire to prolong the discussion, but if separate accounts are kept I would suggest they should be kept differently from the manner suggested by my hon. friends opposite. I would suggest that the accounts of the branch of the Intercolonial Railway from Point Lévis to Moncton be kept separately from the accounts of the rest of the road; that the accounts of that part of the Intercolonial Railway between St. John and Moncton, between Moncton

and Sydney, C. B., and between Halifax and Pictou be also kept separately. If that were done I think it will be found out that the eastern portion of the road pays remarkably well, and that the deficit on the running of the Intercolonial Railway is largely incurred between Point Lévis and Moncton, and that it is chiefly on account of carrying the products of the great Province of Ontario to the consumers down by the sea at a lower rate than should be paid to the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would like to ask the acting Minister whether, if the Bill passes and all the branches and extensions are under the one management, it is contemplated to make any change in the freight arrangements as regards the new branches of the road?

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Perhaps the Minister could give me the information before the Bill passes. I simply want to point out that along the Intercolonial Railway from Campbellton to Halifax, including Pictou, the rate is precisely the same, but the moment you leave Windsor Junction on the Windsor and Annapolis Branch, the rates are much higher; and also from New Glasgow, Antigonish, Port Mulgrave and Point Tupper, the rates are a great deal higher. I want to find out, if they were all brought under the one management, whether the rates could not be made the same from Antigonish as they are along the line to Pictou and other points on the Intercolonial Railway. I see no reason why, on the Windsor and Annapolis Branch, freight can be carried to Pictou at a certain rate and it cannot be carried to Annapolis at the same rate. I hope that before the Bill passes we shall have some information on this.

Mr. BOWELL. Does the hon. gentleman wish to know whether the through rates or the local rates are to be changed?

Mr. CAMPBELL. The through rates.

Bill reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 24th June, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 115) to amend the Act respecting Government Harbours, Piers and Breakwaters.—(Mr. Tupper.)

POSTMASTER AT GALT.

Mr. SEMPLE asked, Did Mr. Thomas Cowan resign the office of postmaster at Galt before the 5th of March last? If so, has he been reappointed, or does some other person hold the position?

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness).

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Thomas Cowan did resign the office of postmaster at Galt before the 5th of March last. He has been reappointed.

INDIAN AGENT ALLEN.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Did the Government receive the following letter, and if so, what action have they taken in regard to it?

"To the Right Honourable
"The Superintendent General of Indian Affairs.

"SIR,—Last winter (a year ago), there were informations laid with Indian Agent Allen by the undersigned Indians.

"Three of those informations were against Thomas McVittie, of Denny's Mills, for selling liquor to Indians.

"McVittie was fined in two of the cases; fine $50 in each case.

"The informant Johnston, who is an Indian of the Saugeen Band, went several times to Allen about his share of the fines, but could not get any cash. All that he could get from Allen was $10 in goods out of Mulvaney's store in Port Elgin, and he was entitled to $50, $25 in each case.

"There was an information lodged against Charles Briggs, of Paisley, for giving liquor to Indians.

"The information against him was laid by Thomas Solomon, an Indian and Councillor in the Band.

"Briggs came in company with Mr. Hilker, of Port Elgin, and paid him (Allen) $50, fine and costs, before trial.

"Solomon has not got his $25.

"At last October pay-day (October, 1890), Agent Allen hearing that Solomon was going to report the matter to the Indian Department, sent word to him that he had $15 for him, and if he did not take that he would not get any.

"Agent Allen is giving orders on our annuity money to merchants, and one merchant he allows to make orders, and accepts the same.

"He allows the same merchant, R. Buckley, to sit at the pay-table and collect his pay, when all others have to stay out of doors.

"There are several matters that require investigation, and if you require proof you can summon the following persons, viz.:—A. Lindsay, Merchant; John Wood, Merchant; D. Robertson, Merchant; J. J. Creighton, Merchant; A. Hambridge, Carriage Manufacturer; H. Harmer, Furniture Dealer; and nearly the whole Band of Saugeen Indians.

(Signed) "RALPH JOHNSTON.
"THOMAS SOLOMON."

Mr. DEWDNEY. A letter from these parties was received by the Department of Indian Affairs, containing charges against Agent Allen, similar to those mentioned in this letter, which purports to be a copy thereof, but is not. The letter was acknowledged, and a copy of the same was forwarded to the Inspector of Indian Agencies and Reserves with instructions to investigate and report upon the same. No report has yet been received from the inspector.

POSTAL ACCOMMODATION AT DIGBY, N.S.

Mr. BOWERS asked, Is the Government aware that the postal accommodation at Digby, N.S., a central station for the distribution of mails, is totally insufficient for the demands upon it? If so, is it the intention of the Government at an early date to make more suitable arrangements for the erection of a building and the extension of postal accommodation in that locality?

Mr. HAGGART. The Post Office Department has no communication on the subject of the question asked by the hon. gentleman.

BERNE COPYRIGHT CONVENTION.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. EDGAR) asked, Whether the Canadian Government has requested the Imperial Government to give notice, on behalf of Canada, for

the renunciation of the Berne Copyright Convention? If such request was made by the Canadian Government, what was the date thereof? And if notice has been given by the Imperial Government, what was the date thereof?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Canadian Government has requested the Imperial Government to give notice, on behalf of Canada, for the renunciation of the Berne Copyright Convention. Such request was made by the Canadian Government in August, 1889. The notice, I believe, has not yet been given by the Imperial Government.

BONDING OF FOREIGN FISH.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to make any change in the regulations respecting the bonding of foreign fish, or to require that such fish imported in bond shall be exported in the original packages?

Mr. BOWELL. No regulations exist having special reference to fish more than to other warehoused goods, all of which is defined by law. It appeared from representations made to the department in 1889 that the provisions of laws had not been observed in relation to fish, and instructions were issued to collectors calling attention to the law's requirements and insisting upon their observance. The circular issued at that time was as follows:—

"I have, by the direction of the hon. the Minister of Customs, to call your special attention to the provisions of section 89 of the Customs Act as amended by the Act 52 Vic., chap. 14 (last session), and now in force, which provides that goods entered for warehouse shall be immediately after entry transported to and placed in the designated warehouse; and of section 96, which provides that if goods so entered are not duly carried into and deposited in the warehouse, or having been so deposited are afterwards taken out without lawful permit, &c., such goods shall be seized and forfeited; and to point out that under these provisions of law the practice which has heretofore existed at certain ports of permitting foreign fish which has been so entered for warehouse to remain on the wharf for the purpose of being further cured, packed or repacked before entry ex-warehouse for consumption or exportation, can be no longer lawfully allowed, but such fish must immediately, on being entered, be placed in the designated warehouses and there secured in the same manner as any other bonded goods; this, however, does not prevent the packing or repacking of such fish under Customs supervision within the bonded warehouse, under the terms of section 88 of the Act; but no privileges can be given further than within the section hereinbefore referred to."

It is not the intention of the Government to make any change in the law regulating the bonding of fish or other goods; the provisions of the law being sufficient to protect the revenue *in re* bonding of all goods.

BOUCHERVILLE WHARF.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. PRÉFONTAINE) asked, 1. To whom was the work on the Boucherville wharf entrusted? 2. Was the work awarded under contract for a public call for tenders, or not? 3. And if the work was awarded without tenders, why was it so awarded, and what was the price?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. 1. The work was entrusted to the municipality of the parish of Boucherville. 2. No; but it was arranged for under an agreement with the municipal council of the parish of Boucherville, County of Chambly, to whom the estimates have been paid as the work has progressed. 3. The amount paid was in the light of a contribution towards the completion of a work commenced by the said municipality and constructed by them. The amount agreed to be paid to the municipalityis $3,200.

KINGSTON POST OFFICE.

Mr. AMYOT asked, 1. Whether there are in the post office at Kingston boxes or drawers fastened with lock and key, leased yearly to private individuals, and were there any such in 1889? 2. What is the yearly charge per box, and to whom does the amount belong? 3. Does the postmaster of Kingston make a yearly report thereon to the Government? 4. Does the said postmaster keep a record of the names of the lessees of the said boxes?

Mr. HAGGART. 1. Yes, and they were so leased in 1889. 2. The yearly charge per box varies from $4 to $6; the amount belongs to the Government. 3. Yes. 4. Yes, but only from year to year.

EMPLOYMENT OF W. A. SHEPPARD.

Mr. GUAY (for Mr. CHOQUETTE) asked, Whether Mr. W. A. Sheppard is employed by the Government as an immigration agent, or in any other capacity? If he is so employed, has he made any report?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Mr. Sheppard is incidentally employed for the distribution of immigration publications in towns of the United States. He has been so employed since 1883. He has furnished regular reports of his operations.

CAPTAIN CLAUDE GIGUÈRE.

Mr. AMYOT asked, 1. Has Captain Claude Giguère been in the employ of the Dominion Government, and also in that of the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec for thirteen years and over?

2. Has he been employed, with men under him, to clear the bed of the river forming the harbour of Quebec; to dredge and level the River St. Lawrence at various places; and to lay the foundations of various wharves for the Government?

3. Has he performed these services and duties to the satisfaction of the officers of the Government?

4. Has he been employed by the Government, during the season of navigation for 1890, as diver, or otherwise, at Grosse Isle?

5. Were his services for the same work retained by the Engineer, George L. Bourchier, or other person, for the season of navigation for 1891?

6. Did the said Giguère accept the offer made him?

7. Did the said Bourchier, on the 12th May, 1891, write to the said Captain Giguère informing him that his services would no longer be required?

8. At whose suggestion was this cancelling of the agreement decided upon? Was it, among other persons, done upon the advice of another diver? Why did the Government act in this manner? Does the Government intend to pay and reimburse to the said Giguère whatever loss he may have suffered by reason of the foregoing?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. 1. Yes, Giguère was employed by the department. Nothing is known in the department as to his being employed by the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec.

2. Giguère was engaged in the removal of boulders at Quebec, Three Rivers, &c.

3. The work was performed satisfactorily.

4. He was employed at Grosse Isle during 1890. Mr. Bourchier says that Captain Claude Giguère's men, Peter Baeudette and X. Parre, worked for him, on account of Government, at Grosse Isle, from 14th October, 1890, till 15th November, 1890.

5. No; Giguère was not retained for the season of 1891.

6. Mr. Bourchier says he never made Giguère any such offer.

7. His men's services were of a decidedly temporary character; they were paid for their time by the day, and liable to be discharged at any moment when their services were no longer required.

8. There was no such agreement.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, When was the Electoral Franchise Act passed? How many times has it been amended since? How many times have the lists been revised? How many times suspended? Have the revisions and suspensions occurred alternately? Were revisions promised which did not take place? If so, why? Will the lists be revised this year? What has been the cost of each revision? What the total cost? Was anything paid for the lists in seasons when suspended? If so, how much?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I find that in one particular I was mistaken in the answer I gave the other day, and will, therefore, answer the whole question. The Electoral Franchise Act was passed in 1885. The lists have been twice revised. The Act has been twice suspended. The revisions and suspensions have not occurred alternately. The revisions were not promised which did not take place, but the intentions of the Government with regard to revisions were simply declared. The lists will be revised this year. The cost of each revision has already been laid before the House, including the total cost. Nothing was paid for the lists in seasons when suspended.

DREDGING KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER.

Mr. CAMPBELL asked, How many yards of dredging, according to engineer's report, have been done on the bar of the Kaministiquia River by Captain Murray, and what amount of money has been paid him for the same, since July, 1890? How many yards have been dredged in the River Kaministiquia by the same party, since July last, and how much money has he received for the same?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. On the bar, 50,010 cubic yards at 7 cents, $3,500.70; in the river, 99,650 yards at 19 cents, $18,933.50; total, $22,434.20. The quantities of dredging to be done during the season of 1890 were as follows:—On the bar, 50,000 cubic yards; in the river, 100,000 cubic yards.

LANGEVIN BLOCK.

Mr. MULOCK asked, 1. What is the total amount expended by the Government in connection with the Langevin Block? 2. What is the amount of all unpaid claims in connection with the erection of said block?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The total amount expended is $778,961.60. On main contract for construction, $252,593.57; on contract of roof, $15,813.99; iron stairs, $3,854.58. In answer to the second question, these claims are not recognized by the department, with the exception of the small sum of $1,000 or $2,000.

SAULT STE. MARIE WHARF.

Mr. GILLMOR asked, Did the Government purchase the property at Sault Ste. Marie, Ont., upon which the Government wharf is built? If so, from whom, and upon what terms was the purchase made? What was the total cost of the wharf? Who is in charge of it? What agreement (if any) was made with the party in charge as to rent to be paid by him or payment to him?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The property mentioned, which is valued at $67,000, was conveyed to the Crown by William Henry Plummer on the 8th July, 1888, the consideration being $1, and that the Crown should extend the wharf built thereon, and appoint the said W. H. Plummer wharfinger at a fixed salary, to be paid out of the tolls collected on said wharf. The total cost of the wharf, extension and repairs up to date is $13,605.36. There was no agreement.

BAR AT THE MOUTH OF THE RIVER THAMES.

Mr. CAMPBELL asked, Whether, in view of the great obstruction to navigation caused by the bar at the mouth of the River Thames, in the County of Essex, Ont., the Government propose to have the said bar removed during the present summer?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Last session Mr. Campbell moved for the papers, &c., in reference to the dredging off the mouth of the River Thames. Since then there has not been any further examination nor report. In the last report on this subject it is stated that to make a channel 5,000 feet in length of a permanent character through the "bar," with a width of 150 ft. and a depth of 12 ft., would require the following outlay:—Dredging, $10,000; protection works, $75,000; total, $85,000. During 1889 the sum of $4,179 was expended in dredging at this place. The Government has not decided whether they will have work done there this year.

BREMNER'S CLAIM FOR FURS.

Mr. LISTER asked, Has an application been made by or on behalf of Charles Bremner for payment for the furs taken by General Middleton? Is it the intention of the Government to pay for such furs?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. An application has been made on behalf of Charles Bremner, but it only came to the Privy Council at the close of last week, and it is too soon for me to state what the intention of the Government is.

SALMON NET FISHING ON THE RESTIGOUCHE.

Mr. FAUVEL asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government that in the event of any of

the present lessees of salmon net fishing rights in tidal waters on the Restigouche River, in the County of Bonaventure, dying, that their heirs will be deprived of a continuance of such fishing rights? If so, why?

Mr. TUPPER. There are no lessees of salmon net fishing rights on the Restigouche River, but there are licenses which are only enforced from year to year. The license is granted only for the year's fishing, so that no rights are involved, and it is, therefore, unnecessary to answer the other part of the question.

IMMIGRATION TO THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. DAVIN asked, What reply has been sent to the memorials of the Legislative Assembly of the North-West Territories on the subject of immigration? If the memorials have been rejected, on what grounds?

Mr. HAGGART. The reply given to the Legislative Assembly of the North-West Territories, on the subject mentioned in the hon. gentleman's question, was to the effect that it would be inadvisable to ask Parliament for a vote for immigration expenditure for any part of the Dominion apart from the ordinary votes for immigration.

NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

Mr. DAVIN asked, Whether the attention of the Government has been called to the following article on the reform of the North-West Mounted Police which appeared in the public press:—

"1. Pension for permanent disablement, irrespective of number of years' service.

"At present a man has to complete fifteen years' service before he is entitled to a pension by reason of being incapacitated.

"2. Promotion to commissioned ranks to be through the force by competitive examination; eligibility to be determined by character and service. A proportion of officers being appointed from the Royal Military College, Kingston.

"By this means, every man on joining would have the possibility of a commission before him as an incentive, irrespective of social or political influence. Police duties are peculiar and can only be acquired by practical experience, embracing, in addition to a knowledge of drill and purely military matters, a knowledge of prairie work and a thorough acquaintance with the duties of a peace officer.

"3. Rigid enquiry into the character of applicants for enlistment, and the maintenance of the age clause. As enlistment is now carried out, almost anyone who is physically fit can gain admittance into the North-West Mounted Police; the consequence is that all sorts and conditions of men flock into the force, with a most deteriorating effect. The constant cropping up of serious crimes brings discredit on a splendid corps and causes the better portions of its members to blush for their associations, and prevents men of good character from enlisting from fear of having to sleep, eat and associate with the class that is now being recruited into the force. No corps in the world is more dependent on the intelligence of its members, who may at any time be called on to perform duties requiring judgment and reasoning powers of somewhat higher order than will suffice for the ordinary soldier. The men have to be self-reliant, and very young men are not desirable material. Twenty-two should be the minimum of enlistment.

"4. Shorter term of service should entitle both officers and men to pensions.

"The maximum term of service at present in the force is such that no man who has endured the exposure, privations and arduous duties of twenty-five years' service can be other than broken down and decrepit. Nor can any officer of thirty-five years' service expect to be capable of enduring the exposure and fatigue of a campaign with the younger men of his command. The Mounted Police is practically on service at all times, and the physical effects are more telling on its members than on men working in other departments of the Government. The maximum term of service should be twenty years in the ranks and twenty-five for a commissioned officer.

"5. A sliding scale of pay to be applied to officers. In the case of young inspectors coming in at, say, $600, an increase of $50 a year up to $1,000, and in the case of inspectors coming in at $1,000, after five years, an increase of $50 a year up to $1,200; for superintendents up to $1,000, and to assistant commissioners, after five years, $50 a year up to $1,800, and the commissioner needs no increase. If anything he is overpaid.

"The justice of this is obvious. At present a newly joined inspector is on the same footing as one who has seen many years' service. Officers should be credited with their back service and receive pay from the date of passing of the new Act in proportion as if the scale had been in force from the date of their appointment.

"6. Previous service in the force to count towards a pension after a man is promoted from the rank to a commission.

"At the present a man promoted to a commission loses the benefit of all his previous service, and starts from the date of his commission as if he had never served a day in the force, with 35 years before him before he can hope for superannuation. Under the present circumstances, a man of 10 or 12 years' service would be foolish to take a commission and relinquish all previous service.

"7. Police to be placed on an equal footing with other troops in respect to the North-West Rebellion medal, whether under fire or not.

"The amount of service was as great, if not considerably greater on the part of the police. Why should the recognition be less?

"8. That officers, non-commissioned officers and men should not be transferred from one division to another, except in exceptional cases.

"After an officer has become proficient in his duties at headquarters, he should be permanently posted to some division, and not be liable to be transferred at any moment, without exceptionally strong reasons. The first duty of an officer is to make himself acquainted with the character and dispositions of all the men in his division, and under his command, and by association be able to take a personal interest in their hopes and troubles, and thus cement the strong respect and regard which should always exist between the men and their officers. He should know the capabilities of each horse, his disposition and peculiarities. To do his duty effectively, he must be reasonably well-known to the inhabitants, and thoroughly posted by personal experience in the topography of the district in which he is placed. As an officer, *a fortiori* with one of subordinate rank. To transfer an officer without any apparent reason, points to the conclusion that he is too intimate with the inhabitants to do his duty impartially. The expense incurred by a married member of the force, in moving from one post to another, is ruinous, and must keep him in straightened circumstances, if not in actual debt. The home comforts that he has gathered around him must be reconstructed, and new friendships and associations formed. Every officer should remain with his division, unless special circumstances necessitate a change, either for personal considerations for the officer thus moved, or for strong advantage to the public service."

Is it the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill this Session on the lines set out in this article?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The attention of the Government has not been previously called to the newspaper article referred to, but several of the subjects mentioned therein were under the consideration of the late Sir John Macdonald and were noted by him for future action. It is not the intention of the Government to introduce any Bill respecting the North-West Mounted Police during the present session.

BELLE CREEK BREAKWATER, P.E.I.

Mr. WELSH asked, Has the Government taken the Belle Creek breakwater, Prince Edward Island, as a Government work? And if so, how much money (if any) has been expended thereon by the Government? Has any contract been entered into

for the rebuilding or repairing of the breakwater? If so, what is the amount of the contract?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government has not taken the Belle Creek breakwater as a Government work. No expenditure has been made thereon, nor contract entered into for rebuilding or repairing the structure.

RED POINT PIER, P.E.I.

Mr. WELSH asked, When did the Government take over from the Local Government of Prince Edward Island, Red Point Pier, P.E.I., as a Government work? How much money has been expended on said pier since it was taken over? Was this pier included in those recommended to be taken by the Government engineer? If not, for what reason was it taken over from the Local Government?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government has not taken over Red Point Pier from the Local Government. The sum of $799.97 was expended during 1885 and 1887 on repairs. It is not recommended to be taken over.

WOOD ISLANDS BREAKWATER, P.E.I.

Mr. WELSH asked, Is it the intention of the Government to allow the breakwater at the Wood Islands, Prince Edward Island, to remain as it is, without repairs or dredging, or will there be placed in the Supplementary Estimates an appropriation sufficient to save it from decay and destruction, and to carry out the recommendation of the Government engineer?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The report from the resident engineer has not yet been received, but it is expected very soon.

WALKERTON PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Mr. TRUAX asked, Have the Government appointed a caretaker for the Walkerton Public Buildings? If so, what is his name, where did he reside at the time of his appointment, and what was his occupation? When was he appointed, and what salary is he to receive?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government has not appointed a caretaker there.

LOCATION TICKETS ON COCKBURN ISLAND.

Mr. LISTER asked, Was Peter McLellan entitled to lot 16 in 4th concession, Cockburn Island, under location ticket either granted or assigned to him? Has the ticket been cancelled? If so, when, and for what reason? Has any person since such cancellation acquired any right or interest in the lot from the Government? If so, the name and address of such person?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Lot 16, concession 4, Cockburn Island, was assigned to Peter McLellan by Thomas Smith, the original purchaser. The sale of the lot was cancelled on the 3rd July, 1888, under section 46 of the Indian Act, for imposition. No return has as yet been made to the department by the local agent of the re-sale of this lot.

Mr. LISTER asked, Was John Alexander Mc Lellan entitled to lot 15 in 5th concession of Cockburn Island, under location ticket either granted or assigned to him? Has the ticket been cancelled? If so, when, and for what reason? Has any person since such cancellation acquired any right or interest in the lot from the Government? If so, the name and address of such person?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Lot 15, concession 5, Cockburn Island, was sold to John Alexander McLellan. The sale of this lot was cancelled on the 3rd of July, 1888, under section 46 of the Indian Act, for non-fulfilment of the conditions of sale. No return has, as yet, been made to the department by the local agent of the re-sale of this lot.

NAPANEE PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Mr. ALLISON asked, Who was the contractor for the Napanee Public Buildings? Who tendered for the work? What was the amount of each tender? Was the lowest accepted, and what was the amount of it? Have the buildings been fully paid for, and what has been the total cost to date?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The contractor for the Napanee Public Buildings was George Newlands. The tenderers for the work were J. J. Lyons, Ottawa; George Newlands, Kingston; G. A. Cliff, Napanee; George Wilson, Gananoque; J. Forin, Belleville; T. Doddridge, Brockville; and A. Cameron, Portsmouth. The amount of the tenders was as follows:—J. J. Lyons, $27,087; George Newlands, $25,350; George Wilson, $26,000; J. Forin, $26,000; T. Doddridge, $27,500; A. Cameron, $32,624. The lowest tender was accepted, the amount being $25,350. The buildings have been fully paid for. The total cost to date is $48,378.80, including cost of site, building of post office box fronts, heating, tower clock and furniture.

INDIAN AFFAIRS IN NORTH BRUCE.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Has the following list of charges been submitted to the Government regarding Indian affairs in North Bruce? If so, what action has been taken?

1. Selling horses, buggies, hay and provisions.
2. By giving orders to merchants and collecting the same.
3. By accepting orders from merchants purported to be made by the Indians, but made by merchants themselves.
4. By stopping the pay from Indians at pay-table, instead of giving each Indian his money in full.
5. By allowing a merchant to sit at pay-table and collect his money, when others had to stop outside.
6. An Indian went to agent's house for his pay, which the agent refused him unless a certain merchant, friend of agent's, was there to collect his money.
7. An order was passed in Council in the spring of 1890, signed by chiefs, councillors and agent, for D. Robertson to supply the Indians with seed grain, the said Robertson to be paid in July quarter and October, 1890, for which he supplied them, and there is quite a balance to be paid him yet. The reason he is not paid is the agent accepting orders from friends of his, and when the Indian leaves the pay-table, he has nothing left to pay balance on his seed.
8. One Jebott called on Indian Agent Allen this spring, offering to supply the Indians with seed

potatoes at 65 cents per bushel, which offer he refused, the same to be paid July and October quarter; but one Gordon, a friend of Agent Allen's, goes to Jebott and buys all the potatoes at 60 cents per bushel, and sells the same potatoes to the Indians at 75 cents per bushel, getting an order from said Indians to Agent Allen, who collects same orders at pay-table. If Agent Allen was looking after Indians' interests, he could have saved the Indians 15 cents per bushel.

9. In April quarter, 1891, the agent accepted so many orders and collected them at the pay-table; that in most of cases the Indians had not a cent left to buy any seed with, and the said Agent Allen did not exert himself, or try to get seed for the Indians, which he should have done.

10. By accepting orders from merchants, friends of his, the said orders made for full amount of annuity coming to them, the said merchants charging what prices they think fit, and said Agent Allen collects the said orders at pay-table, instead of giving each one his money in full, as the Government intended he should, and let the Indians pay whom they pleased, as should be the case. Under the present system of Agent Allen, the Indians are deceived, as the ones that sign the orders, or otherwise have them signed, do not know that they have signed all, or nearly all but a few cents of what is coming to them—in some cases more than what is coming—and the consequence is, the said Indians who sign, or get signed for them, contract accounts in other places, and when pay-day comes, the answer you get is: We have none left; Allen took it all for some merchant friends of his.

11. That the said Agent Allen is not a fit and proper person for Indian agent, as he has no education, and can scarcely write his own name.

Mr. DEWDNEY. In regard to questions 1, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, no charges, such as described under these heads, have been made to the department. The charges made in questions 2, 3, 4, 5, are similar to those made in the letter referred to in the previous question of the hon. member, and have been acted on, as I previously informed the hon. member. No other communication has been received.

METAL PILLARS FOR PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, What is the cost of the metal pillars under the hand (stone) railing of the stairs to the entrance of the House of Commons, Senate, and other public buildings in Ottawa, including putting them in place, and why were the stone ones removed and metal put in? Was the contract let by tender; if so, did the lowest tenderer get the work? Who did the work?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The cost of the bronze pillars underneath the hand (stone) railing of the entrance of the House of Commons and Senate, is as follows:—82 bronze pillars, $1,804; fitting up, iron ties, masonry, stonecutting, $894.70; total, $2,698.70. The stone pillars, which were of Ohio (Devonian) standstone, were, owing to their exceptional exposure to moisture, heat and frost, completely destroyed by weathering, and the railing had to be temporarily supported. Bronze was preferred, being much more durable and less costly than granite. The tenders were as follows:—Messrs. Garth & Co., bronze, at $22 each, $1,804; Messrs. R. Forsythe & Co., red granite, at $32.50 each, $2,665; Canadian Granite Co., red granite, at $35 each, $2,738. The lowest tenderer was given the work.

W. E. JONES, CENSUS COMMISSIONER.

Mr. LAVERGNE asked, 1st. Is Mr. W. E. Jones, of Richmond, Province of Quebec, Census Commissioner, the same Mr. W. E. Jones who is the editor of the Richmond *Guardian*?

2nd. Did the said Mr. W. E. Jones obtain three weeks' leave of absence from the 14th of February last to the 5th of March last?

3rd. Did the said Mr. W. E. Jones receive $10 per day and expenses as Census Commissioner during the aforesaid period from the 14th of February last to the 5th of March last?

4th. Is the Government aware that the said Mr. W. E. Jones employed the aforesaid period of time in canvassing, holding meetings, and making speeches in favour of the Conservative Administration?

Mr. HAGGART. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I may state that Mr. Jones was appointed Census Commissioner; he did not obtain three weeks leave of absence from 14th February last to the 5th of March last; he did not receive $10 a day and expenses as Census Commissioner during that period; and the Government are not aware that he employed the aforesaid period of time in the manner mentioned by the question.

EUGÈNE SOUCY OF TROIS PISTOLES.

Mr. GUAY (for Mr. CHOQUETTE) asked, Is Eugène Soucy, of Trois Pistoles, employed in any capacity on the Intercolonial Railway, and if so, what does he do? Was the said Soucy at one time employed as conductor on the said railway, and if so, why is he no longer so employed?

Mr. BOWELL. This gentleman was employed as a conductor, and was dismissed in 1888 for being under the influence of liquor when on duty.

TRAIN SERVICE IN P.E.I.

Mr. PERRY asked, Has the Department of Railways received a petition from the merchants, traders, and other inhabitants of Tignish and vicinity, in Prince County, P.E.I., praying that an express train leave Tignish in the morning so as to connect at Summerside, P.E.I., with the steamer plying between Summerside and Pointe du Chêne, New Brunswick? If so, what action, if any, has been taken with respect to said petition?

Mr. BOWELL. Such a petition was received from Mr. Richard Hunt, and the department informed Mr. Hunt, on the 14th April, 1891, that the request would not be granted.

BREAKWATER IN PRINCE COUNTY, P.E.I.

Mr. PERRY asked, When the contract of the breakwater or pier at Brae, in Prince County, P.E.I., is to be completed? Has any inspector been appointed to look after said work? If so, what is his name? When was he appointed, and what is to be paid for his services as inspector?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The contract is to be completed on the 16th January, 1892. An inspector has not been appointed, nor will there be

one appointed until the services of such an officer are required.

SALARIES OF POSTMASTERS.

Mr. GERMAN asked, What, if any, is the rate at present allowed postmasters for salary on the revenues collected at the various post offices?

Mr. HAGGART. The salaries of postmasters of staff offices are regulated by the Civil Service Act. Other postmasters are allowed for salary at the rate of 40 per cent. on the first $800 of actual postal revenue collected at their offices, and 25 per cent. on the revenue in excess of $800. A rent allowance is also granted in certain cases according to the following scale:—$40 when revenue reaches $800; $20 for each additional $400 up to $2,000, and $20 for each $500 thereafter.

STEAM FANS ON CATTLE VESSELS.

Mr. SPROULE asked, Is it the intention of the Government to act on the suggestion of M. C. Baker, V.S., their agent at Montreal, and order the use of steam fans on all vessels carrying cattle during the season, during which distillery-fed animals are being shipped?

Mr. HAGGART. The Government intend to insist that all vessels carrying cattle during the season shall have steam fans upon such vessels.

ADJOURNMENT FOR HOLIDAYS.

Mr. LAURIER. I would like to enquire from the Government whether they have considered the fact that there are two legal holidays next week, and have they any suggestions to offer the House in that respect?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government have considered the fact that there are two holidays next week, and we believe that if we took Saturday of next week, thus having Tuesday, Thursday, Friday and Saturday, then the two holidays would not deprive Parliament of more than one day's work. Therefore, when the House adjourns on Friday, we shall ask the House to adjourn until Tuesday at three o'clock, and then sit during the remainder of the week except on Wednesday, which is Dominion Day.

Mr. ROOME. As I am living at a distance from the Capital, it would be little use going home unless the recess were extended till Thursday. I, therefore, suggest that the House should adjourn until Thursday at three o'clock, and sit on Saturday.

Mr. IVES. This is a question worthy of consideration. If the Government insist on sitting on Tuesday, I think it is doubtful that there will be a quorum at the committees and probably not a quorum in the House, but members on both sides, at very great inconvenience, will have to attend on Tuesday and then lie over here or return home for Wednesday and then come back on Thursday. Many of us have engagements on Dominion Day, which will take us home, and, therefore, it will be very inconvenient to come back on Tuesday.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is a great deal of force in what the hon. gentleman has said. I suggest to the Government, whether it would not be better to adopt the precedent given us two or three years ago, and sit on Dominion Day. We have reached that period of the year when it becomes a very serious matter for business men to be away from their engagements and business, and it is desirable to push business with all convenient and reasonable speed. I understand it is not possible to sit on Monday, on account of the character of the day, and it is not impossible, according to precedent, to sit on Wednesday; so the adjournment might simply be over Monday, and the House might sit on Tuesday and Wednesday, and also on the following Saturday, which would make up for Monday, and we would thus be afforded a slight hope, although we do not see the end of the session yet, of arriving at a reasonably early prorogation.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I certainly think that would be the better plan to adopt. Although many hon. members may have engagements for 1st July, there would be a sufficient number of members present to attend the business of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. Every consideration should be paid to hon. members coming from the western and eastern provinces, who have not been home since the session began. It is the duty of members living within a convenient distance of the Capital, who can run home on Saturday and return on Monday, to come here and sit on Tuesday and Wednesday, if necessary, because if we adjourn from Friday until Tuesday and then again until Thursday, there will be very little business done next week. If we commence on Tuesday and take Saturday instead of Monday, and the general understanding is that we cannot sit on Monday, but as we have previously sat on Dominion Day, much work may be done, and I do not understand that members can spend their time to greater advantage than by sitting in the Legislative Halls and doing the work of the Dominion on Dominion Day. I think respect should be shown to the wishes of the hon. members from Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba and British Columbia.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I agree with the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) and also with the remarks of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor). So far as I have been able to ascertain the wishes of members from the Maritime Provinces, they would all prefer that the House should sit on Wednesday next. There never has been a session in which there was greater reason why this should be done, as we all know the circumstances under which the House is now meeting and the sad occurrence which took place during the session, the like of which we hope will not again happen.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. I am very much in favour of the recent proposition. If we are not going to sit on Dominion Day, I think it would be better to adjourn until Thursday. If the House is going to sit on Dominion Day, then we should adjourn until Tuesday at three o'clock.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is desirable that the question should be settled now. There has been a very clear expression of opinion by a majority of the House in favour of adjourning until Tuesday afternoon.

Mr. LAURIER. It is evident that the majority of the members of the House favour sitting on Wednesday, Dominion Day, and if we are to sit on that day, the House had better adjourn until Tuesday. If, however, it is the wish of the House

not to sit on that day, then an adjournment had better be taken until Thursday next.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of course the Government wish to obtain the feelings of the House, because we are only its Executive Committee. From the feeling expressed it appears that hon. members wish to sit on Wednesday. In that case we would lose no time next week, because we would sit on Saturday as well, and, therefore, as the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has said, we would be pushing forward the business of the session as rapidly as possible.

Mr. MARA. We have not yet heard whether it has been decided to meet on Tuesday or Thursday. I understand the leader of the Government to state that the House will not meet until Thursday. If so, I should like the question put to a vote, because a large majority of the members are in favour of sitting on Tuesday, and of course on Wednesday.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think the hon. gentleman may not have understood what I said. From the feelings expressed it appears that the House should, when it adjourns on Friday, stand adjourned until Tuesday at three o'clock, and then sit all next week.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND TUNNEL.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) moved for :

All correspondence. telegrams, letters, reports, estimates and other documents relating to the surveys for, and construction and cost of, a submarine tunnel between Prince Edward Island and the mainland.

He said : I would like to take advantage of this opportunity to make a few observations on the substance of the motion and the reasons why I move for those papers. It will be in the recollection of the House that when Prince Edward Island joined the Confederation, it did so upon certain terms which were agreed upon between that province and the rest of the Dominion, and the only one of these terms about which I am at present concerned is that which provided for an efficient steam service for the conveyance of passengers and mails between the Island and the mainland, winter and summer ; that is, the placing of the Island in continuous communication with the Intercolonial Railway and the railway system of the Dominion. The paragraph in the terms of the Union which relates to this is very comprehensive and apparently very clear, and it stated that we were to have continuous steam service between the Island and the mainland all the year round. If that compact were literally construed it would be necessary for the Government to construct a tunnel, because that is the only means by which continuous communication could be maintained ; but it is said, and said with some truth, that the compact must be construed with reference to the state of facts which were in existence at the time and which might fairly be in the minds of those who entered into the contract, and that at that time nothing was said about the tunnel. I do not say that this is not true, but there is no doubt about the fact that Prince Edward Island, before she entered into union with the Dominion of Canada, was one of the most prosperous little provinces in North America, and the people were progressing from year to year and were satisfied with their then condition and the maintenance of their independence. I have no hesitation in saying that I belonged to the party for many years known as the anti-Confederate party. I belonged to it because I believed we could live very much more cheaply, and by the maintenance of a system of free trade we could be much more prosperous than we could be if we entered into union with the Dominion, where the thin edge of protection had already been inserted, and which had previously to that entered upon a career of extravagance, the results of which were easily discernible by all thinking men. However, the Island, for good or for evil, entered into an enormous contract for the construction of 210 miles of railway, the result of which was to throw upon that province a heavy debt, the payment of the interest on which was found to be enormous, and the people, listening to the voice of the syren at the time they were called upon to pay this interest, agreed to enter into a union with Canada. I may say that I have not heard at any time since then of the existence of a repeal party in Prince Edward Island or of any desire to go back to our previous condition. We always have accepted the situation loyally ; we accept, and always have accepted the terms upon which the union was made, and we desire that these terms should be carried out in a fair and reasonable spirit. I have not yet despaired myself that the terms will be carried out by the Parliament of Canada and by the Government of Canada, but it has been plain to my mind for many years that it is almost impossible to make the Parliament of Canada understand the real position of matters. The impression prevails to-day, and has prevailed for many years that Prince Edward Island has been in some sense or way a favoured Island in regard to its treatment by the Government of Canada. I wish that it were so ; but the facts are directly to the contrary. I hear from time to time statements made in the public press that Prince Edward Island has, relatively to its extent, more railway mileage than any province in the Dominion. We heard a short time ago that the post office service on the Island does not pay, and we have heard it pointed out from the Trade and Navigation Returns that the amount of Customs duty which the Island pays is ridiculously small. People have formed the impression that the Island is a non-paying member of the community and that it is rather a drag than otherwise on the Dominion generally, and if the impression were to be formed only on the information which appears in the blue-books, I cannot say that it is a wrong one. However, I protest against the unfairness of this impression. We had the Island held up to ridicule the other day as the most ignorant province of the Dominion, in the sense that it posted and received fewer letters *per capita* than any other province, and that the post office service was carried on at a greater loss than anywhere else. These statements are totally inaccurate. I turn to the statistical Year Book of the Dominion for 1889, and I find that the total expenditure of the Post Office Department exceeds the revenue by $717,000, and while the expenditure of the Province of Prince Edward Island for the post office service in the year 1890 is largely in excess of the revenue, yet every other province in the Dominion is in exactly the same position. It is not correct to say that the expenditure per head is larger in Prince Edward Island than anywhere else in the Dominion, for I find

that the post office expenditure in Manitoba, Keewatin, and the North-West Territories——

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask the hon. gentleman if he is discussing the motion with reference to the Submarine Tunnel?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I was prefacing my remarks in reference to the tunnel by giving certain facts concerning Prince Edward Island.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not see how that comes under the tunnel question.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am going to show the hon. gentleman that this has an important bearing on the matter. If the Province of Prince Edward Island is highly unproductive and unfertile it would be madness on the part of the Dominion to sanction the expenditure of any money at all, but, on the contrary, if that Island is a progressive, rich and prosperous country, or a country which under normal conditions ought to be prosperous, then I say the matter presents a different aspect. I want to show that, so far as Prince Edward Island is concerned, it is not behind any other province of the Dominion in prosperity and progress, and I wish to correct the impression that has gone abroad in the public press—it is not open for me to refer to a previous debate, but I can refer to matters which appear in the public press—and I say that the statement made there, gathered from remarks made in this House, that the receipts and expenditures in the post office service in Prince Edward Island are worse than in any other part of the Dominion, is entirely incorrect. I say that we come third or fourth in the Dominion instead of last; after Ontario, we follow closely upon Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. I will not waste the time of the House on that. Then, I referred just now to the statistical table which appeared from year to year in the blue books of this Dominion, showing that the Province of Prince Edward Island paid into the Dominion nearly $160,000 in the shape of Customs duties. Sir, that statement was so flagrantly incorrect and misleading, not only with reference to Prince Edward Island, but with reference to some of the other provinces, that it had to be withdrawn. Now I propose to show how very much that statement is at variance with the facts. The total imports of the Dominion in 1890 were $112,765,854, or equal to $21.48 per head of the population, on which a duty of $4.60 per head was paid. Estimating the population of Prince Edward Island at 125,000, that would give us $575,000 as paid into the revenue by that province instead of $160,000 with which we were credited in the Trade and Navigation Returns. Now, is there anybody who doubts, knowing the character of the population of Prince Edward Island, that they pay an average duty per head equal to the average of the whole Dominion? I do not think anybody can doubt that; but if proof is required, we have one test which, I think, will be accepted by hon. gentlemen as a fairly good one. That is: Before you joined the Dominion at all, when you had your own Customs-houses and kept account of the total duties paid, how did you stand? Well, Sir, I find that in 1872, the last year before we entered Confederation, the imports of Prince Edward Island from all countries, including Canada, which was then, so far as Prince Edward Island is concerned, a foreign country, amounted to $2,569,878. At the average importation of $21.48 per head of the Dominion, with our population of 125,000, we would have imported $2,685,000. These figures show that before Confederation Prince Edward Island imported just about the average per head of the Dominion; and if you apply the tariff of the Dominion to our actual importation of $2,569,879 before Confederation, you will find that we pay $569,000 in duty, just what I say we do pay—about $600,000 in round numbers—instead of the paltry $160,000 with which we are credited by the blue-books. Now, the total exports from Prince Edward Island in 1872, before we entered Confederation, amounted to $1,894,174, while the blue-book for 1889 credited us with only $887,000 of exports, or a million less than we exported twenty years ago. It is not necessary for me to call the attention of those hon. gentlemen who know the fertility of the soil of Prince Edward Island and the salubrity of its climate, to these figures; because they know that in a country such as that Island, where almost every acre is settled and under cultivation, and where there are no paupers, all the people belong to the consuming class. But for those who do not know this, it is necessary for me to state a few facts. The area of Prince Edward Island amounts to 1,250,000 acres, one-half of which is under actual cultivation. I find by the census that ten years ago Prince Edward Island had a population of 51 to the square mile, while the population of the other provinces of the Dominion to the square mile was only 4·72. I find by the same census that Prince Edward Island owned 55 head of live stock for every 100 acres of improved land, while the other provinces owned only 38 to the acre. It raised 109 bushels of field products to the acre of improved land, while the other provinces raised only 61 bushels. All of which goes to show that, so far from being inferior in productive power and in the other qualities which go to make a province valuable to the Dominion, the Province of Prince Edward Island stands superior to the general average of the rest of the Dominion. I do not mean to say that there may not be parts of the Dominion which are richer in many ways than Prince Edward Island is. I merely say that, taking it as a whole—its soil, its climate, and the condition of its people—the distribution of wealth is as equal there as in other parts of the Dominion; and although we have none of the very wealthy men, such as are to be found in other parts of the Dominion, the general average of wealth among the people is, I think, up to the general average of the Dominion of Canada everywhere.

Mr. SPROULE. Not much poverty.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Of actual poverty I may say there is none, and it would be impossible for an honest man with such a climate and soil to be an absolute pauper. Surrounded as that Island is with the vast wealth which is in the sea flowing about its shores, with a good soil, an equable climate, and reasonable means of bringing the produce to market, there is no reason why there should be any poverty there at all; and if there is poverty or depression or want, it is owing to an abnormal condition of affairs, not to the general condition. I ask the pardon of the House for quoting these figures, but I felt that it was necessary to do so to show the actual state of the facts. Then, it has been stated against Prince Edward

Island that the Dominion of Canada has built for us a railway 210 miles in length, and granted us other large favours. In regard to that, I repeat now the statement which I have made every year since I have had the honour of a seat in this House —that Canada did not build that railway in Prince Edward Island; that, in the adjustment between Prince Edward Island and the Dominion, the cost of that road was charged to Prince Edward Island. The Dominion Government has built a railway for the adjoining Island of Cape Breton at a cost of $3,000,000, which is chargeable to and paid out of the Dominion exchequer, but the $3,250,000 which the Prince Edward Island Railway cost was charged, every dollar of it, to Prince Edward Island, in the settlement of accounts between the Dominion and the Island.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Is not the interest on the cost of the Prince Edward Island Railway also chargeable to the Dominion of Canada?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Dominion assumed the bonds.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Answer yes or no.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I say that if the bonds were assumed by the Dominion of Canada and charged to the Island, the party who assumed the bonds are supposed to pay the interest. That is right enough.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But the principal sum of $3,250,000, which constituted the cost of the road, was charged to the Island in the Dominion accounts between the Dominion and the Island, and if it had not been so charged we would have received the interest upon that $3,250,000 every year since we entered the confederacy, and we have lost that interest.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). If the Dominion of Canada would only give to Cape Breton $50 per head on the population, which is ninety thousand, we also could build our own road on condition that the Dominion would pay the interest.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You got that and more when Nova Scotia came in.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman, I am sorry to say, has a very incorrect appreciation of what Cape Breton has received, but perhaps I will enlighten him before I sit down.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I will be glad to hear it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And the hon. gentleman will see that Cape Breton received $50 per head and a great deal more. I would ask the attention of the House for a moment to the terms of the Union, which provide for continuous communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. Reasonable efforts were made in that behalf, in my humble opinion, although my opinion is not shared by the majority of the people of the Island, by the Mackenzie Government and the Government which came in afterwards. A great experiment was tried by the Mackenzie Government when, at heavy cost, they contracted for the *Northern Light*. That boat was more abused and less costly than any experiment the Government had made. She was the pioneer in the service, and did a most admirable work; and although she did not carry out the terms of the Union, it was because no boat could in the winter months carry out that contract. After the *Northern Light* had been on the service many years and had performed her work, she was followed by the *Stanley*, an excellent boat, built with the improvements the department, after experience, thought necessary. She is an admirable boat, and in mild winters, when the ice is not very thick, I believe the *Stanley* will carry out that service admirably well; but I am bound to say that in winters of heavy frost, when the ice is heavy, neither the *Stanley* nor any other boat that can be built—but on that point I defer to the opinion of Mr. Welsh—ever will be able to keep up communication for six or eight weeks in the winter. I am not complaining at all of the Government in that respect, but a few years ago we had a project started by the Hon. Senator Howlan for the construction of a subway between the Island and the mainland, which would enable this Dominion to implement its contract with the Island. Well, I never was in favour of that scheme. I made enquiries among scientific men, engineers, with whom I came in contact, and I found it was an experiment of a kind to which I did not feel justified, for one, in asking this Government to commit itself. That experiment consisted in laying an iron tunnel along the bottom of the Straits of Northumberland, some places 90 feet deep, and as no such experiment had ever been tried before, and as the scientific objections to it were very great, I never, for one, either threw cold water upon it or said anything to promote it. Under the sense of my responsibility to my constituents, as their representative, and also as a member of this House, I felt that I could not give this experiment my endorsation. However, the hon. gentleman obtained a charter in this House. He had the right to proceed with that charter, and I believe he entertained the sincere conviction that he could carry it out, but I believe that he came to the conclusion, after the expenditure of a good deal of time and money, that the subway scheme was not possible, and he dropped it. At that time it was thought that the construction of a tunnel was out of the question altogether, and judging from the cost of the construction of tunnels in other parts of the world that opinion was then well founded. But a few years ago, the cost of the construction of tunnels has, by the discovery of new machinery, by the invention of the beach shield and other machinery, been enormously decreased. Last year the question of the construction of this tunnel was discussed in the other chamber at some length, and the leader of the Senate, who replied to the speech made by Senator Howlan, advocating the construction of a tunnel, quoted the cost of the construction of tunnels in different parts of the world, and he showed that if the cost of the construction of this proposed tunnel approximated the average cost of the construction of tunnels in other parts of the world it would be out of the question for this Dominion to undertake that expenditure. He said:

"The Government satisfied themselves that the project of making a tunnel across the Straits of Northumberland or a subway—two very different things, by the way—was really in one sense impracticable—that is to say, it would cost so much as not to justify the expenditure of the sum required for the service which it was intended to perform."

Then he went on to show he had taken the trouble to glance at the subject and to find the cost of the

construction of tunnels in different parts of the world, the Urlberg Tunnel, the St. Gothard, the Mont Cenis, the Severn and other tunnels, and he gave the figures, which are not interesting or necessary for the purpose of my argument or as regards the feasibility of the project. I acknowledge that the leader of the Government in the Senate was quite justified in making the statement he did, and that the figures he gave, $20,000,000 to $26,000,000, were simply appalling; and the Government, forming their judgment, to some extent, upon these data, came to the conclusion that they could not construct the tunnel. Then followed the discovery of the cheaper methods of tunnelling. A revolution, I may say, followed the discovery of tunnelling with the beach shield, and it was found that tunnelling, which at one time was impracticable, owing to its cost, was now brought down to very reasonable figures. So the question we have to meet to-day is what is the probable cost of constructing a tunnel under the new condition of affairs and with the improved machinery. Before I come to that, let me pursue for a moment further the line of argument I was adopting a little while ago, in reply to the interruption of the hon. gentleman for Cape Breton. When Prince Edward Island entered Confederation the terms were arranged on the basis of an additional expenditure on the Intercolonial and the Canadian Pacific Railway of $58,000,000, or about that. It was understood that would be required, and Prince Edward Island got the benefit of that basis being adopted in the adjustment of accounts which then took place. But, as a matter of fact, instead of spending that amount of $58,000,000 on the Intercolonial Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the canals, we have spent $148,000,000, or more than $90,000,000 more than was arranged for in the adjustment of accounts between the Island and the Dominion. The Government recognized the injustice the Island was suffering from, to some extent, in 1887, when we had a Conservative Local Government in power, which had been floundering in debt year after year, because it had not the pluck to put on a little direct taxation. That Government repealed an Act which your humble servant put on the Statute-book when he had something to say in the Government of that province, and they kept getting into debt, and then they came to the Government here and set forth these facts and the injustice which was being done to the Island, and they asked for an increased allowance, for better terms, and this Government gave them better terms. Sir Charles Tupper, who was then Minister of Finance, brought down a Bill to allow Prince Edward Island $20,000 a year, being the interest on half a million of capital. That should never have been accepted by the Government of Prince Edward Island. At the time that Bill came before the House, I pointed out that they were giving just half what we were entitled to; that, instead of giving us the interest on the money which had been expended beyond what was calculated, they only gave us half the interest, and I told the hon. gentleman that the time could not be far distant when the Island would be found knocking at the doors of the Administration, and asking, not that favours be given, but that common justice should be done, and that the amounts expended on the Intercolonial Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the canals and public works in which the Island did not participate, beyond what was calculated at the time she entered into Confederation, should be taken into consideration again, and that the amount should be re-adjusted, not on the basis which was adopted in 1873 of what would probably be spent, but on the basis of what actually was spent, and I think hon. gentlemen will see that there is no injustice in that. The Island, in that respect, therefore, has not been fairly treated. There is another point to which I would call the attention of hon. gentlemen, by which the Island, from its very isolation, not through any determination, I hope, on the part of the House to make it suffer, still has suffered very largely. In 1882 this Parliament entered upon the principle of subsidizing local railways. I always thought that we were entering then upon a very dangerous experiment, one which would land us in boundless extravagance in the long run; I always thought that this system would be made a means of log-rolling between one part of the Dominion and another, that people would come here clamouring for these subsidies, and I saw, too, that the money would not be expended because the roads were in the interest of the country, but in order to bring support to the Government. The results have shown the truth of the predictions then made. I find that the total subsidies granted by the Dominion, according to the Railway Report for 1890, are $46,040,957 I find that the total subsidies paid up to the 30th September, 1890, amount to $37,196,930. If you deduct from this the subsidies paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway of $25,000,000, the Canada Central and the road from Ottawa to Montreal and Quebec, all of which are made part of the great trunk line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and amount in all to $28,919,250, you have paid to railways outside of the Canadian Pacific Railway trunk line the sum of $8,277,680. That is up to the 30th September last. In addition to that, there are now being earned, as appears by the report, of subsidies which we have already voted, an amount of $3,500,000, making a total of subsidies paid or about to be paid, outside of the Canadian Pacific Railway trunk line, of $11,777,680. Where were these subsidies paid? I find that, up to the 30th September, 1890, the subsidies paid were as follows:—Ontario, $2,735,095; Quebec, $3,194,511; Nova Scotia, $1,816,232; New Brunswick, $905,545; British Columbia, $750,000; making a total actually paid of $9,401,383. That amount, be it remembered, is not the amount we have paid for the construction of railways, but simply the amount we have paid in the way of subsidies towards the construction of railways built by private corporations. In addition to that, the Government undertook the construction of branch line of railways in different provinces. They built very largely in the Province of Nova Scotia, so much so that it has become a proverb in the Maritime Provinces that you cannot find any more land in Nova Scotia to build another railway on. For branches and extensions of the Intercolonial Railway, including the purchase of the Rivière du Loup branch, the Government expended in the Province of Quebec, up to June, 1889, $5,520,323; in New Brunswick, $3,371,855; and in Nova Scotia, $7,821,070; making a total of $16,713,248. In 1890, between June and September, we expended in Nova Scotia on the Cape Breton extension and the Ox-

ford and New Glasgow branch, $1,000,000, making a total of $17,713,248. Add to that the cost of the railway from Ottawa to Montreal and Quebec, $2,394,000, and you find that, outside of the Intercolonial Railway proper, there has been an expenditure of $20,107,248 in the construction of branch lines of railway, in addition to the subsidies I have already mentioned. Well, Sir, how did we spend that? We spent $3,019,752 in building the Cape Breton road; $1,556,015 on the Oxford and New Glasgow Railway; $1,318,731 on the Eastern Extension, and $503,000 on the Pictou town branch and other roads, which it is neither profitable nor instructive to repeat, because they go to make up the total I have given. So to summarize the figures and put them in a nutshell, we have contributed in subsidies $12,687,437; and we have spent in building roads, outside of the Intercolonial Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, $20,107,248, or altogether, $32,794,685. Well, we know the cost of the Intercolonial Railway is about $46,908,000. For the Canadian Pacific Railway we have voted $62,000,000, and we have spent $34,000,000 on canals. We have given a grant to the Short Line Railway to St. John of $186,000 yearly for twenty years, which is equivalent to a present payment of $2,687,393; and we have given to the Chignecto Marine Railway a yearly grant, the present value of which amounts to $2,343,000. So the total expenditure made with reference to railways and canals, including the Chignecto Marine Railway, is $180,733,311, of which expenditure the Province of Prince Edward Island does not share in the benefits to any appreciable extent. Hon. gentlemen understand that that is a very large sum of money, and it is an unfortunate thing that a province such as Prince Edward Island, lying as it does in a gulf, separated by water from the mainland, should not be in a position to participate in the benefits which must flow to the counties and to the provinces through which these railways and canals, costing 180 odd million dollars of money, are built and flow. Sir, I have already shown you that Prince Edward Island built at its own proper cost its own railway, and I have shown you the condition of matters with reference to the expenditure in other parts of the Dominion. Then, Sir, I will just recall shortly the terms under which we entered the Union. Before the last election delegates from Prince Edward Island visited Ottawa and interviewed the Government in connection with the construction of this subway, and a Minute of Council was passed, which was not very definite or very clear, and did not commit the Government, I frankly say, to the construction of the tunnel. But the leader of the Government, previously to the election, wrote a letter to Senator Howlan, who was chiefly engaged in promoting this tunnel, and who left the Senate at the instance, as I understand, of the leader of the Government, and came to Prince Edward Island and contested one of the districts there upon the ground that the Government were going to build this tunnel. He came to Prince Edward Island, and he made his canvass solely upon that point, and was beaten by my hon. friend who sits behind me. Senator Howlan held in his hands a letter from the late leader of the Government, Sir John A. Macdonald, written just previously to the election, and which reads as follows:—

"EARNSCLIFFE,
"OTTAWA, February 6, 1891.

"MY DEAR HOWLAN,—In response to your pressing request with respect to the tunnel across the Straits, I desire to repeat that, under the present circumstances, the Cabinet are not in a position to deal with the question. If, as I believe, the country will continue to give us its confidence, the Ministry will, under my guidance, take the matter up without delay. I understand that Sir Douglas Fox is of opinion the scheme is a feasible one. The chief thing still unknown is the cost of construction. I fully appreciate the nature and extent of the obligation incurred by the Dominion to maintain continuous communication between the Island and the mainland. We have tried to carry this out by the *Stanley*, but of course she cannot fight against the elements. So if the cost comes within a reasonable amount, such as Parliament feels itself justified in incurring, I shall be prepared to submit the question for their favourable consideration.

"I am yours sincerely,
"JOHN A. MACDONALD."

Well, Sir, there was a written pledge under the hand and signature of the leader, which was read at every public meeting on the Island, pledging the Government to submit the matter to the favourable consideration of Parliament if Sir Douglas Fox's estimates showed the expenditure would come within a reasonable amount.

Mr. FOSTER. Pledged what?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Pledged Sir John A. Macdonald to submit the question to the favourable consideration of Parliament, provided Sir Douglas Fox's estimate showed that the expenditure would come within a reasonable amount.

Mr. FOSTER. Parliament.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I will read the clause again:

"I fully appreciate the nature and the extent of the obligation incurred by the Dominion to maintain continuous communication between the Island and the mainland. We have tried to carry this out by the *Stanley*, but of course she cannot fight against the elements. So if the cost comes within a reasonable amount, such as Parliament feels itself justified in incurring, I shall be prepared to submit the question for their favourable consideration."

Of course, the hon. gentleman pledges himself there to submit it "to their favourable consideration;" they could not judge of it until he submitted it.

Mr. FOSTER. "If."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Well, I do not know what the hon. gentleman means. He would submit it for their favourable consideration if, in his judgment, the cost came within a reasonable amount, and Parliament, of course, was to judge whether his judgment was correct or not. Now, they promised that, and they promised more. On February the 28th, just at the critical time before the election, the High Commissioner was sent to visit Prince Edward Island. He came as far, I believe, as the town of Pictou.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He went towards it, at any rate. He sent a telegram, and the telegram was reputed to be dated from Pictou, stating that he could not reach the Island; that it was impossible for him to go, and that he had been recalled to Ontario. He was on his way to Pictou, at any rate; I do not know how near he reached it.

An hon. MEMBER. Truro.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Very well; if he had got on board the *Stanley*—it was the only time this winter, I believe, that she was out twelve days in the gulf—probably the electors of Quebec, Toronto

and the rest of the Dominion would have lost the eloquence which he gave them. Well, he could not come himself, but he sent the following telegram to the gentleman who was opposing me in the election:—

"D. FERGUSON, Charlottetown.

"I regret deeply that it is impossible for me to go to the Island as the *Stanley* cannot cross, and I dare not attempt the Capes. I have satisfied myself that the tunnel can be made for six million dollars, and you may rely upon all the aid I can give to that important and necessary work.

"CHAS. TUPPER.

"AMHERST, Feb. 28, 1891."

Now, nothing could be plainer or more distinct than that. We have the fact that Sir Chas. Tupper was brought to this country at the direct request and invitation of the Government themselves, on a telegram from the leader, for the sole purpose of promoting the elections; and doing it in the way he thought was best, and acting in pursuance of his instructions, he telegraphs to the people of the Island that he had satisfied himself that the tunnel could be built for so many million dollars, and that the people of the Island "might rely upon all the aid he could give to that important and necessary work."

Mr. FOSTER. Tell us about the other telegram now.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I will tell the hon. gentleman about another telegram. So here we had the written letter, signed by the leader of the Government, and the absolute, unqualified pledge given by the High Commissioner. The electors were asked to pass upon it. The hon. gentleman asks me in regard to another telegram. I telegraphed the leader of the Opposition whether, if this tunnel could be built for a reasonable amount, the scheme would have his support. He telegraphed that if the Estimates, when produced, showed that the tunnel could be built for a reasonable and fair amount, the project would have his support. I am not concerned in bandying party recriminations; I am more concerned in coming down to practical work. I want to know whether the pledge given by the late leader of the Government, Sir John Macdonald, will be carried out; I want to know whether the absolute and unqualified pledge given by Sir Charles Tupper, his agent, and the agent of the Government, will be carried out; and I also want to know if this question is to be kicked about as a football between parties at all future elections? Since this matter was before the Senate last year, and since the Government of that day, believing the cost to be an appalling cost, refused to sanction it, we have had estimates made by Sir Douglas Fox, and they were brought down by the Minister of Finance in answer to a question by myself some weeks ago. It appears that the cost will be as follows:—For a tunnel of 11 ft., internal diameter, from shaft to shaft, including land tunnel and contingencies, $5,232,640; for a tunnel of 16 ft., internal diameter, from shaft to shaft, including land tunnel and contingencies, $9,596,093; for a tunnel of 18 ft., internal diameter, from shaft to shaft, including land tunnel and contingencies, $10,962,167. So far as I am concerned, I believe that nothing short of the largest tunnel will be of practical benefit to the people. Of course, my opinion may be wrong. I took occasion to consult with some engineers with respect to the smallest-sized tunnel through which the freight car of the Intercolonial Railway could pass. I take it that if a small tunnel could be built through which the mails could be carried in a toy car it would be of no benefit to the people of the Island. Unless you can give a tunnel through which freight cars can pass, carrying produce from the Island to our natural markets, the United States, I do not think a tunnel would be of very great value to our people, certainly not one tithe of the importance it otherwise would be. To give the House some idea as to how the people of Prince Edward Island are handicapped, I will give an example. I suppose it is generally conceded, in no part of the Dominion can root crops be grown as well and perfectly as in the Island, and I suppose that in no part of the Dominion can the potatoes begin to compare with those of the Island. Owing to our natural disadvantages and the fact that we are driven to export our potatoes during three or four weeks in the fall of the year, and thus overstock the market, we are obliged to accept only one-half what the farmers in the adjoining Province of Nova Scotia receive. I find that in 1881 there were grown on the Island 6,042,191 bushels of potatoes, the average price paid to the Island farmer being 22½ cents per bushel. That price will not pay for growing potatoes. At the same time farmers in the neighbouring Province of Nova Scotia were receiving an average price of 44 cents per bushel. Why was that? It was because the Island farmers had to ship all their potatoes during the short period between the time when the potatoes were dug from the ground and the close of navigation, while the farmers of King's, N.S., were able to ship their crop to the market of the United States according to the demand and receive the higher price of 44 cents a bushel. I speak within the hearing of my colleagues, who are more practical men in this matter than I am, and I say that if the farmers in Prince Edward Island could by the construction of a tunnel or otherwise be placed within access of the markets where they could obtain 44 cents a bushel, instead of raising six million bushels they would raise twelve to fifteen million bushels. I have talked to hundreds of farmers on the Island on this subject, and there is but one answer to the question on this point. There is hardly any object, nothing but necessity drives our farmers to sow, dig, cultivate and export potatoes for a price of 22 cents a bushel, and frequently less. They would not do it if they could grow anything else. If this communication can be had, provided by the words of the terms of the Union, if the Dominion can furnish us with continuous communication with the Intercolonial Railway and the railway system of Canada, you will give us prosperity beyond anything that prevailed in that part of the Dominion before. We know we have a market to some extent in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, but it is nothing to speak of; our great market, and the market to which the largest portion of our potatoes goes, is the United States. A few years ago we began, not to export potatoes as a raw product, but to manufacture them into farina starch, and it was discovered by the Americans that the Island could supply the market cheaper than themselves, and thus we could control the market without difficulty. But, unfortunately, protective counsels prevailed, and the Americans

imposed a duty of $40 a ton on farina starch. If we had access to the American market with that duty removed there is no limit to be placed upon the successful growth and production of that remarkable esculent in the Island. The soil is eminently suitable, the conditions of climate are favourable, and that trade alone and the business which would flow from the growth of the potato would make the Islanders a prosperous people. It is said that the estimated cost of the tunnel is very large. I admit that it is very large, indeed, and very careful consideration and very strong arguments are required before any hon. gentleman can ask the Government or the House to become committed to an expenditure of $11,000,000. But I ask hon. members not to turn away from the arguments with a sneer and a jeer, and refuse the proposed expenditure on the tunnel with scorn. If the scheme is not a feasible one, or too expensive, or the circumstances do not justify it, well and good, throw up the scheme; but let it be judged on its merits, and let the House not determine that because foolish expenditures have been undertaken in other parts of the Dominion and so-called wild-cat schemes entered upon, this scheme must be classed with them and thrown out. I beg hon. members to give this scheme patient, fair and reasonable consideration, and to remember not only that we come here asking for a tunnel on its merits, but also on the compact entered into with the Island in 1873. That compact cannot be ignored. I do not think it is the desire of any man to ignore it. That compact I believe the people of the Dominion are prepared, so far as their voice goes, to implement. That contract, I ask, should therefore be read and considered by hon. gentlemen, and particularly by the Government when they come to form their conclusions upon it. I will not ask for the construction of these cheaper tunnels; I say that the only tunnel which can confer upon Prince Edward Island benefits commensurate with its cost is a tunnel which will admit of the passage of freight cars, so that the exports of the Island can be carried to their natural markets. I say that if that can be done the Government will earn the everlasting blessings of the people, and that they will confer upon the people of that Island peace and happiness and prosperity for all time. We must consider the disadvantage that the Island labours under because of its isolation, and the fact that the National Policy, while bearing heavily on other parts of the Dominion, bears ten times more heavily on that Province, because we do not derive any of the incidental advantages that other parts of the Dominion do from the National Policy. In the great cities where manufacturers congregate there are some compensating advantages given to the people for the great disadvantages which it is alleged the National Policy causes, but in Prince Edward Island, while we are obliged to contribute as much per head of the population as elsewhere, we receive nothing in the world in return, and for our produce we get only one-half as much as is paid for the same produce in the adjoining province. We have a compact which entitles us to be placed in continual communication with these other provinces, and although I do not want to ask unreasonable or improper favours for Prince Edward Island, or unreasonable or improper expenditure in this critical financial period of the history of the Dominion, I ask fair-play and justice and the application of these principles to the compact you have entered into with the Province of Prince Edward Island.

Mr. FOSTER. What was your estimate of the export of potatoes?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I did not refer to the export; I said the growth was six million bushels.

Mr. HAGGART. It is not my intention to follow the discussion of the hon. gentleman. I think he has a fair right in this House to show the advantages and the position of the beautiful Island in which he resides and of which he is a representative, and to ask for any public work or any improvement which he thinks may benefit the Island. I heard the hon. gentleman criticize some remarks which had been made in this House during a prior debate, in the course of which he alleged that a misrepresentation had been made in reference to the postal service of Prince Edward Island. I have no doubt he alluded to a statement which I had made on that occasion, and as I do not want the statement I made at that time to be contradicted without reason, I shall briefly give the reasons why I made the allegation, in order to show that the hon. gentleman is entirely wrong in representing my statement as being inaccurate. If I remember aright, the statement I then made was in connection with some criticisms upon the postal service of Prince Edward Island. Perhaps I spoke too hastily; perhaps, even if it were true, I ought not to have said it, but what I did say was that, according to its population, Prince Edward Island made less use of the postal facilities than any other portion of the Dominion. Upon looking at the statistics now, I find that the statement I made was literally true, and I will compare Prince Edward Island with the other provinces to show that the statement was correct. The population of the Province of Ontario, according to the last census, was 1,932,000. The gross revenue from postal receipts in Ontario was $1,748,081 in 1889, the net receipts were $1,278,603.01, and the total expenditure by cheque $1,393,738. The total population of Quebec, according to the last census returns, was 1,359,027, the gross revenue from the post office $691,186.12, the net revenue $535,457, and the total expenditure by cheque, $691,026. The population of Nova Scotia, according to the returns of 1881, was 440,572, the gross revenue from the post office $260,000, the net revenue $166,000, and the expenditure by cheque $258,724. In New Brunswick, the total population was 321,233, the gross revenue from the post office $177,715, the net revenue $120,670, and the total expenditure by cheque $230,125. The gross revenue from the post office for the Province of Manitoba and the North-West Territories was $213,000, the net revenue $154,000, the expenditure by cheque $276,037, and the population, according to the last census, was, in the Territories 56,446, and in Manitoba 65,954. In British Columbia the gross revenue was $96,226, the net revenue $76,115, and the expenditure by cheque $177,160; and according to the last census the population of British Columbia was 49,459. In Prince Edward Island the gross revenue in 1890 was $36,851, the net revenue $25,386, and the total expenditure by cheque $47,656, independent of the amount expended for carrying the mails in

winter across the ice; and according to the last census the population of Prince Edward Island was 108,891. This shows that the total *per capita* receipts from Prince Edward Island are less than those from any other portion of the Dominion.

Mr. COCKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am always gratified when the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) rises to address the House on a subject so dear to him as that pretty little Island which we all love; and I cannot but admire the plucky way in which he comes to its rescue and endeavours to present it to us as the hub of the whole Dominion. At the same time I do not think it is right in him to represent that the Island has not been fairly treated by the Dominion in regard to public expenditure. I have taken the trouble to go through the whole volume of the Auditor General's accounts, so far as they refer to this pretty little Island, in order to ascertain what its real cost to the Dominion is, and they show the modest sum of $600,000 a year of net loss, that is to say, $6 a head of the population. I do not say that it would be cheaper for the Dominion, on the approach of winter, to transport all the inhabitants of the Island to the mainland——

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not object to a certain amount of badinage, but the hon. gentleman surely cannot be serious in making that statement.

Mr. COCKBURN. The hon. gentleman is perfectly serious, and more than that, he has the figures here for the year 1890 which prove his statement to the letter.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Give them?

Mr. COCKBURN. I will hand them in.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read them.

Mr. COCKBURN. The Dominion subsidies and Government allowance amount to $183,903.42. We pay the Lieutenant-Governor a salary of $7,000, and an Auditor and Assistant Receiver-General $4,465. We spend on Customs $19,758, and receive a revenue of $159,970. Of Customs seizures, I credit the Island with one-fortieth, that being the proportion of its population to that of the whole Dominion, amounting to $836. Then coming to Inland Revenue, I find the Excise expenditure to be $1,960 and the revenue $42,946, the Weights and Measures expenditure $1,469 and the revenue $355, and the Gas Inspection expenditure $248 and the revenue $73. On the Prince Edward Island Railway there is an expenditure of $266,485, and a revenue of $160,971. Now I come to the Post Office, and I may say that I have carefully analyzed these figures, and I find this to be the result—that, taking the gross postal revenue for 1890, the revenue from Ontario amounts to 90 cents per head, from Quebec to 50 cents, from Nova Scotia to 59 cents, from New Brunswick to 55 cents, from Manitoba and the North-West Territories to $1.74, from British Columbia to $1.94, and from Prince Edward Island to 33 cents.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How many times more was British Columbia than Ontario? You make British Columbia three times as much as Ontario.

Mr. COCKBURN. I can only take the figures as I find them in the books. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to get through, as I have some other tid bits for him yet. The Post Office revenue from the Island is as follows: Mail service, $31,223; salaries, $24,045; miscellaneous, $3,518; and the mail subsidy, $3,679, or a total for that service alone of $62,465, with a revenue of $25,386, showing a loss of $37,000. Now, I come to the Indians. They cost us $2,490, and strange to say they have no less than eight doctors to attend to them, which doctors cost $425, while the medicine for their patients cost only $26.05, and I add $26.50 for extra medicines; and they managed between them to kill one poor Indian, for whose burial they charge $25.32. The militia for the defence of the Island we maintain at a cost of $9,171. Then we come to public works, and we have been told again and again that we do not give any public works to the Island because it sends members here to oppose the Government: but the fact is that we spent on Dominion buildings $6,129, on harbours and rivers $10,717, and on dredging $10,133, while we received a revenue of only $2,162. Then we gave a subsidy to the Anglo-American Telegraph Company of $1,946. In agriculture we spent $1,097, and got a revenue of $2,229. For the revision of the voters' lists, I charge one-half of the cost, as it comes only once in two years, $1,575. For the elections of 1887 I charge one-fifth of the cost, as they come every five years, $582. For the public health, I take one-ninth of the expenditure in the Maritime Provinces, as that is the proportion of the population, $172. Then we come to the marine expenditure. The steamer *Stanley* costs an annual expenditure of $24,565, and yields earnings amounting to $10,560, and the winter mail service costs besides $2,752, and earns $162; and in this I am not including the interest on the cost of the *Stanley*, of $150,000, or the annual wear and tear of the steamer, which amounts to, perhaps, $15,000, or insurance. Then the lighthouse and coast service costs $16,968, the meteorological service $551, and hospitals $1,112. Wharves and piers yield a revenue of $1,120. For steamboat inspection, I take one-fortieth, as the Island has one-fortieth of the population of the Dominion, making an expenditure of $524 and a revenue of $337. In the same way the sick mariners' fund gives an expenditure of $72 and a revenue of $467. Superior and County Court judges, $19,071.64. On Dorchester penitentiary the expenditure was $4,901.76 and the revenue $515.63, being in each case one-ninth of the whole, as the population of the Island is one-ninth of that of the Maritime Provinces. Then we come to the senators and their mileage, and I find that our four senators from the Island, including their mileage, cost this country $4,849. I think, in respect of senators, we have been extremely liberal to that little province, whose whole population, men women and children, only equals that of two or three wards of the great city of Toronto. Then I find that the members from the Island in this House and their mileage cost $7,404.80. The expenditure on savings banks amounts to $412.19, as the share of the Island. From the fisheries she gives us a revenue of $302.88, but on the other hand her overseers and wardens cost us $3,113.21. Then we come to the fish protection, in connection with the *modus vivendi*, the expenditure on which—Prince Edward Island's proportion of one-ninth, her population being one-ninth of the Maritime Provinces—amounts to $7,173.29, while her proportion of revenue from this item amounts to $1,409.60.

Then there is the census of which, since the population of the Island is one-fortieth that of the Dominion, and the census is taken every ten years, her proportion of the expenditure is one-four-hundredth, and according to this proportion it amounted to $631.67. Then the printing and revision of the voters' lists, which takes place every two years, costs, for the Island's proportion of one-eightieth, $990.78 every year. I then come to the following other items, being the one-fortieth proportion which the Island is chargeable with: Supreme and Exchequer Courts, $1,340; Dominion police, $511; Speaker of the Senate, $100; Speaker of the Commons, $100; the Senate, $1,506; the total cost being $60,217; the Commons, $5,416, or one-fortieth of the total cost of $216,660; Library of Parliament, $801; printing, binding and distributing laws, $113; printing, paper and binding, $1,783, with a revenue of $190.76; immigration, $2,752, being one-fortieth of the total, $110,091; major general commanding, $100; adjutant general, $65; interest on public debt, $241,421, being one-fortieth of $9,656,840; civil government, $32,721, being a fortieth of $1,308,846; Secretary of State, revenue, $235; revenue of outstanding cheques, of which the total amount is $2,212, the Island is entitled to $55 as its one-fortieth share; pensions voted, $1,001, being one-fortieth of the total expenditure of $40,041; pensions, statutory, $7,712, being one-fortieth of the total expenditure of $308,515; superannuation under Supply, $15; public buildings, Ottawa, $8,594; Rideau Hall, $650. These make up a lotal expenditure of $993,371, against a revenue of $410,626, leaving us with a clean deficit of nearly $600,000 per annum chargeable to Prince Edward Island. I may state that the expenditure for fishery bounty, $156,050, being less than the interest on the $5,500,000 received from the United States, has not been considered as a charge against Prince Edward Island. Now, as an illustration of how liberal this Government has been in dealing with this pretty little Island, the garden of the Dominion, whose members here we receive with open arms and the greatest courtesy, let me refer to the question of winter navigation. They have some difficulty in crossing during part of the winter time. The ice being mountains high, the *Stanley* is at times unable to breast it and cross the channel. An arrangement was made that, as far as possible, continuous communication should be kept up between the mainland and the Island, but it never dawned on the mind of any man at that time, I may safely say, that its members would come here, after we had given them that $600,000 per year, and ask us to undertake an expenditure of from $12,000,000 to $16,000,000, to enable a few people to cross over when the *Stanley* was not running. There may be a few odd chickens, a few dozens of eggs and bags of potatoes left on the Island which could not be carried across at that particular season, but there could not be a great many, as the number of passengers carried on ice-boats, when the *Stanley* was not running during the winter of 1889-90, was about seventy souls, and they paid out of their pockets, in solid money, $161.46, and the amount received for freight on the ice-boats during the winter of 1889-90 very nearly reached the sum of $10.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The number of passengers crossed during the season is much larger than that.

Mr. COCKBURN. I said on the ice-boats. I do not wish my language to be misconstrued. The whole question is this: We are asked to make a tunnel to give communication during the short time the people are compelled to cross in ice-boats.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have crossed with sixty men in a boat at one time.

Mr. COCKBURN. I have gone through the returns carefully, and am confident my figures are correct. The total revenue got from the ice-boats was $171.46, not more; and we are soberly asked to spend $16,000,000 in that interest, and at a time, too, when the hon. gentleman told us he did not wish to make any unreasonable demand, as we are temporarily embarrassed through our having just freed the taxpayers of a couple of million dollars taxation.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman's statement with reference to the cost of the tunnel is about on a par with his other statements. Sixteen million dollars is not the estimate of Sir Douglas Fox or anything like it. The hon. gentleman is only $5,000,000 astray.

Mr. COCKBURN. The estimate given by the Finance Minister a week or two ago for a certain tunnel of certain dimensions was, I think, $14,000,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No.

Mr. COCKBURN. $11,000,000; but I would like to see the hon. gentleman who would rise and tell me that he ever knew of any Government on earth who undertook a contract for a submarine tunnel on a basis of $11,000,000 and finished it without an addition of at least twenty to forty per cent. I am not looking at the mere estimate, but at what we know, from our own experience of estimates, would be the inevitable cost of the work. And we are asked, in all soberness of mind and spirit, to take and squander the hard-earned money of the public, at a time when we are doing all we can to relieve the people's burdens, when we are combining on both sides, as we did the other night, to do the best we can to reduce our expenditure on public works. Yet, at this time, we are asked to assume this colossal charge, to enable seventy passengers—let it be one hundred, I do not want to be niggardly—to pass over with their baggage during the winter months when the *Stanley* is not running. I say the proposal is simply outrageous. The Island has already $600,000 a year given to it; and I ask its representatives now, in the name of common sense to be content. In Ontario I find that we contribute to the Dominion a clear surplus revenue of over $2,750,000. Such is our love for our tiny little sister in Confederation that we do not begrudge out of our fullness to give her $600,000. They are the younger provinces, but, when the younger sister is apt to presume on the forbearance and on the wealth of the elder brother, I think it is time for us in all sobriety to state how the case stands, especially when it is said that the Government has not been dealing fairly with the Island in the appropriations which it has made, and when it has been attempted to place the Government in this position, that it does not grant the money, simply because, it so happens, that the majority of the representatives from that nice little Island do not happen to belong to this enlightened side of politics.

Mr. WELSH. Make a note of that.

Mr. COCKBURN. I hope my hon. friend there, whose heart is full of that little Island, which I hope to see daring this summer——

Mr. WELSH. The sooner the better.

Mr. COCKBURN. I am sure I shall have a kindly reception there, judging from the kindly people who are sent here from the Island. I know my hon. friend opposite sometimes looks a little savage, and thunders forth in Ciceronian and Demosthenesian style, but I know that his bark is worse than his bite, and I cannot help thinking that, when he comes out of the House this evening, he will admit that he does not honestly in his heart think that we are going to be taken in in this way, but that it is simply a bluff, so to speak, that he wants some increased harbour accommodation or postal accommodation ; but he cannot surely think for a moment that we would entertain a proposal to expend $16,000,000 or even $12,000,000 on this project, or to load the country with such a debt. In regard to the passengers who come from this nice little Island, which has a population, I believe, of about 108,000—and the four wards of St. Patrick, St. David, St. Stephens and St. James, in Toronto, have about just as much population, and have not four senators or six representatives on the floor of this House, though still we manage to creep along without asking for an expenditure of $600,000—I believe the noble ward of St. John in Toronto would appropriate such an amount as that, if my hon. friend would present it as a solatium for the new Tariff Bill which is increasing the price of tobacco and spirits and other good things. I do not want hon. members to go away with the impression that only seventy passengers crossed there during the year. That is the number of passengers on the ice-boats, when the *Stanley* is unable to run.

Mr. WELSH. You have found that out.

Mr. COCKBURN. The number of passengers carried on the *Stanley* was 1,881. There may possibly have been only 1,000, as perhaps some went forwards and some went backwards ; though, judging from the description of that Island by the hon. gentleman, I should think very few would go back. The total revenue derived from the passengers on the *Stanley* was $5,644.50. Add to that the $161 we had from the ice-boats, and we will have a total of about $5,800, and that would be the interest which we are to get on the $16,000,000 or the $14,000,000 or the $12,000,000 required for the tunnel. We will send them all through the tunnel in future. We will dispense with the *Stanley* and the ice-boats, and we will send their market baskets, their chickens, their eggs and other articles through the tunnel, which we are to build at a cost of $12,000,000.

Mr. McLEAN. The hon. gentleman is speaking of the 70 travellers who crossed in the ice-boats. I suppose he refers to the 70 commercial travellers who came down there from Ontario.

Mr. COCKBURN. I am glad to know that people do go from Ontario, that enlightened province, to that nice little Island, and no doubt when they are there they are quite able to partake of the delicious chickens and the potatoes and the esculent fruits which it produces. If you have to charge the revenues with the amount we receive from that traffic, instead of borrowing our money at 4 per cent. we would have to pay at least 5 per cent., and the $5,800 which we now receive from that traffic would be changed into the payment for a really effective and tunnel service of upwards of $720,000 a year.

Mr. PERRY. If the rumours be true that the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) is to have a seat in the Cabinet, Prince Edward Island will not have much consideration.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 55) to incorporate the Atikokan Iron Range Railway Company.—(Mr. Mackintosh.)

Bill (No. 57) to incorporate the Buffalo Lake and Battleford Railway, Coal and Iron Company.—(Mr. Macdowall.)

Bill (No. 64) respecting the Berlin and Canadian Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Bowman.)

Bill (No. 67) respecting the Victoria, Saanich and New Westminster Railway Company.—(Mr. Prior.)

Bill (No. 68) to amend the Act to incorporate the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Davis.)

Bill (No. 69) to confirm an Indenture made between the New Brunswick Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 40) respecting the Farmers' Bank of Rustico.—(Mr. Macdonald, King's, P.E.I.)

Bill (No. 27) to authorize the London and Canadian Loan and Agency Company (Limited) to issue Debenture Stock.—(Mr. Cockburn.)

Bill (No. 23) respecting the E. B. Eddy Manufacturing Company, and to change its name to "The E. B. Eddy Company."—(Mr. Mackintosh.)

Bill (No. 24) to incorporate the McKay Milling Company.—(Mr. Mackintosh.)

Bill (No. 76) to amend an Act to authorize and provide for the winding up of the Pictou Bank.—(Mr. McDougald, Pictou.)

Bill (No. 41) respecting the Canadian Power Company.—(Mr. Montague.)

Bill (No. 25) to amend the Act to incorporate the Medicine Hat Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Daly.)

Bill (No. 58) to incorporate the Whirlpool Bridge Company.—(Mr. German.)

Bill (No. 72) to incorporate the Peterborough, Sudbury and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company.—(Mr. Burnham.)

Bill (No. 73) respecting the South Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. Sutherland.)

Bill (No. 74) further to amend the Canadian Pacific Railway Act, 1889.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 75) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 26) to incorporate the Pembroke Lumber Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Renfrew.)

Bill (No. 28) to amend the Act to incorporate the *Empire* Printing and Publishing Company (Limited).—(Mr. Cockburn.)

Bill (No. 43) further to amend Chapter eleven of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Senate and House of Commons.—(Mr. McMullen.)

ALBION MINES SAVINGS BANK.

Mr. McDOUGALD (Pictou) moved second reading of Bill (No. 113) to continue the Acts respecting the Albion Mines Savings Bank.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. McDOUGALD (Pictou) moved that the Rules be suspended in relation to the Bill, and that it be referred to the Committee of the Whole forthwith.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. EDGAR. As an exceptional course has been taken by removing this Bill altogether from the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Commerce, I think the hon. gentleman promoting the Bill ought to explain it.

Mr. McDOUGALD (Pictou). Its object is to extend the charter for a period of two years. The charter lapses the 1st of July. The bank was originally incorporated by the Parliament of Nova Scotia and afterwards by the Parliament of Canada, and the object of the Bill is to extend the incorporation for a period of two years, with power to amalgamate with any loan company that may be lawfully incorporated. The terms of the Bill are exactly on the same lines as those of the Farmers' Bank of Rustico which was before the Committee on Banking and Commerce the other day.

Mr. MULOCK. It applies to only one bank.

Mr. McDOUGALD (Pictou). Only one.

Mr. EDGAR. The provision as to amalgamation with loan companies was also in the other Bill?

Mr. McDOUGALD (Pictou). Yes; word for word. I propose to add two clauses similar to those in the Bill regarding the Rustico Bank.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is there any personal liability of the shareholders of the Albion Mines Savings Bank to the outside public?

Mr. McDOUGALD (Pictou). It is a limited liability company, no more than any ordinary bank.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is there double liability of the shareholders?

Mr. McDOUGALD (Pictou). Single liability, I think.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If there is double liability, the creditors of the institution might be seriously affected, as you make no provision that the creditors may have recourse against the shareholders to the extent of double liability, which the statutes provide, in case of amalgamation.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If there is personal liability under the existing organization, it ought not to be wiped out, as it will be by this Bill.

Mr. FRASER. Any company with which this company would amalgamate would know the liabilities before taking over the assets.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is very well, provided the company which took the assets over was a substantial company. But suppose it was not. You get rid of the double liability of existing shareholders and substitute nothing.

Mr. EDGAR. Even if there be not double liability, there may be liability on the capital stock.

Mr. FRASER. From what I know of the bank, there is no difficulty on this point. I know from personal knowledge of the affairs that there are no outstanding liabilities against the bank of any account.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

INDIAN AGENT ALLEN.

On the Orders of the Day being called,

Mr. McNEILL. With the permission of the House, I should like to ask the Minister of the Interior some questions of which I have given him private notice. I desire to ask: Is it known in the Department of Indian Affairs that Mr. James Allen, referred to in questions put by the member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) to-day, was for some where about a quarter of a century, one of the most respected members of the County Council of Bruce? How long has Mr. Allen been employed as Indian agent by the department?

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid these are not questions of urgency such as the hon. gentleman is justified in putting at this time. Of course, if the House is willing, he may proceed.

Mr. McNEILL. Since he has been acting as Indian agent, has Mr. Allen's conduct been such as to cause the department to give any credence to these charges? Are any of these charges of which the department has any cognizance preferred by Indians? Are baseless charges frequently preferred against Indian agents by Indians? Is it within the knowledge of the department that the last of these charges preferred against Mr. Allen is ridiculously untrue?

Mr. SPEAKER. If any member objects to these questions being put, I must rule that they are out of order.

PROHIBITION OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Jamieson (page 271), the amendment thereto of Mr. Mackintosh (page 344), and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Taylor (page 355).

Mr. JAMIESON. I have not had the opportunity of replying to the addresses which were delivered to this House on the main motion which I placed before the House, nor have I been able to say anything with reference to the two amendments which have been moved to the main motion. Under the circumstances, I think the House will indulge me while I offer a few remarks in reply to the remarks which have been made upon this question. I have been very much pleased with the way in which the question has been dealt with by hon. gentlemen who have addressed the House upon it. On this occasion the question has been treated very seriously by the House; it has been treated in a manner in which I think it deserved to be treated, owing to its very great importance. I would have preferred, however, to hear not only the leader of this House, but the leader of the Opposition, express their views to the House

on the subject. I think it was due, not only to the House but to the country, that both those hon. gentlemen should take the House and the country into their confidence upon a question which has moved the country from one end to the other, as is shown by the numerously signed petitions that have been presented during the present session. I do not know what the views of the leader of the Opposition are upon this question, since he has not stated them. However, I feel satisfied that notwithstanding his silence he will, in all likelihood, support the resolution which has been presented to the House. I think the very first occasion on which I ever saw that hon. gentleman was in 1875 at the great prohibitory convention in the city of Montreal, when he occupied the honourable position of a seat upon the platform, and, Sir, I do not think that since that time, at least, I hope since that time nothing has occurred to alienate his sympathies from this great moral movement which is abroad in the country. Now, I want to say a word on behalf of the much-abused Dominion Alliance. That organization has been very much spoken against by several gentlemen who have addressed the House upon this question, and more especially has it been spoken against by my hon. friend from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor). Now, Sir, that organization is composed of representative temperance men, the executive officers of the different temperance organizations of this country and representatives delegated by the different religious bodies of this country, and in this respect, at all events, it is a representative body of men. We who are members of that organization have no pecuniary interest in this matter whatever; we are acting in the interest, as we believe, of our common humanity, in endeavouring to prohibit a traffic which we believe to be injurious, not only to the morals of the people, but to the business interests of the whole Dominion. I have no doubt that some hon. members of this House have been a little troubled, perhaps a little annoyed, by action which has been taken by the Dominion Alliance on this question; and, Sir, I apprehend that before this question is fully settled by the Parliament of this country, both political parties who are now contending for the control of public affairs will be much more troubled than they have been in the past, for if I understand aright the public sentiment of this country, and more especially the temperance sentiment of this country, I believe it is the determination of the friends of prohibition to fight and to wage this warfare until they secure the victory; and if the political parties are not disposed to grapple with this question, it will have to be grappled with by a party organized on different lines altogether. But so far as I am concerned, I would be better pleased to see a coalition of both parties formed upon this question, for it must be settled some day, and settled once for all, if not in this Parliament, at all events in the near future. Now, Sir, the question of the revenue has been touched upon, and I must say that I think this question, from a revenue standpoint, might have been much more easily dealt with at a former period in our history. It will be within the knowledge of the House that in 1883 we had a surplus of $7,064,000, whilst the revenue derived from spirits, wines and beers amounted to $6,254,000. Deducting the latter from the former figures, we have a surplus of $810,000; so that in that year we could have easily grappled with this question, we could have passed a prohibitory liquor law, and the revenue of the country would not have been disturbed in the least, because we would have had a surplus over and above any revenue which was derived from the liquor traffic. However, things have change since then. Not only has the revenue derived from the traffic largely increased, but we have not in later years had the surpluses we had in 1882-83. Last year the revenue from spirits, wines and beer amounted to $7,562,000. We had a surplus of $3,885,000; so that had we been deprived entirely of the revenue which was derived from spirits, wine and beer last year, there would only have been a deficit of $3,672,000 to provide from other resources. I take this ground, and probably I will not be supported in the view I take by the members of this House or by the country, that once we concede the fact that the revenue is derived from a source which is injurious to the best interests of the people, and that the traffic from which it is derived injuriously affects the morals of the people, there should be no further question whatever in regard to discarding the revenue altogether and finding other sources of revenue for the purpose of carrying on the affairs of the Dominion. Passing from this view of the question to another view, I would say that I have been very much pleased, and I am sure the people have been pleased, that we have arrived at this stage in the agitation when not one hon. member has stood up and justified by any language whatever the traffic in intoxicating liquors. The whole question has been narrowed down to this: How can we best get along without the revenue? That is the sole question, and I believe we have wisdom sufficient to enable us to devise means to continue public affairs without the revenue derived from the traffic in intoxicating liquors. I may be excused, since I did not speak at any great length in support of the resolution I submitted to the House, to advert to another view of the question, and it is this. I hold the opinion, and I am not sure but that a large body of the people share with me that opinion, that the temperance people made a very great mistake in the first place in accepting what was known as the Dunkin Act in 1864. I am not going to shrink from making the statement here that I believe the people made another serious mistake, and I thought so at the time, in accepting the Canada Temperance Act. It was a compromise at the time. My judgment was then, and my judgment is to-day, that if the temperance people had followed the line on which they were proceeding prior to 1878, that of making a general advance in favour of prohibition, this movement would have occupied a much more advantageous position to-day than it occupies in this country. But the temperance people, having asked general prohibition, were offered the compromise of the Canada Temperance Act, and subsequently when they came before Parliament and brought the demand for general prohibition before the House, they were told: We have already given you local option; when you come back and tell us you have used what we have already given you, and it has proved ineffectual for the purpose for which it is given, it will then be time enough to ask for an advance on the line of general prohibition. The temperance people of the Dominion, and I

among the rest, laid hold of the Canada Temperance Act as being the very best measure we had, and we did so almost exclusively with the view of testing public sentiment on the question, rather than with the view of finding it effective in producing the results which, perhaps, its promoter intended it should produce, namely, the bringing about of a large diminution in the evils flowing from the traffic in intoxicating liquors. We have been told that inasmuch as the Canada Temperance Act has been repealed in almost all the counties and cities in which it was enacted, consequently the people have changed their views as to the general prohibition of the traffic. But I contend that nothing of the kind can be inferred from the action of the people in dealing with the Canada Temperance Act, because local option cannot be effectual in dealing with this question. What we want is general prohibition, and it will be only when we have general prohibition we shall be able to judge of the salutary effects of the law, and not before. Something has been said, considerable perhaps, in respect to the question of compensation. I am not sure I am very orthodox from an ultra-temperance standpoint on the question of compensation.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do not think you are.

Mr. JAMIESON. For my part I occupy this position: If I had my choice to-morrow between general prohibition and compensation, and no prohibition, I would accept the former, because I believe this country cannot make too great a sacrifice for the purpose of bringing about the general prohibition of the traffic, and it is in holding that view, and that view alone, that I would favour compensation. I hold that so far as the retail dealers are concerned they are not entitled to compensation. It is no doubt within the knowledge of most hon. members that in England there has been a judicial decision given by one of the highest courts that a person has no vested interests, and therefore no legal redress if he is deprived of the annual license which has been given to him from the constituted authorities. This decision sets at rest, so far as legal authority is concerned, the question of vested interests. But I believe it would pay this country, and every other country in which this traffic is carried on, if some means were devised to buy out root and branch the whole liquor interests and provide in some other way for carrying on the Government of the country.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Buying out their votes, do you mean?

Mr. JAMIESON. It will be in the recollection of hon. members that in 1883 we passed a law which curtailed to a very large extent the number of licenses issued in the Dominion. All hon. members who were residents in the Province of Ontario will recollect that a law was passed in that province, known as the Crooks' Act, which very seriously curtailed the number of licenses, and we did not hear a word about compensation in either instance being paid to those deprived of their licenses, the inference being that, in this Parliament and in the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, no opinion of that kind was held by those who framed those two statutory laws. As far as the principle of prohibition is concerned, we are not very extravagant in our demands. At the present time 399 out of every 400 are prohibited by legal enactment from engaging in the liquor traffic, and we are simply asking you to go one further and declare that the four-hundreth man shall be dealt with in like manner. This is a very moderate and a very simple request, and I hope that the good sense of this House will accede to it, and that we shall have, in the near future, prohibition from the Atlantic to the Pacific, which will be a great boon to the people of this Dominion. A very serious objection has been urged against the resolution which I have submitted to the House, on the ground that we made a departure from the action which we have taken on former occasions, and that we now state that the time has arrived when we should have prohibitory legislation in this Dominion, while in former resolutions we did not definitely ask the House to say that the people of this country were prepared for probibition. I am not fanatical upon this question. I have very strong convictions, I must say, but even if the House accepts the proposition which I have made, I am quite prepared to concede to the men who are engaged in the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors a reasonable time for closing up their business and getting out of the traffic. Some will ask what will be a reasonable time? For my part I will be quite willing to concede to these gentlemen at least three years, aye, if it were necessary four or five years, and I think that by the passing of this resolution, although the Government of the country will be bound to act in its spirit, I believe that the temperance people of this country would sustain them in giving reasonable and proper notice by passing a law and indicating in that law that it should come into force at a period of three, or four, or five, years hence. I think that would be reasonable notice to give to the people engaged in this traffic. If it were possible that this question could be dealt with now, I would personally make even greater concessions to get rid of the traffic. If it were possible at this present moment to pass a law to allow the present license holders to continue the traffic during their lifetime, provided they complied with the requirements of the present law and properly obtain their license, I will go so far as to accede to a proposition of this kind, because in the meantime the traffic would be circumscribed, the number of licenses would be gradually reduced, and ultimately we will get rid of the whole business. I wish to offer a few remarks now with reference to the revenue question. I hold the opinion, and I am not alone in holding it, that the diminution of revenue by the prohibition of the liquor traffic will be only temporary. It is within the knowledge of many gentlemen in this House that in the year of Father Matthews' greatest triumph in Ireland, one-half, or more than one-half of the population, were pledged teetotalers, the general revenue of the country instead of being diminished was increased and it ran up to £90,000 sterling beyond the average of any former years. My hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Coatsworth) treated fully on this portion of the question, and it is not necessary for me to go any further in that direction; but I am fully satisfied that if the money which is worse than wasted in this traffic were employed, as it would be, in giving employment to the people and increasing the purchasing power of the people, the duties derived from the increased consumption of dutiable goods would more than

bring about an equilibrium in a very short time. I have a word or two to say in reference to the amendments proposed to my resolution, and I shall deal in the first place with the amendment of the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor). I would readily dispose of that amendment by saying that it is entirely too hazy in its character to receive the assent of the House; if I were dealing with a gentleman of the same profession as myself we would simply dispose of it by saying that it was void for its indefiniteness. The hon. member has not thought proper to indicate in what manner the opinion of the people should be taken or as to how the people were to be polled upon this question.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is a matter of detail.

Mr. JAMIESON. I am not sure but that he actually refuses to say in what way he intended the popular sentiment should be taken, whether at the polls or by a referendum or plebiscite. I think that before any proposition of the kind submitted by the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) received the acceptance of this House it should at all events be clear and easily understood, so that we would know what we were voting upon. I, therefore, trust that the amendment of the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) will not be accepted by the House; and while I am speaking on this subject I would go a step further, and say that if I am authorized at all to speak for the temperance people of this Dominion I would state that we are not prepared to accept a referendum or a plebiscite upon this question, and that the unanimous sentiment of the temperance people of this country is, that if we get prohibition we must get it in a constitutional way, through the people's representatives in this Parliament, and we are not going to ask any new-fangled way of bringing about a result which can very simply be brought about on the floor of this Parliament. I have now a word or two to say with reference to the amendment of my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh). My impression is that it has some merit in it; I am disposed to concede that. I think my hon. friend was of opinion, at the time it was first introduced, that it might produce some good effect. But now so much time has elapsed, and the session is so far spent, that the hon. member's amendment, if accepted now, would be utterly barren of any result. The temperance people of this country want all the information they can possibly get on this question; and for my part I should like to have placed before the people in some proper way all the information asked for by my hon. friend in his amendment. But now, it must be conceded by every member of this House, it is too late to have this question referred to a special committee, for such a committee would not have time to make an inquiry which would be at all fruitful or serviceable to us in considering the question at a subsequent session. In addition to that, I think the hon. gentleman's amendment is obviously unacceptable to the general temperance sentiment of this country, from the fact that he recognizes vested interests on the part of those who hold licenses. My hon. friend shakes his head; but when I read to the House his amendment, I think he will see that I am correct. He asks this House to affirm in the following language:—

"That this House, whilst desirous of moving in the direction of the amelioration of the evils complained of, is of opinion that any legislation should be so safeguarded as not too suddenly to disturb the revenue of the country or the vested interests claiming compensation."

If that does not recognize vested interests, then I do not understand the English language. Now, Sir, I think I shall not follow this question any further. I must apologize to the House for the time I have occupied. I think they will agree with me that, owing to the fact that two important amendments have been submitted, and that I had no opportunity of replying to the arguments of those hon. gentlemen who thought proper to differ from me on this question, it was only reasonable that I should occupy the attention of the House with a few words in reply. I trust that the resolution which I have submitted will receive the assent of the House. I cannot agree to accept either of the amendments, and I shall consequently vote against them both, and stand by the original resolution which I have placed before the House.

Mr. CURRAN. Might I ask the hon. gentleman if he speaks on behalf of the Alliance when he says that they will not have a plebiscite on any terms?

Mr. JAMIESON. I do.

Mr. McNEILL. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is due to myself as well as to the House that I should say a word or two in explanation of my position as the seconder of the amendment of my hon. friend from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor). When I agreed to second that amendment, I had just had a conversation with my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who I am sorry to see is not here at this moment. From that conversation I inferred, erroneously, as it would seem, that he had an understanding with my hon. friend from South Leeds that he would support his amendment, and therefore I thought that amendment was the one most likely to receive the support of this House; it was also the one which came nearest to what I myself would have preferred. But when I agreed to support that amendment I told my hon. friend beside me that I should be obliged, when I got up to second it, to say that I would have preferred an amendment which would go further than his—one which would go so far as to say that the vote of the people on this question should be had at the earliest convenient time. I think it is due to myself that I should say this. I think my course in reference to this matter has been consistent from the first. I was, I think, the first member of this House to support the principle that this matter should be referred to the popular vote, and I am here to maintain the same principle to-night. When the Scott Act was before this House I proceeded upon the same principle, namely, that this was a matter which had been in a large measure removed from our hands and which was really in the hands of the people; and, therefore, I supported any amendment which, in my view, was calculated to improve the working of the Scott Act, altogether irrespective of whether I personally approved of such amendment or not; and, on the same principle, I opposed any amendment which was likely to prevent that Act from receiving a fair trial. So now I hold that this question is really in the hands of the people, and not in the hands of the people's representatives. For many years past we have proceeded upon the principle that before any legislation of this peculiar kind shall be put into operation—legislation which is altogether different in its nature from any other legislation with

which we have to deal--legislation of such a peculiar nature that it follows a man into the privacy of his home and dictates to him there what beverage he shall be permitted to partake of—the people themselves shall be first consulted. We have never ventured to place prohibitory legislation on the Statute-book, or to make the people subject to it, without having first received the permission of a majority of the people who were to be affected by it. This principle was accepted when the Dunkin Act was passed before Confederation. It was endorsed when the Scott Act was passed some thirteen years ago, and it has been repeatedly affirmed and reaffirmed, endorsed and re-endorsed, whenever the Scott Act has been submitted to the popular vote. I say that the right of the people to be consulted before prohibitory legislation is placed on the Statute-book has been affirmed and acted upon in Canada, without intermission or contradiction, for the last quarter of a century and more; and I say that if this House were to-night to trample upon this well-established right, by proceeding to legislate over the heads of the people, the result would be that in the agitation which would speedily arise from one end of this Dominion to the other the course of hon. members in this House would be described as a breach of trust and the action of this House as a piece of tyranny. My hon. friend who has just spoken has said that he does not approve of any new-fangled principles being introduced into our constitution. I wonder if my hon. friend took this objection when the Scott Act, which he supported, was introduced. I do not understand where his consitency is in this matter. Why it should be a new-fangled notion to suggest that this question of prohibition should be left to the vote of the people, when my hon. friend has been supporting for years the Scott Act, which was in principle just the same, only that it went a little further—because all that is proposed in this resolution is that the principle should be left to the decision of the people, whereas in the Scott Act not only the principle but the details were so left.

Mr. JAMIESON. Hear, hear.

Mr. McNEILL. My hon. friend seems to think that is a modification of the principle. I venture to say that it is, in this sense, that we give away a great deal more of our authority, as representatives of the people, if we say that the people must pronounce not only on the principle but also on the details. No doubt my hon. friend has the idea that what is proposed is the introduction of the plebiscite. Well, the plebiscite is a very dreadful name. It is something which has a very bad odour in the nostrils of hon. members in this House, and, no doubt, justly so. There is no doubt that the plebiscite was very improperly used in France. There is no doubt it was there made an instrument of tyranny and an instrument to misrepresent the views of the people, and our general elections might be similarly used if they were conducted in the same way as the plebiscite was conducted in France. I am not here to argue on behalf of the plebiscite, but I say that if our own general election had been conducted in the same way as the plebiscite in France it would have been no fairer in its results. What was done under the plebiscite? Questions were drawn up in accordance with the wishes of the government of the day and submitted to the people, without any opportunity whatever being given to discuss them. Not only so, but the government officials in every quarter of France were ordered, on pain of instant dismissal, to force the people to vote yea, and in many cases the negative ballots were withheld altogether, so that no opportunity was given to vote otherwise. If we were to conduct our general elections in that way the result would not be altogether satisfactory, and though I am not here to argue in favour of the plebiscite, I venture to say that because the plebiscite was misused in France is scarcely a valid argument against the principle. But what is proposed here differs very largely from the plebiscite, because the plebiscite, as is generally understood, is a question which is left to the people without an opportunity being given for discussion, and often drawn up in such a way as to be misleading. Not one of these objections apply here. This is not a question which is submitted to the people without discussion, for it has been amply discussed on the public platform and in this House time and again. What we propose is very much more like the referendum as used in Switzerland. It is not quite that, because in this amendment we do not propose to leave all the details to the people, but only the principle, and the principle has been thoroughly discussed. In Switzerland the referendum is generally an act of the legislature, all the details of which have been arranged and discussed by the legislature, but which is left to the people's decision under certain circumstances. When it is an act bearing on the constitution it is left as of right. In other cases, if thirty thousand of the people, or eight cantons, petition for it, they have the right to have any Act of Parliament submitted to them before it becomes law. In this case we simply suggest we should do, to a modified extent and in a modified degree, what we have done in the case of the Dunkin and Scott Acts. In these Acts all the details were left to the people. In the present case we ask that the principle be left to the people, and that principle has already been thoroughly discussed. For my part, if any hon. gentleman prefers to this proposition the suggestion that an Act of Parliament should be submitted in place of the principle only, I am perfectly willing to accept that proposal; but I say that this House is committed to this policy, not only because we have acted in this way in reference to the Dunkin and Scott Acts, but because this House has itself declared, by a resolution, that this question of prohibition shall be submitted to the people when the people are prepared to pronounce upon it. I want to know whether the natural, the logical, the consistent thing to do, is not to leave it to the people, and ascertain whether they are prepared for it or not, and for this reason I have much pleasure in seconding the amendment of the hon. member for Leeds.

Mr. LISTER. I suppose that, when a very large proportion of the people of this country pronounce in favour of prohibition, it is the duty of Parliament to give them what they desire. I have no doubt that the Government have decided on some policy in regard to this matter. I believe we were informed by the Minister of Finance or some other member of the Government, when this question was last under discussion, that the Government would be prepared to announce to Parliament and the

country their policy upon this question, and I think that, before we are asked to pass a vote upon it, it is the duty of the Government, the plain and manifest duty of the Government, apart altogether from the promise they have made, but upon the merits of the question itself, so that the House may deal intelligently with this question, and may form an opinion upon the policy which the Government may adopt, to tell this House what their policy is. The various views which are held upon this temperance question have been ventilated here. We have heard the arguments for and against it stated, and the views entertained had been enunciated on both sides during this discussion. I certainly had hoped and expected that the Minister of Finance would have been heard. I remember that, fourteen years ago, it was my pleasure to listen to that hon. gentleman advocating the cause of temperance. If ever a man was devoted to the cause of temperance, I thought it was that hon. gentleman at that time. He urged it with all the eloquence he possesses and with all the persuasiveness of which he is a master, and I thought that, if ever a man would stand by the ship till it sank and went out of sight, that man would be George E. Foster. Some years afterwards I was elected to Parliament, and my hon. friend was elected about the same time for a constituency in the Maritime Provinces. I believe he had been a Liberal up to that time, but he was, I think, elected as an independent, or, if not as a Liberal, he was a temperance man first, last and all the time. Judge of my amazement when I read the account of an interview which he had with a deputation which had gathered from various portions of this country and met him in his official capacity as Minister of Finance, and judge of the amazement of the people of this country, who looked upon him as the champion of temperance, as the leader in this question, when they read his words:

"He said that equally strong prohibitionists might not agree as to the methods and times for prohibition. This was neither a Government nor a party question, but a popular question, and the people only could decide what was to be done. They must remember that there was a wide difference between enactment and enforcement. The delegates spoke of obtaining prohibition in the near future, but the resolution of Mr. Jamieson contained no future—it was essentially the present. Did they mean that there was to be no grace; that the carrying of the resolution was to be followed the next day by a prohibitory liquor law; or did they mean that the resolution was to be adopted and carried into effect when the Government saw means and methods at their disposal? Again, if the law was passed the first thing to be faced was a loss of seven millions and a-half of revenue."

Fourteen years ago there was no question in regard to that. At that time he pressed upon the people vehemently the question of prohibition, and said that the country was ripe for prohibition, and the people of the county in which he was speaking declared that the country was ripe for prohibition. Again he said that, if such a law were passed:

"Moral sentiment said, 'Let it go; men's souls cannot be weighed on the balance against money,' but it was a practical difficulty, nevertheless, for the next moment he, as Finance Minister, would have to come down to Parliament with a scheme to provide that revenue. And how was it to be done?

"A delegate—Reduce your expenditure!

"Mr. Foster said that was impossible and that the only way to meet the loss of revenue was by imposing direct taxation, for which the people were not ready. He was not prepared to pass a prohibition law, be unable to enforce it or to raise the revenue, and have a reaction set in, with the result of sweeping the Government that enacted the law out of power, and a return to a state of things ten times worse than they were before. His position was this: The people had a right to what they wanted, but the first duty of the Government was to ascertain if the people really did want prohibition and would stand by it and take all the attendant consequences.

"Rev. Dr. Potts—How can you ascertain that?

"Mr. Foster replied there were two ways—one by the simple constitutional means of making prohibition a direct issue at the polls and elect men pledged to support a prohibitory liquor law; the other by what was known as a plebiscite. Either means would be effectual. As to what his action in the House would be, they would see for themselves when the proper time came."

A change came over the spirit of the hon. gentleman's dreams after he took a seat in the Cabinet, for now he says that the difficulties in the way of total prohibition exist in regard to the finances of the country, that there is no way of making up the deficit which would naturally arise from having immediate prohibition. That hon. gentleman has in this House, in 1883, 1884 and 1885, voted for and supported prohibitory resolutions. He has declared by his voice and his vote that this country was ready for total prohibition. Ned I recall the discussion which took place here in 1886, when the Robertson amendment was proposed declaring that now the country was ready for prohibition? If you look at the votes polled on that night you will find the name of George E. Foster as one of those who sustained that motion. In 1884 the gentleman who now occupies the important position of Finance Minister spoke upon this question, and he said:

"I am within the mark when I say the evils resulting from the liquor traffic have done more to retard the prosperity of the country and to sow the germs of disorder and discontent than any other evils probably with which the country has been afflicted."

He also said:

"So, Sir, when we desire that the liquor traffic be suppressed by legal enactment, we are within the bounds and rules which economic science on every page lays down, and which will join us in declaring that the liquor should be suppressed in the best economic interests of the country."

He further said:

"Men have got beyond the idea that they are here simply to recruit soldiers, to gather taxes, and to carry on war and let the best interests of the country take care of themselves, and they have come to the conclusion that in the future, is the practical duty of legislators to dig down into the causes which lie at the root of social deterioration."

Later in the same debate he said, on page 1120 of the *Hansard*:

"I make bold to stand up and declare from my place in Parliament, that this free people in the Dominion of Canada will not cease their agitation, and will not be satisfied until the largest application of the principle of prohibition has been made to a traffic which they know is an enemy to the best interests, material, moral and social, of the people."

Again, on page 1121 he said:

"We legislate to keep up the brewery, to keep up the liquor shops in our country, who employ altogether some 11,000 or 12,000 persons. Now, there is another class in this country, and that is the 4,400,000 and over, who do not make and sell liquors. The legislation we have at present is in favour of the 11,000, but it is against the best interests of 4,400,000."

In this debate Mr. Robertson, M.P. for Shelburne, moved to add the rider:

"And this House is of the opinion that the public sentiments of the people of Canada calls for immediate legislation to that end."

Mr. Foster insisted that this addition to his motion was in order, and voted for it. And again, in 1885, on the motion made by Mr. Kranz, M.P., to grant

compensation to distillers and brewers, Mr. Foster said (*Hansard*, page 243) :

"To-day we have a resolution which distinctly recognizes the fact that the prohibition movement can no longer be ignored, that the people are behind it, and this resolution is, if I understand it rightly, the calm and deliberate expression of opinion that whether they be prepared for death or not, death is imminent. * * * That question has been before the country for 50 years; it has steadily been making forward towards its solution. Every year it has been increasing in strength ; every year its influences behind it have been augmented."

Then, Mr. Foster in an address subsequently, delivered in 1885 (*Hansard*, page 251) :

"He computed the loss to Canada by the liquor traffic, in loss of labour, by deaths caused by it, to be $12,000,000 yearly. He also computed the loss to the Dominion, by money thrown away on the liquor, to be $40,000,000, or a total loss yearly of $52,000,000."

Now, Mr. Speaker I repeat that these were the views of the hon. gentleman previous to his being called upon to take a seat in the Cabinet. I am not saying that these are not his views to-day, I am not questioning that he may be an ardent temperance man still ; but if we are to judge from the statements made by him to the delegates who met him on the occasion referred to we must conclude the opinions which he expressed in 1884, in 1885 and in 1886, are not the opinions which he holds to-day. What is the reason? Is it that he is afraid to face the question? Is it that he is afraid, as he stated to them, that the Government of which he is a member will be swept out of power ? Or is it true that rather than sacrifice himself on this question, which to him was greater than all other questions, he would prefer to sacrifice that great question rather than lose the seat which he holds in the Government of this country? Fifty-two millions a year is the loss which he estimated this country sustained, and the hon. gentleman, ardent advocate as he was of the prohibition movement for all these years, long before he had a seat in this House, and for years afterwards, rising on every occasion when this question was brought before the House, advocating it with all the skill, with all the power at his command, we find that suddenly, when a seat is given to him in the Cabinet, all these difficulties arise—the question about the revenue, the question as to whether the result of such legislation would not be to sweep the present Government out of power. Sir, the people of this country can only conclude that the position which the Government are taking to-day, that the utterances which my hon. friend made to that delegation, indicate an abandonment by him of all the professions he has ever made on the question of prohibition, and that he prefers a seat in the Cabinet with its $7,000 a year to standing by the principles of which he professed to be such a warm and ardent adherent. Sir, never in the history of this House, never in the history of any Parliament of Canada since we had parliamentary government, has there been presented to the House such a mass of petitions on any question as we have had this session for prohibition. They indicate that behind these petitions are hundreds of thousands of people who are placing this question above and beyond every other question that this House has to deal with. And this House must deal with it. They will not be allowed to trifle with this question ; the people of the country will call them to account ; they must deal with it in one way or the other. If Parliament is opposed to this prohibition movement, if the Government is opposed to it, then it will become a question at the polls, and let the Government take the consequences if they think proper. But it must be dealt with ; and I repeat again, that before this question is submitted to a vote of this House it is the plain and manifest duty of the Government to declare its policy thereon.

Mr. McMILLAN. I would not have said anything upon this question were it not that a good deal of weight has been laid upon the enforcement of the Canada Temperance Act ; and I think statements have been made on that subject not in accordance with the facts. I think the member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) stated that the Government of the Province of Ontario had not enforced the Scott Act, and that it was their duty to enforce that law. I think the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) made a statement of the same description, and said that the Provincial Government of Ontario had not enforced the Scott Act simply because it was a Dominion law. That hon. gentleman also stated that if the Dominion Government had undertaken to enforce the Scott Act they would have been interfering with provincial matters. I would remind those hon. gentlemen that the Dominion Government took the licensing system out of the hands of the Provincial Government and assumed control of it. Let those hon. gentlemen look back to the time when the Scott Act was passed in the 60 counties they speak of in the Province of Ontario, and let them remember that the officials who at that time were empowered to enforce the licensing system and enforce the McCarthy Act—I speak of my own knowledge and experience when I relate what took place in the County of Huron, and I can assure the House that in all that county the Dominion officials, whose duty it was to see that the Scott Act was enforced, did everything in their power to prevent the carrying out of that law. They went so far as to come before the County Council of Huron and urged the council not to ask the Provincial Government to appoint a police magistrate to try the cases, after it had been found that whenever information was laid and a conviction seemed sure, the case was taken from court to court, and no such thing as conviction could be had—let these hon. gentlemen remember that these things took place under the officials appointed by the Dominion Government to enforce the licensing system in the County of Huron. The inspector refused to have anything to do with the first five informations that were laid before him. When the information was laid before the magistrate then three convictions were secured. This proves conclusively that they were not buncombe informations that were wanted, but informations laid on a good foundation. My mind goes back further, and I think I remember that the Minister of Finance of to-day laid down a very good proposition at one time when he stated the conditions under which a law could be fairly tested. Speaking on temperance, he said that when a law was passed by a Government it was the duty of that Government to provide proper machinery for the proper enforcement of that law, and if that Government failed in that particular duty it could not be said that the law had had a proper opportunity to be tested. Such, I hold, was the condition of the Scott Act in many portions of Ontario. Proper machinery was not provided by the Government when the law

was passed, and for that reason the law in many instances proved a failure. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) stated that for two or three months in his locality the law was obeyed, but after twelve months the law was at an end and liquor was sold as at any other period. This proved that the people of the country were prepared to obey the law, providing the Government had provided proper machinery to carry it out. I believe such to be the case. Let me say that the social drinking habits of the people of this country and of the old country are such that it becomes the duty of each individual to put his shoulder to the wheel and endeavour to remove this gigantic evil. I heard the other day of a condition of things in my native land for which I was ashamed. I read a statement from the contractor for the construction of the bridge over the Frith of Forth, in which it was stated that in building the bridge it was found that the workmen of Britain had fallen into such a condition that when men were required who were prepared at all times to do their duty the contractor had to employ Italians and Bavarians. After the Scotchmen had worked two or three hours, which was the time they were able to work on the foundations of the bridge, the moment they left work they went to the hotels, and when they again returned to take their places they were not capable of performing their duties. Hence, foreigners were put in their places, and the long-boasted British workmen had to give place to men who were not, I believe, superior but inferior, except for this drinking evil. I also saw recently the statement of a sea captain sailing between the old country and Australia. When asked what kind of sailors he preferred, he said he would not have Englishmen, Irishmen, Scotchmen or Americans. When asked his reasons, he said they went ashore when the vessel reached port and got drunk and fell into the hands of the police, and there was no satisfaction in employing them. Then he was asked as to the nationalities of the men he employed. He replied Italians, Danes and Norwegians, with whom he said he had no trouble; and for cooks he chose Chinese. These nationalities are superseding British sailors in sailing British vessels. This is an evil permeating all classes of society, from the millionaire to the beggar in the street. The bench has not been free from the evil results of intoxicating liquors, and even the pulpit has at times been disgraced by the effects of the traffic. I hope the Minister of Finance still holds the opinion he formerly held, because he made another statement. He said that after looking somewhat carefully into the subject and making a fair estimate, he came to the conclusion that the people of Canada spend each year for intoxicating beverages a sum in the neighbourhood of $40,000,000. Yet that hon. gentleman told a deputation which waited upon him that the Government could not afford to lose annually $7,000,000 of revenue. The hon. gentleman himself admitted that $40,000,000 was spent in drink, for an object that was not in the interests of the wives and families of Canada, and it must be admitted that if the money was otherwise expended the people would be better able to pay revenue than when their earnings are spent in intoxicating liquors. Under the Scott Act in 1886, the inspector of gaols and prisons stated that in one portion of Ontario where over 1,000,000 people lived under the Scott Act, there were 1,800 crimes committed, but in another portion with a little over 1,000,000 people living under the Crooks Act, crimes reached 5,800, or a result of 1 to 4 in favour of the Scott Act. That must be taken as evidence of the beneficial effects of the Scott Act in Ontario. I hold that if we wait for every man to obey every law we will never pass it or enforce it. We have always had laws against burglars; and yet burglars are almost daily brought before the courts. We have laws against theft, and yet every day thieves are punished. Does any one object to the law, or does any one propose to do away with the police force simply because the laws are not obeyed? If we had a prohibitory law to-day it would have an educational force on the people that nothing else ever possessed. Whenever you get people to obey the law there is no necessity for the law, because, the people are a law to themselves. Taking all these facts into consideration, I cannot vote for any amendment to the main motion. I will give it my vote, and if the main motion is not carried I will then be prepared to vote for a plebiscite.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Taylor) to amendment (page 355):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Baker,
Hodgins,
McNeill,
Madill,
Ross (Dundas),
Taylor, and
Wood (Brockville).—7.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Adams,
Allan,
Allison,
Amyot,
Armstrong,
Bain,
Barnard,
Barron,
Beausoleil,
Béchard,
Beith,
Bergeron,
Bergin,
Bernier,
Borden,
Bourassa,
Bowell,
Bowers,
Bowman,
Brodeur,
Brown (Chateauguay),
Brown (Monck),
Burdett,
Burnham,
Burns,
Cameron (Huron),
Cameron (Inverness),
Campbell,
Carignan,
Carpenter,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Carroll,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),
Charlton,
Choquette,
Christie,
Cleveland,
Coatsworth,
Cochrane,
Cockburn,
Colter,
Corbould,
Corby,
Costigan,
Craig,
Curran,
Jamieson,
Kaulbach,
Kenny,
King,
Kirkpatrick,
Landerkin,
Langelier,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
Laurier,
Lavergne,
Leduc,
Léger,
Legris,
Lépine,
Lippé,
Lister,
Livingston,
Macdonald (Huron),
Macdonald (King's),
Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Macdonell (Algoma),
Mackintosh,
McAllister,
McDonald (Victoria),
McDougald (Pictou),
McDougall (Cape Breton),
McGreevy,
McGregor,
McKay,
McKeen,
McLean,
McLennan,
McLeod,
McMillan,
McMullen,
Mara,
Marshall,
Masson,
Mignault,
Miller,
Mills (Annapolis),
Mills (Bothwell),
Moncrieff,
Montague,
Mousseau,
Mulock,

Daly,	Murray,
Davidson,	O'Brien,
Davies,	Paterson (Brant),
Davin,	Patterson (Colchester),
Davis,	Pelletier,
Dawson,	Perry,
Delisle,	Pope,
Denison,	Prior,
Desaulniers,	Proulx,
Desjardins (L'Islet),	Putnam,
Dewdney,	Reid,
Dickey,	Rider,
Dugas,	Rinfret,
Dupont,	Robillard,
Dyer,	Roome,
Earle,	Ross (Lisgar),
Edgar,	Ryckman,
Edwards,	Sanborn,
Fairbairn,	Savard,
Fauvel,	Scriver,
Featherston,	Semple,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),	Simard,
Flint,	Skinner,
Forbes,	Somerville,
Foster,	Spohn,
Fraser,	Sproule,
Fréchette,	Stairs,
Gauthier,	Stevenson,
Geoffrion,	Sutherland,
Gibson,	Temple,
Gillies,	Thompson (Sir John),
Gillmor,	Tisdale,
Girouard,	Trow,
Godbout,	Truax,
Gordon,	Tupper,
Grandbois,	Tyrwhitt,
Grieve,	Vaillancourt,
Guay,	Wallace,
Haggart,	Watson,
Harwood,	Weldon,
Hazen,	Welsh,
Henderson,	White (Cardwell),
Hutchins,	White (Shelburne),
Hyman,	Wilmot,
Ingram,	Wood (Westmoreland), and
Innes,	Yeo.—185.
Ives,	

Amendment to the amendment negatived.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not altogether in reply to the exceedingly kind and somewhat seductive invitations from the other side of the House, that I should make known my views on this question before the House comes to a final vote, that I rise for the purpose of asking the indulgence of the House for a very few moments. For two or three years past, although almost every year the question of prohibition in one form or other has been before the House, and has been discussed, I have not had very much to say, and that for reasons of my own. During that time I have been subjected, of course, to a great many criticisms and to a great many misrepresentations. I do not complain of that; every person in public life has to be subject to these criticisms and these misrepresentations, and it would be impossible for me to keep track of either one or the other and reply to all. I do not intend to-night to reply to the gentleman from Lambton (Mr. Lister), I leave that to some other person whose quality of mind will better fit him for the purpose than my own. I have, however, to thank him, although he unwittingly did it, for the service which he has done me. He has quoted from speeches which I have made, and I hope he has received a deal of benefit from the research and reading which has been necessary in order to acquaint himself with these speeches and excerpts. I am quite sure that he has selected the very strongest utterances I have made, and those most apropos to the question which is now under consideration, and I propose to use these as a text for explanation in the few remarks to which I ask this House kindly to listen. The hon. gentleman has read from certain speeches of mine, delivered, he says, fifteen years ago, and delivered later than that, but a few years ago, and he has done me the service of reading a newspaper report of my answer to the delegation which waited on the Government some few weeks since. I take this occasion to say that this newspaper report does not exactly convey the ideas that I tried to express; in the main the ideas are what I did express, but the conjunction is not the same, and a different sense could be taken from them than what I proposed they should bear. That always happens, or very often happens, when newspaper reports of what one says are made hurriedly. However, I desire to say this: that with reference to the question of prohibition I have not changed my views as to the principle from the time that I had views upon this subject, whether it be fifteen years ago or whether it be later. I to-day believe in the principle of prohibition just as strongly, and more strongly, than I have in any other previous part of my life. I believe also in the practicability of the principle of prohibition, and in this I will no doubt differ from a great many gentlemen on both sides of the House. I cannot help that. I have my opinions. I propose to keep them, and I have to avow here to-night in the House and before the country, that I am of the opinion, from the light and knowledge that I possess upon it, whether it be sufficient to enable me to give a proper judgment or not: that the principle of prohibition is a feasible and practical one in its application to the country; that it is feasible and practical under certain conditions. Now, I desire to say in the next place that any hon. gentleman who reads my speeches in the past will find that I never burked nor blinked the difficulties that were in the way of the enactment and successful carrying out of prohibition in this country; neither was I ever so dishonest with myself or with my audience as not to tell my audience in the first place what I thought were the difficulties that were to be encountered, and what I thought was the battle to be fought before the victory could be won; and if hon. gentlemen inside of this House, and if people outside of this House—and many of them, too, who profess to be very strong temperance men, and I do not doubt their profession—would be honest enough to quote all my speeches and to take me fairly on this point for review, what I state to-night would be found to be amply carried out.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Life is too short for that.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend may not be altogether in a condition to keep quiet, but he would do me a very great favour if he would allow me to speak without interruption. What I have stated to be the difficulties in the way of prohibition, and what I believe to-night to be difficulties in the way of the practical realization of prohibition are mainly these. There is first the desire for intoxicants, the desire for stimulants which exists in a large proportion of the people of this and of other civilized countries. There may be a difference of opinion as to why this is; some gentlemen say that this is a natural appetite in man, others say that it is an artificial one and that it is bred by circumstances and by custom, or that it is transmitted by inheritance. I am of the second belief and not of the first. However I am not

here to-night to discuss this point, but simply to say that it has now, and has in the past more than now, been one of the great difficulties to be encountered in the practical carrying out of the prohibition principle. I stated as well, and I hold to the same belief now, that the power of custom is another of the great difficulties which stand in the way of the practical realization of prohibition. Any man who studies history, any man who has gained experience, any man who observes to-day, knows the power of custom and what a yoke it places even upon intelligent men. That power of custom, draped in all the allurements of hospitality and of genial fellowship, is one of the adjuncts of the liquor traffic and one of the incitements to the drinking usages of the country; and these will have to be largely reformed and overcome before the principle of prohibition is practically realized. I have always stated, and I state to-day, that the moneyed interest is another great difficulty to be overcome. The man who manufactures intoxicating liquor does it to make money from it; the labour he employs is paid by this money; the man who sells the liquor by wholesale has his profit; the man who retails it has his profit; the municipality, the province, the Government has its share, and, before the man who manufactures can pocket his gains, he has to divide with all these different classes; and, when you talk prohibition, and before you get prohibition to be an accomplished, practical fact, you have to fight, and you have to conquer, that interest. I have stated, as well, that another difficulty in the way of prohibition was the difficulty of its enforcement. Any person who has had practical knowledge and experience of license laws and Scott Acts, of local option laws, or of prohibition, in any country, knows the difficulties to be met with in enforcing a law of this kind. We may say they should not exist, we may shut our eyes and declare that they do not exist, but all the same they do exist and they have to be overcome, and they are a factor to be encountered in the ultimate carrying out of the principle of prohibition. I have always stated and I state to-night that another difficulty to be overcome is the difficulty of the adjustment of revenues. The gentleman from Lambton (Mr. Lister) misrepresented me in this matter. The gentleman from South Huron (Mr. McMillan) also misrepresented me. Neither of them probably, I will do them the justice to believe, intended to do so; but anyone who states that before that deputation or any other deputation I gave as a reason why I could not favour a prohibitory law, that the $7,500,000 of revenue stood imperatively in the way, states what is not true, and states what I did not state. I want that to go as current outside as inside of this chamber; and gentlemen who have a thought about them ought to be careful on these points of criticism of the reputation of another, even though he be nothing but a public man, and ought to be sure of the grounds of their criticism. I never said such a thing. I am here to make another statement. I do not count a gold dollar for one single moment in the balance against one single ray of light or happiness that comes into the humblest home in this country. I do not count your handful of dollars against the happiness or well-being of one single man, if it is attacked and in danger; and I am here to-night to state that I do not look at the $7,500,000 as worth one moment's argument if it is put in the balance against a strong demand of the people to do away with what I consider to be an evil, and to bring about a state of things which I consider would be better for the homes, the happiness and the material prosperity of the country. But I did not meet that temperance delegation, and I do not propose to meet any other temperance delegation, and say to them: True, $7,500,000 of the necessary revenue of the country will be taken away, but do not let us think about that, that presents no difficulty. Do not I know that it is a difficulty? Was I not honest in stating that it was a difficulty? Would I not be dishonest if I did not say that that is a practical difficulty, and that we must consider how it is to be met? Nobody knows better than hon. gentlemen opposite, who have been for years ambitious of occupying the Treasury benches, that the moment they take possession of them they must expect the question of ways and means to be one of the most important questions with which they are to grapple; and however favourable they are to prohibition when they are on the Opposition seats, when, in the far-off time, I hope, they come to occupy these benches as a Government, they well know that whenever a man or a set of men, no matter how good their cause may be, comes to them and says: We have a proposition; we wish you would carry it out; you will lose $7,500,000 of revenue, but then there will be a great advantage to the country, and you should not let that trouble you; they must reply: It does trouble us; it is a practical difficulty to overcome, and we must find how to provide the ways and means. Sir, if this country and this Parliament agrees to it, I am here to state that no better thing could be done in this country than to do what? Than to provide in some other way for the $7,500,000 of revenue in order to have a country blessed with the sobriety and peace and consequent plenty that I believe would come from a well-ordered and well-enforced prohibitory law. Now, that is simply my position. Criticize it as you may, but criticize it fairly as I place it before you; and any man who has been Finance Minister, or who wishes to be Finance Minister, will know that he has a practical difficulty to face when he is asked to come down to the House and provide for $7,500,000 of taxation, by giving it up for any cause, no matter how good it may be. Sir, it has been stated that that would be saved to the country, and it has been said that in speeches formerly made by me I had declared that. So I have declared it, and I believe it would be saved to the country; but I believe too that although it would be saved to the country, and the country would be so much the richer for that saving, it none the less is a difficulty to provide for the financial needs of the present; and this is to be done by increased taxation, and by some method other than that which we have now for raising our taxes. So much with reference to that point. I said that I believed in the feasibility of a prohibitory law under certain conditions. What are those conditions? I will name but one, that is, the condition which follows as a logical sequence, as a necessary deduction from what I have just been stating, that before a prohibitory law ought to be enacted, and before it can be maintained so as to do good in the country, there must necessarily be the basis of a strong and preponderating public sentiment in its favour, in order not only to lead to its enactment, but to tend to its maintenance and enforcement as well; and I

say again, what has been quoted as a reproach to me, and I say it boldly and earnestly, that that man is no true friend of the temperance cause or the prohibition movement who will enact a law to-day, if he does not firmly believe in his heart that that law finds its reflex in the overpowering conviction of a preponderating and active majority in the country in favour not only of its enactment, but its maintenance as well; and that he would do the worst possible service to the cause of prohibition to snatch a verdict for the enactment of the law, and find out afterwards if it were not a reflex of such a preponderating sentiment in the country, that it would become a dead letter on the Statute-book, a by-word in the community, and a reproach to the very temperance men who favoured its enactment. So I say the first thing that is necessary as a basis for the enactment of a prohibitory law, and for its maintenance, is a strong, preponderating conviction in the majority of the people of the country who are to be subject to the law, and who are to maintain it by virtue of that strong, preponderating conviction. Now, let us be honest with ourselves to-night. Do we in our heart of hearts believe that this country, from British Columbia to Cape Breton, has that strongly preponderating and actively co-operating sentiment in favour of the enforcement of a prohibitory law? If we do, let us vote for it and enact it. If we do not, let us be honest with ourselves, honest with the cause, and honest with the country as well. Now, Sir, I have one other point. I am met at once with the criticism: We petition you for a prohibitory law; these prove that the country needs it. Now, I am not one of those who would for one moment ridicule the petitions which have poured into and been laid on the Table of this House. I am pointed to the variety, and the scope, and the number of those petitions, and I am told that they are an index that the people are in favour of a prohibitory law. These petitions are, ninety-nine out of every hundred, honest petitions, honestly signed, and many of them bear the prayers of those who pen the signatures that those petitions might eventuate in a strong and effective prohibitory law. And I believe that these petitions merit the careful consideration of this House. But petitions do not show certainly and definitely the state of feeling of the country, and are not the basis upon which we can enact legislation of the importance of that which is proposed. I have every respect for the resolutions that have been sent here, resolutions of the synods, resolutions of conferences, resolutions of temperance societies. These as indications of opinion are excellent, but they do not offer to us that indestructible and certain basis upon which the law proposed could rest for its maintenance and enforcement. I do not believe that the indication given by the vote on the Canada Temperance Act and by the subsequent reversal of that Act, is a certain sign that the people are or are not ready for maintaining prohibition; and I ask members on both sides, coming fresh from their constituencies, if they can assure us they have a warrant or not from the people to vote for the enactment of a prohibitory law during this session. Therefore I say we have not that certain basis upon which, if we are honest, we ought to stand. I am met with the criticism: You doubt that the country is ready, and you do not want to enact the law until it is, but give us no chance to say whether we are ready or not. That is a fair point to put and it has great weight with me. In reply I may say there are chances. You have the constitutional chance, the regular chance, the old chance every four years to elect a man in each county to represent you. Yes, but, they say, that does not fill the bill; when we come to a general election, we see two parties pitted against each other, and there are great questions which overshadow this question of ours, so that we are beaten out of the field and have no chance to get a fair expression of opinion. There is a good deal of truth in that, but it is also true, on the other hand, that if the temperance question does not burn itself to the topmost place in the general elections, that is fair proof that it has not the strong and wide basis it ought to have in order to find its expression and to maintain that expression after it has found place in the enactment of the law. Will it not be that every year this cause, struggling up through the superstructure of other questions, making its way to the front, will make itself at last the overpowering and overmastering question at the polls, and when it does that, it will have its own heaven given warrant for declaring it has in its favour the irresistible mandate of the people. That is my impression. Yet I acknowledge the difficulty. I have great sympathy with one of the strongest and best prohibitionist in his province, who, writing to me a couple of weeks ago, said: "Looking over the field, I have my doubts as to whether the sentiment of the country is strong enough to uphold a prohibitory law, if it were enacted to-day; but for God's sake give us a chance to vote for it outside of other questions." That brings me to the second proposed way of getting at the voice of the people, that is by reference to the people of the question alone, outside of the general elections, and without the disturbing influence of other questions. That is the referendum or the plebiscite, as you choose to call it. There are difficulties in the way. One of the chief difficulties is outlined by temperance men themselves, who, through the Dominion Alliance, which holds itself to be a strong exponent of the sentiment of the country, down through Methodist conferences, lodges of Templars and the like, say: We do not want any plebiscite; we want nothing but the good old British method of voting at the poll, when the man is before us, and when we embody, as far as we can, in our representative, the sentiments of the community; and that expression of the temperance people weighs with me and with this House against the proposal of a plebiscite or referendum. There is reason for their objection to that proposition. It is unusual, and people are properly a little chary about doing an unusual thing in regard to constitutional and political methods; but besides being unusual, it has this objection, that it is indefinite. Under the plebiscite the people would be asked to vote: "Are you in favour of prohibition or not," and they would mark their ballots "yes" or "no." But have they pledged in Parliament the representatives of the counties to prohibition? There is a general expression on the part of the people, but you have not concentrated that opinion in the individual representatives; and when these representatives meet in Parliament, unless they have a mandate from their constituencies to vote for prohibition or have pledged themselves specially to do so, they

will not feel the responsibility resting upon them of carrying out the intention generally expressed. That is one of the chief reasons why the strong prohibitionists of this country are opposed to the referendum. There is this further danger, that if once you get this Parliament in the habit of sending back to the people any question which vexes it, you make that habit a custom, until you take away the strong power of representative institutions, by weakening their responsibility and making it possible for men, with the best intentions, whenever any question comes up which promises to be troublesome, to just refer it to the people and ask their advice upon it in their general capacity. These are the reasons for and against these two methods, and I do not hesitate to say to-night which of these I prefer. I believe in the old constitutional methods. I believe in the votes, from their places in this House, of the representatives of the people. I believe in the responsibility of the people's representatives here on the floor of Parliament; but I do not say that circumstances may not arise with reference to this question, which stands to a certain extent in a different position from others, which may render it necessary that, some time or other, it should go direct to the people; but if that practice is adopted in the country, it will bring many evil effects in its train. I wish for one moment to notice some mean insinuations that have been thrown across the floor to-night, that once I was a prohibitionist and temperance man, and that now I am not, and that the reason is that I now get seven thousand dollars salary a year. If any gentleman has the pleasure and the anxiety of holding a seat on the Treasury benches and goes through his work fairly and well, he will find that at the end of each year that he has had as many clothes as he can wear, and as much food as he can eat, and the chance to do as much work in one year as in any other capacity he would attempt to do in five, and that is about the sum and substance of it. It is not worth while for me to repel that insinuation. I do not propose to lower myself by doing so, but while on this point I wish to refer to another matter. The Montreal *Witness* is a temperance prohibitionist paper, and the Dominion Alliance is a temperance reform body, representative to a certain extent. But when the *Witness* proposes, as it did a few days ago, to say to a member of Parliament: "I have my eye on you. This is a resolution which I put in the hands of the hon. member for North Lanark, and I am going to watch every man, and every man who does not vote for that resolution I am going to mark as opposed to prohibition." Well, I believe in every man having his own opinion, as I believe in the *Witness* having its own opinion, but the time has not yet come when I, occupying a seat in this Parliament, propose to put my conscience and my judgment in the keeping of any paper or set of men. I propose to do what is honest and fair on this question, and I will make an honest confession before this House to-night. The only inconsistency which has been urged against me is that on one occasion I voted for immediate prohibition when Mr. Robertson, of Shelburne, brought that up as an amendment. I did it, and I did it in a moment of weakness. I did it, not because I was convinced that the country was then ready for immediate prohibition, but because I felt that the lash was raised outside of that criticism and that anathema which would be hurled against me if I did not vote for immediate prohibition, and I voted for it. There is my candid confession. Take it, and make what you please of it; but from this time forth I propose to do what I consider to be right and honest, and I will do nothing further and nothing less. Now, after having made these few gentle and unemphatic remarks, allow me to state my position at the present time and what I am in favour of to-day. We never can have too much information. My hon. friend from North Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) does not believe that the whitest and strongest light that can be thrown on this question can be too white or too strong for it. The man in this House who is not a temperance advocate, and has not read widely and studied deeply in regard to this subject, and it is not to the discredit of any one that he has not done so, if he proposes to deal honestly with this question as I know members on this side of the House intend to deal, must come to the conclusion that it is time to stop playing with the prohibition question, that members must make up their minds in regard to the facts of the case, in regard to what course is to be followed, must then say what they will do and must do what they say. In order to do that, we need the fullest information. In 1872 and 1873, there were very large petitions presented to each House of this Parliament. It is a mistake, I think, to say that the petitions laid upon the Table of the House this session were more influential or more numerously signed than those which were presented in 1873, 1874, and 1875. I have not the figures at hand, but I know that those were monster petitions. They came to a Government which was led by hon. gentlemen opposite. They prayed for prohibition. Select committees were appointed by both this House and the Senate, they made their investigations, and both of these committees reported in favour of immediate and total prohibition. But the House and the Government were not satisfied with that, and a commission was appointed to investigate the matter. The commissioners went to different countries and made a year's study of the subject and embodied their views in a report to the Government, and another resolution was presented to the House, and the great temperance convention which met in 1875 also passed a resolution in favour of prohibition. After all that, the Government did not pass a prohibitory liquor law, and I think Mr. Mackenzie stated, as his reason for not doing so, that he did not think the country was ripe for such a measure. Since that time, sixteen or seventeen years have passed, and the world's experience has ripened, and the history of temperance effort and of prohibitory legislation has taken a wide stride forward, so that now it occupies a significant and important position which it did not at that time. How many men in this House have studied what has been done during that period, and followed it closely? I think that every man in this House wants to know what has been done and to get at the results of experiments which have been made in other countries, if he desires to give an intelligent expression of opinion on this subject. During that time Kansas has been added to the roll of prohibition States, and Iowa has also been added to the roll of prohibition States. These laws have remained in force and I believe with great benefit to the countries which have adopted them. It is true that some people dispute that,

but that is not my position. Why should we not learn the results of the world's experience in all these years. What I propose is not for the purpose of shelving the temperance question or the prohibition question, but for the purpose of getting information as to the most approved, the latest, the most reliable data. I propose that a Royal Commission shall be appointed to embody the results of the world's experience in regard to this question from 1874 up to the present time, and to make research and to collect all the facts and all the experience they can get, and lay before this Parliament the result of the experience of other countries and the data which they can obtain from them, which will be of the utmost advantage to the members of this House and will be helpful to the country as well. That will form a better basis for the consideration of this question than anything we have now before us and will enable us to arrive at a proper conclusion upon it. I have said more, perhaps, than I thought I should at the beginning. What I have said I adhere to. These are my convictions and I place them before the House and the country. I move in amendment to the amendment, that all the words after the word "that" in the original motion, and all the words of the proposed amendment be struck out, and the following words added instead thereof:—

"In the opinion of this House, it is desirable, without delay, to obtain for the information and consideration of Parliament, by means of a Royal Commission, the fullest and most reliable data possible respecting—

"1. The effects of the liquor traffic upon all interests affected by it in Canada.

"2. The measures which have been adopted in this and other countries with a view to lessen, regulate or prohibit the traffic.

"3. The results of these measures in each case.

"4. The effect that the enactment of a prohibitory liquor law in Canada would have, in respect of social conditions, agricultural business, industrial and commercial interests, of the revenue requirements of municipalities, provinces and the Dominion, and also, as to its capability of efficient enforcement.

"5. All other information bearing on the question of prohibition."

And it is only fair for me to state before sitting down that this resolution is drawn out very largely on the lines of the amendment of my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh), widened and broadened considerably in the scope which he had arranged for in his amendment; and, although, as he stated, there was no knowledge and agreement between myself or any member of the Government and himself in regard to that matter, his plan, in its essence, recommended itself to the Government, and this is simply a little widening and broadening of the principles on which he based his amendment. I hope that the House will adopt this amendment, and that good results will come to the cause of temperance and sobriety in Canada from the work of that commission.

Mr. LAURIER. It seems to me that if ever a conclusion on any subject was at variance with the proposition itself, the conclusion which the hon. gentleman has offered to us in his amendment is such; it is totally opposed to the principles he has just laid down. The hon. gentleman stated that he was a prohibitionist at heart, and still believed in prohibition; he was not always required, as he said, to defend himself against the charge of inconsistency. Well, I will not go over his record to charge him with inconsistency, I will be satisfied to take his speech to-night and the conclusion at which he has arrived, because if ever two things were inconsistent, it is the proposition laid down by the hon. gentleman in his speech and the conclusion to which he has arrived. He stated that he was a prohibitionist at heart, that he still believed in prohibition, and that he would be ready to enforce it, but for one fact as to which he was not quite certain, and that was whether the public opinion of this country was ready to sustain and maintain a prohibitory law, if a prohibitory law were passed. In lofty language the hon. gentleman said that he would not hold a piece of gold against a ray of light, not even a handful of gold against a ray of light; but he said that judging from the experience of the past he had reason to believe that if a prohibitory law was passed to-day, it would not be enforced, and that the country would reap no better results from it than it is reaping to-day. What, then, would be the conclusion at which one would expect the hon. gentleman to have arrived? That we should have information as to whether public opinion is ready or not to sustain a prohibitory law. That would be the natural consequence. The hon. gentleman is ready to-day to take the responsibilities of raising a revenue, without the revenue derived from the liquor traffic, and he is ready to undertake the task of finding other sources whereby our coffers could be kept full—he would be ready to undertake all that if he could only know this day that there is in the country such a prohibitory sentiment that a prohibitory law would not remain a dead letter upon the Statute-book. This is all the information the hon. gentleman needs, before he asks Parliament to pass a prohibitory law. Now, Sir, this being the fact—and I put the case fairly, I put it in the very words, I believe, which the hon. gentleman has just used, that is the only proposition upon which he wishes to be informed, this is the only light which he asks for now. Now, let us look at the conclusion of his premises. Does he ask for this commission to enquire whether public opinion to-day is ready to sustain a prohibitory law? Does he ask whether the people would vote for prohibition if they were allowed an opportunity of voting upon the question? No, Sir, there is not a word of that. The hon. gentleman reviewed all the methods whereby public opinion could be tested on that matter. There was the plebiscite, he said, but he does not want a plebiscite, perhaps there might be objections against it. There is the old constitutional method, the old British method, that we employ to settle every question that comes up, that is by an election every four or five years when the people are called upon to pronounce their judgment. There is force, certainly, in the remark of the hon. gentleman that if to-day public opinion was seriously in favour of prohibition, it is probable that the voice of the people would make itself felt to that effect by sending to Parliament a majority of members ready to vote for it. But the hon. gentleman discarded all these methods, and he wants information, so he says, as to whether the people are ready, as to whether public opinion is in favour of prohibition. Let us look at what he proposes. He asks for a Royal Commission to investigate what? To ascertain what is to-day the public sentiment in regard to prohibition? To ascertain whether the people, if consulted, would give their decision in favour of prohibition? Nothing of the kind, but only, to ascertain "the effect of the liquor traffic

upon all the interests affected by it in Canada." That, Sir, is the conclusion of the hon. gentleman who, a moment ago, said would not hold a piece of gold in comparison to a ray of light. Does he want to know what would be the effect of prohibition upon the material interests of the country? He would not be in doubt as to where he would get the revenue.

Mr. FOSTER. That is for your information, not so much for mine.

Mr. LAURIER. Oh, that is too charitable, and too thin at the same time. I do not ask for information; I am ready to vote on the propositions which are before the House. The hon. gentleman said a moment ago he did not want any information upon that subject, he was ready to find the revenue. Now, he wants to be informed:

"1. The effects of the liquor traffic upon all interests affected by it in Canada.
"2. The measures which have been adopted in this and other countries with a view to lessen, regulate or prohibit the traffic.
"3. The results of these measures in each case.
"4. The effect that the enactment of a prohibitory liquor law in Canada would have in respect of social conditions, agricultural business, industrial and commercial interests, of the revenue requirements of municipalities, provinces and the Dominion, and also as to its capability of efficient enforcement.
"5. All other information bearing on the question of prohibition."

Sir, this is only an unmanly attempt to shirk the question.

Mr. FOSTER. You have not given us your views yet.

Mr. LAURIER. I have given my views on this amendment.

Mr. SCRIVER. It has been said that history repeats itself, but if it does it affords us strange examples of contradictions in the conduct and utterances of public men, I think if there is any one person who listens to the eloquence, the very eloquent and forcible speech which the Minister of Finance made this evening and who heard the equally eloquent and forcible speech which he made some years ago, but who will admit that the hon. gentleman sees entirely new light, that he does not at all stand, notwithstanding his profession of being a prohibitionist still, upon the same grounds that he did in 1884. On the 5th March in 1884, Mr. Foster moved:

"That the object of good government is to promote the general welfare of the people by a careful encouragement and protection of whatever makes for the public good, and by an equally careful discouragement and suppression of whatever tends to the public disadvantage.
"That the traffic in alcoholic liquors as beverages is productive of serious injury to the moral, social and industrial welfare of the people of Canada.
"That despite all preceding legislation, the evils of intemperance remain so vast in magnitude, so wide in extent, and so destructive in effect, as to constitute a social peril and a national menace.
"That this House is of the opinion, for the reasons hereinafter set forth, that the right and most effectual legislative remedy for those evils is to be found in the enactment and enforcement of a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes."

Mr. FOSTER. Those are still my sentiments.

Mr. SCRIVER. The hon. gentleman had no doubt at that time as to what the country requires.

Mr. FOSTER. Now show the inconsistency.

Mr. SCRIVER. I have some more quotations to make, and I prefer to make these quotations rather than to give any utterances of my own. They are altogether more forcible and powerful as arguments in favour of the immediate enactment of a prohibitory law, than any considerations I am able to present.

Mr. FOSTER. What a public benefactor I have been.

Mr. SCRIVER. I think you were, or aimed to be at one time, but I am afraid you have sadly fallen from grace. Referring to two or three points which the Minister of Finance has urged this evening as constituting a reason for taking very different ground from that he took in years gone by, I propose to read two or three quotations from the speech the hon. gentleman made on that occasion, and no one within the sound of my voice will fail to understand how strangely different his present position is from his position on that occasion, and he has laid himself, at least, open to the charge of inconsistency, if not of want of strict candor. The hon. gentleman, after speaking at some length of other aspects of the question, went on to say:

"There is another question which has agitated the minds of a good many, and is looked upon as a very serious objection to the passing of a prohibitory law. I allude to the loss of revenue to the country in consequence of this. I will not go into the moral question as to whether this revenue is obtained in a legitimate manner, as to whether it is right or wise for this country to batten upon the proceeds of this traffic, but I will simply quote the authority of a gentleman whom I am glad to see sitting in his seat opposite to me to-night, a gentleman whom a large majority of this House consider to be a very high authority upon financial matters. I allude to the hon. the Finance Minister, who last summer, on August 9th, at Westminster Palace Hotel, in London, made a speech upon Canadian liquor legislation, and in that speech he said:

"It has been my misfortune, or fortune, having been a great many years in the Government of my native Province of New Brunswick and in the Government of the Dominion, to hold the post of Finance Minister in all these Governments, and I have never heard but one opinion about the revenue question, namely, that it is of quite secondary importance, though it is, I admit, a more difficult thing with you. The revenue we obtain in the Dominion of Canada is probably five or six millions of dollars a year, and it costs $20,000,000 in providing it for us. No Finance Minister would remain long in office who would, in this day, propose a scheme for raising a revenue of $5,000,000 that would cost $20,000,000 to collect."

"Mr. Speaker, I think that, coming from such an authority as this, this House will accept the view I have propounded, and I do not believe that there are a great many people in this country who would not be prepared for the statement, that the hon. Finance Minister there made. There are not a great many people in this country who would not fully understand, that although direct receipts from this traffic would certainly be expunged from our revenue, still the improvement in the general commerce of the country, the improvement in the general welfare and well-being of our community, would be so great that the receipts in all other branches of our revenue would be increased correspondingly, and there would, practically, after the first year or so, not be any diminution whatever in our revenue from our tax-payers.

The hon. gentleman did not seem to have any doubt on the financial question at that time.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question! question! dispense.

Mr. SCRIVER. We cannot possibly dispense with these quotations. It is only fair to quote the utterances of the member of Parliament against the utterances of the Minister. I really think the hon. gentleman's speech in 1884, was more convincing than his eloquent speech to-night. He proceeded to say:

"There is another point which I now come to, and that is, when we ought to prohibit. It is generally said that we should not prohibit until the country is quite prepared

for that action; until there is not only an evident desire on the part of the country for prohibition, but also that the country should be prepared to sustain the prohibitory measure and to assist in carrying it out. I believe this is, to a certain extent, true: but I believe also, that one of the very best means of obtaining that happy period in the country's history is to commence by prohibiting. I believe that the very fact that a prohibitory law is in existence is one of the very best educating powers in the community. I believe that, by the legislative action of the Parliament, we may have a better influence upon the people of the country to bring them to that opinion than we can in any other way whatever."

What then is the use of a Royal Commission? The hon. gentleman continued:

"It is true that in years past moral suasion has been tried, and moral suasion has accomplished a great deal. Far be it from me in any way to detract from the noble efforts of those who have spent their time and labour in trying to improve the principles of the community upon this question, but I believe that, in conjunction with moral suasion, as an assistant and help to moral suasion, it is absolutely necessary that the Government of the country should propose a law, and should assist those who are trying this moral suasion to carry out that law and to enforce it. What has been the result in those countries where we have a prohibitory law? We find universal testimony to the fact that in those states and countries where the prohibitory law has been in existence the people have found the education which it exerted upon the community was the very greatest possible to be imagined."

The hon. gentleman then went on to speak of the effect of the prohibitory laws in some of these states. However, I will venture to give only another extract from the hon. gentleman's speech delivered in 1884. He said further:

"But there is another argument which we may fairly adduce. It is very inconsistent for the Government of any country to license people to sell intoxicants, and thereby encourage intemperance, while at the same time they pretend to be educating people in favour of temperance. Certainly it is a very ineffectual mode of educating people in favour of temperance by precept, when by practice the Government educate people in favour of intemperance. So long as we may be told that the liquor traffic is perfectly respectable, that it is acknowledged and fostered by the Government, that traffic cannot possibly be considered disreputable, or immoral, or wrong. It is very difficult for us to preach when we do not practice, and I think, Sir, that it is the duty of the representatives of the people to take the first step in practising that which they are endeavouring to preach to the people.

"Now there is another objection very often urged against prohibition, and that is that prohibitory legislation cannot succeed, and must necessarily be ineffective, and conducive rather to evil than to good. I believe we have not to go outside the limits of our own country to see the fallacy of this argument. I come from a county in which a prohibitory liquor law has been in existence for a long time, and I can emphatically say that, while it has not accomplished all that we desire it should accomplish, while it has not been absolutely and entirely enforced, still it has accomplished so much good that the vast mass of the people in that county would regret exceedingly to see it repealed. Nay, more, they would strenuously resist and forbid the repeal of that law, and any agitation in favour of such repeal would meet with a most determined opposition. I think I am justified in saying this when I recall the fact that the other day I presented to this House a petition signed by 1,200 or 1,500 of the electors of my county, asking that this resolution, in favour of which I am now speaking, should be passed by this House. If the Dunkin Act, which has been for many years in existence in my county, had been inoperative, if it had produced more evil than good, if it had not, at all events, accomplished some of the good which was expected of it, it would have been quite impossible that so large a number of the most intelligent electors in my county should have asked for the passage of a resolution in favour of prohibition. Instead of that, they would have sent petitions here asking that the resolution be rejected, pointing out how prohibition had failed in its effect. We know that in a large number of counties in this Dominion the Scott Act also has been in force, and although, no doubt, there are conflicting opinions in regard to its action, still the simple fact remains, that in every district I know of where this law is in force, the liquor-sellers and those who wish to obtain liquor, together with the manufacturers of such liquor, are opposed to such law, is to me a convincing argument that that law has done harm to the traffic. I believe if we could obtain evidence from these counties where prohibitory laws are in force, the evidence would be overwhelmingly in favour of prohibition."

I beg to remind the House that it was after such utterances as these that the hon. gentleman gave the vote he did give in favour of Mr. Robertson's resolution. He says he gave it in a moment of weakness. Well, he does not do justice to the powerful arguments he used as a reason for giving the vote he did give. Those arguments, I am sure, were convincing to a great number of hon. members who listened to them, and would be equally convincing if repeated to-night. I have felt it to be my duty, as well as my pleasure, to quote the utterances of Mr. Foster, M. P., against the utterances of the Hon. Mr. Foster, Minister of Finance.

Mr. FLINT. We have heard from the Minister of Finance probably one of the most extraordinary confessions ever made in Parliament by a public man, that he voted on an important public question in a moment of weakness and in consequence of appeals made to him by certain parties outside of this Legislature. Is the time coming when we will have another confession from the Minister of Finance, that the resolution now moved by him in this House, was moved by him in a moment of weakness also; that it was the result of a lash of some kind; and that threatened with penalties inside of this House or outside of this House he has put forward this motion? Comparing the motion made by the Minister of Finance on this important subject with the speeches with which he has ornamented the question of prohibition during the last fifteen or twenty years, I think that we will see that a great change has come over the spirit of his dream and that some motive—I will not attribute any improper motive to him—but some motive of an extraordinary character must have influenced a man of his character and position in this country to take the extraordinary stand he has taken on this question to-night? What are the conclusions the Minister of Finance lead us to? We find the country agitated from one end to the other on a question of great economic and moral importance; we find the Table of this House overwhelmed and overburdened with petitions upon this question, asking the House to take certain action with regard to the passage of a prohibitory law; we find certain amendments suggested to the House by representatives of the people, one looking to a vote of the people on this question and another looking towards an enquiry upon the subject. And, after the able speech, the eloquent speech, and the powerful speech delivered by the hon. Minister of Finance, as that hon. gentleman is always able to deliver, and for which he has no greater admirer than myself, we find he has simply adopted in another form an amendment of one of his supporters and looking to the same end. I will make some practical criticism upon the speech of the Minister of Finance which I submit to the consideration of the House. In the first place, we are to be treated to delay, we are to be treated to a costly commission to gather facts which have already been gathered, facts which the hon. gentleman himself has given to the public, facts which are within the reach of every member of this House who wishes to make any effort to gather them, facts which are well known from one end of the country to the other, and facts upon which the whole prohibitory agita-

tion which has led to this discussion have been based. The country is well aware of the effects of the liquor traffic upon all the interests concerned in Canada. We require no expensive Royal Commission to sit one or two years to lay these facts before the Legislature: the country is well aware as to the measures which have been adopted in this and other countries with a view to lessen, regulate, or prohibit the traffic. An expensive Royal Commission paid by the people of this country to gather facts already in their possession will not add anything to the educational influences which are already before the people in connection with this subject, and so every conclusion which has been suggested by the mover of this amendment has already been settled by committees of this Legislature, by the able addresses which have been delivered in Parliament during the past fifteen years, by the vast amount of literature which has been poured forth by the press of Canada during the past quarter of a century on this subject and which is within the reach of every person within this Dominion. But, Sir, assuming that we have an expensive Royal Commission, that we have half a dozen gentlemen roaming throughout this country and other countries, we have at the end of this period a bulky report circulated at immense expense, interesting I grant you and replete with valuable information—but the main question is left precisely in the position it is now in after the lapse of two or three years. The Government will still be groping in the darkness for some practical means to carry into effect the will of the people, and to pass a prohibitory liquor law which, according to the arguments of the hon. the Minister of Finance himself, will be of incalculable benefit to every man and to every interest in this country. I say, Sir, it is a lame and impotent means of evading a direct pronouncement upon this question, and if it is carried into effect we will be in precisely the same position two years hence as we are to-night. The question of a plebiscite will still be open for discussion and consideration, the probability of a prohibitory liquor law being enforced by the people of the country will still be open for debate, and after years of delay and a heavy expenditure of public money we will not have advanced one step in the matter. I think it would be more manly and more in accordance with the disposition this Parliament has manifested in treating other subjects, that the representatives of the people in this House should vote at once either for or against the principle of prohibition. As there are large numbers of members in this House who have some doubts as to whether the electorate of the country is in favour, by a large majority, of prohibition, the Legislature to-night, or as soon as practicable, should come to a conclusion as to whether they should submit this question to a plebiscite or otherwise. Personally, I am opposed—and chiefly for the reasons given by the Minister of Finance—to the idea of putting this question before the people by a plebiscite or referendum. The reasons I have given against the appointment of a Royal Commission will apply to this also. After having placed the question before the people, after having referred it to the people at the polls, suppose the people have given a substantial yea to the question thus submitted to them, the Legislature will find itself in precisely the same position it is in to-night, as to how best to deal with this question, and the personal feelings or political proclivities of some hon. gentlemen will still be bound to interfere with the carrying into effect of a strong and reasonable and practical prohibitory law. I think it would be far better than all ulterior questions should be laid aside and that Parliament should, at as early a date as possible, decide on the principles of prohibition and leave in the hands of the Government or other competent authority the framing of a prohibitory law. I agree with what has been well said by the hon. mover of the resolution (Mr. Jamieson), that it is not the desire of the temperance people of this country, who are forcing forward with the utmost energy they can bring the necessity of a prohibitory liquor law, it is not their desire to bring that about in such a way as to destroy or injure suddenly any great interest connected with this question.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Was not that a subject of discussion in the Alliance whose resolution this is? Was not the question of the Legislature dealing with immediate prohibition the subject of discussion in that Alliance, and was not this resolution framed by the Alliance as a hard and fast resolution for immediate prohibition?

Mr. FLINT. I believe the resolution of the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) was a resolution suggested to him by the Alliance, but even if it had not been suggested to him by the Alliance——

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then let me say it is the resolution we are voting on, not the hon. gentleman's opinion.

Mr. FLINT. I am speaking now in regard to the whole question rather than to the amendment of the hon. Minister of Finance. I was saying that assuming that on a plebiscite the people would show themselves in favour of the law, we would then be in precisely the position we are in at the present time with regard to taking any practical steps to carry out the will of the people; and I think that, even at the expense of some delay, it would be better that Parliament itself should come to the conclusion to enact a prohibitory liquor law; then the Government would be required by Parliament and the opinion of the country to enforce it as they do any other law on the Statute-book. I am not disposed to admit that the question of prohibition is so different from any of the other great questions of legislation as to be treated in any exceptional manner. However, the question has been so fully dealt with by the hon. Minister of Finance and the other hon. gentlemen who have spoken, that it would be unfair to the House for me to dwell any further upon it at this hour, and I will only conclude by saying that I trust that the resolution of the hon. Minister will not be accepted by the House, but that we shall reach some definite conclusion on the main question, or on some collateral question more closely connected with it than is suggested by a proposal for a plebiscite, a commission or anything of that kind. I am strongly opposed to the amendment.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I wish to say a word or two before the motion of the hon. Minister of Finance is voted upon by the House. With regard to that motion, I entirely concur in the remark of my hon. friend beside me, that it is wholly beside the speech which the hon. Minister addressed to the House. That hon. gentleman proposes that the

House shall recommend a Royal Commission on this subject. Why should the House take the responsibility of recommending a Royal Commission to His Excellency the Governor General out of the hands of his constitutional advisers? We may appoint a committee in the promotion of public business, or to investigate or obtain information on a subject requiring the action of Parliament; but the appointment of a Royal Commission is entirely in the hands of the Administration, and it is usually employed for the purpose of getting information for the Government to enable them to submit to the House some proposition relating to the administration of public affairs. Now, the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches do not require a vote of this House to enable them to appoint a Royal Commission. But, Sir, the appointment of a Royal Commission, under this motion, as my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has most conclusively pointed out, is for the purpose of getting information which will not in the smallest degree assist us in dealing with this question. I apprehend that a large majority of the members of this House are in favour of prohibition. The only question upon which the friends of prohibition are divided is whether such a measure can be made practically operative in the country. Upon that I have already expressed my opinion. For the reasons that I gave at an earlier period of this discussion, I am of opinion that such legislation should be preceded by a proper ascertainment of the opinion of the country on the question, which can be most readily and most effectively had by a plebiscite. Now, I do not agree with the hon. Minister of Finance, that this would be in any degree a departure from the principle of responsible government, or would in any degree weaken the practice that has heretofore prevailed on the part of representatives of the people, of assuming the largest possible degree of responsibility in dealing with public questions. The object of obtaining a vote of the people upon the question is to ascertain whether they really desire a measure of prohibition or not. I believe that such a measure, if carried into operation with fair efficiency, would be of very great advantage to this country; but I am of opinion that a measure which would simply close the houses now licensed to sell liquor or the places licensed to manufacture it, and leave every person free to engage indiscriminately, without any fear of the law in the sale, with which it is proposed to do away, would be a worse state of things than that which we undertake to remedy; and I would like some assurance that there would be an efficient enforcement of the law before I would undertake to put such a measure on the Statute-book. The difference between a measure of this sort and ordinary measures which the representatives of the people are called upon to enact, is that there is no constant, active public opinion required in order to make ordinary laws efficient. If you put on the Statute-book a law against forgery or a law against theft, the number of offenders is very small, and the immense mass of the people, the entire community I may say, are in sympathy with the enforcement of the law, and are altogether against the offender. That does not hold good in the same way with regard to sumptuary legislation, and you must have a healthy, active, strong public opinion behind your law in order that it may not be inefficient. For that reason I am desirous that there should be ascertained in the simplest possible way, that is, by popular vote, the opinion of the country on this question. What the hon. Minister of Finance has proposed does not bring the House any nearer to a solution. It does not enable us to ascertain what the opinion of the country is. These hon. gentlemen may appoint a commission; they may summon witnesses; they may take evidence; but what is it all about? About the evils of intemperance? Why, Sir, we know them. About the amount of money that is obtained from licenses? That can be easily ascertained; it is a matter of no consequence. About the amount of revenue that would be displaced? We know that already. About the appliances that are to be employed for making good any deficiency that would arise from the adoption of such a measure? That is the business of the Minister. He has all the means of obtaining information now, without a commission at all. A more inconsequential proposition than that which the hon. Minister of Finance has submitted to the House could not well be conceived, so remote is it from every practical consideration which it is possible to give to the question. Now, the Minister of Finance said that the former Administration had not gone as far as the petitions desired it should go. Well, the Government of that day did assume the responsibility of dealing with that question. We had a majority in Parliament, and we did not seek to shirk the responsibility of dealing with a question upon which public opinion was being agitated.

Mr. BOWELL. How?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We introduced what was called the Canada Temperance Act, which is an optional law. It is a law which may be brought into operation anywhere, whenever public opinion chooses to bring it into operation. The Canada Temperance Act is rightly styled by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the case of the Queen against Russell, in which their lordships said: It is a measure of prohibition for the whole country, but it is a measure which is left in abeyance until public opinion in the various localities chooses to bring it into operation.

Mr. BOWELL. Was not that after this House had authorized the Government to appoint a committee to travel through the United States and obtain information?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If I remember rightly the House appointed a committee, and the committee conducted the enquiry, but the Government themselves appointed a commission.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman does not go quite far enough. That committee recommended certain action to be taken, which is almost in the line of the motion made by my hon. friend on my left, and the Government acted upon it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Certainly, at that time we made enquiry, and were largely influenced by the opinions of our friends in New Brunswick, who had tried a prohibitory law which was made universally operative over the entire province. It was however inefficient, and in the vast majority of places it was not enforced at all. In two years it was repealed, and nearly every one who had assisted in putting the measure on the Statute-book was defeated in the elections. We were all of opinion, after very carefully considering the subject, that legisla-

tion in advance of public opinion would do more harm than good : and it is because I still hold that view, I am anxious to know precisely what is the state of public opinion in this country upon this question ; and that can be ascertained by plebiscite more accurately than by any other method ; and that being the case, I am opposed to this proposition for delay. I am opposed to this proposition to obtain information which has been already obtained, and I am in favour of a referendum in order that the opinions of the people of the country may be ascertained on the subject, The proposition which the hon. Minister submits has no relevancy to the question before us.

Mr. LANDERKIN. We have learned to-night that the Finance Minister in the past has had moments of weakness. He has told us so, and in one of those moments he voted in this House for a prohibitory resolution. I wonder if the hon. gentleman has one of those weak fits upon him now.

Mr. FOSTER. No ; I feel quite strong.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I wonder if the resolution which has emanated from his brain is the result of weakness or of power. He was good enough to tell us to-night that in the future he would be more honest. Had he not done so, some of us might have had some suspicion about the honesty of his course in the future. After I had in a playful manner said, when the hon. gentleman asked the hon. member for Lambton to read all his speeches, that life was too short, was the Finance Minister in a moment of weakness when he indicated that I was not in a condition to understand them if I did read them. The hon. gentleman may have thought that I who am always in a condition to know what is said in this House, would tolerate an impertinent and false charge such as that. My position is so secure, wherever I am known, that the imputations of such a man as he will not be listened to by any hon. gentleman in this House. I have been in this House for a good many years, and during all that time hon. gentlemen know well that I have never been in other condition in which I was not able and ready to attend to legislation, when the Finance Minister, from the position he has attained, casts, after the playful exclamation I made use of, an imputation of that character upon me, I would perhaps be justified in not replying to it and may be now demeaning myself by noticing a statement of that character coming from the source it did. It may be possible that I, who never, in the discharge of my public duty, referred to the personal characteristics or to the frailty of any member in this House or out of it, I may see fit, on some occasion, to serve back to the Government the meed and measure that they deal to me on the other side. I may yet be obliged to do it, and I think, if I invite a comparison to be made between my record and that of the hon. gentleman, I have no reason to blush either for my friends or for my record. I listened on one occasion to the Minister of Marine, when he made a statement of the same character as that to which I have just referred. I considered the impertinence and the source it came from so contemptible that I did not reply, nor would I reply to-day did I not think it possible my silence might be construed into an assent. But I tell the Finance Minister and every other gentleman in this House that I am prepared to discuss my career and record, either as a temperance man or in any other relation they choose, and if the Finance Minister will throw down the gauntlet and will give opportunity for a discussion——

Some hon. MEMBERS. To-morrow.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That is the policy on the other side, but I am here to take it up to-night. I have tolerated those calumnies, and have lived through them. The hon. Minister of Finance says that public men are liable to be misrepresented. The best evidence that the charge made by the hon. Minister of Finance was false, was the fact that it was made by him. Take his record on the temperance question. The first session he came here he delivered a lecture on prohibition which lasted some six hours. He was then prepared to sacrifice everything in order to secure that boon. At that time, the Minister of Finance was enjoying his indemnity here, and he was enjoying a large source of revenue from his temperance lectures. His sources of income were well known to the people of this country, and I do not object to his obtaining his livelihood by those means. At that time he thought prohibition was a necessity, and by advocating it he reached the Treasury benches, and, after he reached the Treasury benches, not one word, not one act, nothing does he do but to discourage the measure upon which he rode into power. That is the gentleman who tried falsely to impute to me to-night a statement which he knows to be false and to be a calumny and a slander. I will not imitate him by investigating his career further than as a public man. I will not be drawn out of my course by any scandalous imputation he may make upon me, a false and scandalous imputation which every member of this House knows, and which the hon. gentleman himself knows, to be a false and scandalous imputation.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I must call the hon. gentleman to order.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. SPROULE). I think the hon. gentleman is violating the rule which says that no member should use offensive imputations against another.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If the Minister of Justice is just, why did he not call the Minister of Finance to order when he made that imputation against me ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, you have ruled the hon. gentleman out of order, and he must withdraw the expression.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am going to withdraw. I said he made a scandalous and a false statement against me. He made both, but I withdraw them both.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is an evasive statement and is out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. When unparliamentary expressions are used, the member who uses them must withdraw them absolutely, without any qualification whatever.

Mr. LAURIER. My hon. friend has objected to most offensive language used by the Minister of Finance against him, and he has protested against an imputation upon his character. If he is not allowed to refute and deny any such imputation, there should be some change in the Rules or in the fair-play allowed in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the expressions of the Minister of Finance were unparliamentary, he should have been called to order at the time.

Mr. MULOCK. That is not the point.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The question of order is before the Chair.

Mr. MULOCK. I wish to speak to the question of order.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No one denies that the hon. gentleman has a right, as the leader of the Opposition has said, to defend himself, and to deny and refute any insinuation made against him in strong terms, but he must keep within parliamentary language. He has just admitted that he said that the Minister of Finance made a scandalous imputation which is false, and that he knew to be false.

Mr. MULOCK. As I understand the point upon which your ruling is asked, it is this: The Minister of Finance made a statement reflecting upon the character of my hon. friend from East Grey——

Mr. LANDERKIN. South Grey, if you please.

Mr. MULOCK. My hon. friend from South Grey. He denies that, and says that the imputation was false and scandalous. If an imputation is made against a member of this House, surely he has a right to say that it is untrue.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think, Mr. Speaker——

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Chair has not yet decided the question.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We are discussing the question of order. I think the well understood rule is that you may characterize a statement as being untrue and false, but you cannot charge the member who made it personally with being a liar, or say that he is stating what he knows to be untrue. You can characterize the statement as untrue, but you must not accuse the person of stating what he knew to be untrue.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. member said both. He said that the statement was untrue and scandalous, and that the Minister of Finance knew it was so.

Mr. LANDERKIN. In order to stop any further discussion on that point, I will bow to the wish of the Speaker and withdraw the statement, and I suppose that is all that is necessary. I do not know that it is necessary, but, if the Minister of Finance will see that he has done me an injustice and will have the manhood to get up and say so, the discussion will end, and I will give him the opportunity of doing so.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If the hon. gentleman has finished, I desire to make a few remarks on the subject now before the House.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have the floor still. I only asked whether the Minister of Finance had the manhood to withdraw that statement or not?

Some hon. MEMBERS. What is the statement?

Mr. LANDERKIN. He knows very well the statement he made.

Mr. FOSTER. I really do not know what all this is about. If the hon. gentleman or any hon. member on that side will mention the statement I used against the hon. gentleman which was false and scandalous, I will withdraw it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I heard the statement.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman is out of order.

Mr. EDGAR. The Minister of Justice cannot have the floor the whole time.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) would have the right to refer to what the Minister of Finance may have said in respect to him, but it is rather late to call the Minister of Finance to order for what he may have said, and to which attention should have been called at the time, if it were necessary.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I bow to that decision, as I do to all the decisions of the Speaker.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has risen to give the information asked for by the Minister of Finance from any member on this side.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman has asked any hon. member on this side of the House to state the words used by the Minister of Finance in reference to the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin). I was here at the time, and the words he used were: "the hon. gentleman is not in a condition to be quiet." I would like to know what the hon. the Finance Minister meant by that?

Mr. SPEAKER. I must say that this question is exceeding all bounds, If the expression used by the Finance Minister was an unparliamentary one, the attention of the Chair should have been called to it at the time. We cannot discuss it now, whether it were unparliamentary or otherwise. I did not hear the expression used by the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), but if, as stated by the Minister of Justice, it was that the statement of the Minister was false, and he knew it to be false, it certainly was unparliamentary, but I suppose I am to understand that the member for South Grey withdraws that expression.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That question having been solved and the Minister of Finance having screened himself behind the ruling of the Chair and allowed an imputation like that to rest against me, I will conclude that he has taken another of his weak fits, has got one of his parliamentary fits—if it were in order I would say something else; and the Speaker, and the Minister of Justice, and some other members on that side of the House might come to his rescue. Now, I could carry this case further, I could reason it out with him in its entirety, I could go along his career since he entered the House, and I could consider his position, his variety of positions on this question, ever since he came to this House and some time before; I could follow him up and down the lines when he went around with his carpet bag and when he was lecturing on this subject. I will not do that, I am not going to do anything of that kind, nor do I impute any fault to him for that. But when he makes a specialty of this subject, gets into the House on this subject, gets into the Government on this subject, and just as soon as he gets into the Government, then he shelves this subject, and puts his prohibition into the pigeon holes of the department, and never mentions it again in the House, then, I have a right, as a public man, and he being in the

Ministry, to criticize his conduct, and I will do so. It appears to me that it is a proper question for me to discuss, and it is a proper question for this House to discuss, and I tell him that it matters not to me what opinions he may entertain of me or of my course in the House. But there is this about it: I believe the people will think that these momentary weak spells which he has are not always momentary, and that they will last for a considerable season; and there are some people in this country who will believe that these weak turns will last as long as he is in the Dominion Cabinet and gets his salary. A great many people will believe that. I think I am quite parliamentary when I say that. He chooses to make imputations against me, I am not going to make imputations against him; but I believe there are some people who will take that view of the case. As to the language in which he refers to the press, as to the sneers that he makes at the Montreal *Witness* which tried to impress this truth upon the country, as to his declaration that he would not allow the press to dictate to him, and as to the terms in which he speaks of the press that endeavours to carry out the principle which he says that he admires, I will leave that with him and them to settle; but I will not allow him, nor will I allow any other member of this House, to get up and make statements about me which are false, which are not correct, as long as I am in this House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I want to say a few words on the subject which was before the House an hour ago. As regards the question which has just been under debate, I confess I was not able to follow the argument if any, and I shall not attempt to reply. I will only express my regret that the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) should have indulged in language which seems to me entirely uncalled for by anything which transpired this evening. I think that hon. member will be willing to admit himself that he is in the habit, I will not say in the habit, but that he occasionally indulges in the practice, of throwing remarks across the House in a loud tone of voice while members on this side are speaking, in a way that is rather disagreeable to a gentleman who desires to carry on his argument to the House without interruption. He did so while the Minister of Finance was speaking, and the Minister of Finance made a retort at the moment which I may not have fully heard, but which I certainly did not interpret in the offensive sense in which the hon. gentleman seems to have received it. I think the hon. gentleman might have regarded it—I certainly did at the moment—as a playful answer to playful badinage on his part, which is very often rather a rough kind of play. I do not intend to say anything more upon this subject than to express regret that this episode has taken place, and that the hon. gentleman has seen fit to resent what was said to him in answer to his interruption in a way that seems to me to have been quite uncalled for. I want now, Mr. Speaker, to say a few words upon the subject under debate, and but a very few words considering the lateness of the hour. For the greater part of the evening, since the Finance Minister resumed his seat, the question which has been dealt with by hon. gentlemen opposite who have endeavoured to answer him, has not been at all pertinent to the resolution moved by the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson), to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh) or to the sub-amendment moved by the Minister of Finance; but the all important question, it would appear from the hon. gentlemen who have spoken, has seemed to be not the merits of prohibition, not the merits of a proposition to make a public enquiry for the information of the people who are eventually to decide this question, but the more important question, overshadowing all others, seems to have been whether inconsistency can be found between the speech of the Minister of Finance this evening and some speech he made at some other time. The first hon. gentleman to criticize his consistency was the leader of the Opposition, against whose remarks I have nothing to say but this, that the friends of the Minister of Finance are quite willing that the contrast shall be made between the speech of the Minister of Finance, which was frankness itself, which stated the views that he held on this question from the time he entered Parliament down to this moment, and admitted an error he had made once, and the speech of the leader of a great party who resumed his seat without daring to express his opinion on this question. I also think we are willing, if I may pass now to one of his supporters, to contrast the record of the Minister of Finance upon this question with the speech and the record of the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver), who resumed his seat after occupying the time of the House, agreeably it is true, because he was reading eloquent passages from the speeches of the Minister of Finance, but who left us in such doubt as to where he was upon the question, that I had to ask three or four members beside me whether he was a temperance man or a friend of the liquor traffic.

Mr. SCRIVER. You will have no doubt when he votes.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will have no doubt after he votes, and I hope that hon. gentleman who threw a taunt across this House about history repeating itself, will not repeat his own history when I remind him that in 1877 he was afraid to vote that a prohibitory law was the true remedy for the evils of the liquor traffic. A member of this House, in 1877, moved that a prohibitory law was the true remedy for the evils arising from the liquor traffic—that was the first part of it, and the second part of it was that it was the duty of the Government to bring in such a measure. The member for Huntingdon shirked behind the pretext that there was a question before the Supreme Court as to who had power to legislate on the question of prohibition, and he voted that the words "a prohibitory liquor law is the true remedy for the evils of the liquor traffic" be struck out of the resolution. He promises us that we shall know more about how he will vote, so that we shall know more about how he feels than we have ever done since 1877. I desire to offer a few observations with respect to the remarks of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) as regards this question. I entirely agree with him that on a question of such great importance we ought to be certain before coming to a conclusion as to whether public sentiment has reached that point of determination, assuming it to be in favour of prohibition, as to ensure the full enforcement of the Act after it is passed. I agree

with the hon. member for Bothwell too as to the propriety of passing laws of this kind, sumptuary laws as he designated them and as they are generally designated, as to which public sentiment may not be in full accord. But where I differ from the hon. member for Bothwell, and where it seems to me the argument obliges us to part is on this point: The hon. member for Bothwell says that with a view to ascertain that he desires at once to test public opinion by a vote. Now what is the logical conclusion of the hon. member for Bothwell on this point? It is this, that although he has been a member of Parliament for a long period of years, a leading and fully imformed member of Parliament, better informed and better experienced than the great majority of us here, after all his experience, his reading, his contact with the people and the study of this question, yet he, a public man, is unable at this moment to come to the conclusion as to whether public opinion of this country is strong enough to warrant the passage of this measure, and he proposes to leave it without information to the electors, not one in a thousand of whom has the information and knowledge he has on this question. What is the difference between that proposition and ours? It is that at every phase of this difficult question we shall gather in the most authentic way the largest and fullest information that can be obtained in this country and everywhere else, not for the purpose of informing the Minister of Finance—and that sophistry was in all the arguments we had from the other side—not even for the information of the Government alone, but for the information of this House, as a basis for future action and for the information of the electorate, to whom the hon. member for Bothwell proposes we shall eventually refer this question. If he, with all the study and experience he has been able to bring to bear on this question, is unable to come to a conclusion, surely he may consider that the electors can be enlightened by information obtained by means of a Royal Commission. Then there was the equally illogical strain in the hon. gentleman's argument as to the unconstitutionality, or the impropriety from a constitutional point of view, I had better put it in that form, of this question being investigated by a Royal Commission instead of by the Government. The hon. gentleman declared that the Government was here, that it should give the information to the public, and was the constitutional committee of this House for such a purpose. But the hon. gentleman illogically then came to the conclusion that while the Government was qualified to deal with this question and get the information, this Parliament, which is constitutionally bound to legislate on the question, was incompetent and must ask the people to legislate for it. There ought to be very little uncertainty as to the basis of a proposition of this kind. The resolution of the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh) sets out on its face more fully than the sub-amendment does the nature of the information which is required in this country. After all the discussions which have taken place on this question it is true that members have been able to tell us what the loss of revenue to Canada will be, but I have not heard any view of the question as to what the provincial losses will be as regards provincial revenue, what losses the various municipalities of this country will be, what the loss to the carriers and other branches of industry and commerce will be, and also the loss to the men engaged in the industry that will be put out of existence by the adoption of a prohibitory law. Moreover, we have had no information within the last 17 years as to the working of prohibitory laws restrictive of the sale of intoxicating liquors in other countries of the world. If it was right, as I suppose it was, as I have no doubt it was, for the Government composed of hon. gentlemen opposite in 1874, under the report of a joint Committee of both Houses, to issue a Royal Commission and send their commissioners throughout the United States to get information on this point, surely now after, as the Minister of Finance has said, new states have been added to the roll of prohibitory states, after 17 years have elapsed, is there any impropriety, any unconstitutionality in making the same enquiry now, and even enlarging the bounds of that enquiry, so as to ascertain what, under the altered conditions of our country, the effects of a prohibitory measure would be upon our own people? If the Government now is the best qualified body to get this information and lay it before the House, I presume it was so in 1874. But in that year the course now proposed was adopted. I will not detain the House, as I might have done at an earlier hour in the evening, in showing that time after time in Great Britain, not only on kindred subjects to this, but on this subject itself, enquiries have been made year after year as to the working of laws to restrict the sale of intoxicating liquors even in the British Isles themselves. No less than three Royal Commissions have been issued within the limits of Great Britain as to the working of the license laws in that country, and they have collected information and laid it before the public and Parliament for the purpose of informing the public mind, as well as the mind of Parliament, as to all the facts and circumstances surrounding the question. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) expressed to the House a strong preference for a decision of this question by a plebiscite. For a moment I wish to present to the House a few of the objections to that proposition; I will state them very briefly and not elaborate them considering the hour of the night. I think that course is open to a very grave objection, not only because it is or is supposed to be repugnant to the theory of our constitution, but because it pratically weakens the power of this Parliament for all time to come, to say that it shall abrogate its functions in discussing any public question and leave that to the people to decide, instead of its being decided by the men whom the people have sent here to deal with that and every other question that may require the action of Parliament. I can easily conceive, to say nothing of the theoretical objections, that in future years when measures may be brought forward to which vigorous opposition will be raised in this House or in the country, a clamour to do the same thing would be raised, and we would find in all our future experience in Canada that the precedent set on this occasion was not only a departure from our constitutional theory but a very inconvenient one in practice; there would be no safety, no security, and very little strength in this Parliament until that precedent was virtually wiped out, so far as regards its authority and its force for all time to come. That is, however, only my opinion upon the question. I say that assuming I am wrong upon that point and that at a future period this Parliament should say

I am wrong, I do believe that if this question in all its intricacy is to be submitted in the form of a plebiscite, then the information which it is proposed to get by this commission and to circulate by this commission throughout the country is more important than ever. To come back to the argument with which I have started; if this information is needed here—and this debate shows it is needed—for these considerations, and this evidence, and these facts which we desire to enquire into have not been discussed by anyone here who pretends to be a master of them, if they are needed for the deliberations of this House, undoubtedly they are ten times more needed by the people who are to vote upon this question should a plebiscite be adopted. For these reasons I trust that the amendment which the Minister of Finance has made will be adopted. I am reminded by an hon. friend near me that the proposition to submit this question in the form of a plebiscite, even if we are disposed to it, would not settle the question, and that mode of disposing of it—if it can be called disposing of it, but I should rather call it a shirking of the question—that mode of disposing of it for the present has been denounced and discountenanced by the very organization which has entrusted this resolution to my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Jamieson). For these reasons I hope that the amendment will be adopted, I hope, to use a simile which I will borrow for the occasion, that this House either upon the question of a plebiscite or upon the broader question of prohibition, will not risk the safety of the ship of State in seas the soundings of which have never been taken. I do believe, Sir, that the information which will be asked for and obtained by this Royal Commission will do a great deal more to form and enlighten public opinion throughout the country on this question than any member who has spoken on the other side of the question has been willing to admit this evening.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I beg the House to be assured that at this early hour of the morning I do not propose to enter upon any lengthened discussion of the question before us. I have one or two ideas to present and I shall present them in very few words. I may be allowed to remark with reference to the opening sentences of the Minister of Justice's speech that his promise was sadly marred by his performance. He attempted to lecture hon. gentlemen on this side of the House because they did not confine their arguments to the question in dispute, that they had entered on the question as to the consistency or inconsistency of the Minister of Finance and he deprecated that the time of the House should be wasted with such fruitless discussion. He had no sooner ended his denunciation of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House for their supposed breach of parliamentary rules, than he himself entered on a criticism as to the consistency of my hon. friend from Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver). The hon. member for Huntingdon needs no defence at my hands and I should imagine that the course he took on the occasion to which the Minister of Justice refers would need no defence in the mind of any lawyer. The hon. gentleman knows that at that time the question as to the powers of this Parliament on the liquor legislation was in dispute. He knows that the question had been carried to the Supreme Court of this Dominion, that it was *sub judice* and the opponents of Government for the purpose of snatching a party vote had asked the House to pass a legal judgment upon a question which was then *sub judice* before the Supreme Court of the Dominion, and my hon. friend the member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) acting with a discretion which I should expect from a gentleman of his prudence and years, declined to usurp the position or to exercise the functions which should be discharged by the judges of that court. That is the amount of the inconsistency of the hon. member for Huntingdon. I have to make a remark on a personal matter which has arisen very unpleasantly to-night. The Minister of Finance is charged with having used language of a most personal and offensive character against one of the most respected members of the Opposition in this House, a gentleman who has sat here for many years with credit to himself and to the constituency he represents, and a gentleman whom I think both sides of the House will unite with me in saying, that, whatever may be thought of his political opinions, there is not a man in the House at present or a man who ever sat in the House with him, who does not respect his personal character. I am quite sure that when party passions subside there is no one on the other side of the House who will defend the unwarranted attack made upon him in an indirect way, and if the hon. the Minister of Finance did not intend to make that attack personally offensive, when the opportunity was afforded him by the member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) it would have become his position and his dignity if he disclaimed any offensive intention. This is a matter of opinion, but the hon. gentleman knows that if that kind of innuendo is introduced, it is a two-edged sword which can be used by both sides of the House. Now, as to whether we should vote in favour of a Royal Commission, or vote to refer this question to the people, I am in favour of referring it directly to the people, because this House has already passed its opinion upon the subjects which you now desire to refer to a Royal Commission. If my recollection serves me aright, the last time the House discussed and voted upon the question of prohibition, it decided that it was prepared to carry out the necessary legislation to enact prohibition on one condition and one only. The House was satisfied with regard to the information it had, the House was satisfied with regard to the effect prohibition would have, but the House was not satisfied as to whether public opinion was ripe for it, and subject to that qualification, and to that qualification alone, the House declared, by an enormous majority, that if public opinion was ripe for prohibition, it was quite prepared to carry it into effect. If the country is now ripe for prohibition, I ask the House to have the manliness to do what it said it was ready to do three years ago, and to carry out the pledge it gave to the country. I call the attention of hon. gentlemen to the fact that the reference to the Royal Commission does not embrace any mode of testing public opinion, and that the only point upon which you are not satisfied is the one point that you did not refer it to the Royal Commission to decide. You refer to that Commission to take evidence and to find out what would be the effect of the prohibition, but you have already determined that you know enough about that, and the Minister of Finance in his speech to-night declared that he himself was ready to vote on the effects

of prohibition in this country. Although one pities the miserable inconsistency of the hon. gentleman which is apparent in his conduct, yet one cannot but admire his audacity when he said that although he once voted for prohibition he did it in a weak moment. But, Sir, upon this point—and it is one as to which we ought not to quibble about consistency or inconsistency, because it affects not one man, but the honour of the House—not only the Minister of Finance, but the House has pledged itself by an enormous majority that when it once became satisfied that public opinion was ripe for prohibition, it would be ready to enact such a measure. That is the only question we have to satisfy ourselves upon, and how are we to satisfy ourselves upon it? Simply by taking a vote of the people, either in the ordinary constitutional way or in the way of a plebiscite. Sir, the arguments advanced by the hon. Minister of Finance, who I may say holds a brief for the liquor interest to-day, against taking the vote in the ordinary constitutional way, are insuperable.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has no right to state that I hold a brief for the liquor interest.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Well, if the hon. gentleman will tell me for whom he does hold a brief, I will withdraw my charge, and make it consistent with the facts.

Mr. BOWELL. If he were half as well paid as you were for the short time that you held a brief, he would be very well paid.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is very pertinent to the subject. I admire the appropriateness of the remark made by the hon. Minister of Customs. It is intended to be personally offensive, but owing to the fact that it is so appropriate to the discussion, I will forgive him the intrusion. I want to know if we can test public opinion by the ordinary mode——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question has been raised as to whether the hon. gentleman was in order in charging the hon. Finance Minister with holding a brief for the liquor interest. I may say that I hope the hon. member will withdraw that expression.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Certainly, Mr. Speaker, if you are of opinion that that expression should not be made, I do not need any argument upon it—I will bow to the Chair and withdraw it without any hesitation. Sir, on the question whether we could test public opinion in the ordinary constitutional mode at a general election or not, the hon. Minister of Finance—who does not hold a brief from the liquor dealers, but who alone knows for whom he does hold a brief, which is on the opposite side from the brief which he held when he spoke four or five years ago—has convinced me that we cannot test public opinion properly at a general election. Every hon. gentleman knows that at a general election there are one or two prominent questions which divide the great political parties; and he knows that nine-tenths of the electors vote on these great questions—questions of state, questions of policy, financial questions such as that which were argued at the last general election—and he knows that a very small fragment of the people are prepared to say: We have no interest in these great questions of state, and we are going to vote on this one little question of whether we shall have prohibition or not. Every practical politician knows that you may go on for the next twenty years as you have been going for the last twenty years, and so far as the general elections are concerned you will never be able to deduce from their results, whether a preponderating mass of the people are in favour of prohibition or not. Sir, I base my argument on these two propositions: First, that you have been discussing for nearly a quarter of a century whether the people are in favour of prohibition or not, and after having held a dozen elections you have never been able to come to a conclusion; and, secondly, you have declared by a resolution that when you can come to a conclusion, you will vote in favour of that conclusion; and, I now say that, that being the case, if there is another proposition which holds out a fair prospect of enabling you to form a conclusion, although open to some objections, such as novelty, you are bound to accept it. When I last addressed the House on this question, I stated that if an opportunity were afforded to me, I would move directly and squarely that this question should be submitted to the people, and I had a resolution prepared to move in the following words if my hon. friend from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) had not anticipated me:—

"That all after the word 'That,' in the original resolution, and all the words of the amendment be struck out and the following substituted:—

"In view of the large number of numerously signed petitions presented to this House from all parts of the Dominion, praying for the passage of a law prohibiting the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes, and in view also of the continuous agitation existing on the subject, and the inutility of passing such a law unless supported by a decided majority of the electorate, and the differences of opinion now existing as to the wishes of the electorate, this House is of opinion that the question of passing such prohibitory legislation should be submitted directly to the electorate at an early day in the form of a plebiscite."

That resolution has nothing vague or uncertain about it. It leaves the question, divorced from all other questions, to the people, the source of power, whose opinion we should take as our guide, and it will enable us to carry out the pledge which we have embodied in the resolution carried in this House before, and will, I think, meet the wishes of the better class of prohibitionists and the better class of thinking men in this community.

Mr. JAMIESON. I have only a word to say. In the first place, I must express my regret at the turn which the debate has taken. It has been the object of the temperance people of this country as far as possible to separate this question from party politics, and it was the desire of the temperance people, whose spokesman I am on the present occasion, to have this resolution discussed upon its merits, entirely aside from any political complications. I may say further, in reference to the suggested amendment of the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) that as I stated before, so far as I understand the sentiment of the temperance people of this country, they will not and cannot accept a proposition to submit this question to a plebiscite. If that amendment were passed, I have no hesitation in saying that the temperance people would not fight the question at the polls, because such action would be in direct opposition to their sentiment on

the question. So that any amendment of that kind would be entirely abortive, so far as bringing forth any proper fruit is concerned. Now, I must say, in reference to the amendment of the Minister of Finance, that I was not aware of the character of the amendment until it was read here to-night, and so far as I am concerned, as the proposer of the resolution before the House, I cannot at the present stage accept the amendment of the Minister of Finance. My desire is to get an honest and square expression of opinion upon the question of prohibition pure and simple. At the same time, I am bound to say that I am not opposed, and I believe the temperance people are not opposed, to all possible light being thrown upon the question. We do not fear investigation, but believe the more light obtained the greater strength our cause will have. Under other circumstances, I would not object to that proposition, but under present circumstances I must object to it, because I want an expression of opinion upon the motion and not upon the amendment. But, if any good is to be got out of the commission, if any information is to be obtained by it, I for one, if it came up in the proper way, as a substantive motion, would not oppose it. I trust this question will not be indefinitely postponed, but that next session all necessary information will be before the House, when I, for one, if I still retain the confidence of the prohibitionists, will endeavour to press it again upon the consideration of Parliament.

Mr. McNEILL. I just wish to say that, in view of the statement made by the representative of the temperance party in this House to-night, I shall vote for the amendment of the hon. Minister of Finance. I stated in my constituency to the temperance people there, that I would support a resolution to leave this matter to the people at once, and I believed that that would be satisfactory to the temperance people; but, as I now understand it, it will not be satisfactory to the temperance people, and I think the proposal of the Minister of Finance the most reasonable one to adopt, and I will support his amendment.

Mr. FRASER. I do not wish, as the seconder of the resolution, to be considered as agreeing in the statement made by the mover. The temperance people are ready to have the question submitted to the people and voted upon, and they want no law which will not be sustained by the large majority of the people.

Mr. JAMIESON. I desire not to be misunderstood upon this question, and if I apprehend correctly the hon. member for Guysborough he has quite misunderstood me. I have stated distinctly that my desire is to have a square vote on the question of prohibition, and that I cannot accept the amendment of the Minister of Finance. I did qualify that statement by saying that, under other circumstances, I would not object.

Mr. FRASER. I made no reference to that at all. I only wished to state that, as the seconder of the resolution, I do not accept the statement that the temperance people will not accept a plebiscite.

Mr. JAMIESON. I may tell the hon. gentleman that for the past fifteen years I have been a member of the Dominion Alliance. That question has been repeatedly before them, more especially during the last few years. And the hon. member for Huntingdon will bear me out when I say that, so far as the Alliance is concerned, they are absolutely opposed to a plebiscite. I have a resolution sent me from Hamilton a short time ago to that effect passed unanimously by a thousand people.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Foster) to amendment (page 1321):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Adams,	Léger,
Baker,	Lippé,
Barnard,	Macdonald (King's),
Bergeron,	Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Bergin,	Macdonell (Algoma),
Bowell,	Mackintosh,
Burnham,	McAlister,
Burns,	McDonald (Victoria),
Cameron (Inverness),	McDougald (Pictou),
Carignan,	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Carpenter,	McGreevy,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McKay,
Cleveland,	McKeen,
Coatsworth,	McLean,
Cochrane,	McLennan,
Cockburn,	McLeod,
Corbould,	McNeill,
Corby,	Madill,
Costigan,	Mara,
Craig,	Marshall,
Curran,	Masson,
Daly,	Miller,
Daoust,	Mills (Annapolis),
Davin,	Moncrieff,
Davis,	Montague,
Denison,	Patterson (Colchester),
Desalniers,	Pelletier,
Desjardins (L'Islet),	Pope,
Dewdney,	Prior,
Dugas,	Putnam,
Dupont,	Reid,
Dyer,	Robillard,
Earle,	Roome,
Fairbairn,	Ross (Dundas),
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),	Ross (Lisgar),
Foster,	Ryckman,
Fréchette,	Skinner,
Gillies,	Sproule,
Girouard,	Stairs,
Gordon,	Stevenson,
Grandbois,	Taylor,
Haggart,	Temple,
Hazen,	Thompson (Sir John),
Henderson,	Tisdale,
Hodgins,	Tupper,
Hutchins,	Tyrwhitt
Ingram,	Wallace,
Ives,	Weldon,
Joncas,	White (Cardwell),
Kaulbach,	White (Shelburne),
Kenny,	Wilmot,
Kirkpatrick,	Wood (Brockville),
Langevin (Sir Hector),	Wood (Westmoreland).—107.
La Rivière,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Guay,
Allison,	Hargraft,
Amyot,	Harwood,
Armstrong,	Hyman,
Bain,	Innes,
Barron,	Jamieson,
Beausoleil,	King,
Béchard,	Landerkin,
Beith,	Langelier,
Bernier,	Laurier,
Borden,	Lavergne,
Bourassa,	Leduc,
Bowers,	Legris,
Bowman,	Lépine,
Brodeur,	Lister,
Brown (Chateauguay),	Livingston,
Brown (Monck),	Macdonald (Huron),
Burdett,	McGregor,
Cameron (Huron),	McMillan,
Campbell,	McMullen,

Carroll,	Mignault,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Mills (Bothwell),
Charlton,	Mousseau,
Choquette,	Mulock,
Christie,	Murray,
Colter,	Paterson (Brant),
Davidson,	Perry,
Davies,	Proulx,
Dawson,	Rider,
Delisle,	Rinfret,
Dickey,	Sanborn,
Edgar,	Savard,
Edwards,	Scriver,
Fauvel,	Semple,
Featherston,	Simard,
Flint,	Somerville,
Forbes,	Spohn,
Fraser,	Sutherland,
Gauthier,	Trow,
Geoffrion,	Truax,
Gibson,	Vaillancourt,
Gillmor,	Watson,
Godbout,	Welsh,
Grieve,	Yeo.—88.

Amendment (Mr. Foster) to amendment, agreed to.

Motion, as amended, agreed to on a division.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1.55 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 25th June, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. MULOCK moved:

That it is desirable that any witness called before the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts, be examined under oath or affirmation touching any matters coming before them.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 116) further to amend the Inland Revenue Act.—(Mr. Costigan.)

EXCHEQUER COURT ACT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 117) further to amend the Exchequer Court Act. He said: The principal provisions of the Bill are four. The first is that the divisions of the Exchequer Court shall have jurisdiction to decide disputes between claimants to patents of public lands, where any dispute of the kind may be referred to the adjudication of the court, as, for instance, where a deceased person has become entitled to a patent if the patent has not issued and there are rival claimants to the estate. The second provision refers to cases in which a judge is disqualified from sitting. At present there are no means by which a substitute judge can be appointed, unless the judge is actually disqualified by interest. But there happen to be some cases where there are other reasons than actual disqualification to make it desirable that the judge should not sit, as, for instance, cases in which as Deputy Minister of Justice he has given an opinion. The object of the provision of the Bill is to enable a judge to be appointed *ad hoc* in such cases, and to make good his jurisdiction, notwithstanding that the regular judge may not have the interest absolutely to disqualify him in law. Another provision is to confer on the court jurisdiction between subject and subject, to give remedies in cases under the patent law in relation to copyrights and trade marks. Finally, the remaining provision is to introduce the interpleader practice in Exchequer Court cases.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). When the hon. Minister refers to patents in lands, does he refer to patents that may be issued by one of the departments here, or to patents generally?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Patents to be issued from the departments here.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. JONCAS. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before taking up the Orders of the Day, I hope the House will allow me to draw its attention to an article which I find in *Le Monde* of this morning, in connection with the position which I took in this House on Monday night. The article, as I translate it, reads as follows:—

"MR. JONCAS VOTED WANT OF CONFIDENCE IN THE GOVERNMENT.

"Mr. Joncas was elected by acclamation at the last election. Until lately the member for Gaspé had almost always supported the Government; but he is of Liberal origin, and as the herring-keg will always smell of the herring, so now Mr. Joncas has retained the taste of his early years, and he now returns to his first loves, without any ado. Perhaps the best way after all to pass from under one flag to another is to march off in silence."

Mr. Speaker, *Le Monde*, of Montreal, has always made itself the mud-cart of the Conservative party since it came into existence. The editors of *Le Monde*, of Montreal, have made their paper the vehicle for all the filth with which the Conservative party wants to cover its opponents, and I am not at all surprised if I find myself a little besmattered with mud by the editors of *Le Monde*. I would not pay any attention to this article were it not for its giving me the occasion to explain the vote which I gave here on Monday night against the Government. The editors of *Le Monde*, Mr. Speaker, have such supple spines, they are so accustomed to crouch neath the whip that lashes them, they are so used to quietly and smilingly wipe away spittle thrown in their faces, if it pays them to do so, that they cannot understand independence of character in other people. Mr. Speaker, I voted for the motion of my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, on Monday night, because I wanted to protest by my vote against the principle which seemed to have presided at the formation of the present Administration. I wanted to protest by my vote against the fact that the senior Privy Councillor of Her Majesty, the first lieutenant of the chief whose death has left such a great vacancy among us, the one we are still in mourning for, and whose loss will be long and keenly felt by the Conservative party, had been left aside. I wanted to protest against the complete ignoring of the man who for twenty-five years of his life, in weal or woe, fought by the side of the chief whose loss we lament. I had another reason, Mr. Speaker, for my vote, a reason personal to me, which it does not suit me to make public here to-day; but grave interests con-

nected with my county were on the verge of being sacrificed, or I thought they were on the verge of being sacrificed to political gamblers, to parasites, to leeches, such as the editors of *Le Monde*, who take the best blood of the Conservative party for their own benefit ; and, Mr. Speaker, I will not suffer an injustice to be done to those who have entrusted to me the duty of representing them in this House, I will not sacrifice their interests in order to please individuals of the stripe of the gentlemen of *Le Monde*. Now, *Le Monde* says that I am of Liberal origin, and that I have changed my flag. Mr. Speaker, for twenty years of my life I have actively and honourably fought the battles of the Conservative party, I have fought them at my own cost and expense ; no one has ever had to pay me $80,000 in order to have me remain true to my party ; and I will continue to remain a Conservative and true to my party as long as the policy of my party will be acceptable to me, and as long as the interests of my constituents will be safe, as long as justice will be done to us. Mr. Speaker, I wish to improve this occasion to give a formal denial to an assertion which was made by the Liberal press after the last general election. It was asserted that I had pledged myself solemnly, and by writing, to support my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. My hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, knows as well as I do that there is no one in his party who can say that such a pledge is in existence ; that such a pledge ever existed ; that there was ever any question of such a pledge. Now, Mr. Speaker, *Le Monde* may continue to insult me in its columns, but I am thoroughly determined upon one thing. I ran as an independent Conservative at the last election in the County of Gaspé, and I mean to remain an independent Conservative. I mean to vote for my party, as I said before, as long as justice will be done to the interests that I represent ; but if the interests which I represent ever seem to me in danger I will in no wise scruple to vote against the party now in power, and if ever I come to leave the ranks of the Conservative party it will be because I refused to remain in the company of people whom I thoroughly despise, and who seem to be paid to insult the friends of the Conservative party.

WINNIPEG AND HUDSON'S BAY RAILWAY COMPANY.

House resolved itself into Committee on the following resolution :—

That it is expedient, in order to enable the Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway Company to construct a railway from the city of Winnipeg to some point on the Saskatchewan River, to enter into a contract with such company for the transport of men, supplies, materials and mails for twenty years, and to pay for such services during the said term eighty thousand dollars per annum, such payment to be computed from the date of the completion of the said railway.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. DEWDNEY. The House will recollect that for the last two or three years the policy of the Government has been to connect the two extensive commercial arteries, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Saskatchewan district, by joining the Canadian Pacific Railway with the Saskatchewan River at different points in the Territories and Manitoba by branch lines of railways. Some two years ago, a resolution of an almost similar character to the one now before the House was presented. That was to grant a financial subsidy to a railway starting from Regina and running to Prince Albert, on same terms as those now presented to the House. Last year hon. gentlemen will recollect that an arrangement was also made by which we assured the construction of the road from Calgary to Edmonton. With regard to the construction of those two roads, I am glad to be able to state that they are commencing to realize what we expected of them, and a large settlement has been going in to both the districts served by these two roads, and especially on the western route. We have had deputations from some of the Southern states this year inspecting the lands of both these roads, and the reports from these delegates are of the most satisfactory character. With regard to the question of policy, I am quite sure the House will agree with me as it did agree with the Government in previous years, that it is one which cannot but be beneficial to the North-West Territories and Manitoba. A few days ago, I find that a gentleman, who has had an opportunity to study the country, and is well known to hon. members of this House, the Hon. Edward Blake, has stated, with regard to the Western road from Calgary to Edmonton :

"Certainly the development of the country must be greatly assisted by the branch lines to the fertile districts, both north and south, of the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It was essential that care should be taken that no consideration should enter into their location other than with the view of tapping the very best portions of the country."

Well, that is what the Government have done with regard to the line which is now under consideration, and which I may say, passes, almost from its starting point to the Saskatchewan, through as fine a section of the country as we hold in the North-West or Manitoba. The conditions upon which we ask the assistance of this House and the terms upon which we propose to give assistance to the company who propose carrying out the work are precisely the same as those given to previous companies. We propose that the company shall contract for the transport of men, materials, supplies and mails for twenty years from Winnipeg to a point on the Saskatchewan, at $80,000 per annum, to be paid on the construction of the railway from a point within the city of Winnipeg to a point on the Saskatchewan River, such payment to be computed from the completion of the railway to such last-mentioned point. The subsidy will be made payable in half-yearly payments and be assignable to trustees to secure the company's bonds on the whole or any part of the undertaking. The tariff rates will be the same as those agreed upon for the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway Company, and remain undisturbed for six years. And in case the amount earned by the company between Winnipeg and the point on the Saskatchewan River for Government service should not amount to the sum paid by the Government, one-third of the land grant earned will be kept to recoup the Government. At the same time the Government wish it to be distinctly understood that they are assisting this railway, not as the great Hudson Bay Railway which we have heard so much about lately, but on its merits as a colonization road. It is also understood that the company shall at no future time make any demand on the Government for financial assistance for the construction of the railway northward from the

Saskatchewan River. The line originally located and which has been fyled within the Department of Railways, commenced at the city of Winnipeg, and ran along the eastern shore of Lake Manitoba to the Saskatchewan River. It is now proposed to probably alter the direction of that road in order to accommodate the very large settlement which is going in to what is known as the Dauphin Lake district. For the last eighteen months settlers have been flocking into that country, and constantly calling out for railway communication. I may state, for the information of hon. gentlemen, that the character of the country is excellent. I hold reports from different engineers who have been there, and who all express the opinion that it is one of the most valuable portions of our western country for settlement. There is no occasion for me to read extracts from these reports, but I hold them in my hand and will show them to any member who wishes to look at them. When I brought this matter up first in the House, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) stated he would like to have some idea with regard to what surveys had been made and the estimated cost of construction. It is estimated that the road can be built, the whole of its length, including rolling stock, station houses, equal to the Canadian Pacific Railway standard, for the sum of $15,000 per mile. I might also further state that a contract has been already let to the firm of Messrs. Mann & Holt, who have constructed the roads from Regina to Prince Albert, and are also now building the road from Calgary to Edmonton. The contract has been let to those gentlemen for the sum of $11,000 per mile for the line proper without the rolling stock. A land grant has been given for some years to this company to the extent of 6,400 acres per mile within the limits of Manitoba and 10,000 per mile from Manitoba to Hudson Bay—although we have nothing to do with the Hudson road proper beyond the limits of Manitoba and towards Hudson Bay. The land has been given in alternate sections on each side of the railway line. I may also state that the company is not exactly in the same position as the two other companies I have referred to. At that time an arrangement had been made with the Canadian Pacific Railway to operate the line six years. No such arrangement has been made in this case, but it is presumed that there will be no difficulty as to the operation of the road. With regard to the main Hudson Bay road, I may state that I have given my personal attention to that, and have come to the conclusion, after a good deal of study, that the road is feasible and the navigation sufficiently open to accommodate the traffic, and I believe, if constructed, it would result in cheapening the cost of transportation of our wheat produce some 15 or 20 cents per bushel. These are my own private opinions in regard to that line, but I may state further that the Local Government of Manitoba appear to have come to the same conclusion, because they have made to this company, if it continues the line we are now assisting from the Saskatchewan to Hudson Bay, a grant of $1,500,000. I hope the House will look favourably on this resolution, and that I shall be allowed to introduce the Bill, which I hope will be adopted.

Mr. SPOHN. Representing the constituency I represent, and coming from the part of the country I come from, I feel I would be false to my constituents, false to the Province of Ontario, and false to the Dominion of Canada, if I remained in my seat and did not protest against spending money for such a scheme as this. I consider that every dollar spent on this railway is thrown away and lost to the country. I must congratulate the Minister of Interior for the very plausible manner in which he brought forward his motion. He tells us that he intends to grant this subsidy only for a colonization road as far as the Saskatchewan. Do we not know that the building of this road depends on the Manitoba bonus, and that the promoters of this scheme will go to the old country and expect to float that scheme on the ground of the Manitoba grant and the grant they expect from this House, and do we not know that the Manitoba bonus depends upon the completion of the road to Hudson Bay? Therefore, I propose to discuss this as a Hudson Bay scheme and not as a colonization scheme. This is merely introducing the thin edge of the wedge. It is merely sugar-coating the dose, but although it is sugar-coated, the coating is too thin, and we get the bitter taste before we swallow the nauseous draught. I claim that this is a violation of all the policies of all the Governments of this country, who have spent so many millions of dollars in building the Welland Canal, the Sault Canal, and enlarging the St. Lawrence Canals, and in building the Trent Valley Canal. More than this, I object to an expenditure of this money for such a purpose, because I maintain that this is impracticable. I maintain that this road, if built, will be of no practical purpose, and I believe that the people who pay the taxes have a right to be heard on this question. I dare say some people will make money out of this road. No doubt the contractors will make money out of it, and it will be the old story over again. We have had too much of this kind of public expenditure in the past, and it is time that we should put a stop to it, and we should not spend money at this day unless it is to be of benefit to the country at large. I was pleased the other day to hear the member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) stand up for the Province of Ontario and tell us that that province paid more than half the taxes of the Dominion, and that the city of Toronto itself contributed more to the taxes of the Dominion than the Maritime Provinces and the North-West put together. When this question comes to be decided, I hope the member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) will vote as he speaks. I expect the members for Manitoba will support this Bill. No doubt they will all support it. We will probably, for the first time in the history of this House, find the member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) and the member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) sailing in the same boat. Of course, whether this road be completed or not, there will be a certain amount of money spent in Manitoba, and there will be a certain boom in consequence of that, but I believe I can show the House that, were this road built, it would be of no advantage to the Dominion or to the Province of Manitoba. I claim that, in questions like this, demanding a large outlay of public money, demanding that we go to the old country and ask for credit from the capitalists of the old country, on the endorsation of this House, these questions should be calmly debated and we should go into all the details in order to see whether this or that

expenditure is feasible ; but, if ever there were a wild-cat scheme put before the people, I believe this is the scheme, and, whether it be started as a colonization road or not, it will be floated on the English markets as a road to Hudson Bay, and every dollar obtained on the English markets for the road to the Saskatchewan will be obtained for a Hudson Bay scheme, and therefore it will be obtained on false pretences, because that bonus from the Manitoba Government will not be given until the road is completed to Hudson Bay. Therefore, this House should discuss this question not as a local colonization road to the Saskatchewan, but as a road to be built to Hudson Bay, and and which can only benefit the contractors. In going into this matter, I propose to quote certain authorities, but before doing this I would remark that nearly all the statements and papers given us by the promoters of this road are slightly coloured. Take the question of distance : They claim that Churchill is 700 miles from Winnipeg. Every engineer will tell us, and every practical railway man knows, that, in following the curves of the streams and in making the necessary curvatures to get the proper levels, the length is increased to a considerable extent. I have it on good authority that, when this road is completed to Hudson Bay, instead of being 700 miles long, it will be over 800 miles. Then again, as to the distance between Churchill and Liverpool, it is stated that the distance is in favour of Churchill by a few miles. The distance from Churchill to Liverpool is stated at 2,926 miles, and from Montreal to Liverpool at 2,990 miles. In making up this statement, they follow the same line as in the other, and take the longest line from Montreal, by Cape Race. Surely, if the Hudson Straits are navigable, the Straits of Belle Isle are navigable, and that would be in favour of Montreal by 150 miles. This matter of distance is, however, of minor importance. Now, the distance from Winnipeg to Hudson Bay is 800 miles ; the distance from Winnipeg to Fort William is 426 miles, being a difference in favour of Fort William of at least 350 miles. It costs, to carry a ton of grain at present rates, 1½ cents a mile per ton, but grain has been carried, and grain can be carried, on railways at 7 mills per ton. If we take the lower rate at which grain has been carried, we find that we can carry it from Fort William, past Montreal, for less than the difference on the freight between Winnipeg and Churchill. What I mean is this, that what we gain by the difference in favour of Fort William will carry grain past Montreal to Liverpool. Now, I do not propose to take up your time by discussing the navigation of Hudson Bay, because that has nothing to do with this question at all ; but I propose to discuss the navigation of the Hudson Straits, because through the Hudson Straits every vessel must pass, and whether Hudson Bay is closed or whether it is open, matters not. If the Straits are closed, then navigation is closed ; consequently, I propose to confine my remarks to the navigation of the Hudson Bay, and I will try to make them as brief as possible. We know that the *Alert* established several stations through these Straits ; I do not propose to take up every one of them, but only the principal ones through which navigation must pass. In doing this I shall quote from Lieutenant Gordon's report. We find that vessels going into Hudson Bay cannot pass the straits before August. The *Alert*, on 7th May, fitted up with stores on board, with the members of the expedition, sailed out from Halifax at 11 a.m. Surely this was early enough to try the Straits. Now I will quote from his report :

"On June 15th, at 5 p.m., made the edge of the ice about 35 miles east of Cape Resolution, the ice, though heavy, was slack ; steamed in, working as near course as possible. At 1:30 a.m. of the 16th made the land—Cape Best The ice was now run tight together, so we banked the fires and left the ship to pull under a foretopsail and F. T. staysail. From June 15th to July 6th we were drifting with the ice. At times the ice would run abroad and then the ship was worked under steam or sail, in whatever direction seemed most promising. I append hereto a chart on an enlarged scale, showing approximately our drift in the ice."

This shows the condition of things at the eastern end of the Straits. The *Alert* passed through, planting observation stations at different points. —

"On the following morning, August the 4th, observed a vessel in the ice in the Straits, supposed to be the Hudson's Bay Company's ship *Diana*, bound for Fort Chimo. The ice was so thick around the shore that it was with difficulty we were able to work our way into the harbour (Port Burwell), and when in there the ice was jammed so tightly that I walked from the ship to the shore without difficulty. Arrived at Churchill August 31st, soundings all the way across the bay. We made Knightshill Beacon at 8 a. m. of the 31st, and anchored in Churchill harbour at 2 p. m. the same day. Stopped at Churchill to survey harbour. Started on return voyage September 7th. On the morning of the 7th, we left Churchill and shaped course across the bay ; no field ice was met with except a few scattered pans lying off the south-east end of Salisbury Island ; there were, however, quite a number of icebergs, sometimes eight or ten being in sight at one time."

Now follows the ice record at Nottingham Island :

"NOTTINGHAM ISLAND, STATION NO. 5.—ICE RECORD.

"[*September*, 1884.]

"1st. Closely packed ice extending across the Straits.
"2nd. Ice moving with the tide, large field near Cape Digges, not much change in appearance from yesterday.

"[*October*, 1884.]

"1st. Clear water in middle of Straits, heavy pack along the shore.
"2nd. Straits full of ice as far as can be seen, no open water visible.
"3rd. Ice loose, body of pack has moved east.
"4th. Fog bank to the south in a.m. ; in p.m. cleared and showed heavy field of ice lying north and south to the east of the island, clear water to south-west.
"5th. Snowstorm ; ice packed on the shores.

"[*November*, 1884.]

"24th. Heavy ice closely packed in the Straits.
"25th. Heavy ice moves east and young ice forms in the Straits.
"26th. Straits opposite are frozen as far as can be seen.
"27th, 28th, 29th, 30th. Ice solid and immovable extending in every direction.
"31st. Ice east of here moving to north-east, ice to south remaining stationary."

This shows that navigation was closed before 24th October. I will now give winter record :

"[*January*, 1885.]

"1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th. Ice solid in every direction.
"5th. Snowstorm.
"27th. Drifting snow.
"28th. Ice packed closely in every direction.
"29th, 30th. 31st. Straits completely blocked.

"[*February*, 1885.]

"1st. 2nd, 3rd. 4th. Ice packed solidly in every direction.
"5th, 6th, 7th. Snowstorm and drift.
"8th, 9th, 10th, 11th. Straits blocked with heavy ice.

"[*March*, 1885.]

"1st, 2nd, 3rd. Ice solid in every direction.
"4th, 5th. Snowstorm and drift.
"6th. The Straits to the eastward is clear of the heavy ice and is now covered with a smooth sheet of young ice.
"23rd, 24th, 25th, 26th, 27th. Heavy ice closely packed in every direction."

I give this report to show that there is no possible chance for winter navigation by the Straits, as some promoters have claimed. I will continue to read the record :

"[*April*, 1885.]

"1st. Clear water shows to the east and north-east, but ice is closely packed.
"10th. No open water visible.
"11th. Snow falling and drifting.
"12th, 13th. Straits in every direction closely packed with heavy ice.
"14th. Snow falling and drifting.
"29th. Strait completely covered with ice.
"30th. Snow drifting.

"[*May*, 1885.]

"1st. Snow drifting.
"2nd. Heavy ice, closely packed, with ice in every direction.
"3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th. Heavy ice in every direction.
"29th, 30th. Straits completely blocked.
"31st. Three or four small patches of open water near the station, elsewhere the ice is closely packed.

"[*June*, 1885.]

"1st, 2nd. Ice closely packed.
"6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th. Ice closely packed.

"[*July*, 1885.]

"8th, 9th. Straits covered with ice, somewhat scattered on the 8th, closing upon the afternoon of the 9th.
"10th. Straits covered with tight fields of ice. * * *

"[*August*, 1885.]

"1st. Compact and heavy ice to eastward.
"4th. Heavy ice is still visible to the eastward.
"5th. Ice has all moved east towards Salisbury Island; Straits to south-west completely clear, and clear water extends some miles to the east of this station.
"6th. Ice is still closely packed to the south of Salisbury Island, and seems to extend to the southward.
"7th. Ice south of Salisbury Island is moving this way; elsewhere the Straits are completely clear.

"PORT LAPERRIÈRE (CAPE DIGGES), STATION NO. 6.

"[*October*, 1884.]

"1st. Heavy ice both in Bay and Straits, with open water channel showing occasionally. * * * *
"21st. Drift ice in the Straits all day as far as can be seen.
"22nd. No open water visible in the Straits.
"23rd. Same as 22nd.
"24th. Bay, Straits and harbour frozen solid with new-formed ice.
"25th, 26th, 27th, 28th, 29th, 30th, 31st. All the ice solid; no water to be seen in the Straits. The 23rd seems to have been the last day on which navigation would have been possible.

"[*November*, 1884.]

"1st, 2nd. No water visible."

Sometimes the ice shifts, and there may be streaks of open water, but I have given the conditions as found by the observers at these dates. I will pass over the winter and take up spring navigation.

"[*July*, 1885.]

"8th. No alteration, ice tight everywhere.
"9th, 10th, 11th. Ice still remains solid.
"12th. From the Island for five or six miles the ice is broken and drifting, beyond that the pack is close.
"13th. Foggy.
"14th. No open water in the Straits. * * *

"[*August*, 1885.]

"4th. Weather thick, could not see any distance.
"5th. Ice close in Strait in a.m., but in p.m. ice was broken and scattered.
"6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th. No ice in Strait * * *

"ICE MET WITH ON THE VOYAGE OF THE 'ALERT.'

"Our observations show that during the first half of the month of June, a belt of ice varying in width from 30 to 50 miles, extended the whole length of the Labrador coast, from Cape Chudleigh to Belle Isle. Off the entrance of Hudson Straits at this time the field extended from 35 to 100 miles to the eastward of Resolution Island, and on the 16th of June when I endeavoured to enter the Straits the ship was beset in heavy ice about ten miles to the S.W. of Cape Best. This ice was very heavy and some of it in large sheets, but at the turn of the tide the pack generally slacked off a little when the ship was worked on under steam or sail as opportunity offered; this state of affairs continued until the 4th of July, when, owing to the damage done to the ship, we had to return to St. Johns. Except on one occasion no large amount of open water was seen from our masthead, the ice always seeming to be tight to the westward of the ship. I measured the thickness of many of the pans: some were 22 feet, but the common kind was floe ice, about 10 feet in thickness. On the 4th of August when we got back from St. Johns there was still a great deal of ice in the Straits and some of the pans were of great size, many of them being over half a mile in length.

"NOTES ON THE ICE MOVEMENTS IN HUDSON BAY AND STRAITS, 1768–1769.

"Capt. Falconer states: 'In the month of July, when the above Hudson Bay Company's ships commonly get their passage through the Straits outward bound, it is almost blocked with ice, some of which is aground in 100 fathoms of water, * * and this with the large quantities of floating ice makes the passage dangerous, and detains the ships, some years, till the latter end of August, before they get clear of the Straits.'

"The ice mentioned in the above quoted paragraph as being aground in 100 fathoms of water is undoubtedly intended to apply to icebergs, some of which I have myself seen aground in from 80 to 100 fathoms. On the north side of the Straits some of these large masses of ice getting aground at high water of spring tides will remain fast for weeks if they do not break up. Capt. Falconer states that the Bay was only navigable from the latter part of July to the middle of October."

I propose to give some extracts from Captain Hawes' report. Captain Hawes has made fourteen voyages to Hudson Bay. He places the probable period of navigation for steam vessels properly fitted for ice work as seldom exceeding three months, 15th July to 15th October :

"As to the closing of the navigation in 1884, Mr. Laperrière reports, at Cape Digges, that on 25th October the ice was solid in every direction, and at Nottingham Island a similar entry is made on the 27th. A distinction must be made between the closing of navigation by the formation of young ice, and the presence of a large field of heavy old ice which is cemented together by the formation of young ice between the pans. In the first case any ordinarily powerful steamer could go through without risk, but in the second case the most powerful of the whaling or sealing steamers would be helpless. The western end of the Straits is always subject to incursions of this heavy ice, from Fox Channel, and especially so in the months of September and October, when strong north-easterly and north-westerly gales are frequent.

"HUDSON STRAITS.

"In Hudson Straits, for the first 20 days of August, the ship was always in the ice; the average surface water temperature for this period is 31° 3."

I have given you a report of the experience of the expedition during 1884 and 1885, and will now give 1886, as you might think 1885 an exceptionally bad year. To give a better idea I will quote instructions from Hon. Mr. Foster :

"'OTTAWA, 22nd June, 1886.

"'To LIEUT. A. R. GORDON, R. N.,
"'Halifax, N. S.

"'SIR,—With reference to the voyage of the *Alert* and the work to be performed under your charge for the present season, it is desirable that you should be guided by the following instructions, which are intended rather as an index of the general wishes of the department, than as an absolute direction from which you are under no circumstances to deviate. Changes that may be rendered necessary, by circumstances now unforeseen, and other work than that indicated which may appear to you proper to be done during the course of your voyage, are to be within your own discretion, always bearing in mind the purpose of the expedition, and the time at your disposal.

"It is desirable that you should proceed to the mouth of Hudson Straits with as little delay as possible, so as to avail yourself of the very first feasible opportunity to make the passage through. If you are prevented from at once entering the Straits, you will occupy your time in taking accurate observations of the extent and condition of the ice, the prevailing winds, and the currents at its mouth.

"'At the earliest possible period consistent with the safety of the expedition you will push through the Straits, in order that to demonstrate the earliest date of opening navigation and the time required to pass through the ice, noting carefully all the incidents of the passage.

"'Unless necessity exists for visiting any of the stations, of which you will be advised by the system of signals agreed upon, you will not lose any time in visiting them during your outward voyage.

"'It would be well to delay your homeward voyage through the Straits to as late a period as is consistent with safety and the labour involved in gathering the men and plant of the observing stations, in order to gain whatever data you can as to the condition of the Straits at the latest period of navigation.

"'The observers, the houses and all portable and valuable articles at the stations you will take on board the *Alert* on your return voyage, and bring them with you to Halifax.

"'You will bear in mind that it is the wish of the department to demonstrate as far as possible the navigability of the Straits, for purposes of commerce, in point of time and facility, and anything that will conduce to that end the department relies upon you to do to the limit of the means placed at your disposal.

"'I am, Sir,

"'Your most obedient servant,

"'GEORGE E. FOSTER.'"

As you see, Sir, the Government took every pains and every precaution to ascertain the truth and the proper condition of the "Straits" during these years. If, on examination of these reports, we find that these "Straits" are not navigable I submit it is the highest folly to grant any money towards the building of this road. In making this voyage the spring had every appearance of being favourable, and when they left Halifax it was supposed they would make an early voyage. They say:

"We commenced this voyage with every hope of making an early and successful passage of Hudson Straits, as the news from Newfoundland was that the ice had left the Labrador coast, and that the season, so far as the movements of the ice were concerned, was an unusually early one. Our subsequent experience showed that certainly, all along the Labrador coast, and to a less extent in Hudson Straits, the season was earlier than last year.'

"From the 11th to the 19th July the ice covered the Straits from 'Emma Island' to Cape Digges, and through this 200 miles we worked, every time the ice opened gaining something, if only half a mile. Much of this ice was heavy old ice, and of such a nature that no ordinary steamer which could be used as a freight-carrier, even if strengthened and sheathed for ice, could, in my opinion, have passed through at this time without injury.

"On leaving harbour of Digges Island on the morning of the 25th the ship was again beset and only got clear on the following morning. After this date we met no ice which would in any way have interfered with navigation.

"Captain Guy, of the steamer *Arctic*, one of the most powerful of the Dundee whaling fleet, has kindly furnished me with notes, from his experience in Hudson Straits this year, and the following is taken from his communication:—

"'The *Arctic* left St. John's, Nfld., on 16th May, and proceeded northwards, making the ice at the south side of Cumberland Gulf on 25th May, intending to go into the gulf; the ship was, however, beset about ten miles from Monumental Island, wind being from the eastward, and drove from there around the south side of Resolution Island into Hudson Straits, still fast in the ice, and only got free at the Lower Savage Islands on 2nd June.'

"Capt. Guy found the S.W. ice extending to the east of Resolution Island and Cape Chidley, about 40 to 50 miles tight, with from 10 to 20 miles of slack beyond that.

"From the Lower Savage Islands to Ashe Inlet, Capt. Guy says they had no trouble, but the voyage occupied from 2nd to 5th June, and the distance is only 150 miles: we must admit that the progress of the *Arctic* was not very rapid.

"After leaving Ashe Inlet, Capt. Guy states that he found the ice much heavier, being now from 15 to 20 feet thick; proceeding north-westward, he got up into Fox Channel as far as Cape Queen: here, however, he found an impassable barrier of ice, and tried to cross the channel to the westward: this was also impossible, and so the *Arctic* headed south, watching for a slack place to enter the barrier of ice. From the 20th June to the 25th July, the *Arctic* was steaming between Cape Queen and Charles Island, trying to get into Hudson Straits, and only reached the western end of the Straits on 26th July, or five days after the *Alert* had got through and into harbour at Port Laperrière.

"A little loose ice was met with early on the morning of the 28th, but otherwise there was nothing of interest occurred, and we arrived and anchored in Churchill harbour at 5.15 p.m. on the 29th, having made the run from Cape Southampton in forty-six hours.

"From 30th July to 3rd August, we were engaged in making a survey of Churchill harbour. A copy of this plan has been forwarded.

"The harbour at Churchill is formed by the mouth of the Churchill River, which empties itself into Hudson's Bay at that angle in the coast lying between Cape Churchill and Seal River. Between these points the older rock formations come right down to the sea.

"We remained here till Friday, the 20th, at 3 a.m., on which day we left for Marble Island, steaming up the western shore of Hudson's Bay.

"22nd. Arrived and anchored in outer harbor at 10 a.m. On the Deadman's Island I found a letter from Capt. A. P. Benton, of the bark *Wave*, which read as follows:—

"'MARBLE ISLAND, 1st August, 1886.

"'Wintered in the outer harbour in company with the *George* and *Mary*. Had a mild winter, but cold and backward spring, the thermometer not reaching 30° till 19th May. Commenced cutting trenches 18th March, but did not get out till 16th day of June. The *G.* and *M.* got out 12th June.

"'Cruised all over Hudson's Bay the rest of June and July. Saw only one cow and calf, got her, 145 brls. Spoke *George* and *Mary* 16th July, clean, bound to Repulse Bay; she saw one whale but did not get him.

"'*Welcome* full of ice; did not see a whale there. On 16th July the ice extended from Whale Point across to Cape Harding. The whale I saw was on the 2nd day of July; saw nothing in June.

"'In February scurvy began to come on the crew. First natives came to the ship 21st April; bought one deer, afterwards bought five more deer. In middle of May things looked blue. The 28th May we were sawing ice in nine fathoms of water, and the ice was on the bottom. We used between the two barques nearly forty bomb lances to blow the bottom of the ice out. The pack was fast to the floe, 1½ miles, ever since January; could not do anything with it. The 1st of June the pack broke off from the end of Deadman's Island and afterwards we got along quite well, sawing. The ice in the harbour was 7½ feet thick. Nearly one-half of the crew of both vessels were down with the scurvy and the remainder more or less afflicted with it; but we got along quite well after we got out. All are in good health now.

"'I leave here to-morrow for a short cruise and home.

"'ANTHONY BENTON,

"'*Master of barque 'Wave,' New Bedford, Mass.*'

"September 7th. At 5 p.m. left Port Laperrière for Nottingham Island, steaming dead slow. At 11 p.m. weather rather foggy; met a lot of loose ice, off the edge of which we lay till daylight.

"September 8th. At daylight sighted Nottingham Island, and at 8 a.m. arrived in Port de Boucherville and anchored. All hands were immediately put to work getting off the stores and taking down the house, the whole work being completed and the ship at sea again at 6 p.m. the same evening.

"About Nottingham Island there was a good deal of loose ice, which, though nothing to seriously affect navigation, was heavy old ice, and was undoubtedly the advance guard of the pack of old ice coming down from the north, but appearing somewhat earlier than in 1885.

"September 9th. After leaving Nottingham Island the wind again began to freshen from the eastward, with a rapidly falling barometer; it blew fresh all day of the 9th, and before midnight it was blowing a whole gale. This continued all day."

I now give the experience of Nottingham Island for 1885-86:

"PORT DE BOUCHERVILLE, NOTTINGHAM ISLAND.—ICE RECORD.

"[*September*, 1885.]

"27th. Ice all round, and has come close to shore to the northward. No open water visible to north-east or east.

"28th. Ice formed on the harbour; field ice covering the Straits in every direction, with small spots of open water showing.

"[*October*, 1885.]

"1st. The pack has drifted back again, and is to-day nearer the shore to the northward than yesterday.

"3rd. The ice is now tight and compact in every direction; from the top of a hill some distance inland, a little open water shows near the horizon between south and east; elsewhere no water to be seen. The bay to the north of the station is frozen so that the seals can lie on it.

"4th, 5th, 6th, 7th. Ice in every direction, slackening and tightening with the tide; at times large lakes of open water show."

I pass over the winter and come to the summer again.

"[*July*, 1886.]

"9th, 10th, 11th. No open water in sight.

"12th. S.W. wind has blown the ice off shore.

"13th. Ice to the northward and between here and Salisbury seems compact, but the Straits to the south must be nearly clear as we could hear the sea breaking on the outer edge of the ice near the shore to the south.

"15th, 16th. Ice tightly packed on the shore; no open water.

"17th. Ice loosened out a little and some open water shows in places.

"18th, 22nd. Ice remains loose; much open water.

"23rd, 24th. Open water along shore, but ice visible on the horizon.

"25th, 26th. Ice swings in a little occasionally, but it is always loose and much broken us.

"28th, 8 p.m. Ice packed tightly in all directions.

"29th, 30th. Not a particle of open water to be seen. Ice packed tightly to the horizon."

"NOTES ON THE ICE IN HUDSON STRAITS AND BAY.

"In considering the question of the quantity and movements of the ice in Hudson Straits, the first point that arises is whether the only ice to be met with there is that formed in the immediate locality, or whether there are sources of supply beyond.

"We have now had voyages on three years to Hudson Straits, and it is certainly legitimate to assume that we have not met with all the kinds of ice which are at any time to be found in these regions. I consider that they may be divided into three types or classes: First, there are in Hudson Straits at all times of the year, icebergs; second, up to the end of July or beginning of August there is much young floe ice, by this is meant the ice which has been formed during the winter immediately preceding. Its thickness is variously reported from 7 feet 6 inches at the harbour on Marble Island to 3 feet 10 inches at Port Burwell, in the eastern entrance of the Straits. A mean between these two measures would be, I consider, a fair average for the thickness of this class of ice, when met with in Hudson Straits, say somewhere about 5 feet of solid blue ice; covering this ice is a sheet of snow packed solid and as hard as the ice itself, and, like the ice, of varying depth. In the month of July 2 feet would probably be the average depth of this cap or crust of snow, thus making the total depth of ice and snow together from 7 to 9 feet.

"The third type of ice is what I called in my first year's report the 'heavy Arctic ice.' This ice is of every thickness, from 10 to 40 feet; it is the product of many winters in which it has been growing in thickness, both below by freezing, and above by the accumulation of the successive winters' snows.

"Port Laperrière and Nottingham Island. During the season of 1884, the field ice never left the Nottingham Island, but remained there, swinging to and fro with the tide, all summer. On 2nd October, at Nottingham Island, the Straits are reported full of ice as far as can be seen, and the date of the final closing fixed by the observer there was 26th October. At Port Laperrière, first ice 19th October. Straits closed, apparently full of ice, 22nd October.

"The general direction of Hudson Straits at the eastern end, is about N.W. and S.E. (true), and across the mouth of the Straits, flows persistently the great Arctic current, carrying with it, not only giant bergs from the Humboldt and other glaciers, but field ice from the Arctic Sea coming down the East Greenland coast, together with all that comes down Davis' Straits and from out of its many bays and fjords. The quantity of this ice which passes down across the mouth of Hudson Straits is enormous, nor does it all pass across; a great deal of it is carried right into Hudson Straits to the south of Resolution Island; more comes in through Gabriel Straits and thence flows westward along the north shore of Hudson Straits. This westerly set apparently terminates about the eastern side of Salisbury Island, because the bergs are seen to come in the Straits, and to pass up the north side going west beyond Ashe Inlet. The breadth of ice outside of Hudson Straits varies greatly from time to time. I have been told of its being 120 miles off in March, and this year in the end of May, Capt. Guy, of the *Arctic* says, 'We found the south-west ice extending off Resolution Island from 40 to 50 miles of tight ice, and outside from this 10 to 20 miles of slack ice;' showing up to the 25th of May, this year, an impenetrable barrier of 50 miles of tight ice between navigable water and the entrance of Hudson Straits. This mass of ice outside pens up the ice in Hudson Straits, and it is only after a westerly blow of some duration that it moves off to the eastward and permits of the ice moving out. About the end of June or beginning of July, the bulk of the northern ice has passed south of Cape Chidley, and the Hudson Straits is free to pass out, but at this season of the year the westerly winds form only about 30 per cent. of the total, hence the discharge is slow and vast quantities of this ice disappear in the Straits and Ungava Bay under the influence of the rising temperature of both air and sea.

"It will be admitted that with the experience extending to centuries, which the Hudson Bay Company have, if it were possible for them to get their ships in earlier they would endeavour to do so; inasmuch as the detention of one of their ships over a winter in the bay, entails loss of markets, more or less undue wear and tear of vessel, and the additional expense of wages and maintenance of the crew. I have examined the records of 116 consecutive arrivals at York Factory, and find that the average date is September 4th. Of the 116, 48 arrived in August; earliest date, 6th August. The latest arrival was the 7th October, on which occasion the ship wintered in the bay.

"There is no question but that the year in which the ship arrived, 6th August, must have been an exceptionally favourable one, because of all the August arrivals only 13 arrived prior to the 20th of the month, and in considering the question of the navigability of the Straits by steamships for the ordinary purposes of commerce, I am of the opinion that steam will not lengthen the season at the beginning more than a month to five weeks, so that our own experience, and that of the Hudson Bay ships, points to the first half of July as being the earliest date at which the Straits may be considered navigable for the purposes of commerce, by steamships fortified for ice navigation, and at the same time capable of being used profitably as freight carriers.

"It has been held by some that the ice in Hudson Straits was so light and so much broken up that there was no risk of an ordinary vessel being crushed in it. I am informed that one of the American whaling vessels was crushed in 1885, and the Hudson Bay Company some years since lost a vessel by the ice in the Straits.

"The Hakluyt Society have published a work entitled 'The Geography of Hudson Bay,' by Capt. Coats.

"Capt. Coats was an officer in the Hudson Bay Company, who commanded vessels sailing into Hudson Bay from 1727 to 1751. During this time he was twice crushed in the ice, and in his geography he says: 'In the year 1727, when near the meridian off Cape Farewell, when running through the ice with small sail, two pieces of ice shut upon us and sunk our ship. Again in 1736, being entangled in the ice six leagues within Cape Resolution when the ice shut upon us by the tides only (for it was dead calm) and crushed our sides in and sunk her in 20 minutes.'

"GENERAL REMARKS ON THE NAVIGATION OF HUDSON BAY AND STRAITS.

"Having now made voyages on three years to Hudson Straits, and having carefully examined the reports by the observers as to the formation and movements of the ice in Hudson Straits, I have the honour to submit the following statement in regard to the navigation of these waters.

"In discussing this question, I think it well to state that I am not required to report on the commercial aspect of the case, and whether Hudson Straits navigation can be made to pay, nor do I, in the seasonal limits given, mean to state that it is impossible for a ship occasionally to get in earlier or leave later; but having carefully considered the subject, I give the following as the season during which navigation may in ordinary years be regarded as practicable for the purposes of commerce; not, indeed, to the cheaply-built freight steamer, commonly known as the 'ocean tramp,' but to vessels of about 2,000 tons gross, fortified for meeting the ice, and of such construction as to enable them to be fair freight carriers. These vessels must be well strengthened forward; should have wooden sheathing, and be very full under the counter; the propeller should be of small diameter and be well down in the water. I place the limit of size at about 2,000 tons, because a larger ship would be somewhat unwieldy, could not make such good way through the loose ice; and being

unable to turn so sharply she would get many a heavy blow, that the smaller ship would escape.

"I consider that the season for the opening of navigation to such vessels as the above will, on the average, fall between 1st and 10th July. The position and movements of the ice I have already discussed, and need not here repeat. The closing of the season would be about the first week in October, partly on account of the descent of old ice from Fox Channel into the western end of the Straits; this old ice being rapidly cemented into solid floe by the formation of young ice between the pans; in such ice, no ship, however powerful, could do anything to free herself. At this time, too, the days are rapidly shortening, and snowstorms are frequent though not of great duration.

"Altogether, I consider the navigation of Hudson Straits as being more than ordinarily difficult, with shores inhospitable and bleak, presenting such a picture of loneliness and desolation, that it takes some time to get accustomed to it. The only safety in thick weather lies in the constant use of the lead and keeping a bright lookout, as the dead-reckoning is frequently in error to a considerable extent."

Now, I think I have quoted enough to show that it is impossible to navigate the Hudson Straits during the winter, that it is impossible to make more than one voyage in the year from England and return, unless under most favourable circumstances and in the face of extraordinary risks. To show you what is thought on this subject, I will quote from the evidence of Mr. Smith, the Deputy Minister of Marine. In his examination he stated that he considered it almost impossible to make more than one trip from England to Churchill and return, and he was asked:

"Do you refer to sailing ships when you speak of a vessel making two trips in the season?—No; I am speaking of fast steamers. It would have to be an exceptionally fast steamer, and a favourable season, with as little delay as possible. Of course the vessels for this work have to be built exceptionally strong. Chief Commissioner Graham told me that the vessels were provided with double stores and double crews, against accident. The ordinary ocean vessel would not be able to go in there at all. They should be as strong as wood and iron can make them, and no expense spared in their construction."

He was further asked:

"Do you not think there would be a great deal more for steamers?—With steamers, as you are aware, we have had some experience. We did everything possible to strengthen the *Northern Light*, and make her efficient for the service; still with all that she has cost a great amount of money to keep her in repair. The character of the ice is such that an ordinary steamer could not go through at all; that is, ocean tramps, as they are called—these vessels that sail between Liverpool and New York. The ice would knock a hole in the bottom of such a vessel in a moment, and she would go down. We had to put both greenheart and iron-plating on the *Northern Light*, and yet she runs a chance of incurring heavy expense for repairs at any time."

And still they ask for a grant of money for a railway to this region. Now, Mr. Pusey gave evidence before the Commission. He wrote to Captain Spicer in reference to the building of a railway to Hudson Bay, asking the price of materials and his opinion as to the navigation of Hudson Straits, as Captain Spicer had often been there. Captain Spicer answers as follows:—

"GROTON, CONN., 17th March, 1883.

"MR. C. H. PUSEY, New York,—Your favour of the 16th March is at hand and duly perused, and I am a little surprised to hear that the subject of a line of steamers to Hudson Bay is still being agitated. I thought the subject had been dropped. I have been consulted before on this matter, both in this country and in Europe, and my answer has always been the same—impracticable. But to answer your questions in order as asked, I will say:

"1st. There is no average length of time to be depended upon, as there are no two years alike. In the year 1863 I battled the ice from 1st July to 22nd August to get into Hudson Bay, and left for home 23rd September, and it was by a piece of good fortune that I was enabled to get clear. But a gale of wind for two days cleared the south shore, so that by coasting inside the islands and rocks I got clear. The year 1862, Captain Charles Allyn, in the barque *Black Eagle*, attempted to leave the Bay 10th September, but had to turn back again and winter, on account of heavy pack ice. In 1863 a Hudson Bay Company's ship did not get into the Strait until after I did, and there were two whalers lost the same year, one 17th July and one in August, about the 20th, I think. These vessels were well fortified for the ice. The Hudson Bay Company's ships are built expressly to combat ice, and they have found, by an experience of about 200 years of navigation there, that it is not advisable to attempt the Strait until about 1st August, and never to stop later than 15th September, except they winter, and I think there is no year that the Hudson Strait is free from ice three months, and no steamer or vessel has any business there, except built expressly for the ice, which iron vessels are not. There are always floating icebergs.

"2nd. I have never known it to be safe in the Strait, early or late. Thick fog and snow, strong currents and icebergs are always there.

"3rd. My experience in that country for twenty-four years compels me to say I do not believe any man can tell, with certainty, within two weeks of the time he could arrive there, not only from Liverpool, but even after he had entered Hudson Strait.

"4th. I do not think that, with a dozen trading posts on the north shore of Hudson Bay, they would secure $3,000 worth of trade. I have had the whole shore, and never got $500 in sixteen months.

"5th. I would not guarantee to land any freight of railway material, or any other, at a given time, for anything less than cost of said freight and the liabilities of damage.

"In my opinion, to sum up, it is simply an absurd project, and I think it would be safe to guarantee the loss of every vessel that attempts to carry wheat out of James Bay three months in the year, and I think Col. Wm. H. Gilder could have told you the same if he would, and I can point out several masters here who would tell the same story, I think. If there is any point that I have omitted, I would be happy to answer, if asked.

"Yours respectfully,

"J. C. SPICER."

Now, Sir, I think I have said enough to satisfy anybody on the question of navigation; and I propose now, for a few minutes to speak of the possibility of this road, if it were built, becoming a paying enterprise; because I believe it is our duty to take into consideration, not only the navigation of the Straits, but also the power of the railway to earn money for the bondholders if such an unfortunate thing happened as that the road should be built. As I have stated before, the distance from Winnipeg to Churchill is at least 350 miles farther for railway traffic than by Fort William; consequently, all grain shipped from the North-West must pay the railway rate on these extra 350 miles; and I claim, and everyone can make the same calculation for himself, that the railway rate on these extra 350 miles will pay the cost of shipping the grain from Fort William to Liverpool. Now, navigation opens at Fort William generally between the 1st and the 5th of May; this year it opened on the 29th of April. The last cargo left Port Arthur in 1889 on December 3, and in 1890 on December 2. Now, when grain is shipped from Fort William east, there is a chance to sell at the different point for milling purposes, or supposing grain were quoted at 80 cents or 90 cents a bushel at Winnipeg, and rose 10 to 15 cents a bushel at the Sault, at Port Huron, or at Owen Sound, this cargo could be sent to these places or direct to the shipboard, as the case may be, and all grain shipped to Fort William has the preference of the sale at these different points. Of course, any change in price that takes place during the transportation of grain from the North-West during the winter is no advantage to the grower, because every bushel of grain that is raised in the North-West and shipped to Fort Churchill will be locked up nine months, and

whether grain goes up or down the grower suffers, for the wheat buyer carries the risk, and, consequently, gives a lower price. Now, grain is being carried from Chicago to New York at this season at 4½ cents per bushel, and from Port Arthur to Duluth and New York at 4⅞ cents. Two cargoes were shipped in May from Port Arthur to Kingston at 2½ cents, and other cargoes have been shipped at 2⅜. It cost to carry grain from Kingston to Montreal from 2 cents to 2½ cents per bushel, and it is being carried this year for 2 cents. Corn is sometimes carried for ¼ of a cent less than wheat. One cargo has been shipped in May from Chicago to Montreal at 4¼ cents. Now the grain is shipped from Montreal to Liverpool at 3 cents per bushel, and often less, being carried as ballast in cattle and other ships carrying light freight on deck. The rate of 4½ cents from Chicago to New York is by the Erie Canal *via* Buffalo. Grain has been shipped from Chicago and Duluth to Buffalo at 1¼ cents, and these ships get a return cargo of coal. These ships carry grain from Chicago and Duluth to Buffalo and get return cargoes of coal, and the competition is so great on the lakes and will always be so great, that if this scheme which is proposed be ever carried out and grain be carried by it for the producers of the North-West, it will have to be carried for almost nothing and the bondholders must pay part of the running expenses or hand the road over to the Government. If the Hudson Bay Railway be built, it will have to carry grain at such low rates that the investors in the bonds will never see the interest much less their capital. I can assure the House, and I believe every sensible man will agree with me, that no man who invests his money in these bonds, when they are floated on the English market, will ever see his interest much less his principal, and I believe the Government should not allow a scheme like this to be floated in order to take in the English capitalists. We all know that some money will be made out of it. No doubt the builders of the road will make money; no doubt the contractor will make his pile; but God help the poor foolish bondholders. Now, the ships which carry goods from Montreal, New York and Boston must have return cargoes. Grain has been carried for 1 cent a bushel. Hudson Bay ships must be expressly built, will cost more, carry less, and cannot bring any return cargoes to compare with vessels coming to Montreal and Boston, and as they can only make one voyage to Churchill and back, and possibly two under the most favourable circumstances, therefore if they are to pay, which they never will, it will be at the cost of the producers of the grain. At the present time ships of over two thousand tons are passing through the Welland Canal, and when the Sault Canal is completed and the St. Lawrence Canal is enlarged, as should be done, we will have navigation from Montreal direct, and vessels will make through trips from Fort William to Montreal at lower rates. Why do the Government talk of building the Trent Valley Canal, if they intend to build this railway to Hudson Bay? I submit that the Government should be honest with us, and either stop this grant, or go on and build a railway to Hudson Bay, because we know that the promoters of this scheme, when they go to England, will not ask the moneyed men of England to subscribe their capital for the road to Saskatchewan, but to subscribe their capital to build a railroad to Hudson Bay; and they will show, backed up by their flowery arguments, that they are bonussed by the Manitoba Government and the Dominion Government. I ask, is it fair to the moneyed men of England to allow this scheme to go in this shape and ask them to advance money? The Trent Valley Canal is a public work, it has occupied a prominent position in this country, and the promised completion has done a good many great services in the past. We generally hear of it sometime before an election, after which it dies out. Now, as far as I am concerned, I believe the Trent Valley Canal is feasible. It can be built for a very small expenditure, and I believe, if it were built, grain vessels, taking grain from Fort William, can be unloaded at the terminus, which fortunately will be in my riding, and the elevation, as all shippers know, will benefit the grain. Then grain can be carried through the Trent Valley Canal as cheaply as through the Erie, and we know that at present grain is carried more cheaply between Chicago and New York than between any other places of like distances and similar situation. I, consequently, submit it is much better for the Government to invest the money in completing the Trent Valley Canal, enlarging the Welland Canal and St. Lawrence Canals, and allow the provinces which have built the Canadian Pacific Railway and have been taxed a large amount of money therefor, to be recouped by building up the cities along the line of the Trent Valley Canal, and along the River St. Lawrence and our lakes, instead of throwing away all this money in the wild scheme of building a railway to Hudson's Bay, which will only allow of one trip a year to England. For the benefit of Manitoba members, I wish to submit that should the Hudson Bay Railroad ever be built it will be of little use to the farmers of that country. Grain in Manitoba—and if I am wrong I ask the hon. members for Marquette or Selkirk to set me right—is cut from the 15th to the 25th of August, and is not shipped until the 15th or 25th of September. Now, everyone knows that by the time this grain reaches the elevator at Churchill, it will be too late for shipment to England that year, and it will, consequently, have to be locked up in the elevators at Churchill, and the grain buyer must pay interest and storage, all of which must come out of the pockets of the Manitoba farmers. So that, notwithstanding the fact that it may at the present time look like a small boom to have this road started, I can assure the representatives of Manitoba that were this railway in operation to-morrow, it would be of no practical use to the farmers of that province. The storage of grain at Port Arthur costs 4 cents a bushel for five months. I will leave it to the promoters of this scheme to say what it will cost for eight or nine months at Fort Churchill, when interest on the grain and insurance also must be paid, and all that comes out of the farmer. Now supposing that you store grain at Fort Churchill and the price of grain rises during the winter, there is no outlet. We know that the price of grain often fluctuates, that it often goes up in the fall and goes down in the spring; and all the grain which would be shipped to Churchill would be deprived of that rise. How different it is at Fort William. If grain can be sent from Manitoba to Fort William and stored in the elevators there, and a rise takes place, that grain could be shipped by railway. I am informed

that two million bushels of grain were shipped last winter, and I contend that it is much better to apply this money to enlarging the St. Lawrence Canals, and to completing the Trent Valley Canal, instead of going on with this scheme. I would like to hear from the hon. members who represent counties along the Trent Valley Canal if they intend to support a scheme that will indefinitely postpone the work. Do the representatives of the people along the banks of the St. Lawrence intend to support a scheme which, if we are to believe the words of the promoters, would, if it were feasible, draw the produce of the country, not through the River St. Lawrence, but past it? I believe that the people of the eastern provinces will see that it is their duty to vote against this scheme, and I would also like to ask the member for Algoma (Mr. Macdonell) what he intends to do? Does he intend to vote for a scheme which will block up Port Arthur and Fort William by the building of a road to Hudson Bay? I think it is time for the Finance Minister to intervene in this matter before it is too late, and to prevent this scheme being floated on the home market. I submit that it is a wrong to the people of the old country that any scheme should be floated which will eventually injure the credit of this country, and every thinking man who looks into the circumstances of the case and studies them, must know that this scheme will never pay. No Government should allow such a scheme to be floated when they feel and know that it will never pay, and I ask the Finance Minister to save himself from the curse of the children and grandchildren of those who may invest their money in these bonds through the endorsation of the Minister of Finance.

Mr. DALY. I regret very much that the hon. gentleman has seen fit to take up so much of the time of the House this afternoon in discussing this question from his standpoint. I admit that the hon. gentleman has a perfect right to criticize this Hudson Bay scheme or any other scheme which may be before the House, but I cannot understand his calling upon members from Ontario living along the Trent Valley Canal to oppose it, meaning, I suppose, that a certain amount of traffic will be lost to that enterprise by the construction of this Hudson Bay Railway. I am perfectly willing that the Government should give reasonable aid to the Trent Valley Canal, and I would not oppose any aid given to any enterprise in the Province of Ontario, the Province of Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, or any other province, but, so far as the Hudson Bay scheme is concerned, it is the one scheme upon which all parties, all people and classes of Manitoba and the North-West Territories are agreed. I do not think the speech the hon. gentleman has made would go down with his fellow-Liberals in the Province of Manitoba, or that the farmers of that province have the same views in regard to the Hudson Bay Railway as he has enunciated here to-day. The farmers of Manitoba are looking forward anxiously to the building of that railway for the relief they need by giving them a nearer access to the market for their grain. The distance from Winnipeg to Montreal is 1,425 miles, and all grain shipped from Winnipeg to Liverpool by way of Montreal has to travel that distance. The distance from Winnipeg to Fort Nelson is estimated at 650 miles, so that there is a saving of 700 miles. Take the freight on a car of grain for 700 miles.

Mr. SPOHN. The hon. gentleman speaks of Fort Nelson. Everyone knows that Fort Nelson is not navigable, and, therefore, the intention is to go to Fort Churchill.

Mr. DALY. I do not admit what the hon. gentleman says in regard to Fort Nelson, but I will speak of that later on. I was saying, when I was interrupted, that there would be a saving of 700 miles of land carriage, and the farmers of Manitoba and everyone who has studied the question believes that when the Hudson Bay Railway is an accomplished fact, then, and then only, will they get the proper price for their grain. As to the storage of grain at Fort Nelson or Fort Churchill, whichever of them may be decided upon, does not the hon. gentleman know that nearly all the wheat sent from the North-West is stored at Port Arthur, and that nearly all the wheat which comes from the western territories of the United States is stored at Duluth, during the winter months? We say that the principal business of this railway will be done in the winter season. The hon. gentleman says that our farmers cut wheat between the 15th and 25th August, and in that he is correct; but the grain is not threshed, as a general rule, until November, or even December and January, because, after the grain is reaped, it is necessary, in September or October, for the farmer to get his fall-ploughing done. Every winter our elevators are full, from Winnipeg to the eastern boundary of the Province of Manitoba. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company are every year increasing their storage capacity, and in Duluth the elevator capacity has had to be increased every year since the grain industry developed in the west. The hon. gentleman ought to recognize the fact that it is not the farmers but the buyers who will ship the grain, that a great deal of grain is purchased for future delivery both in the United States and in Canada, and that a great deal of this grain will be stored at Fort Churchill or Fort Nelson for the future delivery at Liverpool. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman devoted a great deal of his time to the navigation of the Hudson Straits. I did not expect when this matter came up this afternoon that the discussion would take the direction that it did. I did not suppose, for instance, that any hon. gentleman would inflict upon the House quotations of reports that were made some years ago. It is well known to members of this House that that report was published and circulated throughout the length and breadth of Canada, and that it is in the hands of any person in Great Britain who desires to look into this scheme, of any financier to whom the promoters would be likely to apply, and desired to inform himself concerning the navigability of the Straits. The hon. gentleman said: "God help the bondholders." Well, I can assure him that, so far as the Hudson Bay Railway is concerned, every matter and every detail will have to be laid before the financiers to whom the promoters may apply. They will not have to depend upon *ex parte* statements of the promoters, but they will have laid before them the very report the hon. gentleman has read, and which is printed and distributed with the imprint of the Government of Canada upon it. Now, Sir, in order to answer the remarks of the hon. gentleman, I will also quote from many

authorities to show the navigability of those Straits :—

"Dr. Bell, of the Canadian Geological Survey, who has made five voyages through the strait: Navigable from middle of June to middle of November.

"Captain Jacob Tabor, a New Bedford whaler: From first of July to first of November.

"Captain St. Clair, New Bedford whaler: From first of July to middle of November.

"Captain Clisby, of New London, Conn., who has had 14 years' experience in those waters: Four months and often five.

"Captain William Kennedy, who commanded an expedition in search of the remains of Sir John Franklin, and who has had eight years' experience of the Strait: From June to November.

"Mr. W. A. Archibald, for many years in the service of the Hudson Bay Company at Moose Factory; From June to December.

"Captain William Hackland, in the Hudson Bay Company's service for 39 years: Strait never freezes; no reason why steamships should not navigate it any time.

"The Canadian Government sent three expeditions to the Strait and Bay—1884-85-86—under command of Lieutenant Gordon, in all of whose reports the period of the navigation of the Strait is placed at four months.

"Captain J. J. Barry, the first officer in each of the expeditions, an experienced Newfoundland sealer, thinks ocean steamers can enter as early as June, and can certainly come out as late as December.

"Mr. W. A. Ashe, Superintendent of the Quebec Observatory, the officer of the expedition in charge of the station on the north coast of the Strait, from August, 1884, to September, 1885, says the Strait is navigable for from four and a-half to six and a-half months, varying accordingly to the class of the ship.

"Mr. William Skynner, an officer who accompanied the three expeditions, thinks the Straits can be navigated from June to December.

"Commodore Markham, R.N., an experienced Arctic navigator, accompanied the expedition of 1886. He reports: 'I believe the Strait will be found navigable for at least four months of every year, and probably often for five or more. There will, I have no doubt, be many years when navigation can be carried out safely and surely from the first of June until the end of November.'

"Captain John Macpherson, of Stepney, London, as first officer and captain in the service of the Hudson Bay Company, made voyages from London and Stromness to Hudson Bay and return annually for twenty years. He writes: 'There is no reason why steamships should not make the passage (of the Strait) as early as the first of June, and come out as late as the middle of November.'

"The Bay is open all the year round. It is described by Lieutenant Gordon as 'a vast basin of comparatively warm water,' and by Dr. Bell as 'very tranquil and wholly free from storms.' In his evidence before the Committee of the House of Commons, the latter stated that he found the mean summer temperature of the water of the Bay 53° Fah., while that of Lake Superior was 39·5° during the same season."

Now, in order to set the hon. gentleman at rest upon this question, I may state to him that an agreement has been entered into between the Hudson Bay Company and William Milburn & Co., and every gentleman coming from the lower provinces, and having to do with shipping interests, will recognize that company as one of the largest steamship companies in the world. William Milburn & Co. are prepared to put their ships on that route as soon as the financial arrangements are made. In addition to that, Billbrough & Co., who are the Lloyds' Agents, have made an agreement to the effect that they will insure cargoes, so that so far as these gentlemen in England are concerned who have made themselves conversant with the facts by means of the reports the hon. gentleman has referred to, and by investigation on their own account, they are satisfied not only to enter into contracts for the supplying of the ships that are needed to sail from foreign ports to Port Churchill, but the insurance underwriters are prepared to effect an insurance upon those cargoes.

An hon. MEMBER. At what rate?

Mr. DALY. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman at what rate, but I can tell him they are prepared to do it according to the St. Lawrence rates; that is exactly what the agreement states, and I think that ought to set the question at rest. These gentlemen who have made this agreement have, no doubt, investigated thoroughly the question of the navigation of these Straits. This resolution before the House does not, in my opinion, commit this country to building the whole of the Hudson Bay Railway. It is simply a colonization railway for 250 miles from the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway into the northern territory. That territory is being well settled and well opened up, and it is necessary that those people going in there should have railway communication. It is on the route of the line from Winnipeg to Hudson Bay, and since people in the Edmonton district and the people in Prince Albert district are able to get railway communication on the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, these people who are living in the northern district, in the north-western portion of the Province of Manitoba, desire also to have railway communication. Those people are just as much entitled to recognition at the hands of this House as were those of Calgary and Edmonton, who have a railway from Regina to Long Lake. The motion of the hon. the Minister is merely to the effect that the same aid should be given to that portion of the Hudson Bay Railway that was given to the Calgary and Edmonton Railway, and to the Prince Albert Railway. I take it that the question of the feasibility of the whole line, and the navigability of the Straits, had nothing whatever to do with the question now before the House. I would say to the hon. gentleman that this particular portion of the country through which this 250 miles will run, is one of the most fertile districts of the Province of Manitoba. We have reports in connection with this scheme from several gentlemen who went through there, from which I will read the following :—

"The country between these points, a distance of 242 miles, is very flat and almost free from rock, except in the immediate neighbourhood of certain parts of Lake Winnipeg shore.

"The first 30 miles of it is prairie land similar to that in the rest of Manitoba. After passing through this there is a well-wooded country with many open plains extending as far as Fairford on the Partridge Crop River. All of this country offers great inducements to the settler, and is already occupied by farmers and fishermen along a large portion of the lakes and Swan Creek, which flows into Lake Manitoba north of Oak Point Mission.

"It is well watered with many lakes, round which there are splendid hay lands and clearings for cattle grazing: especially is this the case at the Rat Lakes, about 75 miles from Winnipeg.

"After leaving these, the line passes close to Dog Lake, an offshoot of Lake Manitoba. This lake is 14 miles long and drains the best piece of farming land on Lake Manitoba. From this point to Fairford Mission (which is about 132 miles from Winnipeg) there is a little muskeg, otherwise the same good country prevails.

"There will be little or no difficulty in constructing the line so far, as the country is so level that beyond raising the track and draining, no further construction would be required. There are no rivers to bridge. Fairford itself has already a good settlement, and only awaits a means of outlet to rapidly establish itself as an important agricultural and lumbering centre. It is one of the oldest missions in the country. There is a great quantity of exceedingly fine spruce and poplar all through this country, the spruce attaining to an enormous size, often growing from three and four feet across the stump."

Now, we have reports of engineers who have gone over this line at different times, in different years, and every one of these men report that the line can

be very easily constructed, and that it will cost, including bridges, $15,000 per mile, which, hon. gentlemen will admit, who have any knowledge of building of lines of railway in the prairie country, is a very moderate sum, considering that quite an expensive bridge will have to be built at the Narrows of Lake Manitoba. Sir, I have dealt as concisely and as succinctly as possible with the remarks of the hon. gentleman opposite. Let me say that this Hudson Bay scheme is one in which every portion of the country is deeply interested, and every person in the great Province of Manitoba and in the North-West Territories have a personal interest in it; indeed, their interests are bound up with it. I may say that so strongly do our people feel upon this matter that when the Greenway Government came into power they saw fit to repeal an Act that had been upon the Statute-book granting aid to the Hudson Bay Railway by guaranteeing bonds to the extent of four and a-half millions. That raised such a discussion throughout the length and breadth of the country, that it was made a plank in the platform during the late elections, particularly in my election and in the election of the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Macdonald). My opponent, Mr. Martin, and Mr. Campbell, the opponent of the hon. member for Winnipeg, had taken a certain stand in connection with the Hudson Bay Railway, and I have no doubt that the large majorities received by my hon. friend from Winnipeg and by myself can be attributed, in a large measure, to the position that the Greenway Government took upon this scheme. Immediately after the general election in March last the Manitoba Legislature met, and so strong had the feeling grown, and so strong were the supporters of the Government who had come from bye-elections and other elections, that they prevailed on the Government entering into an agreement, from which I will quote in a few moments, with the Hudson Bay Company. This agreement provides for a grant to the company of $1,500,000 on the completion of the line; and it further provides that the railway to be completed by the company shall be an all-rail road from Winnipeg to some port on Hudson Bay, and the first 100 miles the company shall complete by 31st December, 1892, and the whole road should be completed and operated within five years from 1st May, 1891. The standard for the construction of the road is to be the same as fixed by the Parliamnt of Canada for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is that the Manitoba Act?

Mr. DALY. Yes. Hon. gentlemen will observe that this agreement is surrounded with safeguards; that so far as the Legislature of Manitoba is concerned, it commits itself to giving aid to the railway, but only on condition of its completion to Hudson Bay, and not until then will the amount of $1,500,000 be paid over. Coming back to the question of the aid asked in the resolution, $80,000 per annum, I do not know whether hon. gentlemen understand the question thoroughly or not, but in the agreement, which the Minister of the Interior read, it is provided that the company shall be paid $80,000 per annum, and in consideration of this subsidy shall carry Government mails and freight, and so on, and if at the end of twenty years the company shall not have earned by the carriage of freight and mails that sum of $80,000 per annum, the Government is to take one-third of the land grant in repayment of the deficiency, whatever it may be. So far as the speech of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Spohn) is concerned, the hon. gentleman must remember that the House is committed to the Hudson Bay Railway as a through scheme, that the Parliament of Canada gave to the scheme a land grant of 6,400 acres per mile within the limits of Manitoba and 12,800 acres per mile outside, and so, no matter what arguments may be advanced, Parliament is committed to the whole scheme. All we ask is that, in that portion of Manitoba I have described aid shall be given in the same manner as it is granted to the Edmonton, Calgary and Prince Albert Railway, in order that the people living in the Dauphin district may have an outlet. If it should prove that the building of 300 miles of railway will enable them to carry out the scheme, so much the better for the people of Manitoba. I desire the Committee to understand that we do not approach this matter in Manitoba from a political standpoint; both parties have committed themselves to it by the legislation which was passed last year, and by the legislation passed when Mr. Norquay was in power, and that passed at the instance of Mr. Martin and Mr. Greenway, showing that the whole people, irrespective of politics, are bound up in the success of this scheme, and that the matter under discussion affects almost the entire portion of Manitoba.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am not in any way interested in the Trent Valley Canal, and I do not intend to let that great work influence the vote I shall give on this resolution, nor do I intend that any other public work shall interfere with the decision I have arrived at with regard to my duty towards this resolution. This matter must stand on its own merits and be decided on its own merits alone. I may say at the outset that I have always been very sorry in regard to giving my vote to commit the country to any of these desperate schemes. With me it has been a vital question whether the projects are likely to prove remunerative to those who put their money into them for the purpose of carrying them into execution. That is the first question, because in a great measure the credit of the country, and not only its credit, but its good name and also its honour is connected with the manner in which these enterprises are carried out and prove remunerative. I need not tell the Committee that this House has sometimes given its sanction to rather questionable schemes, to schemes that have brought moneyed men great loss and have also brought disrepute on our common country, and have prevented legitimate enterprises securing on the most favourable terms the money needed to carry them out. With respect to the Hudson Bay project, the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) said that both Manitoba and the Dominion are committed to the scheme, that both of them have made grants. But, strange to say, the Manitoba Legislature, composed of gentlemen who ought to know every circumstance connected with the scheme, and who ought to know from the reports of the exploration of the country, the territory through which the line will pass, and also the prospect of the road ever becoming a paying one, did not put one single dollar into the enterprise. The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) has told us that the Legislature

voted $1,500,000. How was it voted? Only to be paid when the road is constructed, and not one cent before. The resolution before the Committee proposes that $80,000 a year for twenty years shall be paid for certain services to be performed when the road is constructed. I submit that if the enterprise is not a proper one, and is not likely to pay, this grant will deceive people in the money markets of the world. It will go far to enable those floating the scheme to put the bonds on the market, and the unfortunate men who put money into the enterprise will suffer serious loss. The question for the Committee and the House to determine is, whether it is a feasible scheme, and one likely to succeed as a commercial undertaking and pay a fair return to bondholders. Let hon. gentlemen bear in mind that this is a part of the great Hudson Bay Railway scheme. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Spohn) has quoted from the report of the expedition sent by the authority of Parliament to report on the feasibility of the scheme. We have also other reports, which declare, in a most unmistakable manner, that as a commercial route for the carriage of produce between Manitoba and Great Britain, this route is utterly impracticable. And yet, Sir, we are asked again, by the resolution now before us, to give the sanction of this House to a scheme to lead the moneyed men of the old country into a trap to invest their money in a wild-cat scheme. This railroad is one of two things: it is either part of the Hudson Bay Railway, pure and simple, intended for the purpose of through traffic, or else it is a colonization road. If it is simply a part of the Hudson Bay Railway, I think I have said enough, and the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Spohn) has said enough, to show that the road is impracticable, and that it would be worse than money thrown away to invest anything in it. Worse still, the honour of the country would be involved by encouraging the financiers of the old country to invest their funds in a wild-cat scheme. I know that in the map laid on the Table of this House we have what is called an alternative route. I submit to this Committee, and I want it to be particularly noticed, that according to all the information we have, the line of the Hudson Bay Railway, as originally surveyed and as shown on that map, is not a colonization road; that it runs through a country which has no necessity for a railway and which is not fit for farming, and that there will be no traffic upon it unless it is traffic through to the Hudson Bay. Therefore, as originally surveyed, the railway is not in any sense of the word a colonization road, nor is it in any way calculated to settle up the waste lands of Manitoba and the North-West. It is of no practical use whatever except as a through line to the Hudson Bay. As I have said, they show an alternative line on the map. The original line runs between Lake Manitoba and Lake Winnipeg, but the alternative line crosses over the narrows in the middle of Lake Winnipeg and runs on the east side of Lake Dauphin. It is patent to every one in this chamber that the great object of the nations of the world who are making any efforts in this direction is to shorten the lines of communication. The route from Winnipeg to Hudson Bay is a very circuitous route, and if the railway runs to Port Nelson it very much resembles a half moon, and the more circuitous the line the less chance there is of paying, and that the alternative line greatly increases the length of the road by still further deflecting from a straight line. I have only to point to the Intercolonial Railway, as an example, to show that the long circuitous route by which it was built has precluded for all time the possibility of it becoming a paying investment, and has made it a burden of half a million dollars per year or more on the people of this country for all future generations. Let me draw the attention of the House to the fact that the survey as originally made is very circuitous, if you run to Port Nelson, which my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Daly) points out as the objective point on the Hudson Bay, which is the nearest port they can get to. When those explorers were sent out they reported that there was 27 miles of a shifting sand roadway which is constantly fluctuating from the mouth of the river until you get to the clear water out of Port Nelson, and that the only practical harbour on the Hudson Bay is one at the mouth of the Churchill River, which greatly increases the length of the road. Another word about this route as a colonization road. I submit that it is not in the proper place for a colonization road at all; there was such a railway charter asked for here last session and it was refused because it was going to interfere with the Hudson Bay Railway line. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) last year asked a charter for a line starting from Portage la Prairie and running by Lake Dauphin; and I may tell the Committee, from reliable information which I have, that there is a splendid farming country in Lake Dauphin district. This road when it crosses the Narrows gets into good land and runs east of Lake Dauphin, but I submit that it is about 100 miles too long. Somebody may say that it was none of our business how long it was, but I contend that it is our business, because we have given 6,400 acres of land per mile, and every mile extra is just so much out of the property of the country. If you are going to build a colonization road, the proper place is where the member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) asked a charter to build it last year; or better still, and I tell the House there is a still better route, if you run a line from Gladstone, Nuppawa or Minnedosa right up into the very country which is going to be served by this long railway, you will save 6,400 acres of land per mile for every mile you cut off, and instead of a road 200 or 300 miles long one within 100 miles long will serve the whole purpose. The attention of the House has been called to the fact that the period of navigation is so short in the Hudson Bay that it utterly precludes it from being a safe route for carrying grain to Great Britain, and that fact being established beyond the possibility of dispute, as shown by my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Spohn), you can never by that route take the year's crop out in the year it is raised. This, as the hon. gentleman showed so forcibly, is a very important consideration in this matter, for if you can bring the crop down by the present route or take it by any other way to the market, you have a chance to sell at any time of the year, but if you take the crop by the Hudson Bay route you cannot get it to the British market before August or September of the next year. All these things considered, I appeal to the Committee to pause before launching themselves upon a scheme of this kind. I believe it will pay those who constructed and pro-

jected it, but as the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Spohn) says, where will the poor bondholders be. I submit that this House should be very careful before they do anything which would lead the moneyed men of the old country into investing in any such wild-cat scheme as this, a scheme which will never pay anybody except the projectors and those who build the road. After careful consideration of the question, these are my views upon it, and I feel it my duty as a member of this House, and as a citizen of this our common country, having the welfare of Canada at heart, to oppose this scheme to the bitter end at every stage which it reaches in this House.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to discuss as to whether the bondholders or the people who purchase the bonds of the Hudson Bay Railway will derive interest or not from their investment. I take it for granted that men who have money to invest will make it their own business to know whether it is properly invested or not. I have been a little surprised and amazed by some of the arguments used against this scheme by hon. gentlemen who have spoken this afternoon. We are told by the first gentleman who opposed this scheme that the railway is no good, that it is impracticable, and that the Hudson Bay Straits cannot be navigated, and then at the close of his remarks he attempts to point out to this House that if this aid is granted that road will be built and that it will consequently destroy the trade that would otherwise come through the Trent Valley Canal.

Mr. SPOHN. I did not say that the Straits could not be navigated, but I said that, as a commercial enterprise, the railway would be a failure. Of course, we know they could make one trip a year there; that is considered navigating it, I suppose.

Mr. WATSON. Well, if I were under the impression that ships could only make one trip a year, I do not think I would rise on the floor of this House and advocate the scheme, nor do I think the promoters of the Trent Valley Canal would lose much trade. But I have greater hopes of the navigation of Hudson Straits than the hon. member for Simcoe. If I did not believe that our grain would be carried out in the same year that it is grown, I would not support the scheme. But I am under the impression that at least a portion of our grain can be taken out the same year that it is grown. The scheme would be practically wiped out, so far as outside capitalists are concerned, if it were understood that that could not be done. If the grain had to be stored up at Churchill or Nelson for eight or nine months, that would be fatal to the scheme. At the present time, instead of the farmers of Manitoba not threshing their grain until November or December, the greater portion of it is shipped and goes eastward by the lakes in the same season that it is grown. Now, while I am glad that there are some schemes on which the hon. member for Selkirk and I can agree, I regret that he could not sit down to-day without having a fling at the Greenway Government, by stating that they were forced to do certain things. I may say that the Greenway Government have always supported the Hudson Bay Railway, and the change made by them in the form of the assistance they were granting to the scheme from a guarantee to a direct grant of a million and a-half, was made to suit the promoters of the scheme, and that change, I believe, had the almost unanimous approval of the people of Manitoba. The Local Government felt that they could not speculate too much in a work that was calculated to benefit not only Manitoba, but the Territories westward even to a greater extent than Manitoba, and they made the change because circumstances had changed. The railway monopoly was done away with, there was another railway in the country, and the same importance was not attached to the Hudson Bay Railway as at the time the guarantee was given. However, last session, the Manitoba Government considered it so important that they agreed to give it a bonus of $1,500,000 if the road were completed within five years. This should convince the members of this House that the people of Manitoba feel an interest in the construction of this work. As the hon. gentleman who last spoke has stated, it is not a colonization railway. Although it might be run though a country where it would be more profitable for colonization purposes, there are some 37 miles of it built now in the direction indicated on the map; and it is proposed to continue it by the Narrows of Lake Manitoba and westward of Lake Winnipegoosis, and Cedar Lake to the Saskatchewan River. By this route it will tap the Lake Dauphin district, which is already fairly well settled; and it will give communication with steamers on the Saskatchewan River a month earlier than it would if it ran to the eastward of Cedar Lake and on to Grand Rapids. Another reason for carrying the road to the west of Lake Manitoba is that by that route it will be more valuable to points west of the city of Winnipeg. While Winnipeg is an important city, there are many other points of importance in Manitoba and the North-West, and it is also of advantage to these points that the road should be constructed westward of Cedar Lake. This route passes through a tract of country which is probably fit for grain-growing, but it is certainly good for grazing, and it would open up a large territory which at present remains undeveloped. From the Narrows of Lake Manitoba there is good navigation to the north end of Waterhen Lake. There are also valuable fisheries and timber areas in the same district, which this road would be the means of developing. Now, we have heard read here to-day some reports made by Commander Gordon, who was instructed to make the survey he did for the purpose, I believe, simply of pleasing the people of Manitoba and the North-West; but the Government did not go into the matter as if they wished to obtain the most favourable report regarding the project. I believe they desired to have such a report made as would discredit the scheme rather than one favourable to it. They sent out to Hudson Bay an exploring vessel which was nothing more nor less than a sailing vessel, the *Alert*.

Mr. SPOHN. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. The *Alert* is a steamer.

Mr. WATSON. The *Alert* is a sailing vessel with a 50-horse power engine in it. It was stated by the hon. Minister of Finance, who I do not think knew what he was talking about, that it could be worked up to 150-horse power, but if that were done it would burst the boiler. I would ask any gentleman familiar with the matter if he thinks that a vessel with a horse power equal to what is

used on the small tugs which ply up and down the Ottawa River here, would be sufficient to carry a vessel through any ice such as the *Alert* was likely to encounter. I think the Government in sending that vessel to test the navigation of Hudson Straits were trifling with the subject. It had to go with wind and tide. Only 175 tons of coal could be carried on the vessel. and how long would that last? I know nothing personally of the navigation of those Straits, but I feel satisfied from the reports made by a special committee of this House which sat in 1883, and of which Mr. Joseph Royal, now Lieutenant Governor of the North-West, was chairman, and the evidence given before that committee, that there is from two and a-half to four months' navigation there every year. That evidence was given by gentlemen who had examined the Straits, believing that it was only fit for fishing and hunting. The Hudson Bay officers and the New Bedford whalers want to preserve their fishing and hunting grounds; and, consequently, when enquiry is made as to the navigation of the Straits, they give the people to understand that the navigation, so far as regards a commercial route, is not feasible.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. gentleman think the road, if continued between Lake Manitoba and Winnipeg, would have any traffic at all at present?

Mr. WATSON. Up to Grand Rapids?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes.

Mr. WATSON. I certainly do not think it would have as much as if it would cross at the Narrows of Lake Manitoba, and went through the Lake Dauphin country which is now settled.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the population?

Mr. WATSON. There are some six or seven townships in that district settled, and all the even sections are already homesteaded, while the odd sections, although reserved for railway purposes, are all squatted upon, so that there is hardly a valuable section of land remaining to be taken up in that district. The people there are greatly in need of railway communication, and, as was stated by the hon. member for Middlesex, when I introduced a Bill last year, which I am sorry was not passed, it would have formed a portion of the Hudson Bay Railroad when that road would be built. I stated then that I believed the Government had trifled with the House; and when we have before us the report of the Deputy Minister of Marine, certainly, as was stated by the hon. member for Simcoe, the Government apparently wished for some excuse for not giving assistance to the Hudson Bay road. Now, so far as the cost of the carriage of grain is concerned, it appears to me that there cannot be two opinions as to the benefit which would be derived in the shipment of grain to Liverpool. I am not going to give a set of figures as regards the cost or comparative cost. It is sufficient for me to know that competition would necessarily lower the rate, and if the Hudson Bay Railway had any idea of carrying grain freight, they would have to charge a lower rate than the Canadian Pacific Railway. As I strongly believe in competition, I believe that this road, if it will not do all that the people of Manitoba and the North-West expect, it will certainly reduce the rates. Now, I do not think I will occupy any further time in this discussion. I feel that this road is entitled to the grant as much, if not more, than either the Calgary and Edmonton, or the Regina and Long Lake road, for these roads are only colonization roads; and with regard to them we do not expect anything better than a colonization road; but this line of railway will, we expect, in addition to being a colonization road, run through to the Hudson Bay, and give us more benefits than a simple colonization road. For that reason I am in favour of the resolutions now before the House, and I trust this House will see fit to pass them, and pass a Bill founded on them giving this road the $80,000 a year for twenty years. If I had my way, I would divert this road into a better country. I have some reason to hope the promoters may see fit to adopt a better road, that is a road running along the south end of Lake Manitoba altogether. There connection could be made by their line with Portage la Prairie, and then the route which is to be traversed by the line I proposed last year, could be run on to the west, and open up a good tract of country for its full length inside of Manitoba.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is there not a large settled district west of Lake Manitoba, and would not this proposed line cut off that settlement from all railway accommodation between Lake Manitoba and Riding Mountain?

Mr. WATSON. In that newly-settled country there is certainly a large settlement, and this road, as laid down, would require a branch running from the south end of Lake Dauphin to the west. I had hoped that the charter, granted two or three years ago, and which was extended last year, of the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company would have been carried out, and I have hopes that road will still be built. If it is, it will accommodate the settlement in that section better than the Hudson Bay road. But they have got the land; and if not wiped out by other enterprises, I hope the promoters of the scheme may be placed in a position to go on and construct that road.

Mr. ROSS (Lisgar). This road runs through my county, starting from Winnipeg and running northwest. North of the present terminus, there are a number of settlers in my county, forty miles away from any railway, and there are settlers going in even back of that, so that in a year or two there will be settlers sixty miles from the railway. It is the intention of the promoters to cross at the Narrows and use the western route, and not between Lake Manitoba and Winnipeg, because there are some settlers west of Lake Winnipegoosis. With regard to the country around Lake Dauphin, a large number of settlers will go in north of that this year, and a large number went in during the past year. Besides that there are large timber areas in that region, and along the streams that rise in Duck Mountains and run towards Lake Winnipegoosis, where mills would be erected to accommodate the settlers, and timber would be sent down by rail to Winnipeg to supply the people in Winnipeg and settlers on the prairie. For this reason the road is very important as a colonization road at present, and a large amount of traffic would be given to it in the near future. The charge was made by the hon. member for North Middlesex that this is a wild-cat scheme. The hon. gentleman had no right to apply that term to this, any more than to any other system of railway. Two companies came before this House,

one last year, and one the year before. One was for the road from Regina and Long Lake to Prince Albert. That company was a colonization company, and received the assistance of the Government. It was not a wild-cat scheme, as the road is now built and operated to the great advantage of the people on the Saskatchewan. The other was for the purpose of building the road between Calgary and Edmonton, which is now under construction. It was asked why the Local Government dealt differently with this company from the manner this Government has dealt with it. The positions of the two Governments are different. This Government looked at the fact that colonization roads must be assisted, and they aided the Central Railway from Regina to Prince Albert—the road running northerly from the Canadian Pacific Railway to the great Saskatchewan. Then they aided the road near the Rocky Mountains, because there was a large settlement around Edmonton which wanted outlet, and the Government looked at it from a purely colonization standpoint. Now, they say, we will build a third one. Thus, we will have three colonization roads —the middle, the western and the eastern—all going to the Saskatchewan from the south. Now, the Local Government looked at the question from a totally different standpoint. They will not and cannot assist colonization roads, but they want to assist any road that will bring about competition with the present system in Manitoba. First, they went to work and aided the Northern Pacific because they believed it would compete with the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, they say we will give assistance to another competing line, the Hudson Bay road purely, because they believe it is going to be a competing line with the Canadian Pacific Railway when completed. That is why they are assisting it in this way, but they would not give any aid to it as a colonization road. I can say nothing further than that I join with other hon. members from my province, that we are a unit and feel that it is of great importance to the people of that province that this road should be be built.

Committee rose, and, it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee on the resolution.

Mr. McMULLEN. I quite agree that we were committed, from the time of Confederation, to the construction of a trans-continental line of railway, composed of the Intercolonial, coupled with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and reaching to the Pacific coast; but I deny that, on the part of the confederacy, there was ever any understanding that the North-West should be given, as it has been given and is now being given, aid towards the construction of side lines and others throughout the North-West, in the way of colonization companies' lines. It was distinctly understood, when we expended the money we did for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, that the lands in the North-West should be used to recoup the Dominion treasury for the amount expended on the construction of that line. We know the statements which were made by hon. gentlemen opposite, from time to time, with regard to what this Dominion might count upon in the way of receipts from the sales of lands in the North-West. We have never realized any portion of that recouping, as far as the Dominion treasury is concerned. We have not received from the North-West the first tithe of the amount we have expended on the Canadian Pacific Railway. We have spent enormous amounts on the development of the North-West, largely at the expense of the older provinces of the Dominion, and I contend that the accommodation now given by the Canadian Pacific Railway and the canals, for the shipment of goods from Port Arthur to Quebec, by the expenditure we have made on the enlargement of those canals, should suffice for the North-West until we have a larger population in that territory and in Manitoba than we have now. I am not going to discuss the feasibility or the necessity, from a Dominion standpoint, of the construction of the Hudson Bay Railway. I am not going to discuss the question as to how many months or how many weeks in a year Hudson Bay is available to navigation. That has been dealt with by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Spohn), who has read extracts which I think will convince any reasonable man that, if these seas are open for three months in the year, that is about the full extent of time during which they can be safely navigable. With the very limited population we have in the North-West, with the very limited development in comparison with the development which was expected to take place in that country, when the scheme for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway was first proposed, viewing the whole ground, taking a retrospective glance at our experience in regard to it, I say that it is taking a step altogether in advance of the requirements of this country to ask us now to consent to the expenditure of $80,000 a year for twenty years for the construction of a road to Hudson Bay. I do not think it is at all necessary. From the extent of the territory which has been opened up by the Canadian Pacific Railway and the lines which have been opened up in consequence of the money and land grants which have been given, I think we have enough territory opened up which is not yet occupied, and that we have no necessity to open up any further territory at present. The older sections of this country have been crippled financially by the enormous expenditure which has been made on that section of the country. When we consider that, in the older provinces, we have counties and provinces which, through sheer necessity, subjected themselves to an annual drain in the way of taxation for twenty years to secure the railway accommodation they absolutely required, and that they are yet struggling with the financial embarrassments produced in that way, and that they have never received one dollar by way of relief from the Dominion treasury, but have been compelled out of their own pockets to contribute towards the construction of these lines, I ask if it is just or reasonable to ask them to quietly consent to a guarantee of this kind being given to a line which is to run through an unsettled wilderness, and of which the financial results are very questionable, to say the least. I cannot sit still and consent to the passage of this resolution. Early in this session, there came from

the west of Ontario a large deputation to wait on the late First Minister and the Minister of Finance, and to press upon them that, under the changed condition of things in this country, after the Dominion Parliament had decided to subsidize short lines in the different provinces and had taken under its control almost the whole railway system of this Dominion, and was yearly granting aid to other lines, as a matter of justice and right they should be recouped to a certain extent for the money they had expended on their local lines. The reply they received was that the Government would seriously consider the question, while they held out no expectation to that deputation that these municipalities would receive any relief, because the First Minister stated that the drain upon the Dominion treasury now was so great that they could not hold out any hope that any relief would be granted. If that is the case, and these municipalities and counties are to be treated in that way, how can these men be expected to consent to granting $80,000 a year for a road of this kind, which means $2,000,000 added to the debt of this country, capitalizing it at 4 per cent. The claims of these municipalities would be settled by $2,500,000 or $3,000,000. I intend, and I wish hon. gentlemen to understand this fact, if this Bill is pressed upon the House, to present a resolution that no guarantee of any kind whatever towards the construction of this line shall be given until those municipalities to which nothing has been given in the way of a refund of the amounts they have expended on their lines have had their claims settled. I wish every hon. member from the west of Ontario to understand that he will have to face an amendment of this kind on this Bill, because I consider that these municipalities should be settled with before the Dominion Parliament is asked to give any guarantee in aid of this wild-cat scheme, for I can call it nothing else. The speech of the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) would have satisfied me, if nothing else did, that it is unwise and imprudent to give this guarantee. He said that the products of Manitoba and the North-West could not be sent out by the Hudson Bay Railway in the same year in which they were raised.

Mr. DALY. It is nothing of the kind.

Mr. McMULLEN. He stated that the farmers of Manitoba and the North-West required to devote their attention to ploughing their ground for the next year's crops from the moment their harvest came off until the last moment they could plough, and that their threshing was not done till some time in November, and that, as a result, this line could not possibly be used till the following spring. Now, when we consider the fact that the wheat, according to the hon. gentleman's argument, has got to be not less than nine months in transit before it reaches the market of Liverpool, I say the proposition is absurd, unless they are going to have in Europe the experience that Joseph had in Egypt, when they will have to lay up grain for seven years. It is a fallacy to think of using this road to transport the surplus produce of the North-West to the markets of Liverpool. It is nonsense, when you come to consider the rapid transit of the produce of all sections of the world by steamships and railways; and the idea of hoarding up at one point on the Hudson Bay a large portion of the output of the North-West and leaving it in storage for six or seven months before you can ship it to the markets of the world is absurd and a fallacy. I base my arguments on the statements of the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly,) and if his statements are true, as I have no doubt they are, in my humble opinion, to use a common phrase, they knock the bottom out of the whole scheme. I wish, by these remarks, to indicate the position I am going to take upon this important question. When we come to consider the indebtedness of this Dominion, when we realize that we have an acknowledged indebtedness of 237 millions, as stated by the Finance Minister the other night, and when we consider that we are subject to an annual interest charge within a few dollars of ten millions, as shown by the Auditor General's account, although the Finance Minister says it is less, I say that it is going a step altogether beyond the abilities of the people of this country to consent to a grant of $80,000 a year for twenty years to construct this line. Let us wait patiently till our North-West is filled up. Let us utilize the lines we have already produced at a very large cost to this Dominion, let us utilize the magnificent line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the water-stretches that we have in this Dominion and that are an undoubted advantage to us; and when Manitoba and the North-Wess get a population of four or five millions, then, if we find the carrying capacity of those lines are insufficient to meet the requirements it will be quite time enough to consider the propriety of staking the resources of the Dominion to produce other lines. Let us lie quietly by, doing everything we can to increase our population and to fill up the lands in the North-West that are still lying unoccupied. It would be very much better to take a small proportion of that money and devote it to an active and energetic immigration policy, that would bring into the older provinces men from the old country who would take up lands that are now for sale at a reasonable price, and allow those who are struggling under financial embarrassments to go and take up new land in the North-West. Let us fill up our country with a population first, let us put ourselves in the position to produce a great deal more than we are producing at the present moment, and when the necessity arises, if further export accommodation should be necessary then we can furnish it; but in my opinion it is unwise and imprudent to ask our consent in the meantime for such a large outlay when it is not necessary. Let me say that if any one argument would be necessary to convince me that this outlay is unnecessary it is the fact that the produce of the country that goes by the Hudson Bay route has got to lie in transit for from eight to nine months before it reaches the market of Liverpool, for that is the statement of the hon. member for Selkirk. If any one thing beyond another was necessary completely to squelch out any prospects of the undertaking commending itself to this country, it is that statement of the hon. gentleman regarding the time that it will take to carry produce over that route. For these reasons I shall oppose the scheme, and if the resolution is carried, when the Bill is introduced, I shall from time to time present resolutions declaring that until such time as the municipalities of western Ontario, which have built their own roads and never received a single dollar, have been recouped for their outlay, not a dollar shall go towards the construction of this road.

Mr. ROSS (Lisgar). I wish to correct one statement made by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). He says the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) made the remark that this road could not ship out grain during the season in which it was grown, and therefore he opposed it. Now, that was not the expression of the member for Selkirk. What the member for Selkirk said was, as I understood him, that even by our present route *viâ* Lake Superior the bulk of our grain could not be shipped out in the year in which it was grown, and that *viâ* the Hudson Bay route, if we could not do any better, we could at least do that much. The hon. member for Selkirk and myself both think that we can ship out more grain in the season in which wheat is grown by the Hudson Bay route than we can at present *viâ* Lake Superior and Lake Huron.

Mr. DALY. I suppose a word of explanation from me is necessary. I do not suppose this matter would have obtained any prominence were it not for the remarks of the hon. and clever gentleman from Marquette (Mr. Watson), and if he had not the mind of a child he would have understood exactly what I said. I read from a pamphlet, quotation after quotation, showing the months within which the Straits were navigable, that is, from June to December. What I said with reference to wheat going out—and I want the statesman from North Wellington to bear this in mind, although I may not have explained myself as fully as I might have done—was that the bulk of the grain from Manitoba and the North-West would be stored, just as the bulk of the grain from the North-Western States is stored to-day at Duluth. We know that at Duluth there are fourteen or fifteen million bushels of wheat stored during the winter season. What I undertook to say, and what I say now, is that the bulk of the threshing in Manitoba is done in and after October; though there is threshing done in September, and there is a large amount of grain shipped in September by the lakes to Eastern Ontario and Quebec to be ground into flour for the people of the eastern provinces; but the bulk of the wheat of Manitoba is bought after the period at which navigation closes. It is true that in certain portions of Manitoba where grain ripens more rapidly than in others, people endeavour to get their grain to market earlier, in order to get the advantage of low freight rates by water, but the bulk of our wheat at present has got to lie in elevators until navigation is opened in the spring. There is a quantity of wheat shipped during the winter *viâ* Boston on the all-rail route, but only a small quantity. The evidence I have adduced to the House shows conclusively that if this Hudson Bay route is navigable between June and December we can, if there is grain threshed, as I admit there is, in September, earlier get the benefit of the Liverpool market. But it is a matter of perfect indifference to the farmer. It is not the farmer who will have grain stored in the elevators at Fort Churchill or other points on Hudson Bay, as at the present time thousands of bushels of grain are held every year by buyers at the elevators at Port Arthur after the cash is paid over. If this is the only argument against the Bill I do not think it will affect the question before the House.

Mr. WATSON. As explanations are in order, I desire to offer one, especially as the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has been allowed a second speech. The hon. member for Selkirk said that if I had the mind of a child I might understand what he said. I admit that if I had the mind of a child I might understand what he said, but as I have a mature mind it is very hard to understand what he meant to say, when he said exactly the contrary.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not altogether surprised at the opposition which has suddenly arisen against the resolution, because it is quite in harmony with the pessimistic policy usually displayed by hon. members opposite respecting the development of this country. Their ideas rarely extend beyond their own limited localities, and if they succeed in convincing their constituents that every dollar should come there they have accomplished a great deal, for beyond that they have no higher aim. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has reminded the members from Western Ontario that they will be called to account for this vote, and he said he proposed to divide the House on it, and he declared that not one dollar should be spent in that country for railway schemes until Ontario was recouped her outlay for railways in the past. The people of Ontario occupy a very different position from these people in Manitoba. The hon. gentleman's constituents have railways all round them to-day, and are in a very different position from the western people, who have to struggle with the difficulties of life and have not the comforts to be found in the older settlements. The hon. gentleman spoke as if we would be rolling up some large debt to the Dominion by carrying out this, which he designated as a wild-cat scheme. I wonder what he understands by this term? I presume he means an impracticable scheme, the scheme of a railway going into an inhospitable country where settlement was never likely to take place, and for the reason that they would be unable to raise crops from their labour there would be no use for railways. Regarding the practicability of navigating Hudson Bay, I need say but little. But I hold different views from those who declare this region is an inhospitable one and will grow nothing. In 1883 I brought down to Ontario potatoes raised at Fort York and Fort Churchill, and on the shores of Hudson Bay, weighing two pounds and two and a-quarter each. I was assured by a person who grew them that not only would potatoes grow there, but small fruits and other vegetables would grow to maturity as well as in any part of Ontario. If this is the case, and this is a fact beyond dispute, it is a guarantee that this is not an inhospitable region, and that it is only a matter of time when it must be settled by people who will come from Ontario and other parts of the country. But the question is this: Does this involve any divergence from the policy of years past? What has been the policy of this Government? It has been to throw as rapidly as possible colonization railways into different unsettled parts of the country. In many sections of the North-West people from Ontario and foreigners have been struggling hard with the difficulties of life, and railway communication is an important factor in enabling them to cope with those difficulties. In the prairie country the railways are even more needed than in the wooded district. This is no divergence from the principle we have adopted and followed for

several years past. This is not rolling up debt against this country. We have been giving liberal subsidies to any company willing to extend railways to any part of the country where there were settlements and where there was no settlement at present. This is a colonization railway, not aided by land but by a money subsidy; not as money given away, but a loan of money from the country, for which we are to get a return in the shape of the carriage of mails and freight which will be needed as settlement advances. It is not as if this road were going to pass through a country all of which had to be settled, because there are different sections already well settled.

Mr. LISTER. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say there was no land subsidy?

Mr. SPROULE. This resolution does not offer a land subsidy, but a loan, for which we are to receive labour in return. I am speaking of the resolution which is now engaging our attention. There are localities where considerable settlement has taken place already, and it becomes important that a railway should be built at the earliest possible date, and therefore the necessity of devising some scheme whereby gentlemen can obtain money to build it. When we remember that we are not piling up debt, but that it is a loan from which we shall receive a return in a short time, and that we are not giving all the money to-day but spreading it over twenty years, when settlement will have reached that country, not only from Ontario and other provinces but from European countries, it is apparent that we will obtain not only a return of the money but a much larger return in the shape of dutiable materials consumed. I do not understand why Ontario people should feel injured because we propose to give to their friends and relatives some of the facilities and conveniences of life found in that part of the country which they have left. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has no doubt many of his constituents out there, as I and many others in Ontario have. It is not unfair and unjust to assist them to cope with the difficulties incidental to a new country.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Did the hon. gentleman not vote against the proposed charter through this part of the country when proposed by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) last year?

Mr. SPROULE. I am talking of the present motion, and if the philosopher for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) will confine himself to the subject I will be content to answer his question. The opposition to this measure is most unreasonable, illogical and unfair, and I do not think any people in Ontario would condemn the proposal to aid in building a railway through this very important part of the country, where there is plenty of water, plenty of timber and arable land.

Mr. DENISON. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Spohn) seemed to wish to have some opinions from Ontario members in regard to granting $80,000 a year. As a member for Ontario I may say I heartily endorse the grant of $80,000 per annum for this railway, and I do so for this reason: that it is a part of the country which is entirely unknown and unsettled beyond the confines of Manitoba; within the confines of Manitoba, I understand, it is fairly well settled, and the people there require means of access to the markets of Ontario and the east, while beyond that little or nothing is known. From that district up to Hudson Bay it is practically a *terra incognita*—people know little about it; but with the expenditure of this sum of money the people of Canada can have access to that inland sea and will be able to know whether the fisheries are as productive as they are reported. We will be able to see also whether the forests are capable of development in the way of timber limits, and so forth.

Mr. GIBSON. Hear, hear.

Mr. DENISON. It is most likely also that there will be a great development of mineral wealth in that district. An hon. gentleman says "hear, hear," but I recollect hon. gentlemen opposite spoke in the same way about the Canadian Pacific Railway. We were told by them that the Canadian Pacific Railway would not earn sufficient to pay for axle grease for running it, but we find now that the Canadian Pacific Railway is the only railway in the whole country paying a dividend, not only on its bonds but on its stock, a fact which I think can hardly be said about another railway in the whole length and breadth of Canada. When hon. gentlemen opposite occupied the Treasury benches they concluded it would not pay to build the Canadian Pacific Railway line through the Lake Superior section. They started their line from Port Arthur, but now we find that part of the road developing into one of the richest nickel countries in the whole world, and we find many thousands of people pouring into that country, while a few years ago we looked upon it as useless and barren. Again, Sir, when I was west of the Rockies, two years ago, I was told that the Kootenay district was developing into a rich and valuable country; the Canadian Pacific Railway let daylight in there, allowed the people to get in their machinery and gave them a chance of prospecting and developing its great riches. From the very first I have always had strong views on the question of assisting the construction of a railway to Hudson Bay, and whether the outlet to the sea can be used or not is really after all, to my mind, a secondary consideration. Of course, if it can be developed, and a line of steamships can be run from Fort Churchill or Fort Nelson to England and other European ports, it will be a great advantage, and the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) has read to-night the statements of a dozen or more gentlemen showing that that bay was open to navigation from three to five months during the summer. We all know that for 200 years back the Hudson Bay Company have been sending their steamers there every year. It has been an accessible water for 200 years, and we have never heard of any disaster happening. Even supposing that this does not turn out as good a route as we should hope, still it will develop that great inland sea, and will permit the Canadian people, who have an adventurous turn of mind, to prospect that country and to fish on the seas. I am satisfied that the people of Canada will never regret the granting of the small sum of money asked for this great Dominion work, which will develop that valuable country.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he has considered how many million acres there are which have been opened up by railway communication in the North-West, where no settlement has yet been had and which are still open for settlers?

Mr. DENISON. It is not altogether a question of settlement. I am in favour of still more developing our country. I believe in opening up the whole country, and I believe, too, that we cannot have too much development.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). I did not expect to have an opportunity of addressing the House on this question to-night, but as the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Spohn) has asked what will be the position of the member for Algoma on this question I take the opportunity now to reply. I listened with a great deal of attention to the remarks of the Minister of the Interior and I also listened with attention to the introductory remarks of the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Spohn), but as his argument appeared to me to stray far afield, and as the gentlemen in the back benches sweltering under a semi-trophical sun could hardly stand the pressure when he talked of the immense icebergs and the floating ice in Hudson Bay, I took the opportunity to retire from the House at that time to get into a cooler sphere. Now, I wish to tell the hon. gentleman that with regard to my own district of Algoma I can place myself on record in a very decided way. The hon. gentleman's argument, as I said before, appeared to wander far afield: it wandered in fact all the way to Hudson Bay, where this resolution did not intend to carry it at all. As I understand the proposition made by the Government to-night, it is a question whether or not the Government of the day will bonus a colonization railway to some point on the Saskatchewan. That scheme I am prepared to support, and I may tell the hon. gentleman and the House that I would be prepared to go even further to-night if the matter under discussion was to subsidize or bonus the whole Hudson Bay Railway. With regard to the district which I have the honour to represent, the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Spohn) evidently intended to make it appear that if I supported this scheme it would be taking traffic away from the town to which I belong and from other towns in the district of Algoma. I dispute that contention *in toto*. I think, Sir, that by the development of the great west there will be traffic enough for us all, whether we are residents of Port Arthur, or whether we are residents of Winnipeg, or whether we are residents of Toronto, or any other city of Canada; and I am prepared to-night to support this resolution on the ground that this railway opens up one of the finest stretches of country in the Province of Manitoba. There is no finer part of the Dominion of Canada than the Lake Dauphin country, through which it is proposed to construct this railway, and, as I have already said, I would be disposed to go further than even subsidizing this railway, and subsidize the whole Hudson Bay road. I cannot approve of the stand which the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has taken to-night, for it strikes me that his policy is a very selfish one to propose in this House. It strikes me, as a western man, as a man whose duty it is to develop, to the greatest extent, his own district, as well as the whole western district of this great Dominion of Canada, that the hon. gentleman's proposition is selfish in the extreme. I come to this Parliament as a representative of those people who have received aid from the present Government to build a railway through a mining region, and I can say to the members of this House that I am not prepared to support this resolution? I had the honour of coming to Ottawa with my predecessor in the representation of Algoma and soliciting aid for the construction of a railway in my district. Let me ask, who are building that railway to-day? They are not my political friends nor the political friends of the Government, but they got that aid, and that railway is being constructed through a mining region, as I said, almost a wilderness. It is through a mining district, and the result remains to be seen what the producing capacity and what the output of that district is going to be. Sir, my district has received from this Government nearly $300,000 to aid in the construction of that railway, and would I not be a craven to that district and to the Dominion of Canada if I did not stand up here to-night and advocate the grant to this railway which has been proposed by the hon. Minister of the Interior? Therefore, I shall vote for the resolution.

Mr. FORBES. Before the resolution is put I would like to say a few words. Though as a member of this House I am favourable generally to the granting of bonuses to railways, I do not agree with the object of this resolution, which is for the grant by this Parliament of $80,000 a year for twenty years for the building of a railway to Hudson Bay. If the object is to aid in the extension of the road to Hudson Bay, a distance of some 800 miles, then all I can say is that that has not been honestly put before the House in the resolution as it stands. The objections to this project which have been put forward by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Spohn) are most pertinent to the case, and there has been no attempt to answer them. The experts who were sent out by the Dominion Government have shown that Hudson Straits are actually non-navigable, except for two or possibly three months in the year. Now, if the syndicate who are promoting this undertaking are doing it on a commercial basis they should make some effort to show that the reports of these experts are not in accordance with the facts, and they should be prepared to lay before the House proper evidence in contradiction of the statements made by the hon. member for East Simcoe. Moreover, I would call the attention of the Maritime Province members in this House to the effect of the passage of this resolution on the Atlantic ports of the Dominion. We have in Nova Scotia a large grain elevator, which was built for the purpose of holding the grain brought from western Canada over the Intercolonial Railway and other railroads for shipment to foreign ports. If it is intended by this resolution to divert that line of trade from the Intercolonial Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway, and the Maritime ports to the Hudson Bay, I take it that the Maritime members of this House will, as a unit, oppose it—not on the general principle that it is wrong to subsidize railways, but because the impracticability also of this scheme is a sufficient excuse for them to oppose the diversion of that trade which should come to their own ports. My province, one of the counties of which I have the honour to represent, has put forward paramount claims for aid to railways. We have in the Counties of Queen's and Shelburne a strong agitation on foot for a railway

which I might classify—according to the description given of the Hudson Bay road by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly)—as a colonization road. The hon. member claims that the proposed grant should be made to the Hudson Bay Railway, on the ground of its being a colonization road, which will open up new lands to settlement, as well as valuable timber limits and mill sites. If that is a valid argument for a grant of $80,000 a year for twenty years to this railway, with how much greater reason can we, in Queen's and Shelburne, ask for a subsidy for the 45 or 47 miles of our railway which are yet unsubsidized, on the basis that our railway is a colonization road? Because the construction of our line will have the effect of opening up large timber limits and great powerful mill sites, and bringing people engaged in the lumber business nearer to the centres of trade. If that is a good argument why we should support the proposed subsidy to the Hudson Bay Railway, I say on the same ground that $20,000 a year for twenty years, or even $10,000 a year for twenty years, would give us a sufficient sum of money, if capitalised, to build our railway. If it can be fairly urged that Parliament is pledged to this scheme on the ground that a resolution in favour of it has already been accepted by the House, I say that we are equally entitled to a grant on the ground that Parliament has already agreed to the principle of the railway in the Counties of Queen's and Shelburne. From the peculiar nature of this proposition I feel myself bound to oppose it, though not on the ground taken by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, who oppose a general distribution of public moneys for railways on the ground that the public debt of Canada is too large. I look at the matter in a different light altogether. I hold that the public debt of Canada, if incurred for public works, is properly incurred by the Government of the day; but it behooves the Government as trustees of that fund to consider wisely whether they are going to support a measure like this, which is so fraught with danger to the investors of capital, which is loaded with visions of profit having no practical foundation, that it is likely to reflect on the credit of the country and embarrass the promoters of future schemes of utility in this country. I can understand the hon. members for Selkirk, Lisgar and Marquette supporting this measure, because the railway is designed, as we might say in vulgar phrase, to go right past their barn doors, and interests their constituencies. In so far as it assists in developing and expanding north-western Canada, I am in favour of the scheme. In so far as it does assist in developing the North-West, I am in favour of a grant; but, I say, as it stands to-day, it is in an incomplete and insufficient condition and not entitled to our support. If the promoters would come in with the resolution asking a grant for a portion of the line, 100 or 200 or possibly 250 miles, on account of colonization, they might expect the support of hon. members on this side; but when they ask our support, on the ground that it is to be extended to a point on Hudson Bay, with the object of carrying the trade of the great North-West through that channel, and when it is shown, conclusively, that such a scheme will not warrant the arguments put forward on its behalf, and that it goes beyond the wants of the country, it is our bounden duty to oppose any grant. And, therefore, I feel bound to oppose this resolution.

Mr. DAVIN. I need hardly say that I listened with pleasure to the speech of my hon. friend who has just taken his seat, although I cannot agree with his arguments. It is impossible to keep from one's mind the building of the Hudson Bay Railway, and I do not think it would be desirable to do so. The resolution reads as follows:—

"That it is expedient, in order to enable the Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway Company to construct a railway from the city of Winnipeg to some point on the Saskatchewan river," and so on.

So that the resolution itself suggests, and very properly suggests, the time when, instead of having a colonization railway before us from Winnipeg to some point on the Saskatchewan, we shall have the Hudson Bay Railway running right from Winnipeg to Hudson Bay. And not only that, but the map which is on the table and those which have been circulated by the promoters of this scheme contemplate a Hudson Bay Railway, not merely from Winnipeg to some point, either Nelson or Fort Churchill, on the Hudson Bay, but a railway running south-west from the Hudson Bay right into the heart of the territory, and from the North-West Territories right down to the Pacific coast in the United States. Now, if it were only a colonization road I consider that it should still get the support of this House. It goes through a country and into a country that will invite settlement. That portion of the Saskatchewan country which it will open up is known to every one familiar with the North-West as a portion of the North-West that may invite the largest possible amount of settlement. But, Sir, I think that regarded as the herald of a complete Hudson Bay Railway, as the herald, not merely of the Hudson Bay Railway from Winnipeg to Hudson Bay, but also of a railway that will inevitably be built from Hudson Bay south-west right into the heart of the territory, and running down to the Pacific coast of the United States, it is a still more desirable scheme to support. If the Committee will bear with me for a moment I will point out that if you take a map properly scaled and use a measuring line you will find that the distance from Fort Nelson to San Francisco is precisely the same as from San Francisco to Chicago. There is as much evidence as that picked by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Spohn), to show that the Hudson Bay is navigable for four and a-half months in the year. In fact, the Bay is navigable for the whole year; but with regard to those Straits on which the hon. gentleman dwelt at such length, the Straits near Nottingham, there is evidence in the very same documents from which he quoted—the evidence of experts who have made four and five voyages through these Straits—to prove that they are navigable for four and a-half months during the year. The leader of the Opposition, who is an experienced lawyer, knows that if you were to take the report of a case in court, and cull the testimony of a few witnesses, you might prove also almost anything; and if the hon. member for East Simcoe had been as impartial as he was earnest and had given us the evidence of such experts as Professor Bell and some seven or eight others, who had made a voyage through these Straits between the middle of June and the middle of November, he would have found that the evidence

on which he relied so much, namely, that in some places the ice went down to the bottom, is incredible, for these places are three hundred and a still greater number of fathoms deep.

Mr. LAURIER. What says the report?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That was the report he read.

Mr. DAVIN. He read the evidence of witnesses. I think myself that Mr. Gordon was prejudiced against the road. I say he was, because we have the evidence of experts, men just as skilful as he, who made these voyages within the middle of June and November, and they declare solemnly that these Straits are navigable for three and four months during the year. What is the fact? That route is the historical route. It is the route the Hudson Bay Company has used. My hon. friend was again incorrect when he stated that the Hudson Bay Company was accustomed to build and buy ships of great strength. Why, they do nothing of the kind. They have been accustomed to buy ships by no means so strong as the hon. gentleman represented, and it is in evidence they have sometimes bought ships anything but strong. They require boats not drawing much water, in order that they may be able to go up to York Factory, where the water is very shallow. It is because this is part of the great Hudson Bay Railway that I support it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It may go in the opposite direction.

Mr. DAVIN. How?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) It may run to the North-West.

Mr. DAVIN. One moment. My hon. friend from Selkirk naturally looked at this from a Manitoba point of view. I naturally look at it from a North-West point of view; and if my hon. friend from Prince Albert (Mr. Macdowall), who takes a very deep interest in this question, were here, he would also look at it from the point of view of the North-West. What I look forward to is the time when we shall have a railway running almost in a straight line from Fort Churchill down to San Francisco: and what would that do? It would drain all the wealth of the Pacific coast, not merely in Canada, but in the United States. The distance from the Hudson Bay at Fort Nelson to San Francisco is exactly the same as from San Francisco to Chicago, and, under these circumstances, looking at the immense length of a railway from Chicago to the Atlantic, if you take the distance—because you get to the short parallels—from Hudson Bay to Liverpool, you will find that by the Hudson Bay route, of which I now speak, Japan will be 2,300 miles nearer Liverpool than it is to-day. Such a railway would bring the North-West from 700 to 1,000 miles nearer to Liverpool. What does that mean for the North-West farmer—for the men of Prince Albert and Battleford, and Moose Jaw, and Regina? It means 15 cents a bushel more for their wheat than can be got under the present conditions of transport. And under those circumstances I say that, once grant that those Straits are navigable for three or four months in the year, you have the real North-West railway which is to take out the grain of the North-West. I may refer to the speech of my hon. friend, the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), to whose remarks I always pay the greatest possible attention, because he is one of the most laborious and most estimable members of this House, and it is always instructive to listen to him. He takes the greatest possible pains to gather facts and figures, and he is always well posted. The only fault I have to find with him is probably that the light that gleams on those figures is not of the broadest kind. Now, I found him somewhat inconsistent. I was very glad to hear him say—because I think I heard something different from these hon. gentlemen in other days—that he wanted immigration to go into that country; he said that he wanted immigration to go into Ontario, and, to make room for these immigrants, he wanted the people of Ontario, whose farms are so largely mortgaged, to go up to the North-West. He wants to have boundless room for these people in the North-West, but he objects to a small expenditure which would result in opening up more country for them to occupy. I found that somewhat inconsistent. When conversing with merchants in Quebec, in Toronto and in Montreal, I found that already the custom of the North-West is of the greatest value to them. My hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) speaks in reference to certain municipalities in the west, and proposes that, until they get something which he says they are entitled to, nothing more should be done to the North-West. Sir, the North-West is like some vast undeveloped farm belonging to the people of Canada, and, as you develop it, you add to the wealth of Canada. If you go to the merchants and manufacturers of Canada from Quebec, the old capital, to Sarnia, they will declare to you that they have done well out of the North-West, and the more you swell the population there and the more you bring in the immigration which I am glad to see my hon. friend is desirous of having brought in the more it will be for the general benefit of Canada. My hon. friend talks about this as a wild-cat scheme and as being impracticable. We heard the same thing about the Canadian Pacific Railway in other days, and not so long ago; but from the same hon. gentlemen who talked about that railway ten or twelve years ago with doubt we now hear that it is a great railway. It is a great railway, but within two or three years with a single line, as every one knows, as Mr. Van Horne knows, it will be inadequate to take out the produce of the North-West to the sea.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How many trains are run a day?

Mr. DAVIN. I do not know, but I do not think a great many more trains can be run with a single line. You may know more about railways than I do. I do not profess to be a railway man. But I have heard railway men say that with a single line the Canadian Pacific Railway will not be able in a short time to carry the produce of the North-West. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) smiles incredulously. It is the amiable disease of the philosophic mind to be incredulous.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then you ought to be the most incredulous man in the House.

Mr. DAVIN. I have a buoyant nature, which counterbalances my philosophic pessimism. I have heard railway men say that they doubt, and even in 1887 they doubted, whether the Canadian Pacific Railway would be able to carry all the produce of the North-West. Anyway, it is certain

that in a short time one line will not be able to carry it out. If that is not so, why should the Northern Pacific try to get an entrance there? Why should the Grand Trunk desire to get a line into the North-West? Not for the sake of having a line in the North-West, not for the sake of spending tens of thousands, or even millions, of dollars in order to have a line there as well as the Canadian Pacific Railway, but because they know that, in a very short time, the carrying trade from that country will be valuable. My hon. friend says: Rely upon these great lines, and let us wait. That was the cry exactly which we heard in other days and which is echoed now. I think we heard it from my hon. friend from Norfolk last year, and this year I have heard it said that it would have been much better if we had not built the Canadian Pacific Railway so rapidly, but had gone slowly and taken twenty or thirty years to build it, so that we might have peopled the country gradually as we proceeded. I say it was the greatest pity in the world that the scheme to build that road in 1873 did not go into force, as then we should have been ten years advanced in the North-West. I say now to these gentlemen who doubt about this line and take the same attitude in regard to it as they did in regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway that they are making the same mistake. They doubt whether it is feasible, they doubt whether it will pay, they doubt whether the money will not be thrown into the sea by taking this course. Five or six years hence, when some other railway scheme is before the House, these gentlemen will say: let us rely on the one line from Winnipeg to the Hudson Bay—forgetful of all this cold water which they have tried to throw upon this resolution, which is simply a tentative scheme—proposing not to go too fast but step by step. My hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Forbes) has spoken of the trade which is likely to be taken away from Halifax if we have the Hudson Bay Railway completed. I believe that the more we develop every portion of Canada the better it is for every other portion. I believe you cannot make any portion of Canada too rich, and in my own small way I have preached to the people of the North-West, where there is a great deal of jealousy between the rival towns, that they should not be jealous one of the other, but should work for the common good. The leader of the Opposition is far too enlightened not to agree with me that, if we believe, as can be proved, that these Straits can be navigated for three or four months in the year, if this railway is what we believe it will be, this railway will be for the general benefit of Canada. Referring again to my hon. friend from Queen's, I must say, if I may do so without offence, that his speech gave promise of his being a useful ornament to this House. What may happen, after all, in reference to that same Nova Scotia in which he is interested, and in which he takes so much patriotic pride? Look at the map! You will find that such a railway as this Hudson Bay railway, such a large scheme, such a scheme as is adumbrated in the map which is before you, will bring the grain from Assiniboia, from the Saskatchewan, from Alberta, down to those forts on the Hudson Bay, and it is possible that we will see ships from Halifax coasting around to the Hudson Bay to take that grain to the city my friend is interested in. My hon. friend is laughing; he facetiously says "in ice-boats." Sir, when this is completed you will have infallibly many and many a cargo of grain taken from Churchill and or from Port Nelson, whichever happens to be the place ultimately adopted, right round through those Straits, right down by the coast into the very port of Halifax. My hon. friends laugh, but they laughed at other things which afterwards came true. Now, I rose merely as a North-West man to show the interest that we take in this matter and also to expose, if I may venture to hope that I have exposed, one or two fallacies that have been uttered in this debate. I hope the House will pass the resolution, and I hope that the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), when the Bill comes down, will be in one of his genial moods—for when he is in a genial mood he is one of the most genial of men—and that he will not carry out his desperate threat of opposing the measure at every stage.

Mr. FRASER. This scheme appeals to me on account of its magnificent proportions. There is everything about it to make men in this House enthusiastic. It is going to enable tourists to go through that country and enquire what kind of a country it is; that is a great matter. It is going to enable them to see whether there are timber limits in that country, so that we will no longer be obliged to travel on foot to find out where the timber limits are. A railway will be more convenient, for we are advancing all the time. It would be too bad for the hon. member for Toronto or myself to have to travel through that country on foot to find out whether there were any timber limits or mineral lands there; and for those who, like myself, are fond of fishing, it would be inconvenient to carry on foot our nets and fishing tackle to fish in the waters of that vast region. Therefore, it appeals to every man in every conceivable way, and I do not see very well how I can oppose it. It means just a million dollars, including interest; about $3,000 a mile for 300 miles, that is just what it means. But a difficulty meets me much more important than the difficulty that presented itself last night, when we had to appoint a Royal Commission to enquire into it. We know little about the character of the country. We do know something about the question for which a Royal Commission was appointed last night, but we know extremely little about this Hudson Bay region, and the evidence we have now, about the feasibility of shipping, is conclusive against it; therefore, we should go another step, and the Government should issue a Royal Commission to obtain proper data for voting this money before we pass this resolution. I can very well understand how the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) would like this railway to be built, and, if anything could make me vote for it, it would be the fact that he wanted it. But there seems to be a diversity of opinion among the members of the North-West themselves. If I understood the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), a few moments ago, he said something about a railway that some one wanted in the North-West, and others wanted it in Manitoba. I am a little confused, but I understood from his remarks that there was really a difference of opinion among the members from that section as to where the road should be built. Be that as it may, from all that I have heard, I am satisfied that this country does not require it. I agree that the money spent on the Canadian Pacific Railway

may have been well spent, but I cannot forget that the Minister of Finance himself had to admit that the immigration into that country, notwithstanding the Canadian Pacific Railway, had not come up to our expectations. Now, would it not be wise for us to wait and see whether the Canadian Pacific Railway is going to fulfil all the grand predictions we heard about it, before we vote these millions to build any other railway? We are told it is going to help settlers to come down from the Hudson Bay and settle in the North-West, as if we needed another way for settlers to get into the North-West. If settlers are not going into the North-West by the present road, I submit there is not much chance of getting them to come in by any other. I can well understand how hon. members from the North-West want this road for the benefit of the settlers now there. I happen to come from a county where, from one end of it to Halifax, a distance of nearly 200 miles, there is not a foot of railway. I come from a county that has, according to the last census, a population equal to between one-fifth and one-sixth of the whole population of the North-West, and still there is not a mile of railway in that county. Twelve short miles would bring the county town in connection with the Eastern Extension Railway, but we cannot get it built. Now, I submit that there should be some little consideration shown for the older counties as well as the new counties. Remember that I am not saying a word against the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway; but that being built, and not having fulfilled the predictions made concerning it, I am afraid, notwithstanding the eloquent manner in which members have spoken in behalf of this scheme, that the prospects do not warrant us in passing this resolution, although we are told that there is going to be a railway from the Pacific coast up to that point, that we shall have vessels from Halifax going to Hudson Bay, and coming back to Halifax on the way to England, and perhaps the grain would have to be put into elevators at Halifax and rest awhile before going over to England. I cannot see my way, therefore, to support this resolution, coming as I do from a province where, although we have received money for railways, we still feel that the wants of our people are not fully met. In view of the fact that the North-West is not being filled up as was anticipated, in view of the fact that we have a falling revenue, in view of that facts that we brushed off the book last night the sum of $2,000,000 a year, I submit that at present I cannot see my way to support this scheme. I do not think we have sufficient evidence to prove that we can have shipping from that point, and as wise legislators we ought to have such data as will convince reasonable men that it is practicable to get some advantage from this scheme before we consent to engage in it. It appears to me that the scheme is undertaken as a speculation. We are told this new country is going to be filled up by people who will pay taxes, if only the settlers were able to get into that country. That is one side of the question; the other side is the hard fact that we will have to pay $80,000 for twenty years on that speculation, without having any data to convince us that it is going to pay. I am not opposing this on sectional grounds at all. While I would like to receive as much money as possible for roads in Nova Scotia, I am bound to say that there is no feeling of sectionalism in my province. If it was going to be for the advantage of the whole Dominion that this road should be built no one would object to it, for I agree that if that country were filled up with settlers the whole nation would benefit by it. But believing that we have not sufficient data before us, that there is no prospect that the scheme would bring us any return, and that older sections require the money, I am bound to oppose the resolution.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think hon. members are entitled to further information on this subject before the resolution is taken out of Committee. It is worthy of the consideration of the House that a number of hon. gentlemen who have this afternoon and this evening so ardently supported this resolution were gentlemen who opposed the construction of the railway 12 months ago through this same section of country, or a very considerable section of it. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) submitted a measure to the House last year for the purpose of connecting the settlement west of Lake Winnipegoosis and Lake Manitoba with the Canadian Pacific Railway by a line of railway lying west of Lake Manitoba. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross), and the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly), and the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule), all of whom have ardently supported this resolution, all of whom have pressed on the attention of the Committee the importance of constructing a railway in that section of the country, were equally ardent and earnest in opposing the Bill of the hon. member for Marquette, and they have not informed the House what new light they have received during the last 12 months to induce them to ask for railway accommodation for small settlements to which they denied railway communication 12 months ago. It would have been interesting if those hon. gentlemen had told the House how it was that they opposed the Bill of the hon. member for Marquette last year and how it is they are supporting this resolution for the purpose of constructing a railway at very considerable expense to the public treasury for the accommodation of the inhabitants of a portion of the same district. Why, this railway, located where it is, as shown on the map, will leave out a settlement nearly 100 miles in length, for which no railway accommodation will be provided. The House will be interested in learning how it is that those hon. members from Manitoba have come to change their minds. Is it because they are not so much interested in furnishing railway accommodation to the inhabitants as in promoting the interests of certain parties who are interested in this charter? How is it they support this scheme, and they opposed the one proposed by the hon. member for Marquette? I do not think there is any difficulty on the part of the Committee in drawing its own conclusions. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is always an ardent supporter of any measures proposed by the Government. I can well understand why the hon. gentleman should support this resolution proposed by a Minister of the Crown, and should have opposed the Bill proposed by a member of the Opposition. It is not the merits of the question that determine the merits of the proposition; it is not the public interests. It depends altogether in whose hands the Bill may be for the time, and who it is that in

this House is promoting the measure. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) informed the House that this railway ought to be located in the interests of the population of the North-West Territories, that the interests of the people of Manitoba should not be considered, or that they should be made subordinate.

Mr. DAVIN. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I understood the hon. gentleman to make a distinction between Manitoba and the North-West.

Mr. DAVIN. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell us what he did say?

Mr. DAVIN. What I said was this: that my hon. friends naturally take a great interest in this line as Manitoba men; I take a great interest in it as a North-West man, because I look forward also to a line running from Regina to San Francisco. I did not try to put the North-West Territories above Manitoba, or to contradistinguish them. My hon. friend will remember I said that I regarded this line as the harbinger of a great Hudson Bay Railway that would not only come down to Winnipeg, but would also be carried forward to San Francisco.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman told us that the natural route between Japan, China and Liverpool was a railway extending along the Saskatchewan from Port Nelson or some other port in Hudson Bay. In fact the hon. gentleman told us that the construction of a continental road, a road to convey the traffic from the great east to western Europe, was to be a road altogether different from the Canadian Pacific Railway. And the central portion of Canada should undertake to construct a road lying a thousand miles away from the inhabitants who are to bear the burden and pay the taxes. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison) holds that although we have many millions of acres lying in the vicinity of railways already constructed unoccupied and fit for settlement, for which settlers have not been found, we should go on and furnish railway accommodation for every mile of territory which we possess, whether we can get any one to occupy the territory or not.

Mr. DENISON. Not exactly that. It was to develop the western country and the lands there.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). To develop a country without inhabitants and for which you are not getting inhabitants where railways are already provided. The hon. gentleman's proposition reminded me very much of a story told by the poet Moore in criticizing a work on Church and State by an English bishop. Moore tells that there were butchers' shops established everywhere throughout Hindostan for the benefit of the Brahmins, and although it was true that the Brahmins would not eat meat, yet, as it was necessary the butchers should live, it was only right they should be compelled to pay for the meat, so long as the meat was provided. And so we must go on and provide railway accommodation for the whole 3,000,000 square miles of territory we possess, although we have at the present time but 5,000,000 of inhabitants. We have to-day railway accommodation for more than three times the inhabitants we possess. What has been the effect of this extraordinary construction of railways, not merely in Canada but in the United States? We have scattered our population over territory many times as large as it should occupy. This has depreciated the value of real estate more than the protective tariff, and we are continuing to do so by pursuing the policy on which hon. gentlemen opposite have set out. Why should the farming population and the industrial and artizan classes of the older provinces burden themselves with additional taxation to provide railway accommodation for men who are still on the other side of the Atlantic and likely to be there for a generation, when every mile of railway built has a tendency to diminish the value of real estate in the settled districts, the amount of capital the people possess, and increase largely the burdens already imposed. I could point to districts in the adjacent Republic where a quarter of a century ago real estate was worth twice what it is to-day, and it is depreciated because a considerable portion of the population have been withdrawn from these districts and taken into the western territories. What are you doing in the North-West? Why, you are withdrawing perhaps five or six thousand people from each of the western counties of Ontario. You have diminished the value of real estate by at least $3,000 for every man you have taken away, and you have scattered these people over an immense area of country where there are bridges to build, school-houses to erect, churches to build, taxes to pay for the maintenence of school-teachers, and where they have immense sums to pay for all these purposes, a mere fraction of which they would only have to pay if they had continued in the agricultural districts of the older provinces. I am not saying that we ought not to encourage settlement in the North-West, but I do maintain that you ought not to go on with the construction of railways far beyond the yet settled portions of the country, and thus enormously diminish the value of real estate in the older provinces and enormously increase the difficulties of life in a new country by the sparseness of the settlements which are established along these immense stretches of railway. I have no doubt that where settlements have already been formed we ought to take into consideration their wants and necessities, but the policy of the Administration with regard to railway construction in the North-West during the past four or five years has gone far beyond this. I know that some hon. gentlemen from the west have pressed upon their constituents their fitness for the place on the ground that these bankrupt companies are indebted to them and that they have a special interest in having them succeed in this House. It seems to me that we will be obliged to call a halt some time or other. You propose now to give $80,000 a year; that represents the interest upon at least $2,000,000 capital which is locked up for twenty years, and what compensating advantage does the country obtain which is called upon to pay that sum of money? Look at the depreciation you are producing in the value of real estate in the older provinces. I am not going to enter now into an elaborate discussion of that question, but it can be made as plain as twice two are four that if you extend railway construction over vast and unsettled regions you will seriously affect the value of real estate, and you diminish the wealth of the

country far beyond the amount of money you abstract from the pockets of the people for railway construction. These are matters that ought to be seriously considered by the House. I do not think that the available wealth of this country is an unlimited quantity ; I do not think you can go on taking $80,000 a year for this enterprise, and $80,000 for another, and $80,000 for a third, as you are proposing to do, without seriously affecting the revenue and seriously embarrassing the population of the country. Look at what you have spent already in the North-West. You are paying, and are likely to pay for all time to come, $1,000,000, or $1,200,000 a year for the extinguishment of the Indian title. That represents $25,000,000, and you have more than twice that sum expended already east of the Rocky Mountains upon railway construction. What have you by way of compensation for this large sum of money ? You have simply transferred from the older provinces, if you take into consideration the diminution in the value of real estate, a far larger sum than the $75,000,000 or $100,000,000 you spent in Manitoba or in the North-West Territories. It does seem to me that it is worthy of the serious consideration of the population of Ontario and Quebec how far they are going to continue this system, and when they are going to call a halt. I think that the Minister who has proposed these resolutions ought to tell us whether he proposes that any payment shall be made to the railway company until this portion of the road which is being subsidized is wholly built, whether he proposes any limitation in time, or whether he proposes to continue this railway as an obstacle to private enterprise for all time to come. I think that the House is entitled to know this, and that it is also entitled to know all about the terms of the payment, while it is discussing this resolution. If we get this information we will be able to consider fully the scheme when the hon. gentleman brings down his Bill. We see two proposed routes on the map which is laid on the Table of the House. Can this company run its line where it pleases ; can it go where there are no settlements if it pleases ; or, can it not go through the settlement if it pleases ? I am disposed to support the plan of free railway construction, but it is to be a plan of free railway construction when the companies receive little or no subsidies. When you propose to give a large subvention to a company, it seems to me you ought to have some voice in saying where the road is to go ; but you do not say that in this case. We have no scheme submitted in connection with this railway, except that the road is to begin at Winnipeg and point somewhere north and west, supposing that it is not to point in an easterly direction simply because there is a large body of water standing in the way.

Mr. SEMPLE. I desire to say a few words upon this very important question. It was stated by the Minister of Finance, the other evening, that he intended to follow a policy of economy, and as far as I know I think that the gentlemen on this side of the House will do the best they can to support him in that if he does not go to an extreme. The question now before us is this : We are asked to vote to-night an amount which when capitalized is $2,000,000. If we were asked for a large grant of land there might be very little objection, because we know that during the last few years the amount received for land in the North-West has not been equal to the amount paid out in expenses of agents and charges to capital account for surveys and other matters. Therefore, if we were asked for a large grant of land there might be no objection, but when it comes to a large sum of hard cash at the present time, when we were expecting a policy of economy, it is something we do not care very much about. Now, Sir, it will be remembered that a few weeks ago a large deputation from various counties in Ontario which had granted bonuses to railways waited upon the late Premier and the hon. Minister of Finance, and were accorded a respectful hearing. The claims they made aggregated about $6,000,000. I suppose that if they had received half that sum in hard cash they would have been satisfied. They were told, however, that the matter would have to be decided by Parliament, and that it was doubtful what the other portions of the Dominion would say if that large amount were granted as an act of justice to those counties in Ontario. That was very little encouragement. The people of those counties had spent largely to supply themselves with railways ; they are now subjecting themselves to direct taxation on account of those grants, and they have received no return from this Government. But although there was no money for meeting that just claim, it is proposed now to grant $2,000,000 to this railway in an entirely new country. Now, Sir, it is often said that the Canadian Pacific Railway is a great railway. There is no doubt that it cost a great deal of money, and the worst of it is that the portion of Canada which contributed the most has received the least advantage from that railway. We had the statement made by the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) the other evening that the Province of Ontario contributed more than half of all the revenue of the country ; therefore, out of the $62,000,000 granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway, Ontario has paid $31,000,000 ; and what has the effect been on the Province of Ontario ? That our farmers have realized less every year, that their farms have been reduced in value, and their taxes increased. I hold in my hand a blue-book issued by the Dominion Government, in which there is some very interesting reading ; it is the Railway Statistics of Canada for 1889. From this we learn what has been granted by the Dominion, the provinces and the municipalities for railways. The Dominion has expended for railway bonuses $145,445,322. The Ontario Government has expended $6,097,007, and the municipalities $10,344,541, making altogether $16,441,548. The people of Ontario, when they wanted railways, put their hands into their pockets and built them, and they are now paying heavy taxation for them. Then we find that the Province of Quebec has been very liberal in its expenditure on railways. The Government spent $13,177,453, and the municipalities $4,253,274, making together no less a sum than $17,430,727. The Premier of that province, who is so popular, has gone to the markets of the world to borrow money ; and it is strange to see the very persons who helped to create this expenditure decrying his Government, so that he may fail in obtaining a loan. Under these circumstances, do you think the people of that province will be willing to increase their burdens by granting this large sum of money to the Hudson Bay Railway ? The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Spohn),

who entered largely into the subject this afternoon, showed from a carefully prepared report made by an expert that this is an impracticable scheme. It is something like that other wild-cat scheme of a ship railway that is to carry ships across New Brunswick. Now, it has been said that many of the people in the North-West are living far away from railways. I grant it. I remember the time when there was not a railway in Ontario. Even after we had the Grand Trunk and the Northern many of our farmers had to team their grain forty or fifty miles, and I do not know but many of them made as much money then as they do now, perhaps more. Those men learned to take things as they found them, even though they did not move very fast: but they endeavoured to clear up the land and make improvements, and if some of them have done well it has only been by hard work. I do not pity the people of the North-West if they have to wait a few years before they get all the railways they want. I believe that both Liberals and Conservatives would be in favour of this road it they could be shown that any good purpose would be served by it. But everybody knows that in a town high taxes depreciate the value of property, and so when Dominion taxation is high, it is a drain on the people, and times are not so good that we can afford to be lavish in our expenditure. In the admirable speech which Mr. Hague delivered the other day at the annual meeting of the Merchants Bank he said that in no year had there been so much bankruptcy in the Dominion of Canada as there was last year, when the failures involved something like $17,800,000 of liabilities. That does not show a condition of prosperity: it shows that too many people have been depending for their prosperity upon borrowed money. Now I hope this will not pass. I hope that this era of economy, of which we have heard so much lately, will begin in earnest, and I shall cheerfully support the Finance Minister in everything reasonable.

Mr. WELSH. As far as the navigation of the Hudson Bay route is concerned, there is no trouble about it. I believe a powerful wooden steamer of two thousand tons or a steel steamer adapted for the ice could make two round trips from England safely to the Hudson Bay every year. I have sold some ships to the Hudson Bay Company in London for that purpose, and have had many interviews with them about the navigation of the Bay, and I think there would be no difficulty in opening that route if the country could afford it. I would be the last to object to the Bill, but we have already expended a very large sum in opening up that country with different railways, and I do not think the financial affairs of the Dominion are in such a very prosperous condition that we can encumber ourselves with a few more millions. The Government ought to look around and see the aspect of affairs in other countries. There is the Argentine Republic, and Chili, and New Zealand, which have been going ahead with their boasted highfalutin prosperity, and have fallen in the money market to the depths we all know of to-day. Look at their stock in the English market to-day, and see where their extravagance has left them? Why, in New Zealand the officials have to work for half pay. I do not think our position is very bad, but I remember only last year the late lamented leader of the Government said he thought it was high time we should call a halt in this railway expenditure, and I think it would be well for the Government to be cautious. I do not like to say anything against the scheme, because I think the members from the North-West ought to be the best judges of their requirements, but I would suggest that the Government should use caution. We had a speech yesterday from the member from Toronto (Mr. Cockburn), who gave us his view of the financial affairs of Prince Edward Island, of which he had evidently made a deep study; and as he appears to be a man of great information and deep thought, who has no doubt crossed the *pons asinorum* and understands a great many things, though there are many asses bridges he has not yet crossed, I would like him to give us a statement, from his point of view, of the state of affairs with regard to the North-West. I have no doubt that he is a useful member of this House, and that he makes a deep study of the financial standing of the different provinces. He gave us Prince Edward Island yesterday, and the least he should do is to give us his opinion concerning the expenditure of $2,000,000 for the construction of this road.

Mr. COCKBURN. I do not think the hon. gentleman is exactly in order; and although I am willing to undertake, as I have undertaken in the earlier part of my life, to handle some pretty recalcitrant subjects, still there are limits, and I really could not undertake the instruction of the hon. gentleman. I must draw the line at my hon. friend.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The debate has taken a much wider range than I had anticipated. I did not anticipate that the Hudson Bay Railway scheme would be the leading question this afternoon. However, I think the promoters of this Bill will find no fault with the debate, which, so far as it has gone, will do them no injury, particularly as the feasibility of the Hudson Bay route has been ably supported by my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Welsh), whose maritime experience is so well known, not only in this House but in all parts of the Dominion. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Spohn) went very largely into the question of the Hudson Bay Railway. No doubt he has been preparing himself for some time, for we must recognize the fact that he was loaded up to the hilt with regard to this question. My impression is, however, that the hon. gentleman has never visited our western country; and it was very noticeable in this debate to see the difference between the views of those who have visited that country and those who have not. Both the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) misunderstood the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), because I am perfectly aware that hon. gentleman is of the same opinion with regard to the main question of the Hudson Bay Railway as its promoters, and is also, I believe, in favour of the road which the Government have now placed before the House for consideration. I was rather interested in the remarks of the hon. member for West Assiniboia in reference to the main line he spoke of from San Francisco to Hudson Bay, because that is the line which has been laid out on the maps ever since that scheme has been mentioned, and it is one which, if the Hudson Bay scheme proper is found to be feasible, will be constructed in the future, if not in

the near future. However, I do not propose to take up the time of the House with reference to that question, but wish to call its attention to the fact that this is a colonization road for which the Government is asking assistance. In answer to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), I may say that on the 16th May, 1890, the Bill was passed respecting the Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway, which compels the completion of this piece of line to the Saskatchewan River within four years from the 21st of June, 1890, and that is the time to which the present company will be limited for the completion of the first 300 miles from Winnipeg to the Saskatchewan; and nothing is to be paid of the subsidy until the road is completed. Of course, the hon. member for Bothwell understands that this is exactly on the same principle as the assistance given the other two roads, one of which is completed and the other under construction.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This road is tied to no particular location.

Mr. DEWDNEY. No. While I mention that, I may say that the old location of the road, which is filed in the railway office as being a part of the Hudson Bay road proper, was the piece which runs between the two lakes, Manitoba and Winnipeg. It is proposed by the promoters, with the consent of the Government, to vary that, and to cross at the rapids of the old crossing of the Mackenzie line, in order to accommodate settlement, which is very much greater to the west of Lake Manitoba than the settlement between the two lakes. A question was raised by the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong), in reference to that, and he appeared to think that the deviation, the crossing at the Narrows, and the adoption of the route by Lake Winnipegoosis, would make the line to Hudson Bay very long. I have nothing to do with that to-day. I think a few miles extra in length will be of advantage, because the line will traverse a much better section of country than it would between the two lakes. He also spoke very feelingly as to placing any scheme on the market which he thought would be unprofitable and likely to result unfavourably to the investors. I should be sorry to advocate any scheme for the English market which I thought was not a legitimate scheme and one for fair speculation. We know that the syndicate which took up the bonds of the Regina and Prince Albert road, built that road in the time they proposed to build it. The same syndicate took up the Calgary and Edmonton road, and I have no doubt they would be glad to take up this scheme if they had the opportunity. So I have no doubt that, if we can be guided by the results in the case of the other two roads, this will not be a speculation which will be disappointing to the investors. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) spoke of the opposition which was given to a line promoted by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) last year. If I recollect aright, there was more than one charter before the Government at that time. I think there were two, if not three. One of them was passed, and a land grant was given, and I have no doubt that in the near future that road from Portage la Prairie to the northern end of the Dauphin Lake will be constructed. There was a conflict, I know, between the two charters at that time, but there was no political significance in it, as far as I am aware, because the gentlemen who were concerned belonged to both sides of politics, and therefore the insinuation, if I may call it so, of the hon. member for Bothwell, has no ground. All the people of that section wanted was a charter covering that piece of country, and it was granted. I should also like to impress upon the Committee that this $80,000 a year is only an advance to the company. An agreement will be made similar to those which were made with the two other lines of railway which have been constructed on the same basis as this. It is a loan, and is expected to be paid back at any rate within the twenty years. I have here a copy of the agreement which was made with the Calgary and Edmonton road, which states very clearly what the conditions are, and the conditions will be similar in this case. They are very explicit. The money advanced has to be paid back, and the Government retain one-third of the land grant to secure them against loss, and, of course, the land is increasing in value from year to year. Therefore, the Government risk nothing in the assistance we propose to give in this Bill.

Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg). I have always been of opinion, and I still am, that the proper course for a young member in his first session is to be a listener and not a speaker, and I have tried to act on this principle, but I do not think I would be justified in casting a merely silent vote on a question in which my constituents are as deeply interested as they are in this question, and in saying this I am stating the case very mildly, for every one who has lived in Manitoba or the North-West Territories for any time, or has even paid a visit of any length to those portions of the Dominion, must be aware that the people there are a unit in favour of the construction of the Hudson Bay Railway. There is no difference of opinion in regard to it amongst people of different races or parties, and whether they come from Canada, England, France or Germany, all are in favour of it, and you will find the strongest Reformer and the most ardent Conservative working together to secure the construction of the Hudson Bay Railway. Nothing can more clearly show this than the large majority by which I had the honour of being returned at the last general election, and, if the House will bear with me, I will exemplify my meaning by drawing a comparison between the two elections which took place in Winnipeg in 1887 and 1891. In 1887 the Conservative party chose Mr. W. B. Scarth, my predecessor in this House, as their standard-bearer. He was regarded as being our strongest man. The Reform party put forward no candidate, but Mr. Hugh Sutherland, who was then, as he is now, the president of the Hudson Bay Railway Company, ran as an independent candidate. He refused to pledge himself to support either party, but simply stood on the ground of the construction of the Hudson Bay road. As Mr. Scarth was the Conservative candidate, and Mr. Sutherland had formerly been connected with the Reform party, the latter got the great majority of Reform votes, but as he was an independent candidate, the crack of the party whip was not heard and there were many defections from the Reform party on that occasion. As I have said, Mr. Scarth had the unanimous support of the Conservative party, and although he was known to be a supporter of the Hudson Bay Railway—and if he

had not been he would never have had a seat in this House—so many of the people had got it into their heads that by electing Mr. Sutherland they would hasten the completion of that road that, when the ballots came to be counted, Mr. Scarth had a majority of but 12, and on a recount that majority was reduced to 8. During the time which elapsed between that and the next election the Conservative party in Winnipeg was split in twain, owing to differences of opinion in regard to the course of the Dominion Government in disallowing certain local railway charters. In February last the Dominion Government dissolved the House and appealed to the country. At that time I was chosen as the standard-bearer of the Conservative party in Winnipeg. The Reformers put in the field against me a personal friend of my own, Mr. Isaac Campbell, a very strong man, a man who is known and respected from one end of Winnipeg to the other, a man of the highest character and of the strictest integrity, a man whose popularity was so well known that he was styled, not in sarcasm by his foes but by his friends, "The people's Isaac." Notwithstanding that he was the strongest candidate the Reformers could have put in the field, with the possible exception of Colonel McMillan, the Provincial Treasurer, it was found, when the ballots were counted, that he was defeated, not by a majority of 12 or of 8, but by a majority of 509. Now, Sir, no one who knows the constituency will say for one moment that, at the time of the last election, I was a stronger candidate than was my predecessor, Mr. Scarth, four years ago. I am perfectly aware that the unpopularity of the platform of the hon. gentlemen opposite, unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union, call it which you will, was quite sufficient to account for the defeat of my friend, Mr. Campbell, popular as he was; still, if that had been the only thing he had to carry on his shoulders, the majority against him would have been comparatively small. But it so happened that a year or two ago, when he was a member of the Local Legislature, where he represented South Winnipeg, in the course of a speech which he delivered in the House he stated that he did not consider the Hudson Bay Railway a pressing necessity, or words to that effect. Well, when the election came on and he offered himself as a candidate for Winnipeg, he stated on the platform over and over again, that, if elected, he would use his utmost endeavours to secure the early construction of that road, and would support any resolution that was introduced into this House with that object in view. Sir, every one who heard him knew that he was a man of his word, but the very fact that there was a shadow of suspicion of lukewarmness on this point was enough to roll up this large majority against him. This feeling is not confined to Winnipeg. My hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Daly) also gained a considerable portion of his majority on account of the feeling that Mr. Martin was not as energetic in support of the Hudson Bay Railway scheme as he might have been, that feeling arising, I believe, not from any hostility on his part to the scheme in question, but from the personal feeling which he had against Mr. Sutherland, the president of the road. In fact, Sir, there is not a constituency in Manitoba or the North-West Territories in which an opponent of the great Hudson Bay Railway scheme, no matter how popular he might be, no matter how strong a candidate he might be in other respects, could hope to be returned if it was supposed for one moment that he would not back up this scheme to the best of his ability. I know that one of the causes of the return of my hon. friend for Marquette (Mr. Watson) was that he was known as a strong supporter of this road. Now, Sir, I will call your attention, and the attention of the House, to this universal feeling in favour of the road, which pervades Manitoba and the whole North-West Territories, and I must say that I think hon. gentlemen who are opposed to this scheme ought to consider very carefully the reasons on which they base their opposition, before they thus oppose the unanimous wish of a whole people. I have been very sorry to hear from the other side objections raised to this scheme from a provincial point of view. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Spohn) appeared to think that Ontario was the only province in Canada, and that the Trent Valley Canal was the only enterprise deserving of any kind of support. That, of course, is a proposition that I know the majority of the members of this House will not endorse. I do not wish to say anything disparaging of the great Province of Ontario. I am proud to say that I am an Ontario man myself. I was born and brought up in that province, and no one admires the energy of the people of Ontario any more than I do; but I do not think that members representing that populous province ought to try to take advantage of the comparative weakness in this House of Manitoba and the North-West, both in population and in representation, to refuse them the privileges which they would press if they were the parties making the request. I do not think it is necessary, at this stage of the proceedings, to enter into any defence of the Hudson Bay Railway scheme as a whole. It has been discussed from various points of view to-night, and I may say that were the Hudson Bay Railway as a whole under discussion I think I could adduce arguments which would at least moderate the views of my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). But as that scheme is not now before the House, and I am sorry to say that it is not, I will not occupy the time of the House by urging arguments in favour of the construction of this road from Winnipeg to Hudson Bay. What we are now considering is a resolution moved by the Minister of the Interior to grant aid to that portion of the road from Winnipeg to the North Saskatchewan, which the Government intend to treat as a colonization road, and which they are perfectly justified in so treating. I may say that I should have been much more pleased, and I know the other members from Manitoba and the North-West would have been much pleased, and their constituents would have been much pleased, had the Government seen fit to extend aid to the whole road. That, however, they have not done, and I think half a loaf is better than no bread, and consequently I intend to support the resolution which is now before the House. But, Sir, I think that if hon. members who oppose it would pay a visit to the North-West, or, more correctly speaking, to the Province of Manitoba, and view the country which will be opened up by the proposed road, they would come to the same conclusion that I have arrived at, namely, that this is a public work which well deserves the sup-

port of this House and of the country. The Dauphin district is one of the most fruitful in Manitoba, and it is, I am informed by those who have lived there, a portion of the country which has the good fortune to escape the early frosts from which some other portions suffer. It is in this respect very like the district immediately round Portage la Prairie, and I believe that this is caused by the north winds being moderated as they pass over those great bodies of water, Lakes Winnipegoosis and Manitoba. Whatever the cause may be, it is a fact that the farmers in that country have hitherto escaped the fall frosts which have, in other portions, caused disaster. Such being the case, you will not be surprised to learn that immigrants have flocked in there at a very rapid rate, and the settlers there find themselves not only inconvenienced, but actually impoverished, by not being able to get the grain they grow to market. Consequently, I will gladly support the resolution of the Minister of the Interior to grant this aid to the road in question, more particularly so as, when completed, I hope it will be the first step in a complete railway from Winnipeg to Hudson Bay, which will give the farmers of Manitoba a short line to the European markets, and that is of very great consequence to them, as every cent they can save in freight is just so much more in their pockets. I would ask the members of this House from every province to consider this resolution cooly and apart from all party feeling, and if they do so, and if they inform themselves on the state of the country, I feel sure that they will be found voting for the resolution which is now under discussion.

Resolution reported.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 118) respecting the Citizens' Insurance Company (from the Senate).—Mr. Desjardins, (Hochelaga.)

PAPASHASE INDIAN RESERVE.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House,

Mr. WATSON. Before the motion is adopted I desire to call the attention of the House to a matter of special importance. It was my intention to have brought it forward last Friday, and I have not had an opportunity to do so since. It is important that it should be brought before the House now. I find by advertisements that an Indian reserve is about to be sold by public sale, the Papashase reserve lying immediately south of Edmonton. It is to be sold on 2nd July. The notice given has been very short, and this is a matter for the consideration of the House. It is not in the best interests of Canada, and it is certainly not in the interests of the North-West, that large tracts of land should be locked up in the hands of speculators. It appears to me from the notices given of the sale that there is a big job on deck. The block of land advertized to be sold covers 25,000 acres, and it is situated in a region of country which is represented to be very valuable. Accompanying the advertisement a map is sent, together with a description of the land. The description of the land is furnisned without the signature of the engineer who made the report or the Dominion land surveyor, and I must say that, judging from the description given in the pamphlet, I do not think any person who knows anything about the country, or about a prairie country, would not be willing to give a dollar an acre for the land. It has been represented to me by gentlemen who know the section and the district that these lands are valuable—they are good lands. They are situated almost immediately at the terminus of the Calgary and Edmonton Railway, a road which is under construction and which will be completed this fall. I hold that these lands should not be sold until the public have had an opportunity of seeing them and having facilities for getting there by railway. I am satisfied the lands will be enhanced in value by the construction of the road, and a much larger price will be obtained for them if sold after the railway is completed in that section of the country than if they are sold to-day. I believe these lands have not been occupied by the Indians for two or three years, and it might be interesting to know what particular demands have been made on the department for the sale of the lands at this particular date. The lands cover 40 square miles, or 25,600 acres, and would accommodate 160 settlers with their families, with 160 acres each. It is a great mistake to dispose of these lands at so short and limited a notice, for I find that, outside of the hand bills, advertisements have only been inserted in the following papers: *Free Press*, Winnipeg, 6th June; Calgary *Herald*, 9th June; Regina *Journal*, 9th June; Regina *Leader*, 9th June. The advertisements have not appeared in the Prince Albert and Saskatchewan papers. The lands are to be sold at Calgary, 200 miles from the reserve, and from the information furnished to me it appears that some speculator interested in purchasing the lands must have succeeded in getting the Government to advertize the lands for sale before the public have a chance of inspecting them, before the railway is completed, and before the public, wishing to obtain lands in that vicinity, can visit the country. For that reason I bring this matter before the House. Hon. members must know from our past history, and members of the North-West know, that the system of disposing of large tracts to speculators has been antagonistic to the country, and for that reason I have thought fit to draw the attention of the House to this matter, which I consider one of great importance, for it means a very great loss to the Dominion treasury. I desire the Minister of the Interior to state what particular demand has been made for the sale of these lands, and what is the object of now selling the lands through which the railway will be completed in a very few months? It cannot be to the interest of the department to do so, because it would receive a very much larger sum for the land after the railway is completed than it could possibly receive at the present day.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) has found a mare's nest. Two or three days ago the hon. gentleman met me in the corridor, and made a statement to me, which I did not take in a very serious manner, to this effect: He asked: What are you doing with the Indian lands near Edmonton, selling them? I replied, yes. The hon. gentleman answered that the description from the survey did not appear to

be as good as the information ought to be, and he added: I propose to bring the matter up on the Estimates. The next morning I sent for the surveyor, a very able man and one of our most able land surveyors, who had had this particular land under his supervision, who surveyed it two or three years ago, and who, last year, was sent up by me for the purpose of staking out every quarter-section and putting in posts, and making a detailed description of every quarter-section. It has been known that we were doing this throughout the country for the last six months. I will not dispute the dates given by the hon. gentleman as to the advertisements. I had been almost dreading the bill which would reach me in connection with this matter, particularly after I received a very large account for an advertisement I ordered some time ago, and was brought to my attention in this House. I made particular enquiries as to the extent the advertising had gone, as I did not wish to be extravagant. I am very much mistaken if there have not been advertisements in the North-West papers for four, five or six months respecting the sale of this land.

Mr. WATSON. The advertisements sent out by the Indian Department, signed by Mr. Vankoughnet, are dated at the Department of Indian Affairs, 15th May, 1891.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That might be the case. They were sent out to the Indian agents and others to be posted up, and to be added to the already extensive advertisements in the newspapers. In reference to the report which the surveyor has made of that land, I may mention that I have been over the land on more than one occasion, and I have been through that reserve north, south, east and west. Portions of the reserve is of excellent quality, but on others the soil is light and it is not so good. I pressed upon the Deputy Minister of Indian Affairs to impress upon the auctioneer, when he sold that property, that he should not exaggerate the description of the quality of the land of the Interior Department, and I did so because I found that an auctioneer, in order to get a large price, had described land far beyond what the reports of the land surveyors warranted, and on account of this we had, in several cases, to exchange the land bought for better land, because we found that the representations made to the purchasers were incorrect. I may say that a more able and a more honest and honourable man than Mr. Nelson, the land surveyor, is not in the service of the Dominion, and I place the greatest reliability in the descriptions he has given. He has valued every quarter-section, and it varies from two to five dollars per acre, and in looking through the field notes of the surveyor and getting explanations from Mr. Dennis, who is our inspector of surveys, I find that it is remarkable how well they agree with regard to the value of land. Now, with regard to the time of sale, I have probably as much experience as the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), and I am the responsible head of the department, and have to exercise my best judgment. I believe now, and I believed six months ago, that the time to sell that property was when the railway was just coming to this point and being finished, because, I believe it would then be more valuable than it would be in a year's time. When the railway is being built is the time to get a boom in the land. The expiration of the contract time for the building of that railway is on the 1st July of this year, and I maintain that a better time could not be selected for the sale of that property. If we find that the land is not realizing what we think it should realize we will stop the sale, but my object is to get every dollar we can for the Indians who are interested in that reserve to place in the Indian funds. I do not know to-day one single individual who has talked of buying one acre of that land. I hope that the road will be built on the 1st July, and I believe that we can get a good price for the land then.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Are these lands surrendered?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; they belong to half-breeds who have taken scrip.

Mr. LAURIER. Do I understand that the lands were surrendered on receiving scrip?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the money then go into the Indian funds?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

THE BUDGET DEBATE.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. Minister intend to proceed with the Budget debate to-morrow, or is there any other business to take precedence of it?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We will ask the House to concur in the resolution that was passed to-day, then we will take the Admiralty Bill and then the Budget.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the discussion to-morrow at all resembles the discussion of to-day it may mean going over the Budget discussion.

Mr. FOSTER. The discussion must have petered out to-day.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are you quite sure?

Mr. FOSTER. No; not certain.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the Budget discussion should go on to-morrow. We consented practically to allow the matter to wait on the very distinct understanding that it would have been continued at once. It is quite impossible that the discussion on the resolution that we have introduced can be got through in one or two days. It may involve very much more delay than the hon. gentlemen think if they allow another day to pass without continuing the discussion.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.10 p. m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 26th June, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 114) for the better security and safety

of certain Fishermen. From the Senate.—(Mr. Davies, P.E.I.)

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. DESJARDINS (Jacques Cartier) (translation) moved:

That the Second Report of the Special Committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates of this House be adopted.

He said: This report, Mr. Speaker, is intended to confirm the first report of the Committee adopted on the 2nd of June, and asking for the appointment of an assistant reviser for the French version. The Committee, on application made to it, first took Mr. J. C. Dansereau on trial, and upon the report of the chief translator that he is perfectly competent for the work, the Committee, at a subsequent meeting, decided to recommend his appointment to be made permanent, at a salary of $1,000, to date from 3rd June; notice has been given, and I now ask for the adoption of this report.

Mr. LAURIER. I would ask to let the matter stand until another day, because I think the whole question of the translation of the *Hansard* ought to be reviewed in this House. The translation is not certainly what it ought to be, and it is so defective as to call for serious consideration. I am sure the hon. gentleman cannot be satisfied with the French version of the *Hansard*.

Mr. DESJARDINS. We are satisfied so far, because no complaints have been made since we have had the additional help asked by the House. I understand that the translation has been going on satisfactorily, and from the report we have received from the chief translator concerning the efficiency of the officer to be appointed, we understand he is perfectly competent to fill the position to which he has been named, and we now ask the House to concur in the report. This report is only the consequence of the first one which was adopted by the House when the appointment of an assistant reviser was asked.

Mr. LAURIER. The whole thing can be revised again, at all events. I have not recently looked at the translation of the latter Debates, but only judge by the translation of the early Debates this session, and certainly that was not at all what it should be. I will take the opportunity of looking at the latter translations, and if it shows improvement I will raise no objection.

Mr. DESJARDINS. The hon. leader of the Opposition might as well bring up that question on the vote for the *Hansard*.

Mr. FOSTER. While the *Hansard* question is up, it may be pertinent to say a word with reference to the reports. There is something wrong with them. The takes are not uniform and some are execrable, and it is more trouble often to revise the speech than to deliver it. I feel exactly of this opinion, that, if we are to have a *Hansard* we ought to have it thoroughly correct. When a speech is taken down, it ought to appear as delivered, and not the opposite or not a very inaccurate reproduction of what the speaker has said. I would rather see the *Hansard* abolished than see it kept on in its present inefficient condition.

Mr. McMULLEN. In reply to the remarks of the hon. Minister of Finance, I am glad to say that I have carefully and closely criticized the few speeches I have made in the House this year, and I must acknowledge that the reports this session are more correct than those of any previous session. I think the way the utterances of members are taken down is remarkable for its accuracy and reflects great credit upon the reporters.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). So far as I am concerned, I have found the reports very excellent in most instances. Occasionally I find a word has been misapprehended or that the reporter has perhaps mistaken the word for another similar in form, but I have nothing to complain of as to the accuracy of the reports, not only during this session, but during the past three or four sessions.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would like to endorse very fully the remarks made by my hon. friend to my left (Mr. Mills). My idea has been that the reporting this session has been better, and more accurate than it has been for the many years I have sat here.

Mr. FOSTER. Then it must have been inaccurate before.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is true that in some previous sessions I have sometimes had to complain that what I have said has been misapprehended by the reporter, but this session I have had no such complaint to make, and only the other day I remarked to my hon. friend how wonderfully accurate were the reports produced. Of course, I know nothing in regard to the French translation.

Mr. DAVIN. As a member of the Debates Committee, I may say that we have paid a great deal of attention to the question which has been raised, and last session I was under the impression that there was one member of the staff—I do not know who he was, and never attempted to find out—who was weak; but this session I have been observing, and it does appear to me that the staff seems to be quite efficient. It is an astonishing thing to me that the report is as good as it is, and for this reason—the reporters sit there, as it were, between two fires. Gentlemen on the other side of the House are talking, and we know how gentlemen are talking on this side. I know that it is most difficult to report a speech when men are talking all around you. I know that, when I was a reporter in the gallery of the House of Commons in England—I suppose I must have been considered very peremptory in my style, but on what is called a full dress night, there is a gallery where members can sit close up to the reporters' seats, and the box which I occupied happened to be next to that gallery, and I had to say to them, "I cannot report when you talk this way." That would occur when perhaps Mr. Disraeli or Mr. Bright was addressing the House. It is amazing to me, as I have said, that the report here is as good as it is under the circumstances, and, comparing that report with what I know, though, of course, I have myself found occasionally a word omitted or misapprehended by the reporter, the Finance Minister may be assured that the report is pretty well done. For instance, the other night in the tariff debate I found that I heard one of the speakers make a certain statement, and I went to the Finance Minister and said: Is that correct? He said: "No, that is not what he

means. It is just a slip of the tongue of the hon. gentleman." Naturally the reporter would take the word down, and the hon. gentleman when he went over the report, would say: "That is not what I said;" because what he intended to say would be in his memory, though he had used one word instead of another, which is a thing which happens to every speaker. The case to which I refer was the use of the words "raw sugar" instead of "refined sugar," a very easy slip to make. I had not heard the part of the Finance Minister's speech on that subject, and consequently I asked him if that was what he said, and he said: "No; he means refined sugar and not raw sugar." I consider that the report itself is very well done. As to the French translation, I have not gone into that and I am not competent to go into that, but I repeat that the English report is very well done.

Mr. LAURIER. I think the Minister of Finance has certainly been unlucky, because the experience of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and certainly my own experience, is that the report is as good as it can be. Of course there will be inaccuracies from time to time, and it is impossible that there should not be some at times, but I have felt great satisfaction with the reporting since I have sat in this House. As to the translation, I cannot believe my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) is not competent to go into that matter, and I wish he would go into that, because it requires the immediate attention of the Committee. I will not characterize that translation. I have not looked at it lately, but certainly the translation in the earlier part of the session was not fit to be published.

Mr. EDGAR. I think there is one weak spot in the *Hansard* report this session. I do not know where it is, but, on the few occasions when I have had to look over a speech, I have suddenly come to a portion which, as far as I could recollect, did not represent what I said at all, whereas other portions of the report were surprisingly accurate. If the *Hansard* Committee would give this matter their attention, I think they would do good service.

Mr. FOSTER. That is exactly what I found. Take the speech I delivered last. I spoke, I think, distinctly, and I was quite close to the reporter. When I revised that speech, I found the first two columns ran just as well as I spoke, and then I found one or two columns which were inaccurate, and were in fact the opposite of what I said, where the speech was garbled and wrong. At the same time, in newspaper reports made in the gallery above, I found this well reported and just what I said. I do not find the majority of the reports in that condition, but every now and then I find a very bad spot, and if the *Hansard* Committee could find out where that bad spot is and take it out, I believe we would have a very good *Hansard*.

Motion agreed to, on a division.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved:

That when this House adjourns to-day, it stands adjourned till Tuesday next, at three o'clock in the afternoon.

Mr. ROOME. Do I understand that we are going to meet on Wednesday and also sit on Saturday? If not, I think it would be better to adjourn until Thursday. Many members who live at a considerable distance would like to go home, and if this House does not sit on Wednesday and on Saturday, I think it would be well to adjourn until Thursday.

Mr. COCKBURN. There is a very strong feeling, particularly in Western Ontario, as to transacting any business on our great national holiday. That is to many hon. gentlemen on the other side as sacred a day as Monday next may be, and I do not think that, throughout the length and breadth of the United States, we would find a single person willing to transact business on the 4th July or who would not consider that as a sacred holiday.

Mr. EDGAR. We do not follow the example of the United States.

Mr. COCKBURN. I was making an appeal to my friends opposite, because I supposed that any objection that might come would be from the other side. I thought, if we had a holiday on the Monday and a holiday on the Wednesday—and I do not understand having a holiday on the Monday and not on the Wednesday—that the Tuesday intervening would be a *dies non*, and therefore that the proposal should be that we should meet together again on the Thursday, and take the Thursday, Friday and Saturday of next week, and the whole of the next Saturday also, and that by this means facilities would be given to those gentlemen who wished to go home and transact business, while work would not be retarded. No doubt those gentlemen who are engaged in the investigation which is going on might meet on Tuesday if they so desired.

Mr. FOSTER. There is one suggestion I would like to make to the House before we discuss that point. It is very necessary for smooth working that we should have the Supplementary Estimates for the current year passed and assented to just as soon as possible. I think there is nothing very important in them that will cause very much discussion. My proposition would be to meet on Tuesday. There are a certain number of members who will remain here, and we will have a quorum. We could agree te take up no other business than the Supplementary Estimates for the present year, and I think we could dispose of them satisfactorily and thereby facilitate the business by one day.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) says we ought to have Wednesday as a holiday, and that if we take Wednesday as a holiday, it is not worth while to meet on Tuesday; so he gives to the House a reason for losing two days next week quite unnecessarily. We have met on the first day of July before.

Mr. COCKBURN. I am sorry to hear it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am inclined to think the hon. gentleman was an assenting party to it.

Mr. COCKBURN. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There was a reason for it; the hon. gentleman was not here, I am told. There is great anxiety on the part of hon. gentlemen who are living far away and who cannot avail themselves of these holidays, not unnecessarily to prolong the session. It seems to me that it is most

desirable to have just as few holidays from now to the close of the session, as possible.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not agree with the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) that it is the general opinion of members from Western Ontario that we should adjourn until next Thursday. We have had a great many holidays during this session. We have been prolonging the session from time to time, and hon. members from both the extremities of the Dominion are kept here a much longer time than they otherwise would be, were it not for these holidays. Now, next Tuesday is a Government day, and there cannot be much work that will arouse much discussion. The following Wednesday is a private members' day, and if there are those who are not willing to work on that day, certainly they are not compelled to be here, but whatever work is done will materially shorten the session; it will keep the members here, and they will be prepared to go on with the work. On Thursday we can resume our legitimate work, and it is important that we should do so, because it is a season of the year when many members can ill afford to be away from home.

Mr. EDGAR. The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) wants to know the opinion of the majority from West Ontario. I think I represent the majority from West Ontario by a large majority, and I cordially agree with him that the majority of West Ontario wants to sit here on Wednesday, and get through the business of the House.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). This discussion, and the discussion we have had previously, have suggested to my mind an idea which I wish to express. The delays, and interruptions, and the lengthening of the session, which these holidays and holy days have produced during this session have convinced me that this House, in its wisdom, should take possession of the whole time and continue its business consecutively.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Abolish all holy days.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I understood the House agreed on the previous occasion that we should meet on Wednesday, and it really seems to me that if we were to alter that understanding it would be a breach of faith. I quite agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn), and I would like to see Wednesday observed as a holiday, and would do anything in my power to have that custom made universal. But I do feel that our circumstances at present are exceptional, and that we will be justified in sitting on that day.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I agree with the hon. gentleman in thinking that this matter had been disposed of the other day, when the Ministry assented to what seemed to be the almost universal opinion of the House. I do not rise to take any further part in that debate, deeming it settled, but to refer to the intimation given by the Minister of Finance or rather an invitation to some hon. gentlemen that they might absent themselves on Tuesday and Wednesday, as the business would not prove to be very important. Now, I desire to call his attention to the fact that a very important Committee is in session, and that if many hon. gentlemen remain away, there will be no quorum of that Committee obtainable, and if that Committee does not sit on Tuesday and Wednesday the result will be to prolong the session by two days further. We cannot hope to get through—anybody on that Committee will see that we cannot hope to get through that investigation without constant and continuous meetings; and I should be sorry indeed if any hon. gentlemen should take advantage of the indirect invitation which the hon. gentleman gave, to absent themselves on that occasion. I wish to recall the attention of the members of that Committee to the important business before it, which requires their attendance on those days. I have no doubt myself that a quorum will be present, unless hon. gentlemen are misled into the impression that really nothing is going to be done in the House. Witnesses have been called to attend the meetings of the Committee, and the desire of that Committee, irrespective of the provinces from which its members come, is to get through the work. These delays are becoming a very serious matter, and we should not allow any more to take place that are not imperatively necessary.

Mr. MASSON. I will not presume to speak for the majority from any section of the country, but I will speak my own feelings in this matter. I would not like to see this House sit on the national holiday. Whatever other people may think, I am sure that a very large majority of the loyal Canadians in Western Ontario believe that the national holiday should be well kept. In Western Ontario we do not keep many holidays, and the few that are kept commemorate some national event. The Queen's Birthday and the Dominion Day are the two most regularly observed by the citizens of Western Ontario, and to those people it will seem strange that, whereas we should have a recess on this holy day and the other holy day, we cannot afford time to respect our national Dominion Day. I think the suggestion of the Minister of Finance, that the House should meet on Tuesday and do such work as can be done without the necessity of a full House, ought to be adopted, and then we could adjourn over the Wednesday and lose as little time as possible.

Mr. DAVIN. I cordially sympathize with my hon. friend's view in regard to the national holiday, but I cannot think that it is of sufficient weight to keep the members here who come from a long distance. When we consider the convenience of those members coming from the West and coming from the Lower Provinces, I think it is a serious thing to keep them here one or two days longer than is necessary. While sympathizing with the desire to observe the national holiday, I do not think that we can be better employed in celebrating that day than in sitting here and helping to govern the country. I am not sure myself that, so far as this House is concerned, we have not too many holidays. But as regards our national holiday, I must say that I think we cannot observe it better than by sitting here and pushing forward the business of the country.

Mr. PRIOR. I wish to protest most strenuously, on behalf of the British Columbia contingent, against having such a long holiday as is suggested. It is most unfair that we who come such long distances should be kept here longer than is necessary. We have to leave our homes a week before the Ontario members, and a week after the session elapses before we reach our homes again, and during the adjournments there is not the slightest

chance of getting home, and so they represent so much time lost to us. I hope this House will not adjourn for the time now suggested.

Mr. HYMAN. After the protest made on behalf of British Columbia, I think it would be unfair for Ontario members, who might visit their homes during the holiday, to insist on the adjournment proposed. We know that more than once during the session there was no opportunity for members to visit their homes, and the length of the session will be considerably increased by the proposed adjournment. Under the circumstances it would only be fair and just for the members from Ontario to assent to the brief adjournment, and to return the kindness which members have shown them on more than one occasion.

Mr. WATSON. As representing the Liberals of Manitoba, the North-West Territories and British Columbia, I object to any long adjournment. It must be remembered that some of the adjournments that have taken place during the session need not have occurred. I agree with the hon. member for Assiniboia that we have too many holidays. If a church feast day takes place in Quebec we have to submit to a holiday on that day. I think the House should meet on Tuesday and Wednesday. In 1885 the House met on the national day, 1st July, and on 4th July it voted a large subsidy for a railway running through the State of Maine.

Mr. TROW. I understood that this matter was definitely settled the other day. I think it is taking up the time of the House uselessly to further prolong the discussion. We have had a holiday to-day, so far as business is concerned, and I am surprised that hon. members should keep harping on a matter that is already settled, namely, that we should meet on Tuesday. I feel astonished at the expression of the Minister of Finance, in which he almost advised members to leave. What are members sent here to do but to attend to public business, and it is absurd that a quorum of twenty members only should attend and pass Estimates. The suggestion is so preposterous, in my estimation, that I am surprised it should be made.

Motion agreed to.

CARLETON BRANCH RAILWAY.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, on Tuesday next, to consider the following resolution :—

That it is expedient to authorize the Government to sell to the city of St. John, for the sufm forty of thousand dollars, the Carleton Branch Railway.

Motion agreed to.

PAPERS *RE* PROJECTED TUNNEL.

Mr. PERRY. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call, attention of the Minister of Marine that the House ordered a return of certain papers regarding connection between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. The question of the tunnel will be before the House in a few days, and I wish to be in possession of these papers. I believe the member for Centre Toronto had possession of the papers some days ago. It is unfair that the papers should not be here. If there is not a sufficient staff to prepare them the number of clerks should be increased.

Mr. COCKBURN. I will state in reply to the hon. gentleman——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

WINNIPEG AND HUDSON BAY RAILROAD COMPANY.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved second reading of resolution respecting the Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway Company.

Resolution concurred in.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 119) respecting a certain agreement therein mentioned with the Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway Company.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ADMIRALTY JURISDICTION.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 13) to provide for the exercise of Admiralty jurisdiction within Canada in accordance with the Colonial Courts of Admiralty Act, 1890.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Bill before the Committee is a most important one, and I desire to make some observations upon it, which should, perhaps, have been addressed to the House more regularly on the motion for the second reading, but the Bill passed hurriedly, and with the indulgence of the Committee I desire to make these observations now, and touch on the principle of the Bill. The Bill is, as I have said, of importance, and is necessitated by the passage of the Imperial Admiralty Act a year ago, and it is necessary that, instead of the Imperial Act, some legislation should be enacted by this House substituting for the old Courts of Admiralty some new court. That power is given to us very fully by the English Act, and the question which the Minister of Justice and the Government and this House have to decide is, what is the best provision we can make for the new courts which we are authorized to constitute under the Imperial Act. I submit respectfully to the Minister of Justice this proposition, that as far as the experience of a hundred years is concerned, during which the Vice-Admiralty Courts of the different provinces have been working, there is no reason to complain that they did not administer justice speedily and well. I have never heard any complaints, more particularly in late years, since the practice of these courts has been simplified. I have never heard any complaint that these courts did not administer justice well. How are these courts constituted? In the Province of Prince Edward Island, and in the Province of Nova Scotia the chief justice for the time being was, *ex officio*, the judge of the Admiralty Court. A different rule prevails in the Province of New Brunswick, and Judge Watters, I believe, was the Admiralty judge of that province, but whether it was a judge so specially appointed to discharge the duties, or whether it was a judge who for the time being held the high position of chief justice of the Supreme Court of the province and acted *ex officio* as Admiralty judge; in either case, I believe, the result was gratifying to those who had litigation in these courts. We are now called upon to constitute courts under the English Admiralty Act, and the first question

that arises seems to me to be: Why do we not continue the admiralty jurisdiction vested in the Supreme Courts in the several Maritime Provinces? I frankly admit that, from the examination of the Imperial Bill, and the reflection I have been able to make upon it, I find that this is the course which presents itself to my mind as the better one, and for several reasons. In the first place you have the courts established already in the different provinces, the courts which the people are accustomed to look to as the dispensers of admiralty justice, and, in the second place, provided you have constituted the Supreme Courts of the different provinces Admiralty Courts and made each of the judges of these courts judges in admiralty, there would be a simple and effective appeal lying directly from a single judge to the Supreme Court of the Province, an appeal which would lie at the door of the litigant. He need not go away to Ottawa or elsewhere, but after the Admiralty judge in the first instance had given his decision he would have the privilege of appealing from that judgment to the full court of the province and getting their judgment upon it. Of course he might go further if he chose, and come to the Supreme Court of Canada, and from that to the Privy Council. One defect of this Bill which strikes me is that the appeal which I have described is taken away, and an appeal much less effective, in my humble judgment, is given. A few years ago the practice in the Supreme Courts in the Maritime Provinces was so large and so heavy that the courts were not able to overtake it. I remember myself fifteen years ago that the dockets of all the courts in the Maritime Provinces were crowded with cases, and the remanets in some provinces were simply appalling. All that has been changed now. We have simplified the practice and procedure; we have to a large extent done away with trials by jury, and the consequence of modern improvements in practice has been not only to remove all the remanets which formerly stood there as rather an impeachment of the courts of the land, but I have no hesitation in saying to-day that not one of the Supreme Courts of the Maritime Provinces are at all overworked. On the contrary, I do not think I would be saying anything improper if I said they have hardly enough work to do. The fact of the matter is simply this: That if you vested the jurisdiction which the Imperial Act enables you to do in the Supreme Courts of the several provinces, so far as the Maritime Provinces are concerned, I do not think anybody could say that the courts would be overworked. They have plenty of time to do the work which is now before them and to do this work in addition. There is another reason why this is so. We have proceeded upon the same lines as the English Parliament has; we have, year after year, by the establishment of County Courts and inferior tribunals, endeavoured, as far as possible, to make justice cheap and to bring it as nearly home to the doors of the litigants as possible, and the result has been that, because of the establishment of County Courts and the cheapness of procedure in those courts, a vast amount of business which was formerly transacted and necessarily had to be transacted in the Supreme Courts, is now transacted by the simpler and cheaper tribunals, just as effectively and just as well, in the interest of the litigants, I believe, as it formerly was transacted in the Supreme Courts. This has been done with the result I have pointed out to the House: that while we have a very large staff of judges in the Supreme Courts of the different Maritime Provinces, they are not overworked. I cannot speak as to Ontario, because I do not know about their practice, but so far as the Superior Courts are concerned, that province is not as much interested in admiralty matters as the Maritime Provinces are. Neither can I speak of the Province of Quebec; and I do not know whether their judges are overworked or not. What does the hon. Minister now suggest for the admiralty system which is in force? He says: I propose to constitute the Exchequer Court a Court of Admiralty; and he proposes to take power to divide the provinces into local admiralty districts and to appoint for each of these districts a local judge in admiralty, with the necessary staff, registrars, marshal, and other officers, to enable the law to be carried out. Well, I do not know whether the hon. gentleman means—he evidently does not mean, I should say, from the Act—to mark out these districts at once or to appoint these new judges at once. I say he takes power to do it, and when they are appointed what will be the result? You have a local judge presumably competent and able to decide upon these questions and growing more and more competent every day because of the practice he will have, and you have an appeal from him, not to the Supreme Court of the province in which an appeal could be argued cheaply and, in my humble judgment, better, but you have an appeal to the single judge of the Exchequer Court at Ottawa. I respectfully submit that a court presided over by a single judge—if I have correctly read the Act, and I think I have—is not as competent and as effective an appeal tribunal as would be the Supreme Courts of the several provinces. I would respectfully submit that point to the consideration of the hon. gentleman who has charge of the Bill, and to the consideration of the House. Now, what would be the effect when this is done? You would have an appeal to the Exchequer Court judge, which, in my opinion, if it differs from the decision of the judge below never would be acquiesced in, followed by another appeal to the Supreme Court, and then each litigant has a right to go to the Privy Council. Now, supposing the matter in litigation is for an amount less than $500, I assume that under the Exchequer Court Act the litigant has no appeal at all. The hon. Minister will, perhaps, correct me if I am wrong, but as I read the Exchequer Court Act in conjunction with this Act no appeal will lie to the Exchequer Court judge for any sum less than $500. That may be a good provision or it may be a bad provision, but my objection to it is that the Exchequer Court as an Appeal Court in admiralty is not as good a court as the Supreme Courts of the several Maritime Provinces would be. In the meantime, before the hon. gentleman marks out these local sub-divisions, and before he appoints the local officers of the court in these districts, he makes a provision for continuing the gentlemen who now discharge the duties of these Admiralty Courts, in their positions as local judges in admiralty. Very well, take the chief justice of the Province of Nova Scotia, or the chief justice of the Province of Prince Edward Island, or Judge Watters with all the experience he has gained from many years practice as Admiralty Judge in New Brunswick; their judgment would be subject to an appeal, to a single

judge constituting the Exchequer Court in Ottawa. I do not think that is right. I do not think the chief justices of the provinces would care to have—I do not think it is right, they should be subject to have their judgments reversed by a single judge at Ottawa, and with all respect to the Exchequer Court judge, whom I think is a very good judge for the purpose he was appointed—I do not desire to make the slightest reflection upon him, for I have none to make—I do not think that either his experience or his position justifies us in assuming that he should constitute an effective or satisfactory Admiralty Appellate Court from the judgments of the chief justices of the Maritime Provinces. Having presented these objections to the scheme on principle, I leave the matter in the hands of the House. I may have to offer some criticism on the various sections, but these are all the observations I have to make at this stage.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am hardly disposed to say that there is not a good deal of force in the criticisms which the hon. gentleman has presented; but I have this answer to make, and I think it will be found to be a sufficient answer when we come to consider the details of the measure, that in dealing with the subject of admiralty jurisdiction, we are dealing with a somewhat anomalous state of affairs as regards the past, and a somewhat temporary state of affairs as regards the present, and we have likewise to consider, to a great extent, new requirements of the future; and any measure proposing to deal with the subject in all its phases, will naturally be open to a good deal of criticism. I have considered, however, all the points raised by the hon. gentleman, and I think the mode in which they are dealt with by the Bill is, after all, the most satisfactory that can be devised. What has been the organization of these tribunals in the past? They have been created under Imperial authority, and that Imperial authority prescribes that in each province the judge of the Vice-Admiralty Court shall be the chief justice of the province until another appointment be made. So that, in the Provinces of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, no other appointment having been made, the chief justices became the judges of Vice-Admiralty, and so were made. In New Brunswick another appointment was made under the authority of this Parliament, a special salary was provided, and the County Court judge of the County of St. John was made Vice-Admiralty judge. The appeals from these judges were not to the Supreme Court of the province, but directly to the Privy Council. We have, therefore, as regards the past, that very anomalous condition of affairs. It only happens by virtue of the non-interference of the Government that the chief justices in those two provinces have been judges of vice-admiralty jurisdiction. It does not follow that that will always be the case. I do not think it will be the case permanently, and we are, therefore, not to criticize the Bill on the supposition that the chief justices are to be judges of the Vice-Admiralty Courts. As regards the present phase of the jurisdiction, we find ourselves confronted with the Imperial statute passed eighteen months ago, which provides that this jurisdiction is no longer to be controlled by Imperial legislation, and that these courts are to be abolished, subject only to the power of this Parliament to vest the jurisdiction in some other authority. If this Parliament does not exercise that power the jurisdiction merges in the provincial courts, and this Parliament has to decide whether it is better that that should occur, or that we should retain that jurisdiction under federal authority. Now, what are the advantages of the two methods respectively? As the hon. member for Queen's has argued, there is some advantage in letting the jurisdiction merge into the provincial courts. The advantage is simply this, that you have one set of tribunals for dealing with all classes of litigation, whether arising on the sea or on land, which I admit has some convenience. But there are some disadvantages in that proposal. One is, that if we adopted that system the jurisdiction would cease to be exercised by men who had derived considerable skill from their past experience in those courts; and, on the contrary, any judge, whether he had ever held a brief in an admiralty case or not, would be constituted an admiralty judge. Another disadvantage would be that we should be obliged, under the terms of the Imperial Act, to provide a pension for every judge, every registrar and every marshal in Canada. That pension, according to the terms of the Imperial Act, is to be provided by this Parliament, and on such a basis as would be just, having regard to the previous emoluments of the office. That would necessitate providing pensions for some sixteen or twenty officers in this country, every one of whom is as well qualified to-day, so far as I know, to perform his duties, as he has been during the last ten years. On that phase of the question, the provisions of the Bill are temporary. It is proposed to continue in office these gentlemen, and to continue the marking out of admiralty districts, which now exists. The Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Quebec and Ontario will, under the provisions of this Bill, remain, subject only to future action, each an admiralty district; and it is proposed, with the view of disposing of the question of pensions, to continue all the present judges and officers. As regards the future, it is proposed to take power to mark out admiralty divisions from time to time. It may be desirable in the Province of Ontario to have more than one judge of maritime jurisdiction; and in some of the Maritime Provinces it may be desirable, for the convenience of localities, that the districts should be subdivided; but we can do that with freedom and with a proper regard to economy when the present officers, who have a claim upon us for pensions, have ceased to hold office, and when we are quite free to appoint new officers, and to arrange the salaries according to what the extent of their divisions and the amount of their duties would entitle them to claim. As regards the question, whether, in the interest of the future, which we have to consider, we should allow this jurisdiction to merge into the provincial courts, or should retain it under our control, it seemed to me that the weight of argument, besides the reasons which I have already given and others which I shall mention in a moment, are in favour of keeping the jurisdiction within our control. When the Imperial Parliament has vested in us the power to create an Admiralty Court, it seems more consistent with the dignity and authority of this Parliament that the court should be one of our own creation, and that we should not simply acquiesce in that jurisdiction passing from our hands and being exercised

by courts of provincial constitution. But we have to keep the fact in view that, in all probability, as the business of the country develops, it will be found necessary that a considerable portion of the jurisdiction now exercised by the Exchequer Court, shall, from time to time, be discharged by local judges. It will in all probability, as the business of that court increases, as no doubt it will, be found more economical and satisfactory that, instead of having the judge absent himself from the Capital and go on circuit throughout the Dominion, the different provinces should have local judges exercising in those provinces, to some extent, exchequer jurisdiction. If we take advantage of this opportunity presented by the Imperial legislation to keep the matter within our control, we shall have the judicial system established. We shall have the Supreme Court, of course, as now constituted by this Parliament, we shall have the Exchequer Court, as now established by this Parliament, and we shall have branches of that court in the various provinces, exercising, not only admiralty jurisdiction, but likewise local jurisdiction as regards cases arising in the Exchequer Court. It will otherwise be impossible to avail ourselves of a system of that kind, unless we create a new set of local judges for the Court of Exchequer throughout the Dominion. I have thought, after giving the matter most serious consideration, and my colleagues agree with me, that it will be desirable to keep in our hands the jurisdiction thus vested in us by the Imperial statute. I think, for several reasons, it will be desirable there should be the right of review by the Exchequer judge here, as we are to some extent curtailing the right of final appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council which now exists. We are entrusting it to a new set of judges for the time being, judges, it is true, of very high rank in some of the provinces, but not necessarily judges of very high rank for the future, and not at all likely to be judges of as high rank or qualification as the judge of the Exchequer Court; and in giving an appeal to him, we are giving an intermediate opportunity of review—before one judge, it is true—before the expense is incurred of going to the Supreme Court of Canada.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Of course in England there is an appeal from the Court of Admiralty to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The appellate jurisdiction is not in the House of Lords. The Vice-Admiralty Courts in most of the colonies are but parts of the Admiralty Court, and for this reason there was a like appeal from them to the Privy Council. But this did not put the trial of admiralty causes under the British North America Act in a different position from ordinary causes which are tried in the courts constituted by the Provincial Legislatures. When we were organized into a Confederation, we were authorized to legislate upon the subject of navigation and commerce, and the marine affairs of the Dominion were placed under the legislative jurisdiction of this Dominion. At the same time, there is a clause in the British North America Act providing for the constitution of courts dealing, not merely with questions arising under the laws of the various provinces, but with questions arising under the law of the Parliament of Canada, by the Local Legislatures of the various provinces. There is nothing whatever to forbid any province giving jurisdiction to any court, which it might feel proper to establish relating to admiralty matters. I suppose the Minister of Justice would not for a moment question that proposition. The Provincial Legislatures in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, might, at any time since 1867, when making provision for the constitution of their courts, have given to such courts, as they saw proper, admiralty jurisdiction; and nothing could have prevented, it seems to me, apart from the prerogative of disallowing an Act constituting a court, and the exercise of such jurisdiction by the court so established. Is there any reason, when the English Government has, by formal act of its Legislature, withdrawn itself from the exercise of admiralty jurisdiction in this Dominion—that is, when it has ceased to treat the Courts of Vice-Admiralty as a part of the admiralty jurisdiction—that this power should not be exercised by the provinces, and that they should not give to some court in each province jurisdiction relating to the admiralty? If that were done, it is clear that a great deal of inconvenience would be avoided, for there can be scarcely any doubt that the judges who now exercise jurisdiction as judges of the Superior or Supreme Courts of the different provinces, would be equally well qualified to consider admiralty cases in their courts. I think it is clear, from the provisions of the British North America Act, that although we may constitute our own courts under the 101st section, we cannot take away from the provinces the power to constitute courts having this jurisdiction. If we were to-morrow to provide a court for the better administration of the laws of Canada and give to that court original jurisdiction, say, in criminal cases, we would not thereby take away from any one of the Superior Courts in the provinces, which has this jurisdiction, its jurisdiction over criminal matters. The exercise of any such power by us would not lessen the power possessed by the Local Legislatures. There is no provision that this power shall be exercised by the Local Legislatures until it is exercised by the Parliament of Canada. The jurisdiction given is absosolute and unlimited as to the time. The hon. Minister of Justice, in discussing another matter, admitted our right to amend or repeal any Imperial Act that was in force in this Dominion prior to the adoption of the British North America Act of 1867. I think that proposition is one that may be maintained. We have had jurisdiction given us over the subject, because it is a settled principle of constitutional law in the colonies that all Acts in force prior to the constitution of a government in the colonies are to be treated as part of the common law, and such Imperial Acts may be altered or amended just as the common law itself may be. Well, that rule applies here to the jurisdiction given this Parliament over the subject of navigation and shipping, and the Act of 1867 gives us this jurisdiction over the constitution of courts for the purpose of trying these matters. It seems to me there are two ways in which we might have proceeded. We might have undertaken to declare, as we did in the constitution of the election court for the trial of controverted elections, that certain existing courts shall have admiralty jurisdiction, and this would not be merging jurisdiction into the existing court, but would be designating that court as an original

court for the purpose of trying cases of this sort. But I very much doubt the propriety of that, and it certainly would be more irregular than it would be to constitute a court in that way for the trial of election causes, because election causes belonging to the Dominion were not such as the Provincial Legislature could constitute a court to try without our authority and consent, and perhaps not even with it; but, as far as the admiralty juridiction is concerned, it being a matter which was referred to a certain class of court, and it being a subject matter over which this Parliament had jurisdiction given to it by the British North America Act of 1867, I think it is clear that, from the passage of that Act up to the present time, any Provincial Legislature may declare that a certain court organized and established by that Legislature shall have jurisdiction in admiralty causes. So, when the Minister of Justice says we ought to retain for the present control of this matter, he is stating a position which cannot be upheld, because, though we may create a court for trying admiralty causes, we might thus prevent the Local Legislature from giving like jurisdiction to a court which it might think proper to establish. It is clear that such jurisdiction might be given to a superior court by the Local Legislature as such jurisdiction may be given over election causes. As to the matter of convenience, is there any special reason for keeping the trial of admiralty causes separate from the trial of any other cause in the proviuces? I do not think there is. Why should not a provincial court try a question of property in a vessel or any dispute in relation to seamen's wages or bottomry bonds, or anything of that kind, just as well as any ordinary matter of contract? Is there any possible reason for it? The Minister of Justice has referred to the question of compensation. Well, if the Minister of Justice were to give the full court an appeal in the case of the trial of an admiralty cause by a chief justice, where he now has the right to try it, no inconvenience could arise and no claim could arise, so long as the chief justice undertook to discharge the duties of judge of original jurisdiction. But it would be easy to provide that this jurisdiction should pass to any judge of the court, upon the demise of the chief justice, and that there should be an appeal to the full court, precisely as in any other case. It seems to me that we are multiplying courts and adding to the expense of the administration of justice unnecessarily, and we are creating difficulties in the way of suitors, we are imposing larger burdens upon them than if we were to merge this jurisdiction into the ordinary jurisdiction possessed by a provincial court. I think there are serious objections to this mode of dealing with the matter, and I hope the Minister of Justice will allow the Bill to stand over for another session and give an opportunity for fuller consideration of the subject than it will be possible to give it during this hurried session.

Mr. EDGAR. Apart from the very interesting point raised by the hon. gentleman who has preceded me (Mr. Mills), as to the rights of the provinces to create Admiralty Courts themselves, I am not at all disposed to quarrel with the Imperial Government for having given power to the British possessions, of which we form a part, to legislate for our own Vice-Admiralty Courts. I think it is a little further concession to our local self-government than we had before. I will not refer to the bearing of this Act on the Vice-Admiralty Courts in the Lower Provinces and in Quebec, but I shall only say a few words in reference to its bearing on the Maritime Courts in the Province of Ontario. For some seventeen years, I think, we have had established in Ontario a Maritime Court under the jurisdiction of the Dominion Government. There was a maritime judge at Toronto, and there were surrogate judges of that court appointed among the County Court judges in different parts of the province. I see by this Bill it is proposed to abolish the Maritime Court in Ontario and to make provision that the maritime judge as well as the surrogate judges shall have all the powers of local judges of the Admiralty Court. I do not think the Minister of Justice can have quite intended one of the effects which will follow from this Act, as I read it. By the Imperial Act, all the powers and jurisdiction of the admiralty division of the High Court of Justice are conferred upon the judges who may be appointed by our Act. Then, by our Act, section 20, the surrogate judges—that is to say, the inferior judges in our Maritime Court, and not the head judge—are made judges of the new court. Then section 9 of this Act gives all the powers of the Exchequer Court to these local surrogate judges, and sections 3 and 4 of the Act give the Exchequer Court the full powers that the English Act authorizes, that is to say, the powers of the admiralty division of the High Court of Justice. Therefore, our local surrogate judges of the Maritime Court under this Act, as I apprehend, would have the full powers and the unlimited jurisdiction of the judges of the admiralty division of the High Court of Justice in England. I do not think it should be. They have in England a limited jurisdiction for the County Court judges as to the amount at issue, and they are also restricted in other respects, and I think that should be the limit of jurisdiction given to our surrogate judges, and that our own surrogate judges should be limited in their jurisdiction to such of the powers of the judges of the Admiralty Court as are conferred by the commission appointing them. Thus they would be restricted by all the directions contained in the commission. I think that the Bill as to the Maritime Court of Ontario will bear more consideration on that as well as on other points, to which I will draw the Minister's attention as the Bill goes on.

Mr. GILLIES. I wish to make a few remarks on the subject before the House. I will say that coming from the maritime section of this Dominion, we are deeply interested in this Bill, and we were glad to learn that the Imperial Parliament last year passed the Act known as the Colonial Courts of Admiralty Act. I am much pleased to see the action of the Minister of Justice in providing machinery to bring this Act of the Imperial Parliament into operation in Canada. But on looking over the Bill itself, I would respectfully suggest that some sections of it might be made a little more extensive, so that the relief it affords might be obtained by all parties seeking a remedy. I find that the Bill, as specified in the 14th section of the Act, makes the head office of Nova Scotia at Halifax. I would like to bring to the notice of the Minister of Justice and to the notice of the House the fact that in the Province of Nova Scotia we

have seven county Court Judges, all of whom are very fairly familiar with the practice in the Admiralty Court, and would be excellent judges to preside over the local Admiralty Courts. I think it would be a very excellent provision to insert in this Act that the County Court judges, in their respective districts, should have jurisdiction by which immediate relief could be given to parties seeking it in those courts. For instance, if we take the wide coast of Cape Breton and suppose a collision took place on any part of that coast, the only point at which relief can be obtained is Halifax, where the party has to go and fyle an affidavit and get a warrant to arrest that ship, and in the meantime she is off beyond the jurisdiction of the court. But if the County Court judge of that district had jurisdiction, the party desiring relief could go to him, lay his complaint, make his affidavit, get a warrant, and have the ship arrested right away. I think, therefore, that the County Court judges should have jurisdiction on matters of this kind, and that they should not be confined entirely to the chief justice, whose residence is at Halifax. This idea is somewhat borne out by the 5th section of the Act, because it gives power to the Governor in Council, from time to time, to constitute any part of Canada a district; and, to my mind, it appears only reasonable that these districts should be created right away, and be made conterminus with the jurisdiction of the County Court judges in the several provinces. Now, a word as to the method prescribed for appeal. I entirely concur with the views of the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) in that respect, and, in saying this, I do not wish to be considered as reflecting in the most remote manner upon the learned and excellent judge of the Exchequer Court. My opinion of him is too well known, and no one can suppose me of holding any but the highest opinion of his learning and his character. But in the Maritime Provinces we have judges who are pre-eminently qualified to sit as Admiralty Court judges, and it is, therefore, no disrespect to him whatever when I say that I do not think his training is essentially of that character which is required for this position. I, therefore, think I am right when I say that the County Court judges will, to say the very least, be fully as qualified to sit and adjudicate upon the claims that may be made before them in the Admiralty Court, as any Exchequer Court judge sitting at Ottawa. I do hope, therefore, that the Minister of Justice will see that such provisions are introduced as will make this court more immediately available to persons seeking relief, than it is at present.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I quite agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Gillies), regarding the circumstances in Nova Scotia with respect to this question. What obtains in the eastern portion of Nova Scotia, as stated by my hon. friend, obtains largely in the western portion of that province. In Nova Scotia we have a great deal of admiralty business to do, and it is a great inconvenience to have to go to Halifax when any of these cases occur. On one occasion I had the experience that the hon. gentleman refers to, in a case where it was only by means of securing the services of a tug that we stopped a vessel from getting beyond the jurisdiction of the court, whereas if the regular means of communication had been taken, the vessel would have escaped proceedings entirely. Now, if it could be so arranged that our County Court judges would have the same jurisdiction in the western portion of Nova Scotia in admiralty matters, I think it would satisfy the members from that part of the province and the public generally, besides being a great convenience to the parties interested

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose, before the Bill is finished, to take power for the Governor in Council, as I indicated in my remarks a few moments ago, to change, from time to time, the limits of any Admiralty Court district, so as to provide for the cases referred to by my two hon. friends from Richmond (Mr. Gillies) and from Annapolis (Mr. Mills). As respects the present admiralty districts, the provision of the Bill is temporary, in view of the necessity for making provisions for existing officers.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would ask the hon. gentleman how this Act affects the compensation of the admiralty judge, if you enlarge his district or diminish it?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I say this is temporary, in view of the fact that we cannot change the limits of his jurisdiction without changing the compensation; therefore, I would not propose to alter the limits of the jurisdiction until a vacancy occurs in his office, and after that, I think a new distribution of the admiralty districts would be very desirable. Now, I think the hon. member from Ontario misapprehended, in that respect also, the provisions of section 20. He seemed to be apprehensive concerning the extent of the provisions in section 20, on the ground that they conferred very high jurisdiction upon the officers who are now performing those functions. It is to be remembered that at the present moment all these officers have the full extent of the jurisdiction possessed by Vice-Admiralty judges in Canada, and they are judges of as high rank as the principal judge of the Maritime Court of Ontario. They are all County Court judges; and looking at the extent of the business which is done throughout that country, and the amounts involved, I do not think it is unsafe to give judges that jurisdiction. I would say, also, that that section of the Bill keeps in view the fact that these gentlemen are in office, and that we cannot enlarge their jurisdiction without compensating them, and we propose under the provisions of this Bill that their jurisdiction in such Admiralty Courts shall from time to time be fixed by the Governor in Council.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Local Legislatures may give this jurisdiction to any court.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That has been the hon. gentleman's argument, I am aware; but I am hardly prepared to agree with it at the present moment. No doubt we have power, both by the provisions of the British North America Act and of the Admiralty Act of 1890.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If I understand the criticisms of some hon. gentlemen opposite, notably the hon. members for Cape Breton and Annapolis, they amount to this: that to ensure speedy and cheap decisions of the Admiralty Court, it is essential to vest the jurisdiction in County Court judges; but, under the operation of the Imperial

Acts this is impossible. We can only vest the admiralty jurisdiction in a court having unlimited civil jurisdiction. The County Courts are not such courts, and, therefore, it is not possible to give admiralty jurisdiction to them. So we are thrown back on two propositions: The one which I submitted, that we should leave it where it should be left, and was left by the Imperial Parliament if we did not legislate, namely, in the Supreme Court of the several provinces; and the other is, to constitute the Court of Exchequer and Admiralty Court. The Exchequer Court is a court of unlimited civil jurisdiction within the interpretation clause mentioned in the Imperial Act. By that clause, unlimited civil jurisdiction means jurisdiction unlimited as to the amount to be recovered. The Exchequer Court comes within that definition. I repeat there are only two possible schemes for this House to adopt: one is to vest the jurisdiction in the Supreme Courts of each province, and the other is to create the Exchequer Court the Court of Admiralty. There are grave and serious objections to the latter course, and the Minister of Justice has endeavoured to meet these objections, but the hon. gentleman has not convinced me, particularly with respect to the right of appeal, and in that the hon. member for Cape Breton concurs with me. The more you think of it, the more objectionable that feature will appear. Putting on one side the objection as to whether it is proper that the judgment of the chief justice should be subject to appeal to the exchequer judge—suppose a case involving $2,000 or $3,000 is tried in Halifax, is decided by the chief justice, and an appeal is taken to the exchequer judge here, counsel will have to come all the way from Nova Scotia to argue the case, the Exchequer Court will take time to consider it, and reverse or confirm the decision. An appeal lies to the Supreme Court, and the same course will be pursued, and the counsel will have to come here. The Court of Review is not a court that recommends itself in practice to the better judgment of litigants or counsel. There should be an alternative appeal, and there should be a right of appeal, either to the Exchequer Court judge or direct to the Supreme Court. That, of course, might get us out of the difficulty. I look with some degree of alarm at the possibility of establishing a large number of local Admiralty Courts within the Dominion. Such a scheme would involve a very large outlay. It must be remembered that the judge selected to discharge the important functions of an admiralty judge must be a superior class of man. He will have to deal with cases involving amounts varying from $1,000 to $50,000, and in case of a collision between large steam vessels, the sum might be $100,000, and therefore, the abstruse nature of the subject, the important character of the cases and the immense value at stake, call for the appointment of a very high officer. What I contend is that we now have that class of officers on the bench in every province, and if instead of legislating so as to create a lot of separate and independent courts in this Dominion, we begin in the direction in which the Imperial Parliament has been legislating, that of making one universal Supreme Court with several branches, we shall be proceeding in the right direction. With all deference to the arguments advanced by the hon. gentlemen opposite, I am still of the opinion that the judges of the Supreme Courts in admiralty cases, with jurisdiction vested in all the judges and an appeal to the Supreme Court of the province, would be a more effective and cheaper mode than that proposed. In view of the importance of the subject, I suggest to the Minister of Justice whether he would be disposed not to press this subject through the House this session, but leave it as a matter for more mature consideration on the part of the legal fraternity throughout the Dominion.

Mr. McDONALD (Victoria). I do not see where the objection in regard to the appointment of County Court judges applies. I think this Parliament could name any person, whether a judge or not.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). The Imperial Act prohibits you from doing so.

Mr. McDONALD (Victoria). No; whoever is appointed will be a judge of the Exchequer Court. If the judge of the County Court were appointed, he would become a local judge of the Admiralty Court. I can quite understand the reason the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) desires to have only one court in each province. He resides at Charlottetown, and no doubt would like to have all the admiralty business transacted there. It has been a great objection in regard to the Admiralty Court in Nova Scotia, that all the court business was transacted at Halifax, and a great many of the outside lawyers obtained very little work there. It was so expensive to get even very small claims through that very many were abandoned. Two years ago we had a seaman's claim for $50, and it cost $100 in Halifax to get a decree to sell the vessel, the expenses being divided between the master of the court, the registrar, and a very small fee for the solicitors. The vessel was afterwards sold for $120. I hope some proposition will be made for the reduction of the fees, and I do not see why the clerks of the court should not have power to make out the necessary papers, especially in regard to claims for small amounts.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman is quite right in supposing that the provisions of the Bill can be applied to smaller divisions than the present admiralty divisions; but such provisions could not be applied without a Bill of this character. As regards the proposal to postpone consideration of this matter, I look upon this Bill as not only important but most urgent. The Imperial Act came into force on July 1st; it provides that certain steps shall be taken in regard to jurisdiction, and it would be very objectionable to allow the jurisdiction to be vested elsewhere and then take it away.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman's arguments no doubt will be quite sufficient to induce him to proceed with the Bill. I understand by the Imperial Act that if we do not establish an Admiralty Court for Canada, the admiralty jurisdiction will be vested in the courts having admiralty jurisdiction, which will be in the Supreme Courts of each province, so that in case we do not pass the Bill it would result that the Supreme Court of the different provinces would be Courts of Admiralty.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is what I meant, that the jurisdiction would pass to the provincial courts, and it would then be very inconvenient for

us to take it away. I may say, in connection with the question as to what is a court of unlimited civil jurisdiction, a difference of opinion has already arisen as to whether anything but the Exchequer Court would be a court within the meaning of that expression of the Imperial Act. It is claimed by one class of the profession that the Exchequer Court is the only court of unlimited civil jurisdiction in Canada, inasmuch as all the others are limited territorially. I merely state that objection for what it is worth.

Mr. EDGAR. The interpretation under the 15th section of the English Act says "unlimited as to the value of the subject-matter."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. But what I wish particularly to say about that is, that the jurisdiction, unless we pass an Act on the subject, even if it were vested in the provincial courts, would be vested in the Exchequer Court as well, because that, undoubtedly, is a court of unlimited civil jurisdiction.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not very well see how that follows; it might in other colonies, but I do not see how it can be in Canada where there has been a distribution of powers under the British North America Act: unless the Minister of Justice is disposed to argue that that Act has no applicability at all to the subject of admiralty jurisdiction, and that all our power to deal with the matter is derived from recent legislation in England. If the hon. gentleman does not hold that view, then he must admit we had the power before. The Imperial Government might have interfered, it might have undertaken to disallow our legislation, but, apart from that interference, we have, under the British North America Act, the power to legislate upon this subject. I apprehend that under section 101 this Parliament might have constituted a court under that provision, which says that in addition to a general Court of Appeal it may establish such other courts as may be deemed necessary for the better administration of the laws of Canada. But the establishment of such courts was not intended to take away, nor would it take away from the Provincial Government, the right to establish courts for the trial of all civil matters and for the trial of criminal matters as well. If we had jurisdiction over this subject before, it is, I think, clear that the Local Legislatures could establish a court having admiralty jurisdiction just as certainly as they could establish a court having jurisdiction over criminal matters. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council held that, so far as the trial of controverted elections is concerned, the Provincial Legislature could not establish a court to take control of that, simply because that was not one of the matters that was usually relegated to a court: that was part of the law of Parliament, and no court had jurisdiction over a matter which belonged to Parliament itself, except it was expressly given by the Parliament whose jurisdiction was affected. That is a principle which shows what the limitation is and how that limitation arises; but I do not see that any such limitation can arise in the case of the jurisdiction over admiralty matters conferred upon a provincial court, and I have not learned from anything that the Minister of Justice has said in defence of this Bill why this jurisdiction should be withheld from provincial courts and conferred upon courts specially created by this Parliament. There is just the one point to which the Minister of Justice referred, and that is the claim that might arise from the judges who now are entitled to salaries of the exercise of jurisdiction as judges in Vice-Admiralty. That, I think, is a matter that might be considered and dealt with without undertaking to create a court in the way that the hon. gentleman proposes, and multiplying the judicial organizations of the country by a Bill of this sort.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. As regards the power for Provincial Legislatures to create a Court of admiralty jurisdiction, I would suggest for the consideration of the hon. gentleman that we have no power, and clearly the provinces have no power to legislate beyond our territorial limits, and that a large part of admiralty jurisdiction has to be exercised in relation to matter arising outside of our territorial jurisdiction.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We try matters of contract in foreign countries.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is no doubt of the jurisdiction of our Legislatures to give a court authority over our own subjects, and over any persons who come within our jurisdiction, but I very much doubt, indeed, the authority of the Provincial Legislature to give to a provincial court, or to any other court, jurisdiction over a vessel on the high seas. At present the Admiralty Courts and the High Court of Justice of England, exercising its jurisdiction through the Probate and Admiralty division, has that jurisdiction by virtue of Imperial statutes; and by virtue of our Imperial statute, this jurisdiction will come to our Canadian court. It is true there would be several classes of cases over which the Provincial Legislatures could give jurisdiction to our provincial courts, but I very much doubt that they could do so in respect to many of the subjects of admiralty jurisdiction.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Let me call the attention of the Minister of Justice to sub-section 7, section 91 of the British North America Act. We have jurisdiction given to us there over "militia, military, naval service, and defence." Supposing we were to apply the rule to which the Minister of Justice has referred: We commission an officer and put him in charge of a Dominion ship, and he undertakes to sail from Halifax to Hudson Bay. If the view taken by the Minister of Justice were applied to that particular sub-section, we would have no control over him, or over the ship, or over anything that might happen outside the marine limit.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is by virtue of our legislation.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not think so. If the hon. gentleman looks at this clause he will see it refers expressly to militia, military, naval service and defence, and it is certainly clear that the Merchants' Shipping Act would not apply to it. I take it that in the interpretation of an Act like our Constitution, you must interpret it in such a way as to make it effective, and so interpreting the Act you will be obliged to admit that there is jurisdiction beyond the marine league. In some of the early cases, more than two centuries ago, with the colonies to the south of us that rule was recognized; and so I think where jurisdiction is given over navigation and shipping you are to give an interpretation broad enough to make the law

efficient. The interpretation which the Minister gives would not so make it, and would be a practical denial of the jurisdiction.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I agree that we must give it the broadest possible interpretation to make it thoroughly effective, but it is not a question of interpretation, it is a question of the authority of Parliament.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am referring to the power given to this Parliament to deal with the subject of navigation and shipping. This same Act provides that those courts shall be established by the Provincial Legislatures.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The reason I press upon the hon. gentleman the desirability of considering whether it would not be better to postpone the Bill is this: The step we are taking of constituting Courts of Admiralty, while open to grave doubts as to its propriety, is irrelevant. If we left the matter over for a year, the Supreme Courts of the various provinces having, in the meantime, all necessary jurisdiction under the Imperial Act, at the end of that time we would be in a position to consider whether they constituted efficient tribunals or not. However, I shall not press the point any further, as the hon. gentleman has apparently made up his mind to go on with the Bill, although I have a very strong opinion upon it.

On section 4,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Could it be open to argument that this section limits the jurisdiction of the court? The Imperial Act vests all the powers of the Admiralty Court of Great Britain in the court constituted by us under this statute, and it is possible that we may be limiting that jurisdiction by declaring that the jurisdiction "shall be exercised throughout Canada, and the waters thereof, whether tidal or non-tidal." The Imperial Act vests in the Admiralty Court jurisdiction "over the like places, persons, matters, and things, as the admiralty jurisdiction of the High Court in England, whether existing by virtue of any statute or otherwise."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Let that clause stand.

On section 5,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would suggest, seeing that there are no divisions existing at the present time, and none immediately contemplated, that this ought to be a legislative Act.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I hardly think it is of so much importance. For example, we want to deal almost immediately with the Province of Ontario. We have there one judge of maritime jurisdiction, which extends all over the province; but we have a number of surrogates, and I think we must almost immediately define the district of each of these. We propose to define it so as not to interfere with the present emoluments of the judge. It is only for that purpose that we propose to exercise these powers now. The others will remain as they are.

On section 6,

Mr. EDGAR. There is a very decided change made here in the tenure of office of the maritime judge of Ontario. Under this Act he becomes a local judge of admiralty; and while he is now and, I think, ought to be a judge holding office during good behaviour, and removable only on an address of the Senate and the House of Commons, this clause puts him in the position of an officer holding his office during pleasure. That was the tenure of office of the surrogate judges, I admit, but I do not think it ought to be the tenure of office of the maritime judge of Ontario. I leave my hon. friend from the Maritime Provinces to say how this affects the vice-admiralty judges in his province.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The tenure of office is such in the Lower Provinces, and in that respect we simply want to keep things as they are. I do not think the objection is a very practical one. The amount of business done in the Maritime Court of Ontario is not very large, and I think it would be very inconvenient to have a different tenure of office in that province.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Why should it not be during good behaviour, as in the case of the other judges?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Under the Imperial Act the chief justices in the Lower Provinces are judges of admiralty during pleasure, and I do not see why we should give up our right.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is hardly consistent with the view that has been held as to the independence of the judges.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think it hardly fair to say that the vice-admiralty judges of the Maritime Provinces hold office during pleasure. It is true, the chief justice of the Supreme Court is, *ex officio*, the judge of the Admiralty Court until the proper authority constitutes an admiralty judge. That can hardly be holding office during pleasure within the meaning of these words as they are ordinarily understood. I think all superior judges should be placed on the same level. I doubt the propriety of appointing a responsible judge, with the extensive and important functions of these judges, only during pleasure, to be subject to removal as the Government changes—the appointment to be in any sense or way a political appointment, and be absolutely removed from the possibility of bias arising from the fear that if his judgment be not satisfactory to the powers that be, or his place required for political purposes, he may be removed.

Mr. SKINNER. A large number of cases in the Admiralty Court are those in which the Government is directly or indirectly concerned, especially fishing cases. Therefore if the judge held office during the pleasure of the Government, his decision might possibly be more or less influenced by that fact, and his conduct be governed by a different rule from that which would govern it if he did not hold office on that tenure.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I desire to call attention to the next line, which empowers the judge of the Admiralty Court to receive such fees as may be from time to time prescribed by general rules or orders. I think it is objectionable that the judge should receive fees. The hon. member for Victoria complained of the expense of Admiralty Courts, and I suppose our desire is to simplify the practice and make it as little expensive as possible, but I doubt whether allowing the judge to be paid by fees will have this effect. That power is rather

calculated to induce him to have rules made for increasing the cost of litigation. It is rather *infra dig* for a judge to receive fees for every order he issues.

Mr. EDGAR. I think it would be far better, as far as we can, to fix the salary in this Act of Parliament, because the salaries of the vice-admiralty judges are now fixed by Dominion statute, and I do not see why we should not also fix the salaries of those who take their places.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No one has stronger objection than I to the system of paying the judges fees, but that is the present system, and if we take away the fees we must provide for an increase of salary.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the hon. gentleman is wrong, as under the Act it is only in the case of the abolition of the court that the judges are entitled to compensation. Of course, I am only looking at the legal aspect of the question.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the spirit of the Act requires that the emoluments should not be reduced, and we should not like to deal otherwise with the judges.

Mr. EDGAR. The fees are abolished by the effect of the Act. The Bill provides that they shall receive such fees as are from time to time prescribed by general rules or orders. Then, under a subsequent section, they have to be made by the Court of Exchequer, and approved by the Governor in Council and transmitted for approval to Her Majesty in Council, so that the whole matter is thrown open, and there can be no better opportunity than the present to fix the salary. Has the Minister of Justice any figures to show the amount of fees received?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Quebec the fees average from $300 to $400 a year. In Prince Edward Island they are very small.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It might be more satisfactory that the salary should be increased by the average amount of the fees for the last two or three years, and the fees abolished.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I did not wish to be understood as advocating a reduction in the fees; and I agree with my hon. friend that if we take away the fees, we will have to give compensation.

On section 12,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Would it not be well to provide that no further suits shall be instituted in respect of the same matter in the principal registry court or any district registry? Supposing a ship was owned in Yarmouth and the ship itself was in Halifax, there might be two suits brought, one against the ship in Halifax and one against the ship's husband or owner in Yarmouth. I think the proviso should be amended.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the difficulty is met by the power given to the higher court to amalgamate the suits and transfer them to its own registry. If we were to make a prohibition such as that proposed, we might interfere with suits instituted in good faith in another place.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You have already provided that, if a suit is instituted in one district, it shall not be instituted in the principal court. Why should you not make a provision that, if a suit is instituted in one district, it should not be instituted in another district?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I agree to that amendment.

On section 11,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Would it not be well to give an alternative appeal direct to the Supreme Court if desired?

Mr. EDGAR. There is another appeal to the Privy Council under the Imperial Act.

Mr. SKINNER. It ought to be defined if this appeal to the Exchequer Court is to be to the Exchequer Court of the Dominion, or if it means such an Exchequer Court as we have in New Brunswick.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That question is settled by the second section of the Act, which says the Exchequer Court of Canada is the one referred to. This clause may stand.

On section 13,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It might be desirable that the fees should be submitted to Parliament for approval.

Mr. EDGAR. Under section 24 of the Imperial Act, the fees have to be submitted to the Governor in Council and the Imperial authority for approval.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is a provision in the present Exchequer Act, that all rules made by that court shall be laid on the Table of the House within a certain number of days after the session, and that will cover this case.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the 24th section only refers to those rules, which require the approval of Her Majesty in Council.

On sub-section *d*, of section 14,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I wish to propose an amendment to section 14 as sub-section 2, to this effect:

That the Governor in Council may, from time to time, change the limits of any admiralty district, create new districts, and assign thereto the names and places of registry.

We want to give new names to the districts as well. At present there is a district for Quebec, and it may be desirable to have a district in Montreal.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is taking power to alter by Order in Council?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Take, for instance, a case in Nova Scotia. At present the Nova Scotia registry is in Halifax, but if it should be necessary to make another admiralty district, it would be desirable that we should give to it the chief registry.

On section 15,

Mr. EDGAR. What is the particular difficulty requiring it to stand in that shape?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. At present, you will remember, it is a maritime court of Ontario, and we want to change its name and call it the Toronto district, in order that the other districts now presided over by surrogate judges may be constituted apart.

Mr. EDGAR. Does the hon. gentleman know how many surrogate judges have been actually appointed?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Fifteen.

Mr. EDGAR. Is it proposed to make fifteen registries?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; some of them have no business, and we will of course drop them.

Mr. MULOCK. A difficulty presents itself to my mind. Suppose it should happen that one of these local judges should be taken ill, and was unable to transact his business. He would still be in office, and how is it proposed to deal with his duties during his incapacity?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is always available the principal judge of the Exchequer Court himself, and these judges have concurrent jurisdiction with him.

On section 16,

Mr. SKINNER. Is it intended that the judges who were holding their offices at the time the Imperial Act was passed, shall hold their office now under the new court without any appointment whatever?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That would be the effect of it. It might be desirable to issue commissions to them, inasmuch as their title of office would be changed. But this absolutely entitles them to continue in their office without any fresh appointment.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You make it a legal and not a parliamentary appointment?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is it the intention of the hon. gentleman to carve out new districts during the lifetime of the present incumbent?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No.

On section 25,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does this provision mean to give concurrent jurisdiction to the Exchequer Court judge with the Admiralty Court judges of the Lower Provinces?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I should imagine that if a case arose in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, it would be more convenient to institute proceedings in those provinces rather than commence a suit in Ottawa.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This provision gives power to the judge of the Exchequer Court to go to the other provinces to dispose of such cases. Section 10 provides the way the suit may be instituted.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Section 23 provides that, notwithstanding the provision of section 10, the initial proceedings may be taken before the Exchequer Court at Ottawa.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It does not mean that.

Mr. MULOCK. It seems to me possible that it may be necessary, by circumstances, to institute a suit in a district in which it may not be the most convenient to continue it, and, in such cases, I think there should be power to change the venue, as it were, to a more convenient district, inasmuch as the position of the vessel gives the jurisdiction. Sometimes it may happen that the party suing may be compelled to institute a suit in an inconvenient district, and section 12 gives power to transfer from the local to the principal districts, but not from one district to another.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If that power were invested in the principal judge, it would be a useful one.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The districts are so large that there could be very little inconvenience of that kind. The district includes the whole province, and, if it is inconvenient for a judge to preside in Halifax, for instance, he could try the suit in Cape Breton or wherever he pleases. A provision that you could change the venue from one province to another would be inconvenient.

Committee rose; and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS.

A Message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:—

MR. SPEAKER,—

His Honour Chief Justice Sir Wm. Ritchie, Deputy Governor, desires the immediate attendance of your Honourable House in the Chamber of the Honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate Chamber.

And having returned,

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that the Deputy Governor had been pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:—

An Act respecting the Farmers' Bank of Rustico.

An Act with respect to the Albion Mines Savings Bank.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 66) to confirm a lease between the Guelph Junction Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Henderson.)

Bill (No. 78) to confirm an agreement between the Shuswap and Okanagon Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and to confer further powers on the Shuswap and Okanagon Railway Company.—(Mr. Ross, Lisgar.)

Bill (No. 46) respecting the South-Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

Bill (No. 65) respecting the Montreal and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

Bill (No. 39) respecting the Maritime Chemical Pulp Company (Limited), and to change the name thereof to The Maritime Sulphite Fibre Company. Limited.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 48) to incorporate the Manitoba Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. Macdonald, Winnipeg.)

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 118) respecting the Citizens' Insurance Company.—(Mr. Desjardins, Hochelaga.)

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

Mr. FOSTER moved concurrence in resolutions reported from Committee on Ways and Means.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT moved in amendment, that all the words after the word "That" be left out and the following inserted instead thereof :--

The situation of the country requires that the Government should forthwith reduce all duties on articles of prime necessity, and more particularly on those most generally consumed by artizans, miners, fishermen and farmers, and further, that the negotiations which the House has been informed are to open at Washington in October next, should be conducted upon the basis of the most extended reciprocal freedom of trade between Canada and the United States, in manufactured as well as natural products.

Mr. WELDON. In rising to address the House on the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford, I shall begin what I have to say by congratulating the hon. Minister of Finance on his good fortune in having to submit to this House so satisfactory a statement as that which he has been able to make, and in having been able to propose such acceptable changes in the tariff as those which he has proposed. It is a good many years in this country since any Finance Minister has had so pleasant a duty to perform as the hon. gentleman had on Tuesday night last. He was then in a position to tell us that, at last, after twenty-three or twenty-four years' struggle, the predictions made two or three years ago that the debt of the country would be allowed for a time to stand still had for two years been verified. He was enabled also to inform Parliament and the country that he proposed to cut down the expenditure, and to effect the greatest reductions of taxes made in any year since the union of the provinces. And he was enabled to give the members of this House and the people of this country the feeling that there was going to be a rest for a time after a most arduous struggle. Almost a quarter of a century ago, the two great parties in Canada, the Reform party and the Conservative party, joined hands and formed a new party, by the name of the Liberal-Conservative party, whose policy was to bring about the union of the British provinces in North America, to bind those provinces together by a railway from the Atlantic coast to the St. Lawrence River, to construct and deepen a system of inland water-ways running from the great lakes down the St. Lawrence. No sooner was the union of the provinces accomplished by the help of that coalition of the Macdonalds, the Cartiers, the Browns and other great men, than the Canadian people, under their strong leadership, set themselves to the fulfilment of that task. In some nine or ten years, at great cost, after great struggles and labour, they had almost completed the Intercolonial Railway. From that time until now, they have been steadily working at the problem of deepening the canals, but shortly after the union, largely, I think, owing to the ambition and foresight of Sir John Macdonald and Sir George Cartier, they conceived the grand project of acquiring possession of the prairie lands of the North-West and the distant Province of British Columbia; and as a condition necessary thereto, they decided on pushing railway communication so as to connect the Atlantic seaboard with the great lakes on the St. Lawrence River, and then cross the prairies and the three chains of mountains to the Pacific Sea. It is with great relief the Canadian people know that these three radical measures have been accomplished. With reference to the canal system, a little remains to be done, but this much has been done, that 27 feet 6 inches of clear water has been given to the great ocean ships going to Montreal, and with the expenditure of a little more money, 14 feet of clear water will be given from Montreal to the head of Lake Superior. This useful and great struggle, which perhaps has taxed the energies of Canadians to their utmost for twenty-five years, is about over; and it is with a feeling of great pride that we find those works completed and those predictions verified, and that we can now hope, for some years to come, to find but a very slight increase in our public debt. When I heard the hon. Finance Minister say that, despite the enormous expenditure which has been made since 1879 on railway construction in the North-West, the actual interest *per capita* on the debt in Canada had not increased by more than 6 cents, I thought the Conservative party, which has controlled for twelve years the destiny of the country, had great reason to be proud; but the feature of which we have the greatest right to be proud in that budget was this: that after all this has been done this country is in so sound a position that our Finance Minister is able to say to the whole body of Canadian consumers, that he is in a position to lower their burden of taxation by $3,500,000, by means of reductions in the tariff. We know well that for many years this article of sugar has been to Finance Ministers of both parties the favourite child of the whole tariff. The Finance Minister in the late Mackenzie Administration used to call it the white-haired boy of the tariff. The sugar duties were so easily collected, their bulk was so large, and the revenue derived therefrom was paid at so few points, that all Finance Ministers were extremely jealous of any attempts to destroy or cut them down. I congratulate the Finance Minister on having had the courage, I may say the self-denial, to take off $3,500,000 from sugar and to give this great boon of free or almost untaxed sugar to the Canadian people. The member for South Oxford, speaking on this question of sugar on Tuesday last, described the net result of all that the Finance Minister had done as being a substitution of taxation of $1,500,000 on those who make and deal in and consume liquors and tobacco for $1,500,000 on the consumers of sugar, and he said the remaining $2,000,000 had been handed over to the sugar refiners. What a preposterous statement for anyone to make in this House, and particularly for an hon. gentleman sitting in the front benches, and who has been a Finance Minister himself? I venture to say that the consumers of the Dominion have received relief by this measure amounting to almost $5,000,000.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WELDON. Hon. gentlemen say "hear, hear." What are the figures? There are 228,000,000 lbs. of sugar consumed annually in Canada. The price has been cut down, as the figures I will read will show, at the refineries both on white and yellow sugar, and, if it be true that one-third of the sugar consumed in Canada is granulated and two-thirds brown sugar, it is a mere matter of arithmetic to see that the cost of sugar at the sea-board is reduced by about $4,000,000. If you pursue the argument, and admit that the remission of 2 cents a pound at the Custom-house as hon. gentlemen opposite contend, means the lowering of the price by two and one-half cents at the retail store, then, in addition to the reduction of $4,000,000 at the Custom-house, 25 per cent.

further must be added for the reduction at the retail stores, so that you will find that the measure of the reduction of the burdens of the people in respect of sugar, is almost $5,000,000. I state this as a manifest truth, and place it against the statement of the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) that the sugar refiners had received the advantage of $2,000,000. I know that the president of the Moncton Sugar Refinery telegraphed Tuesday night to his people to sell granulated at a reduction of 2 cents a lb., and that in Montreal it was announced that granulated sugar had gone down to 4½ cents. The conclusion that I arrive at is that a reduction has taken place of 1½ to 1¾ cents upon yellow sugar, and of 2 cents on granulated sugars. The hon. gentleman says that we have not removed the taxes on sugar, because the taxes have not been entirely taken away, and that some protection has been left for the refiners in this country, but I contend that the protection which is left to our refiners is less than it was under the polariscope tariff of 1886.

Mr. MULOCK. How much reduction is there?

Mr. WELDON. There is a reduction of about 16 cents on the 100 pounds. The ex-Finance Minister says that protection is still given to the refiners. It does not suit him to have the sugar refined in this country. If the Finance Minister had taken off the duty and at the same time had smashed the sugar refineries with their thousands of employés, counting those who work in the refineries and in the subsidiary trades which they need, he would, no doubt, have applauded him. Our idea was to continue to give those people employment and not to drive them away to the country to the south of us. I want to make another flat contradiction of a statement made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). He says :

"We have the maximum of loss to the revenue, and the maximum of advantage to these monopolists. On every pound of sugar which the poorest man consumes, he will have to pay not into the public treasury, but to the sugar refiners eight-tenths of a cent."

I deny that statement. If the hon. gentleman will turn to the tariff, article 2, page 277 of the Votes and Proceedings, he will see that it says that all sugar at and below 14 Dutch standard comes in free, and that which comes in at 14 Dutch standard is a very excellent yellow sugar which we in the Lower Provinces have used very largely. A sugar known as Cuba crystals, which tests as high by the polariscope as 96 degrees, and therefore is nearly a perfect sugar, though a trifle brown in colour comes in free under the present tariff. Then there are Muscovadoes, which will come in free, and thus any poor man can protect himself against any attempt on the part of the refiners to put anything like eight-tenths of a cent a pound on sugar by any combine they might make. The hon. gentleman's statement is not founded on fact. And the truth is that the great bulk of this sugar will come in absolutely free, and this is a protection against any extortion on the part of the refiners. Hon. gentlemen would like the restoration of the old system. I will not at present touch upon the question of free trade against protection, but later on I will deal with that on its merits. Speaking of the low grades of sugar, I might say that last night an hon. gentleman who is interested in the sugar trade, and particularly in the kind which I have referred to as Cuba crystals, informed me that it was selling yesterday, in Halifax, at 3¼ cents, and that Muscovadoes were selling yesterday, in Halifax, at 2½ cents. We noticed that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), in his speech the other night was lacking in his usual vigour, though not in his usual despondency and gloom. The tariff was altogether too much for him, and the cheers with which it was greeted from these benches were the precursor of the cheers with which it will be greeted from the Atlantic to the Pacific. For the benefit of the members of this House who are here for the first time, and who have been too busy and too well employed to read the Budget speeches of the hon. member for South Oxford for the last twelve years, let me say that his speech on Tuesday night presented no very new features. There were some of his old predictions, some of his old boasts, omitted. We heard no more of the old story that the tariff could not do its work in raising a revenue without being prohibitive, but most of the old points came out again ; they were made much in the old spirit, though in a spirit, perhaps, of deeper gloom and despondency than ever before. As he spoke, one was reminded of the old English divine, who, speaking of his own country, said : "The man who goes about in this country telling the people they are not as well governed as they ought to be, is a man who will soon find a large audience." And upon that statement of the judicious Hooker I would like to add this commentary : that the man who goes about this country for seventeen years making the same gloomy statement, will find at last that he will lose his audience—and that is precisely the position of the hon. member, for I noticed that neither the members behind him nor the members in front of him, on Tuesday night, paid very much regard to what the hon. gentleman said. He gave us a short lamentation on the balance of trade, although, as he said it, it was in the way of taunt rather than as declaring his own belief. As to the balance of trade, the figures, as that hon. gentleman gave them, proved nothing more than this, that the exports, which are recorded in the blue-books, are too low, and every man who studies the export tables in our blue books and in American blue-books, know they are too low—they are too low in the case of all countries where there are no export duties. We can easily test that by comparing our exports to the United States, for example, with their recorded imports from Canada ; by our record of exports to the British Islands, with their record of imports from Canada. Our table of exports bulks too low, because of the fact that the Custom-house officers are not very particular in making up the figures. I say, secondly, our exports in the blue-book are but the product of Canadian capital and Canadian labour on our Canadian land, and, as we know, that must be supplemented and added to by the products of Canadian capital and Canadian labour on the sea ; and if those things be added together, you will find the purchasing power of the things that Canada has to sell to foreign countries is large enough to pay for all our imports, and to pay interest on our debt, and that is what is required to make a sound commercial condition. In one breath the hon. member for South Oxford complained of excessive taxation in this country. That was the old story, it was the automatic action of a man who had prepared his speech before he had heard of

the tariff changes and who was forgetting for a moment that we were throwing off three or four millions of taxes. He spoke a moment afterwards of the drop in the revenues for the current year. He was not frank enough to say that that was caused by the fact that since the 1st of April there had been an almost entire cessation of imports in sugar. He complained again of some interview there had been between the Postmaster General and the President of the Canadian Pacific Railway, with the result that he discovered that the Government were giving larger mail subsidies to the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman had not had the patience, nor had he the candour, to go on and to say that in the interval between the old figures and the new, a large system of railways known as the New Brunswick Railway with a large and expensive postal service, had been taken over by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the payments that were formerly made to the New Brunswick Railway now appeared as made to the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. member had one of his old-time remarks concerning the decline of trade, and after the unnumbered rebukes which he has received in this Parliament, I was somewhat surprised to find that with a view to discredit the Government, with a view to discredit the National Policy, he ventured to dwell once more upon the decline in trade between 1873 and 1890. He chooses as the first term of the comparison the volume of our foreign trade in 1873, when he knew perfectly well that the entire decline occurred during the five years when his tariff, his fiscal policy, and not ours influenced our foreign trade. He was not aware that the figures he gave would only have the effect of rebounding against himself, and of bringing our discussion back to his own wretched and lamentable fiscal record. It reminds one of the story that Joe Howe used to tell of a farmer of Digby, in western Nova Scotia, who went to spear a salmon with the handle of a bush scythe, and in doing so cut off his own head. That the hon. gentleman should have had the courage to remind this House of a decline in our foreign trade of from 41 or 42 millions, occurring during the four or five years when he was Finance Minister, is almost passing belief. I say that when Sir Richard Cartwright had control of the fiscal policy of this country, the trade went down by leaps and bounds, and when the Conservative party came into power the tide turned, and trade has steadily gone up by some 40 millions. However, unfair and uncandid as he was, I shall not make my statements so lacking in truth as to insinuate that he was the cause and ought to be held responsible for the 42 millions of a decline. I know better. That was in part due to great economic causes entirely beyond the control of any Finance Minister. I am not going to the extreme length of saying that the National Policy is calculated to develop foreign trade. That is not its aim and purpose, though during the existence of our National Policy our foreign trade has made a reasonable growth. The National Policy has cut down our foreign trade in two distinct respects. It has cut off the export of some of our own raw materials of manufacture, and cut off the import of foreign goods made from those very materials. In the article of household furniture, school furniture, church furniture and all that, the effect of the National Policy was to cut off the export of that birch and ash timber, to cut off the drain of our sons who were going away to the American States to work up that wood and send it back to our provinces, and to cut off the supply of food products that was leaving our provinces as food for our own boys who were there in those foreign mills and factories making up that furniture. When you look at those trade tables you will find a decline in the exports of this timber, it is no longer going out, these food products are no longer going out, and the finished products are no longer coming in. There is a decline in the out-go and a decline in the imports, and that is one of the first effects of the National Policy; although that effect upon the volume of foreign trade was looked for, the policy which produces that effect, in my opinion, is no blunder, but a capital success. A second advantage of the National Policy was in respect of the manufactures that we are well calculated to make from the raw materials which we are not calculated to grow. We were led to import raw materials and to have them manufactured here and sold in our own market, so that under the National Policy we were importing raw cotton, raw manila and raw sugar for example—whereas earlier we had been importing cotton fabrics, cordage and refined sugar; and in respect to the bulk of that trade, again the foreign trade tables will show a decline in value. That was the expectation, that was the very aim of those who defended the National Policy—it was to keep for us our home market by giving employment to home labour, by building up our own towns and cities and thereby to put our people in the position of such greater thrift and comfort that they would be able to buy more largely than they had heretofore been buying of articles of luxury. I look at the tables, and I find that despite the fact that there has been a decline in articles of the first class I speak of, manufactured out of our own raw material, and articles of the second class manufactured out of raw materials grown abroad, so notable has been the increase in the comfort of the whole body of our people, that despite these two reductions, our foreign trade has grown by $40,000,000. The hon. gentleman says that the bulk of the people are poor. He gives us his own bald and naked assertion, but he gives no proof. Year after year I have occasion to go into as many homes as the hon. gentleman, and I suppose a great many more. I know the condition of the people of my own county, and as the result of visiting hundreds of their homes, I take the liberty of stating that the bulk of the people are not poor. I give this as an illustration: Whereas twelve or fifteen years ago musical instruments were seldom to be found in the homes of the middle and working classes, pianos being hardly ever seen and organs being rare, now in the part of New Brunswick I represent the bulk of the farmers are supplying their homes with musical instruments. I put that fact against the hon. gentleman's assertions. We were treated once more by the hon. gentleman, as we have been treated times without number, and this unhappy nation has been treated times without number, to tales of extravagance. The hon. gentleman told us that when the Dominion began its career it spent $13,500,000, and now we are spending $36,000,000, and he cannot understand it. I will tell the House why he cannot understand it. The skies are too near his head and his horizon is too narrow. The hon. gentleman is a

parish politician. Speaking with all respect for his skill in debate, his fluency of speech and his finished declamations, he is a parish politician and not entitled to be named as a statesman. How could any man who took in the whole situation make the complaint he did, that because the expenditure has increased two or three-fold, therefore there had been criminal extravagance. What were we doing at the beginning? We were governing four provinces on the St. Lawrence and on the Atlantic seaboard, and now we are governing half a continent. Why should the hon. gentleman go over all those items, and why should he travel the old ground? We adopted the present policy, and we knew it would be a costly policy, and yet followed it, and it is altogether too late in the day for that hon. gentleman or any gentleman to complain that we have done what we have done. The hon. gentleman says our public works are unproductive. He complains we have spent about $50,000,000 on canals. In all conscience, if there is any one expenditure which that hon. gentleman ought not to make the subject of reproach to the party now in power it is the expenditure on the canals. As a matter of common fair-play he knows well that his old leaders in the Conservative party, and subsequently the leaders in the Liberal party, committed themselves to the policy of thorough canal development and pursued that policy. It is true that when Mr. Mackenzie came into power in 1873, and after advertisements calling for tenders for a very large canal expenditure had been issued and tenders had been received, that hon. gentleman took upon himself to cancel the whole business; but they did not stop their own canal expenditure. They decided on adding millions for canal expenditure. I do not make this as a ground of reproach against the hon. gentleman and his allies, because it was one piece of vigorous and earnest policy to which they were entitled to credit during those long, dismal and unsuccessful years in which they controlled the destinies of the country. The hon. gentleman spoke of the Intercolonial, of the great sum of money it has cost, $50,000,000, and the very large deficits that have been incurred by reason of that road. I confess that I share in some degree the hon. gentleman's regret that the deficit is so large. It is a disappointment to us all, and I think, speaking from the experience of two Administrations, that of Mr. Mackenzie, in which he was his own Minister of Railways, and that of Sir John Macdonald, it has been shown that the political management of railways in this country cannot be made economical. I hope, at a later stage of the session, to express my views on this subject more fully, and I trust we will find some method of dealing more successfully with this railway question, and find it possible to place the Intercolonial Railway in the hands of a non-political Commission, fully strengthened by Act of Parliament, entrenched as the judges are now, and beyond the control of Parliament, a commission composed of able men who will be given almost *carte blanche* to go forward and make the Intercolonial Railway pay. Having regard to the enormous trade done by it in the Lower Provinces it is disappointing to see the increased deficit incurred by it. Hon. gentlemen now in opposition have no hope that they can do better, and if they spoke their minds freely they would say they could do no better. The only hope is to adopt some system such as I have suggested, and I hold this opinion more strongly in view of the fact that I hear such a system has been successfully operated in other colonies of the Empire. But the complaints of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) are loudest as regards the North-West. He saw ruin everywhere, dark clouds were hovering over the Lower Provinces, the canal system was wrapped in darkness, but the deepest darkness was away in the western country. He reminded us that our predictions had not been fulfilled. I will not weary the House by reminding the hon. gentleman of the predictions he made, which are found recorded in his own Budget speeches. They are very entertaining to all who have a sense of humour; a humorous man making an analysis of the hon. gentleman's Budget speeches, noting and commenting on the various predictions and promises he had made, would make this House scream with laughter. The hon. gentleman commonly has a commercial crisis on hand and impending. On Tuesday night it was afar off, for it was only within a "measurable distance." When elections are coming on, however, it will be found that the commercial crisis is at hand. It was so in 1881, 1886, and before the last election. Now, who is this political prophet? Why is he entitled to speak with the authority he claims for a large part of the honest working people of this country? Whose arm does he make strong for work, whose heart does he make lighter; and half the strength of a man is the heart and hope he brings in the morning to his daily toil? What immigrant walking behind the plough on the western prairie whistles with a lighter heart for reading the hon. gentleman's speeches? What fisherman rowing out towards the sunrise over our sleek Atlantic seas has felt his arms strengthened after reading one of the hon. gentleman's speeches? Upon what meat doth this Cæsar feed that he hath grown so great? I have shown his entire unfitness to be called a prophet; he has shown his entire unfitness to be regarded as a safe and responsible statesman, because, right after the last election he took occasion —and I hope his Ontario colleagues will not stand by him in that—he took occasion to sneer at and wound the pride of six of the provinces of this Dominion. He called us in these six provinces the shreds and patches of the Dominion; he called us in the East, and he called you gentlemen in the West, shreds and patches. Was it good politics for a man who aspires to leadership to wound the pride of six provinces; was it good politics to tell fifty-seven members of this House that they and the people from whom they come are in the main a gang of thieves, and that they were in the pursuit of public plunder? I heard my hon. colleague from St. John (Mr. Hazen), in his speech at the opening of this session, refer to that language with due warmth and resentment, and I heard my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Kenny), later on in the session, referring to a letter which Richard J. Cartwright wrote in the Toronto *Globe*, describe it as being insulting, and slanderous, and calumnious, and diabolically false. Although I feel that resentment which both of these hon. gentlemen feel, I cannot work myself into a state of anger, for I have a sense of profound pity, that a man, who has sat in Parliament so many years with colleagues although they are not of his party in this House, could find no better words to say of them than that they are a gang of

thieves and boodlers. I may tell the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) that these six provinces which he calls the "shreds and patches" of the Dominion, and which to-night are represented by fifty-seven members in this House, are the hope of this Dominion. To the development of these provinces we must mainly look for the future greatness of Canada. To-night they have little more than one-quarter of the members of this House representing them, but we will not have long to wait to see the time when they will send one-half the members of this House. I have a right, representing as I do a constituency in one of these insulted provinces, to speak warmly of the unjustifiable remarks of the hon. gentleman. In his eyes, the Dominion of Canada is like the vision which the old king Nebuchadnezzar saw: the head of the Dominion, Ontario, is gold, and the feet representing to him the Atlantic and Pacific provinces are part iron and part clay.

An hon. MEMBER. What about the belly?

Mr. WELDON. The belly was silver, and I think that must be the Province of Quebec in the member for South Oxford's dream. I remember the time when the hon. gentleman had very little love for the Province of Quebec, but now he seems to flirt with that little beauty of the Lower St. Lawrence because she is friendly to him, and it is an interesting sight to see that gallant knight throwing off his armour and "capering nimbly in my lady's chamber to the lascivious pleasing of the lute." Let me ask what good has that hon. gentleman ever done for the country; we do not dispute his mental gifts, but of what service has he been to the country? Has he ever a good word to say for his country? Has he ever a helpful suggestion to make? When he was in power, and when above all other things it was his duty to encourage the people, he kept on discouraging them. He was almost as gloomy then as now; the Budget speeches of 1875, 1876, 1877, and 1878 are almost as dismal reading as his recent speeches. The hon. the Minister of Customs and my hon. friend from Two Mountains (Mr. Daoust) remember perfectly well these years when the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) used to spend the first half of his session apologizing for his blundering prophecy of the year before, and the last half of the session predicting that he would not blunder again, and so on session after session renewing the same dismal plaint. I pass away from my observations in reference to that hon. gentleman, and I wish to say a word about the National Policy. We are told by hon. gentlemen on the other side, that the National Policy has won its last victory. We will see about that. They tell us that the National Policy is a failure. We will see about that. To observe the operation of the National Policy as it appears to us in the eastern Provinces, it is convenient to go back to events ante-dating by several years the introduction of that policy. Like many other members of this House, I was born in a country village, and I can remember well the time when, in each of these country villages throughout the Province of New Brunswick there was an appreciably large class of artizans, There were in each village two or three shoemakers making shoes for the whole people of the district; there was a tannery, tanning the hides of all the cattle slaughtered in the whole district and selling them through the country; there was a harness-maker with three or four men working in the shop, taking that leather and making it up into harness; there was a carriage-maker getting his planks of birch from the mill, putting them upon the old benches and taking his rip-saw and ripping out his shafts and felloes and spokes. Those of us who saw it remember very well when in each village there were the blacksmiths ironing carriages and sleighs, and ploughs and harrows, and making horse shoes and horse nails. As my hon. friend reminds me, we saw the people shearing their own sheep, and carding and spinning and weaving the wool. Well, some of us left our homes in our boyhood and took no particular note of the strange industrial changes that the country was undergoing, but when we went back twenty years later we found that artizan class had gone from the village. We found that where there were three or four shoemakers making boots and shoes for the people of the village there was now but one cobbler left repairing boots; we found that where there were three or four tanneries, tanning skins, taken from the cattle of the country round about, there was now but one or none.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. WELDON. This may strike those gentlemen opposite as extremely funny, but I think, if they wait a moment my learned friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and my acute friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) will find that I will throw some light on the discussion. We found that the village carriage-maker was having his felloes and his spokes and his shafts brought in by the railway almost ready for use, and where previously there had been three or four carriage-makers, there was now but one person employed putting these parts of the carriage together. We found that the wool was no longer carded and spun and woven at home. What had happened? One of those wonderful industrial changes came over the Province of New Brunswick which had come over the face of the entire world. These articles, which twenty years ago were made in little shops by three or four men, were now almost entirely manufactured by great gangs of labouring men in vast mills in the city. We found that the multiplication of labour-saving machinery had entirely altered the industrial condition of the country, and the drawing out of the village of these fifteen or twenty artizans—not agricultural producers, but consumers of agricultural products—deprived all of these villages of a market of some value. These were the signs that village life, which, twenty years before, was picturesque by reason of these small industries, was declining; these were the changes that were visible, and the effect of these changes became more visible when the American war was over. And when the Minister of Finance of that day was the one who should have noticed these signs and changes, and should have made a provision to meet the disaster which could be seen by observant men, he was not equal to the occasion. It was his fault, as I have often heard of that hon. gentleman, that he thought he knew more than anybody else. He would take his books on political economy, his Adam Smith, his John Stewart Mill, his Ricardo or his Fawcett, home to his study and read them there until he was saturated with his learning and the consciousness of his own learning, and he believed the

great captains of industry in this country could teach him nothing. The wholesale merchants, the bankers, the railroad men, the manufacturers, the miners, the farmers, the lumbermen, and the steamboat men, came to the hon. gentleman to impress their views upon him and to show that the existing condition of things was ruining the artizan class, and was driving them out of the country to build up foreign cities, but they could teach the hon. gentleman nothing. He was described very well by one gentleman as sitting there like a fretful porcupine with his quills set against every man who approached him. In those days, as good luck would have it, there sat on the other side of the House men who did not know everything, men who could learn, men who knew that the industrial condition of this country had changed, men who discovered some things which these hon. gentlemen did not see. They took up this policy—not a protective policy, but a national policy. They knew that there never could be a strong nation built up in this Dominion unless it had diversified industries. They knew that if most of the industrial power of this country was absorbed by the republic to the south of us, there never could be any strength or permanence in this Canada of ours. This is the reason that many of us who were trained to free trade in our colleges, who were taught by free trade professors, who had read free trade books, learned, when we came to open our eyes and see the signs of the times, that while free trade might be a good policy for European countries where different conditions prevailed, it was not the policy for Canada. Those free trade books were written by men accustomed to different industrial institutions, and under the inspiration of old world ideals which have not been realized, for even the nations of Europe have not become free trade states. Our Conservative statesmen, with the common-sense ideas acquired by being daily in touch with all classes of the people, gave the people what they wanted, I will not go over the other arguments which in those days were put forward, such as that about Canada being made the slaughter market of the United States. We were 4,000,000, and they were ten times as many, and they needed only to add 10 per cent. to their output in many lines of production in order to supply our wants. Thus they could glut our market and destroy our productive industries; and when these were once destroyed, they could amply recoup themselves by raising the prices of their goods. Herein is the justification for eight-tenths of a cent per pound which the hon. Minister of Finance has laid on refined sugars. Now, the hon. member for South Oxford said there were no intelligent protectionists. There are no intelligent free traders in Canada. Free trade is a fetish, and the days have gone by when men will worship it. Protection with many men is a fetish. Every community, however, must deal with its own problems from its own point of view. That is what our people have done, and that precisely accounts for the fact that the Conservative party have carried the elections of 1878, 1882, 1887 and 1891. I never was a protectionist in my life, but I have favoured a policy which has guarded our home market from absorption by our neighbours in the American Republic. The hon. member for South Oxford, in attacking the Budget speech, laid great stress on the decline of farming and farm values. He said that the value of farms in the Province of Ontario during the operation of the National Policy had gone down from 25 to 33 per cent. in forty-nine cases out of fifty. Here was another of those unfortunate, naked assertions for which that hon. gentleman is becoming famous, and on account of which he is coming to be not very carefully listened to in the House of Commons. I desire to put against his naked and unsupported words the record of statistics which are the latest in point of time that I could find in the library. They are from the Report of the Ontario Bureau of Industries for 1888, published by Mr. Blue, an authority which I do not think the hon. gentleman will repudiate. It tells us that the value of farm lands in the Province of Ontario, instead of having depreciated, have in the seven years from 1882 to 1888, appreciated in value $8,000,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Oh.

Mr. WELDON. I will read you the figures. In 1882, the value of farm lands in Ontario was $632,000,000; seven years later their value had increased to $640,000,000. In the same period the value of farm buildings increased from $182,000,000 to $188,000,000, the value of farm implements from $37,000,000 to $49,000,000, and the value of live stock from $80,000,000 to $102,000,000. In that period the value of farm lands, buildings, implements and stock in Ontario has increased from $882,000,000 to $982,000,000, an increase of $100,000,000 in seven years, which, I think, is a pretty good showing. I wonder if the hon. gentleman, when he next goes into Ontario, will have the effrontery to tell the people that farm property has gone down in value?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should think I would.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You do not even understand the figures you are quoting.

Mr. WELDON. The hon. member for South Oxford, by way of making an attack on the National Policy, has called our attention, as he has been accustomed to do for many years, to the movement of our population away from the country. This is a subject of great interest all the world over; but I know of no cheaper trick on the part of the demagogue than to take some fact which is not traceable to tariff policies or fiscal policies, because it is as patent in free trade countries as in protectionist countries—which is visible all the world over—which operates in almost equal strength in the United States and in Canada, in free trade Scotland, in free trade England, in protective Germany, in Switzerland—which is as universal as the atmosphere—and attributes the same phenomenon in his own country to the defects of the Government. I say it is one of the most cheap and despicable arts of the demagogue. Now, what is the fact as to the movement of population in this country? I will not follow the bad example of that hon. gentleman—I will not pit my naked assertion against his; but I will read from the record, although not at such length as to weary the House. The statement I read is from the Toronto *Globe* of three days ago, an authority the value of which I hope the hon. gentleman will recognize:

"The Scotch census, which is the last of all to come in, shows the same increase in the town and decrease in the rural population which the whole civilized world is becoming familiar with. In England and Wales the agricultural population, during the decade, 1871-81, declined 16 per cent. The figures are not yet available for a comparison of 1881-91 with the previous decade, but it is known that the agricultural population shows a continuation of the decrease that marked the previous decennial."

The census of Ireland for 1891 shows there has been a marked decrease in the rural population, although I do not think that proves very much, because there are special causes for that decrease in the case of Ireland. Even in the United States, the country for which the hon. member for South Oxford has so much admiration, we find striking evidences of a similar movement. In the State of Vermont there has been an actual decrease in population in the last ten years. I mention this, not with any pleasure, because to me as a Canadian there can be no pleasure in the decadence of those commonwealths which have given to law, to literature, to eloquence and statesmanship, some of the brightest minds to be found in the records of our English race. But the fact is, nevertheless, those states where Horace Greely was born, and Daniel Webster, and Longfellow the poet, and Hawthorne, are losing their people by thousands, and, one after the other, these homes are being broken up. I need not to gloat over their misfortune, but by way of illustration of the truth and soundness of the proposition I am setting forth, in Maine, out of its sixteen counties, seven have declined in population; and in the Empire state of New York which, as many of us remember, was in our boyhood the foremost farming state of the Union—and no doubt many of us remember the days when all our wheat flour in the Maritime Provinces was bought in the Genesee Valley—the population shows a decrease in twenty-three out of its sixty counties. I venture to say you will find no such startling statement in any of the provinces of Canada. Pennsylvania shows that twelve out of her sixty-seven counties have decreased in population. So that, in group after group, in state after state, of the Union we find the same deplorable showing. I wish to speak of one group of states, the figures with reference to which are indeed surprising, and that is the great north central division watered by the Ohio, the Missouri and the Mississippi and including the prairie region, a group of states ten in number with a population of 22,000,000. The facts in reference to these are shown by the last American census, and I will not take up the time of the House by mentioning more than a few of them. Ohio with its 89 counties, shows a decline in population in 28 of them. Of Indiana's 92 counties, 25 have declined in population, and in Illinois 30 out of its 107 show a similar result. I think these are the most surprising facts with reference to this matter of the movement of population that we have heard of for a long time. The State of Iowa, an apparently new state, in which one would think the fertile elements of the soil could not be materially exhausted, shows a decline in 27 counties out of its 99. I will not weary the House with reading any more of these figures, but I have them here if any hon. gentleman desires to see them. To be sure I have read the strongest as illustrating my position, but there are a good many other states in which the decline, though not quite so striking, is striking and discouraging indeed. It is not my business or my duty to weary the House with any speculation as to the cause of this decline. I do not know the causes. In our own counties I know many of the causes for the decrease, and no doubt some of them are world-wide. The enormous increase in agricultural machinery, by means of which one man and a boy can do as much in seeding, harvesting, cutting and threshing grain as could be done by four hands thirty years ago, thus saving the labour of two or three men on every large farm, is one of the causes. And another cause, and perhaps the strongest cause, is to be found in the fact that our race is a nomadic race, which has, ever since its history began, gone on wandering south and west until the British race has fairly girdled the globe, and it was a mark of great sagacity on the part of our Conservative leaders that, seeing the drain of population owing to this and other causes, they took the means to divert it into another portion of our own territory. There was one class of farmers who were tired to death draining wet lands, taking stones out of the soil, clearing wooded lands, who were anxious to find a more pleasant field for their labours, and who when they heard that out west, at the cost of not many dollars, there were lands to be had for the asking, free of forests, springs and stones, where there were no obstructions to cultivation, they naturally determined to flock thither. And you, Sir, could not wonder at it. The young and enterprising spirits who were discouraged by the hard work and little progress in the older provinces determined to make their way to the prairie lands; and our Government, seeing this migration, determined on opening up our own prairie lands and in directing thither the course of this movement, so that if we lost these people in the east we would hold them in the west. Another class of people we were losing was the artizan class, which, before the National Policy was introduced, had not sufficient field for employment in our own country, and had to seek their living in the workshops and factories of Boston, New York and other American centres. But by means of the National Policy, instead of that class being drawn off to the United States, we have kept them here. Hon. gentlemen opposite may look wise and shake their heads and laugh, but they have never propounded any rational alternative policy to the National Policy, and it will be time enough for them to shake their heads when they will have found such a policy as will more effectually prevent any outward movement of our population. With reference to the daughters of the household, who in the olden days could only find employment in domestic work, we have furnished them with work in our own cotton mills and other manufacturing industries, and helped to prevent their seeking similar occupation in the United States. I was glad to hear the hon. Finance Minister throw a ray of hope into the discussion by pointing out to our farmers that in the British islands there was a market of great possibilities. It is all very fine for hon. gentlemen opposite to sneer at every effort made to improve things, but the people of this country look to those who are hopeful and suggestive and constructive and not to those political atheists who believe nothing and have no hope in the future. The English market for our farmers, as everyone knows who will study our statistical tables, has been a growing market. We sell twice the bulk of agricultural products in the

British islands that we did fourteen years ago, and during that same interval the American market has shown no growth whatever. The hon. Finance Minister spoke of our very large sales of cheese and beef, and indicated that, with continued energy and skill in studying the demands and conditions of the English market, we could fit ourselves to compete in that market with respect to other articles. There is no manner of doubt about it. Any one who is interested in agricultural pursuits, and who studies the question in a practical way, must know that there is no practical reason why we cannot sell butter, and eggs, and poultry, and many other products of the farm in the English market, much more largely than we do now, and to greater advantage than we ever could in the American market. Further, I am proud to say, there is on the English horizon a cloud the size of a man's hand, indicating a change of policy to our advantage. That may not afford our hon. friends opposite as much pleasure as it does us, but it excites in some of us the hope that, before we are many years older, we may, by means of new political adjustments, find in the old country, for the products of our farms, a much larger market than we have hitherto found. A very small difference of duty, a duty of 5 or 7 per cent. in the English market in favour of our wheat, and our barley, and our beef, and our mutton, and our poultry, and our eggs, and our lumber, would guarantee the very rapid building up of this country. Hon. gentlemen opposite may say that it is perfectly whimsical to talk about such an event, because it will never happen. They say that the leading statesmen on the English platforms have declared against it. They often quote what Mr. Gladstone and other leaders have said, but I say the utterances of Mr. Gladstone and the others on this question are not half so significant as were the utterances of leaders of opinion in England four years before the corn laws were repealed. Let hon. gentlemen read the speeches in the English *Hansard* of 1842-44 against this repeal, and then turn to the *Hansard* of 1846, and they will find that too much attention cannot be paid to those declarations of Mr. Gladstone and the others. Hon. gentlemen will remember that within five years the voters of England have been increased by 2,000,000. Before the last reform Bill there were 3,000,000, and to-day there are 5,000,000 voters, and the 2,000,000 who have been added are almost entirely the farming population. It is Hodge who has come in; it is the agricultural labourer largely who makes up those 2,000,000. The farming population of England, the landlord, the tenant and the farm labourer, are almost a unit in favour of differential duties to protect themselves against the American products and the products of Russia and Germany; and the chambers of commerce, in city after city, which show the indications of a movement even among the manufacturing classes, have declared in favour of this charge. If you notice the very significant articles which have appeared in the London *Times* three times in 6 months, in January, April and May, indicating a very significant change in opinion in England, and if you notice the very significant answers which the Prime Minister there has given within ten days to the people who made enquiries of him in reference to it, you will conclude that there will be great inducements to farmers to go on to the prairie land, and that enormous prospects are open to us in the islands across the sea. I have only to say a word in reference to unrestricted reciprocity and then I have done. The hon. gentleman, in attacking the position of the Government and the Finance Minister, said the Government were not friendly to any reciprocity, and were not in earnest in attempting to obtain any reciprocity. That was a statement which he made at twenty minutes to six. At a quarter after nine, he said the Government were too eager for reciprocity, that they were waiting for the beck or nod of Mr. Blaine to take any reciprocity they could. I must leave the hon. gentleman to reconcile his two statements. It would very greatly enlighten the Canadian public and would clear the public mind if the hon. member for South Oxford would make a clear and emphatic statement and, speaking for his party, an authoritative statement, as to what form of trade policy his party desires. Sometimes they are in favour of free trade which strikes down all the custom-houses on the 49th parallel and along the other portion of the boundary line. At another time they put the custom-houses back again. In fact, they are playing and juggling with names. We ask them in all candour and frankness to discard names and deal with things, and we ask the hon. gentleman to tell us whether he is in favour of unrestricted reciprocity or of commercial union? The hon. gentleman does not deign to answer. I would ask another question: Whether in the event of the hon. gentleman failing to secure what he calls unrestricted reciprocity he will take the responsibility of pressing on for commercial union? Now, the hon. gentleman does not think it necessary to give an answer. I tell the hon. gentleman that the record under my hand shows, as he knows very well, that the American people, with whom he has been bargaining and intriguing for the last two years, are not in favour of what he calls unrestricted reciprocity. There is not one responsible man in the United States in favour of unrestricted reciprocity. Neither Democrats nor Republicans will have it. Mr. Hitt and Mr. Butterworth, speaking of his own friends, will not have it. Mr. Wiman will not have it. The four or five senators of the United States who have been working with him will not have unrestricted reciprocity. Need I weary the House by reading extracts from the speeches of these gentlemen to show that they will not agree to this scheme of unrestricted reciprocity, that they will not allow Canada to have a lower tariff than they have under this scheme, that they contend that our tariff must come up to theirs, and that Canada is not to be the back door for smuggling into the United States? Let me read a few words from responsible men in this country and from leading Americans on this question of unrestricted reciprocity, as to the proposal that we should have a lower tariff than they have, and the policy of striking out the custom-house line altogether. The Hon. Mr. Laurier made a speech at Abbotsford last October, and he describes what he understands reciprocity to be. He said:

"This policy involves full and absolute reciprocity, not only in natural products, but also in manufactured articles, without any restrictions whatever. When the Liberal party comes into power it will send commissioners to Washington, according to the principles affirmed by the Cartwright resolution of 1888, to propose a mutual agreement by which there will be free trade along the whole line, doing away with restrictions vexatious and detrimental to both countries alike, and removing the

custom-houses that go so far to cause friction between two countries designed by nature to exist side by side in friendly relations."

The Hon. Mr. Laurier is in favour of striking down the custom-houses. Mr. John Charlton, who I think, is the member for North Norfolk, in 1891 said :

"With commercial union between the two countries we could dispense with a standing army; for under the new relations that would be established between ourselves and our neighbours there would be no necessity for one; we could do away with our custom-house officers, who would have to seek other fields of usefulness."

Professor Goldwin Smith, who has been the literary ally of those gentlemen, in a letter to the *Mail*, dated 13th July, 1888, declared that :

"The proposed assimilation of tariffs on the seaboard is simply an arrangement to prevent reciprocal smuggling. Let me say once more that commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity mean the same—the removal of the customs line between Canada and the United States."

And again :

"Commercial union would, of course, involve assimilation of tariffs, which, however, would present no uninsurmountable obstacle to negotiation. It would also involve an assimilation of the liquor (excise) duties."

Congressman Hitt—and we have heard more of this light recommended by gentlemen of the Opposition than probably any other—says :

"What is commercial union with Canada? It means, as set out in this resolution, the adoption by both countries of precisely the same tariff of duties or taxes to be levied upon goods coming from abroad, abolishing altogether our line of custom-houses on the north by which we collect tariff duties on goods coming from Canada, abolishing their custom-houses along the same line by which they collect duties upon goods we send into Canada, and having intercourse as unrestricted between this country and Canada as it is between the states. The line of custom-houses would follow the sea and include both countries."

Then Mr. Butterworth says :

"The adoption of the system proposed would involve the assimilation of tariffs, rates and internal revenue taxes, and possibly an arrangement for pooling receipts from customs, and a division on some equitable basis."

I have also a speech which is reported to have been made by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) before the Charlottetown Board of Trade, when the hon. gentleman used his own native intelligence before he had been whipped into discipline.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is rather a "chestnut" which has been read for the last four years.

Mr. WELDON. Here is what he said at Charlottetown :

"Unrestricted reciprocity would differ from commercial union in this respect, that while it would be perfectly free trade between the two countries, each country would have the right to frame its own tariff as regards the rest of the world. Canada, for instance, might have a 25 per cent. tariff while that of the United States might be one of 35 per cent. The immediate consequence would be that imports to the United States, instead of being carried to the great ports of the United States, would be taken to the states by the way of Montreal. To this the states, whose people are not arrant fools, would never consent, and unrestricted reciprocity, although it would suit as well as commercial union, was, therefore, impracticable.

That is what the hon. gentleman calls the straight common sense of the whole matter, and so did the member for North Norfolk and so did these American gentlemen. They know, and the hon. member for Queen's knows to-night, as well as he knew it then, and the hon. member for South Oxford knows to-night, that there is no possibility of getting unrestricted reciprocity, that it is an illusory scheme, and that if this free trade wave had carried them into power, they would have been driven on to the point of commercial union, or they would have to pose, as the repealers in Nova Scotia did a few years ago, as arrant imposters and humbugs. I need not quote Mr. Blake ; he says precisely the same thing, that there is no such a thing to be wrought out as unrestricted reciprocity. The only thing to be got by these free traders is commercial union. They are fond of repudiating Mr. Blake, but I submit that in large sections of the Liberal party of this country, he is regarded as the safest and clearest thinker among them all. I waited to hear the hon. member with his project for dealing with the question of revenue. He knows that free trade strikes down more than $7,000,000 of American duty at a blow, and he knows perfectly well that it strikes off two-thirds of the duties that we now levy on our English trade, which would be some $6,500,000 more ; and he knows that it strikes off, perhaps, a quarter or a third of the duties that we are now levying on the manufactured goods from Belgium, Germany, and other countries. This loss would amount to $15,000,000 or $18,000,000, and how do they propose to deal with it ? They simply knock their heads against a stone wall and declare that the facts are not what they are. What nonsense to say, as the leader of the Opposition said in Halifax and elsewhere, that the loss would be only eight millions ! They know perfectly well that our trade with England would go over to the states. Unrestricted reciprocity has its tap root in the greed of the New England manufacturers to get the market of Canada for their own manufactures. Hon. gentlemen cannot humbug the Canadian people, and they cannot humbug this Parliament. They may say eight millions till they are tired of saying it, but they will not alter the fact. What are the economies they are going to practise. The hon. member for Queen's told us about one of them, the economy in connection with the tunnel. These gentlemen, with these fifteen millions of a loss of revenue staring them in the face, were not going to impose direct taxes to fill up the gap ; they were going to cut down the expenditures, and the first step the leader of the Opposition and the member for Queen's were going to take to cut it down, was to build a tunnel across the Straits to Prince Edward Island from the mainland. The hon. member reminds us that his antagonist. Mr. Ferguson, had a scheme for building a tunnel.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Hon. Senator Howlan.

Mr. WELDON. Yes, I should have said Senator Howlan ; the hon. gentleman was not to be outdone by Senator Howlan, and three days later he had a scheme,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I was referring to the scheme that Sir John Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper pledged themselves to.

Mr. WELDON. The hon. gentleman read a letter sent by the Minister of Railways to Senator Howlan, and I propose to read another interesting document which was sent by another political leader to the hon. gentleman himself. I have not wearied the House very much with humour to-night, but, at the risk of a "chestnut," I will venture to tell a story which somewhat illustrates the humours of the campaign they had in Prince Edward Island, when Senator Howlan with a telegram pressed pretty

close upon the heels of the hon. gentleman opposite. The story is of a hunter telling his friend how the hunter and his dogs chased a rabbit. The dogs, said the hunter, chased the little quadruped out of the alder cover across a swamp, dashed through a river and at last came so close upon the rabbit that the rabbit ran up a tree. "Why," returned his friend, "a rabbit cannot climb." "Well," said the hunter, "this rabbit had to climb." After Mr. Howlan got that telegram from the Minister of Railways the hon. gentleman had to come three days later with a telegram from his own leader. I will entertain the House with that telegram to show you how these gentlemen propose to make up for the loss of the fifteen millions of revenue. I will read the first letter, signed by Wilfred Laurier, addressed to the Hon. L. H. Davies, Charlottetown, as it is published in the Island *Guardian*, and dated at Arthabaskaville, 9th February:

"My Dear Davies,—I enclose you a copy of the letter which I have just sent to Mr. Higgs. I suppose it will be satisfactory. I have no time to write at length. We are deep in the fray, and things are looking remarkably well."

Now, let me read the letter to Mr. Higgs, sent by the same gentleman, and which appears in the same issue of the *Guardian*:

"Arthabaskaville, 9th February, 1891.

"B. D. Higgs, Esq., Charlottetown, P.E.I.

"Dear Sir,—I have your favour of the 2nd of February instant. I hardly would have thought that an expression of opinion as to the construction of a tunnel to connect the Island of Prince Edward with the mainland, should be required from me. Every man who has given any attention to the condition of things and to the necessities involved by the entering of the Island into Confederation, must admit that such a tunnel must be constructed, if the thing is reasonably practicable. The first requisite is to have an accurate survey and reliable estimates. I am only sorry that these were not obtained long ago."

I am sorry the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) who has loaded our files with interesting Bills, and the hon. gentleman from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who last year brought in interesting Bills in the interest of electoral purity, are not here, because their missionary work might be very well directed to that hon. gentleman himself; before they try to convert us hardened sinners, they would do well to try their prentice hand upon him. Now, I do not mean to say that I endorse in the slightest degree the letter or the spirit of the Bills of the member for West Huron and the member for North Norfolk. For my part I think that when hon. members of this House can be led to bring in such Bills, it indicates simply a hysterical and panicky condition of the public mind. I am not saying one word in condemnation of the position taken by the hon. member for Queen's, but I am simply showing what they propose to do as an initial step in meeting this tremendous loss of revenue.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I am afraid that the tunnel has a poor chance at your hands.

Mr. WELDON. I do not know about that.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Will you vote for it?

Mr. WELDON. I will ot commit myself. I certainly will not take such an extreme and unreasonable position as the member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) took the other day, who, I think, has got this same contagion of the narrowness of parish politics as the member for South Oxford. That is not all, neither is it the largest nor the worst. I wish now to call the attention of the House to a matter of much greater importance. The tunnel project if carried out would involve an increase of $10,000,000 to the debt with the additional interest charges; but there is a much greater charge which I desire to press upon the attention of the House, and I do so with much gravity and with a very imminent sense of present danger. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) was not the only man to whom letters were sent by the Opposition leader, and I am deeply disappointed that the leader of the Oppposition is not in his place so that he might correct me if I am charging him with acts he has not done. I only know the facts as they are contained in the record, in *La Patrie*, a Liberal paper in Quebec, the Toronto *Globe*, the leading Liberal paper in Canada, and another Liberal paper in Quebec. The charge is this, that the member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), the leader of the Liberal party, speaking as he must have spoken and as he did speak in the name of the Liberal party, is alleged by his colleagues to have made very great and dangerous promises. It is within the memory of all, that some years ago Mr. Mowat, Mr. Mercier, Mr. Fielding and Mr. Blair met in the city of Quebec at what is known as the interprovincial conference to consider the scheme to amend the British North America Act, but which was merely a scheme to get the provincial subsidies largely increased and thus enhance the burden to the borne by the Canadian Exchequer. I have in my hands the record. They proposed to add, making their calculation on the census of 1881, $1,500,000 to the subsidies of the provinces as an additional charge on the consolidated fund; and their scheme was, without entering into details, that when the census of 1891 was taken the subsidies were to be enlarged, and assuming the proposition that the population would grow 600,000 in ten years, which I hope and think is below the mark, there would have been an addition this year to the subsidies of $480,000. So that next year if the scheme of the promoters had been carried out the revenues of Canada would be charged with an additional burden of $2,000,000 per annum. This I think is a staggering proposal, in fact the most staggering demand made on this country since the Act of Union. There some anxiety regarding the Better Terms for Nova Scotia, and with respect to the readjustment of 1873, and some grumbling occurred on minor readjustments since then, but a proposal to increase by about one-half the entire subsidies paid to the provinces is a radical disturbance of the whole Terms of Union and is a scheme certainly of great moment, and I think of great danger. To those hon. members who have not had their attention called to the fact, it would be a matter of surprise to them to learn that the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) is declared by his good friend and colleague, Mr. Mercier, to have pledged to him, Mr. Mercier, that if he, Mr. Laurier, was elected, the financial terms of the interprovincial conference would be carried out, and those gentlemen with their deficit of $15,000,000 at the outset and contingent liabilities in the shape of a tunnel were pledged to impose an additional annual burden on the exchequer of $2,000,000. Those were indeed rapid advances in the way of settling the question of the finances of the country. I desire to place on record these statements of facts. The Toronto *Globe* of 10th February last

contained a report of a speech by Mr. Mercier at Montreal, in which are the following words :—

"Mr. Laurier has accepted the resolution of the interprovincial conference of 1887, and he has promised to give effect to them when he comes into power."

I am told by some of my hon. friends from Quebec that the message from Mr. Laurier was sent from Ottawa River to Gaspé, and made to do service everywhere. *La Patrie*, of 10th February, 1891, gives a similar report in words almost identical with those of the *Globe*, namely, if I may be allowed to translate :

"Mr. Laurier has accepted the resolution of the provincial councils of 1887 and has promised to put them in force if he comes into power."

A similar report, although not precisely in the same words, was published in *L'Electeur*. I am sorry I am not able to ask the leader of the Opposition whether the statements are true or false, whether Mr. Mercier was warranted or not in saying that the leader of the Opposition in this House had pledged himself to a new and additional expenditure of $2,000,000 a year. I hope before the debate is closed, that this question will be put and a direct answer obtained, as it must be given by that hon. gentleman. I shall close by referring to the question of loyalty. That hon. gentleman sneered at our professions of loyalty for our Queen and native land. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) declared that we had entered on a protective policy, and under it, we taxed heavily our trade with that nation which was the greatest manufacturing nation to which our allegiance was due. He called us 35 per cent. loyalists. But instead of being 35 per cent. as alleged by that hon. gentleman, the duty on British goods is a little more than 22 per cent., for the hon. gentleman excluded free articles in his calculation. It may cause the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) some little anxiety if we go over his record during the last few years, but it gave some of us anxiety four weeks before the last election to see the utterances he made during the heat of the election, the character of the people who were in his pay and with whom he was locking hands in this country. In May, 1890, Mr. Ferguson, the member for Welland, asked the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) if it were true that in May, 1890, that gallant knight had been in Washington giving pointers to those who were preparing the McKinley tariff, and the gentleman said that he had not been giving pointers to the persons who were preparing the McKinley tariff. That denial he renewed this year and his word we implicitly accept, but the hon. gentleman did not deny that he had been in Washington, and, looking at that fact, in connection with so many other facts, we would like to know what that gallant knight was doing in Washington. It would be pure impertinence to ask this question if the visit to Washington were of a single and detached character, but we know very well that at that time certain foreign coadjutors of this gallant knight were engaged preparing a tariff and drafting resolutions, and that our friends on this side of the line were drafting resolutions. We know very well what was taking place there several months after. We know very well that when Mr. Hitt was moving certain resolutions in Congress the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was moving closely-related resolutions in the Canadian Parliament, and then there was a second resolution from the gentlemen down in Washington, and then a second resolution from the gentlemen up here, until they were like two distressed ships at sea signalling to each other and bewildering some of us simple-minded people who did not understand the signalling. That is a spectacle which during one hundred years has never been witnessed by the Canadian people, and I pray Heaven that for another hundred years it may never again be witnessed by them. The same gentleman goes to Boston and he makes a speech at Boston, and if I had not spoken at such great length I would read that speech at length. He made a speech which I think, without exception, is the most shameless speech which ever came from the lips of a Canadian public man. It has humorous aspects in some parts of it. The hon. gentleman sat in this Parliament and he saw the rivalry between the Atlantic ports, the city of St. John and the city of Halifax, which were both struggling for the winter trade of Canada and for the summer trade too. He saw that the city of St. John, relying on the strength of her natural position, was making a bold effort for the transatlantic trade, and he saw that the city of Halifax was pressing closely behind her. What adjustment of the dispute did this hon. gentleman propose? He proposed simply to strangle both of these cities and to give their trade to Boston, not only the winter trade but the summer trade as well. That gentleman had, I will say the shamelessness, to stand before a Boston audience and to deliberately propose to strangle Toronto, Montreal, Quebec, St. John and Halifax, and to give their trade to Boston, and to guarantee to that city that it should hold the whole trade of 5,000,000 of people in fee. "No man could take it from them," he said. I hope he did not speak in the name of his party. I believe I may say that I know that he did not speak in the name of his party, because I know there are a great number of better men in that party. I know there are a great number of more honourable and high-minded men sitting around him and behind him, who were as much ashamed as I was alarmed by the destructive and dangerous utterances which this gentleman made. What else did we see? We learned twelve months ago from the columns of the Toronto *Globe* that Mr. Edward Farrer was a traitor. These were the words of the *Globe*—they are not my words—and a few months later we learned that that very gentleman was employed by the *Globe* as its chief editorial writer, and we learned also that this gallant knight from South Oxford had acquired a controlling interest in the *Globe*. And then came that famous annexation pamphlet of his paid servant; and then came his movements to Washington and Boston, and the intrigues of Mr. Farrer, and the movements of Mr. Farrer, who was in his pay, as we have heard. I would be glad if the hon. gentleman would contradict this. Was the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) at Washington plotting the dismemberment of the Empire and the taking away of Canada from the Queen's Dominions? We know that he was in close friendship and comradeship and political association with Mr. Erastus Wiman, a gentleman who came to Canada and boasted here, with impudent falsehoods on his lips, that he was a loyal Can-

adian, and who went to the Committee of the American Senate and to Boston public meetings and openly declared that he was an annexationist. Now, in view of the fact that Mr. Wiman was that hon. gentleman's ally, that Mr. Farrer was in that hon. gentleman's employ, that the member for South Oxford had got control of the *Globe* newspaper, that he himself was at Washington in May and that he was making these speeches in Boston; was there not good reason for our fearing, as I may say I did fear, and as I do now fear, that that hon. gentleman is at heart, although he may not say it openly, an annexationist.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps you had better ask your present Premier about that!

Mr. WELDON. Ah! go back to history if you like, look at the career of Sir George Cartier who was once in arms against his English Queen, but who afterwards devoted his life to the service of his Queen, and ended that life as a true servant of his Queen. Sir George Cartier did not take honours from his Queen, and then seek to betray her. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if when the roar of the Boston banquet had died away, and the hon. member for South Oxford laid his head upon his pillow and thought of the early days when his Queen, for good services which he had rendered to her, had decorated him with knighthood; I wonder if then there came across his fancy the image of that good Queen, and if there ever came a feeling of baseness, that after having taken the oath of allegiance to the Queen, as all members of Parliament have taken it, and after wearing then, as I am informed he does not wear now, the decoration of knighthood, I wonder if he did not, looking into the future, say: I know that this unrestricted reciprocity is humbug; I know that it is nothing but commercial union; and I know that when Canada puts her feet upon that inclined plane she will irrevocably plunge down to political union with the United States. The hon. gentleman knew that perfectly. Long ago we read the words which Tennyson puts in the mouth of the old English King, when he met first his beautiful Guinivere after her flight:

> "Liest thou here so low,
> Whom once I knew in happier summers."

And so every good Canadian must feel about that gallant knight who twelve years ago, was undoubtedly a patriotic Canadian. I have his words here, delivered at that time, and there is a good honest loyal English ring about them. I read them in the *Hansard*. I remember them now, and I will read them again to show how he has fallen in these twelve years. The hon. gentleman was speaking of the National Policy as being in itself a damage to English trade and he said, when they were delivered:

> "We know that for a long time there have been a number of people in England, who have felt that it was rather hard to be called upon to maintain the police of the seas in our interest and to perform many other things popularly supposed to belong to a central government, and yet to find at the same time their manufacturers excluded by their own colonies, at the very instant when they are doing the utmost possible to promote trade with the colonies. And I can tell the hon. gentleman, that he may rely that when the people of England come to understand the exact operation of the tariff, he will find that he has gone a great step towards inducing them to look with complacency on any proposition which will relieve them from the burden of its defence. There is no use pursuing the ostrich-like policy of shutting our eyes to the manifest political dangers which are apparent to the course we are called upon to take. I do not condemn, to the same extent, his policy as regards the Americans and I admit they have always shown themselves very selfish in all matters of trade policy, but I warn him that he is exposing great important interests in thus rashly throwing down the gauntlet to 40,000,000 of our best customers."

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me contrast with that some unfortunate remarks made by that hon. gentleman within the last few weeks or months. I will read but two short sentences from a speech made by the same gallant knight in this House. Here is the tone in which he then spoke of England—this is taken from our own *Hansard*—referring to our trade policy:

> "If it does discriminate against Great Britain, we have a right to. Our own interest is paramount. We owe Great Britain nothing but charity for her atrocious blundering against our interests. There never was a time that Canada could not have bettered her condition by joining the United States."

Here is another extract taken from a speech delivered by the hon. gentleman at Oshawa, on the 4th of February last:

> "If free trade with the American nation will be good for us, let us vote for it, though it should involve discrimination against Great Britain twice over. Providence has planted us on the American continent, not surely to be the mere henchmen of that distant crown, but to do the best we can for Canada in the way that to us seems best, no matter what the ultimate consequences may be."

Mr. Speaker, it is on the record, and within the memory of the oldest members of this House, that when the hon. member for South Oxford sat on this side of the House, the *Globe* used to speak slightingly of his performances, as it has spoken slightingly of many other able men. At that time he had waited three or four years in the hope of taking a place on the Treasury benches; and when, on the withdrawal from our politics of Sir John Rose, the portfolio of finance became vacant, because his claims were not considered, and because Sir John Macdonald gave the place to Sir Francis Hincks, then this gentleman deserted his party and his leader. Therefore, if after two or three years of impatient waiting for a portfolio, the hon. gentleman in disappointment deserted his leader, it is no very great wonder that, after twelve years of feebleness and baffled ambition, he should betray his country. I tell the hon. gentleman that he and those associated with him have made a stupendous mistake when they have looked to the skies south of the boundary line for the sign by which to conquer. We want no such sign, but we will go on standing by our institutions, looking not to Washington, but rather to London, in the hope that the Dominion will grow, if not rapidly then slowly, to be a strong, earnest, loyal people, until by-and-bye Canada shall become, as most of us—on both sides of the House, I frankly say—hope she will be, a puissant nation, one of the proudest of England's children, standing side by side with the nations of the southern hemisphere and other sister nations, bound in a league of perpetual amity and good-will with the old land. I am sorry, Sir, to have spoken at such great length, and I thank the House for its indulgence.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Mr. Speaker, the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat will lead me on a somewhat different course from what I had anticipated taking in this debate; but I feel that it is due to him, as it would be courteous on my part, that I should endeavour to give such an answer as I am able to the various points he has touched upon. He has introduced subjects which I had not thought of alluding to to-

night; and in view of the prominent position he occupies in this House, I shall at least attempt an answer to what he has said. He opened his speech by congratulating the hon. Finance Minister upon his attitude and mode of delivery. I myself beg leave to tender to the hon. Minister—if they are of any value and he will appreciate them—my own congratulations on the manner and on a great deal of the matter of his speech. I congratulate him especially on the omission of much of what might be termed the gush and bounce that has characterized, not only some of his own previous speeches, but those of his predecessors; and it is not because I wish to detract from this compliment that I say I wondered whether that was due wholly to the good sense of the hon. Finance Minister, or in part because of an inward consciousness that in whatever glowing terms he might depict the prosperity of this country, it was not really as prosperous as he and I fain would have it to be. However, let that be as it may, it was an improvement on many of the Budget speeches we have heard in the past. I can congratulate him, too, as did the hon. gentleman who has preceded me, upon his declaration, that the Government had determined upon a policy of economy. Sir, that announcement was welcomed on this side of the House, and we only hope that the fulfilment of the promise may be witnessed by us in reductions in the estimates that will be submitted to the House. But while I applaud the hon. Finance Minister in his determination to enter upon a course of economy, I wish him to remember that I do not consider it to be economy in the true sense of the word that great public works which are in the interest of Canada, which are becoming almost annihilated in some cases, if we may judge by expressions which we hear from some of the members of this House, that wharves and piers and harbours which have been constructed in the public interest shall be allowed to fall into decay for the want of necessary repairs upon the plea of economy, when we cannot but feel that it is not a principle of economy that is operating, but a lower and baser principle, the principle of a small mind that will withhold a public grant due to a province or a municipality simply because the inhabitants of that province or that municipality have exercised their rights in the true spirit of manhood, and have returned to this House members who are not in accord with the Government policy. Sir, I hold that true economy demands that those necessary works shall be constructed, that they shall be maintained, and that it is the bounden duty of a gentleman entrusted with the administration of the public money—not the money of any Finance Minister or any Government, but the money of the people of this country—to expend it in those works which are demanded on grounds of public interest and public necessity. But, Sir, is economy not to be practised by abstaining from entering upon public works which have no merit in themselves and cannot be defended on purely commercial grounds, or on the ground that they are solely in the interest of this Dominion? Sir, I would like to have some evidence of a better desire for economy on the part of the Government, because I doubt very much whether there is any such desire, and would be glad to have that doubt removed. But the Finance Minister must have resolved on that new departure in economy some time before he announced it in his Budget speech; and if he was honest in that desire, why did he not use his influence in saving to the country something like $250,000 a year in the revision of the voters' lists. Why does he go on spending that money, when he knows that, if properly expended on public works along our sea coast, it would remove just grievances, by enabling the necessary repairs to be made to harbours and breakwaters which naturally become damaged through the course of time? Sir, we will look for the exercise of this economy promised by the hon. gentleman, in his withholding assent from projects that cannot be justified on their merits or the public interest; but we cannot regard as economy the refusal of the necessary grants to maintain in proper condition the public works of the country, even though they should happen to be situated within the ridings of those who may not at present be in accord with the Government. My hon. friend next congratulated the Finance Minister upon the great reduction which he had announced in the taxation of the people. To the extent to which there has been a reduction in taxation made by the Finance Minister, I join in my hon. friend's congratulations; but I could not help being amused at the manner in which that announcement was hailed by hon. gentlemen opposite. For the first time, in many years, there has been the announcement of a reduction in taxation by the Finance Minister; but I remember that for years past, instead of announcements of reduction in taxation, we have had the Finance Minister declaring increases in taxation of 10, 15 and 20 per cent.; and every time the taxation was increased it was increased amid the plaudits of those hon. gentlemen who now equally applaud the announcement of a decrease. That is a marvellous change. Let us hope that hon. gentlemen opposite have changed. Let us hope that the policy which has been advocated by the Opposition during many years, and to which they would not give heed, has at last impressed itself upon their mind as the policy necessary in the interest of the country. The hon. gentleman congratulated the Government on the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I rejoice in the completion of that great national undertaking, but I cannot congratulate the Finance Minister as heartily as I would have desired, for we were given to understand by the hon. gentleman's predecessor, and he pledged the faith of the Government to it, that the completion of that railway would not add, as it has done, $100,000,000 to the public debt, but that this very year—aye, even a year ago—the treasury of Canada would be recouped to the extent of $70,000,000 by virtue of the sales of North-West lands. Yet, to-day, not one dollar of these $70,000,000 is to be found, but, on the contrary, we have millions of deficit caused by the mismanagement of the Government. While we rejoice in the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, we cannot rejoice in the fact that every prediction of the Government has been proved to be fallacious, and that they have been shown utterly incapable to estimate the possibilities of the future. Their whole calculation has been proved utterly unfounded and fallacious in every respect, as cannot fail to be recognized in the fact of the great increase of the public debt. The hon. gentleman congratulated the Finance Minister that we had arrived at a period when the increase of our public debt would cease. Let me ask what credit he is entitled to for

that, in view of the promises made by the Government and the statements furnished by them years ago, that, instead of having a stationary public debt, we would have to-day the public debt reduced by $70,000,000. The hon. gentleman next congratulated the Finance Minister upon the reduction in the price of sugar, and that is about the only item in which there is a reduction ; and he attacked the hon. member for South Oxford because that hon. gentleman could not swallow all the Finance Minister said on this question. It is no doubt amusing to notice how, year after year, different hon. gentlemen opposite are put up to answer the hon. member for South Oxford, and how each year the greater portion of their speeches is made up of denunciations of that hon. gentleman. The hon. member for South Oxford, according to the hon. gentleman, is fast losing any influence he had in the country, and fast becoming very harmless indeed ; and in view of this statement, I could not help thinking what a waste of time it was for a gentleman of the transcendent abilities and statesman-like power of my hon. friend to quote the utterances, and to quote them in a disconnected manner, of the man who has ceased to exercise any influence in the country at all. The hon. gentleman would have done better, with his brilliant mind and his lofty ideas of statesmanship, to have given us an outline of what he considered is the policy that should be adopted by the country. He was particularly angry at the hon. member for South Oxford because that hon. gentleman was not prepared to admit what the Finance Minister gave us to understand, until his remark was challenged, that his proposition was to throw off the whole of the tax upon sugar consumed by the people. But when questioned on that point, we found he had endeavoured to create a false impression, and my hon. friend from South Oxford pointed out that, though it was true there was a reduction in the taxation, that reduction was to be upon the amount of duty that went into the revenue, while the taxation imposed upon the people for years and which did not go into the public treasury at all was still allowed to go into the pockets of the refiners. Is not that true? The hon. gentleman says the whole of the $3,500,000 is thrown off, and he says is it absolutely immaterial if there is some protection left to the refiner, because, he says, the great bulk of sugar, namely, all the raw sugars under No. 14, comes in free. I recognize hat fact. The hon. gentleman talked about Cuban rystals, and about the sugar that would come in free. Why, does he not know that that grade of ugar was comparatively low before, and the Finance Minister gloried in the fact that, through the arrangement of that tariff, only 6 per cent. of the sugars consumed by the people was imported by way of raw sugar, and that 94 per cent. was refined sugar. Yet, he says that the great proportion of sugar to be used by the people in the coming year is to be raw sugars under 14 degrees Dutch standard.

Mr. WELDON. Sugar 14 degrees Dutch standard is free now.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman knows it was not taxed as high as the refined sugar. Now, this talking about No. 14 Dutch standard, is, to many members of this House, something which they cannot be expected to understand. They are not in the sugar business, and, therefore cannot be expected to understand it.

Mr. BOWELL. It is Dutch to us.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then I will put it into English. In order that the House might understand this matter—because it is desirable that this question should be understood, and that the House should see whether all the glory with which the Finance Minister would fain surround himself is fairly due to him, and if it is justly due to him, I will be the first to give it to him, but I want the country to understand what his position is in regard to this matter—I went over to the Customs Department, knowing that they had some new samples by which they test the importation of sugar. I found that they had some new samples in and that they had some old samples left. Of course, I could not get the new samples, but I took some of the old samples and I have here a sample of No. 14 which has become somewhat bleached by process of time, and I have also samples of No. 15 and No. 16. The result of time is that No. 14 is rather lighter than it would be if now imported. I brought these to the House in order to allow hon. members to see the distinction between these different numbers. Here I have No. 14 Dutch standard sugar, which has been bleached by the operation of time till it is at least half a number lighter in colour than the real No. 14 Dutch standard by which they will test the samples of sugar imported. The hon. gentleman says : I have given you a free breakfast-table, I have given you free tea, free coffee and free sugar. If so, if that is the kind of sugar which is to be on the breakfast-table, I venture to say that none of it will be found on the table of the Finance Minister to put into his tea.

Mr. FOSTER. You are mistaken. That is the kind I take.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If so, if that is what goes on the table of the Finance Minister, I do not want the poorest man in this country to have to take that sugar for the benefit of a few sugar refiners.

Mr. BOWELL. I would ask my hon. friend if nearly all the muscovadoes that come into this country are not under No. 14, and if they are not used very largely throughout the whole country ?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No ; and if the Finance Minister is willing to do what is right in this matter let him do what he said when he was interrupted by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) who asked him a question as to his not taking off the duty altogether on sugar. The hon. gentleman then said that when the United States reduced their duties, they retained duties above a certain standard for the benefit of the refiners, and therefore we should do the same. Let me tell him that the United States, a country which hon. gentlemen opposite say is protected far beyond the protection which Canada has, a country which is protected to a wonderful extent, when it reduced the duties on sugar, made raw sugars free under No. 16, that is two numbers lighter than the free sugar that we are to have. The hon. gentleman knows that our refiners would not allow us to go as far as the Americans did, to make raw sugar free at No. 16 and under, as they did, because

the importations which would take place would allow the same leverage to be brought to bear on our refiners as that which is now brought in the United States. But our Government have fixed the grade at No. 14, and no one knows better than the Minister of Customs that it is very risky for an importer to bring in a sugar at the grade of No. 14, because it may sail very close to the wind when it is tested, and it may not stand the test, and if it does not, if it is half over the No. 14, his calculations are altogether upset, and he will find that his whole cargo has to be paid for at an increase of $\frac{5}{10}$ of a cent a lb.

Mr. BOWELL. Is not the sample of No. 16 bleached the same as No. 14?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Yes, that is true, and the comparison is fair. The middle grade that I have here is No. 15, but any member can see for himself the difference in colour between No. 14 and No. 16, and can see what chance the wholesale importer will have to bring in good raw sugar. If the hon. gentleman would follow the example of the United States, by which he said he was guided, if he would make it No. 16 instead of No. 14, it would not be a matter of such difficulty. No doubt, some of this will come in and will be used for certain purposes, but I think the hon. Minister cannot claim much credit for free sugar if he is going to force the people of this country to use No. 14 Dutch standard and under.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the price of granulated sugar?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I see it is now $4\frac{1}{2}$ cents to the wholesale trade.

Mr. WALLACE. That is 2 cents less than it was a week ago.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). My hon. friend is nearly correct. It is $1\frac{7}{8}$ cents less than it was a week ago. I am glad the hon. gentleman is following the market quotations, because then he will be able to follow a business argument when it is presented to the House, as no doubt he will. The Minister of Finance was kind enough to give to the House a table showing the course of the sugar trade in this country. He went back to 1878, he skipped 1879—I do not know why—he gave us 1880 and the years following. He skipped the first year of the National Policy, perhaps, because it was a mixed year, but he gives us the value, the quantity, and the duty during the years named, and he works out the duty per pound and the percentage on the importation from the West Indies and the percentage on the refined sugar imported. That is a very useful table. It was, however, prepared, I think, not for the purpose I am using it for, but in order to show that there was less sugar refined in the country before the introduction of the National Policy, and that sugar was higher. He does not refer at all to the state of the market at that time, or to the fact that refined sugars were being imported at that time of a high grade, and that, though the rate of duty on sugar was less than afterwards, the burden of taxation on the people was much less at that time than it is to-day. He knows that the duty on refined sugar at that time was 1 cent a lb. and 25 per cent. *ad valorem*, while later on it has been $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents a lb. specific and 35 per cent. *ad valorem*, or $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the combined specific and *ad valorem* duties. He knows perfectly well that the burden on the people is the *ad valorem* duty or the combined specific and *ad valorem* duties reduced to an *ad valorem* duty. Is it not a pity that, when he was preparing this table for 1889 and 1890, he did not prepare a table showing the price for which refined sugars were sold in Canada at that time? I felt it necessary to do that myself in order to supplement the table of the hon. gentleman, and I propose to give it to the House. I looked through the Montreal *Journal of Commerce*; I had two bound volumes, the first one started on 4th July, 1889, and I took the quotation each month till June, 1890, taking six months in 1889, and the six months succeeding in 1890, making the whole year between July and July. I took in each case the first issue of each month, and I took the lowest quotation for yellow sugar and the lowest quotation for granulated sugars, that were given there. I added them together and I divided the amount by two, showing how much it was per pound on the average. No one can tell exactly—at least I was unable to do it, perhaps the Finance Minister can tell—what is the exact proportion of consumption for yellows and of whites refined, which come into the country. I think that was an absolutely fair test for purposes of explanation, as the Minister, in dealing with this question, dealt with the average protection, the average rate of duty, and so on in his speech. Now, I find that the net result, taking those months together, the average for the twelve months, that the people had to pay at the refinery for sugar, was $6.64 per hundred pounds. The hon. Minister, in his table which he has given us for 1889, gives the cost per pound of the raw sugar the refinery used, and at $2.60 per hundred pounds, on which he had to pay a duty of $1.64. Therefore, the cost of the raw sugar to the refiner, plus the duty he paid, and which went into the revenue of the country, was $4.24 per hundred pounds. In 1890 this sugar cost him $2.92, the Minister says, on which he paid a duty per hundred pounds of $1.63; so that the cost of his sugar in 1889, and the duty that he paid, and that went into the treasury, amounted to $4.55. Adding these two together and dividing by two in order to find the average price of the cost per pound to the refiner, we find that his raw sugars, plus the duty he paid on them according to the table of the Finance Minister amounted to $4.40 per hundred pounds. Sugar was selling, as I said, during these months, at the rate of $6.64 per hundred pounds, or in other words, there was a difference between the price at which refined sugars were sold and the price which the sugars cost the refiners, plus the duty he paid, according to the Minister's showing, of $2.24 per hundred pounds. The question I want the Finance Minister to answer is this: Where did that $2.24 per hundred pounds, on the two hundred million pounds of sugar consumed, go to?

Mr. WALLACE. There was not any such average.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman is inclined to doubt my correctness. I will explain to him that I started in July 4, 1889, and I closed at June 5, 1890, getting my figures from the Montreal *Journal of Commerce*. If he can find any mistake in what I have said, I can say that it has been made inadvertently, and no one will be more ready to apologize than myself.

Mr. WALLACE. If the hon. gentleman will permit, I will point out the mistake. He has taken the lowest price and the highest price of granulated, when every one knows that there are three pounds of the lowest price sold to one of the highest.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Every one does not know that. I do not know it, nor, I think, does the hon. gentleman know it. Is there any higher priced sugar in Canada than the granulated?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). And yet you said I took the highest price when I took the granulated. The hon. gentleman knows that there is the Paris lump, and he knows there is the ground that is higher than the granulated; but he knows that I took the lowest quotation of granulated sugar, and he knows that it quotes from say, $6\frac{5}{8}$ to $6\frac{3}{4}$, and I took the $6\frac{5}{8}$. He knows that yellows vary a cent and a-half in price, and I did not take the highest price yellow, but I took the lowest. Even if there is a larger proportion of the yellow. I have arrived at a fair basis. But let him say what is a fair basis, for at $2.24 per hundred pounds he will find it amounts to over four millions of money in one year that has to be accounted for. Grant that he is right, let him take the proportion he likes, and see whether it would wipe out over four millions. The Finance Minister might perhaps reply that the cost of raw sugar in his table here was the original cost in the islands, and that he has not added the duty. The duty would be very small. The Finance Minister might say that a part of that was loss and cost in refining. Granting that the proportion would still be very small, there is still a vast sum of money to be accounted for in his table, as to the cost of sugar paid to these refiners and the price they had sold it at. That would be a very useful item for the Finance Minister to include when he prepares another table of this kind. My hon. friend in answering stated that the Finance Minister had reserved some protection to the refiners, but that he had reduced it. Well, if my hon. friend will examine the point I think he will find that the relative protection is greater than it was. What is the protection the refiner has under the duty of my hon. friend?

Mr. WELDON. The hon. gentleman did not contest my position when I was on my feet. I will now show him I was right. Under the old tariff, the polariscope tariff on granulated sugar, the duty was $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound specific and 35 per cent. *ad valorem*. Now, last night the prices of granulated sugar in New York were $4\frac{3}{16}$ cents. Reckoned on that basis the *ad valorem* duty would be $1.46\frac{9}{16}$, which would leave the total duty on granulated sugar imported to-day under the old tariff at $2.96\frac{9}{16}$ per 100 lbs. I am making my calculation on my feet and I need a little time to make it accurately. The duty under the old tariff on as much raw sugar as would make a hundred pounds of granulated sugar is $2. It is 1 cent a pound where it tests 70 degrees by the polariscope, and then $\frac{1}{30}$ of a cent for every additional degree; 30 degrees more are needed to make pure sugar. So that the duties on so much raw sugar as will make a hundred pounds of granulated is 2 cents, and taking that basis the net protection to the refiner is $96\frac{9}{16}$ cents per 100 lbs.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I observe that the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) applauds that statement, and if he understands it, it is more than I do; and yet I think I understand the sugar question as well as he does. I do not want to put any discredit on the figures of the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), but his calculations are very involved.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I wish the hon. gentleman had challenged me before, and I could have answered him in the course of my speech.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not object to the interruption, because in a question of this kind, which is a business calculation, I am willing to admit a man might be wrong; but it is easier to take the question on the basis on which the Minister of Finance put it in his speech. The average protection the refiner had under protection was the difference in the duty he paid on the raw material necessary to make a pound of refined sugar and the duty placed on refined sugar. The protection given to a refiner or to any manufacturer is the difference between the duty on the raw material he uses and that on the finished article he produces. The Minister of Finance says the protection to the refiner was under the old tariff 1 cent per pound. Now, he says: I have reduced it to $\frac{8}{10}$ of a cent per pound. I should like him under this calculation to explain how it is he claims that he has reduced the protection to the refiner, when he says that all the protection the refiner had under the old tariff was $1 per 100 lbs. and now it is 80 cents. I contend that the refiners are in a better position than they were before. It is true the Minister of Finance may say that this is 20 cents per 100 lbs. less than before. But there are other circumstances to be taken into account in determining the amount of protection given to a manufacturer. The prices of sugars in the United States have fallen from 6 cents for refined to 4 cents. The refiner in Canada had a protection under the old tariff of 1 cent against 6 cents. The refiner now has a protection of $\frac{8}{10}$ of a cent against 4 cents; so that now the Canadian refiner has a protection of 20 per cent. against $16\frac{2}{3}$ per cent. he had previously. Accordingly, the refiners in this country are absolutely in a better position and are enjoying more protection than they were before. If the Minister of Finance gives a protection of 80 cents on an article costing $4 he will have to give a protection of $1.20 if the article costs $6 to make the protection equal; but the Minister of Finance admits that it was only $1. I, therefore, say that in the present arrangement of the tariff still greater protection is given to the sugar refiner than before.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). Do we understand the hon. gentleman to say that under the old tariff the duty would be charged on the price of refined sugar in New York, or on the price of that sugar in bond in New York? The hon. gentleman is calculating the duty on the price of refined sugar in New York with the American duty paid. If that sugar was exported to Canada it would be exported at the price in bond, and duty would be calculated on the same footing as now.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Will the Minister of Customs say that? The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood), although he comes from a county which has a sugar refinery, is not posted in the working of this mysterious tariff. I have shown that under an average price of 4 cents in the

United States, which is a high basis, and more than the average basis on the average price of yellows and whites imported from the United States, 80 cents gives a protection of 20 per cent. *ad valorem*. How much protection should the refiners have? I will quote what Hon. Mr. Abbott, the leader of the present Government, stated from his seat in the Senate on 15th March, 1889, in giving his ideas of what would be sufficient protection for the sugar refiners, who the Minister of Finance and the House admit were doing very well that year. Mr. Abbott said:

"I heard in this House and during this debate the statement made that the protection was 100 per cent. In point of fact, the duty imposed on raw sugar averages 65 6-10 per cent., and on refined sugar 71 per cent.; and the difference between those two duties is all the protection the sugar refiner has."

I grant that his proposition is correct; the only protection the manufacturer has is the difference between the duty he has had to pay on the raw material and the duty upon the article he produces. Mr. Abbott said:

"The difference between 65 6-10 and 71 per cent., does not, however, correctly indicate the percentage of taxation, because refined sugar is of greater value than the raw material."

But he adds—and I want to give the House his utterance in all fairness:

"The actual protection afforded to the sugar refiner is the difference between 65 6-10 per cent. on raw sugar and 71 per cent. on refined sugar, plus the disturbing element caused by the difference in value of the class of refined sugars used here, beyond the raw material."

The hon. gentleman is right on that point. The difference in values will have some effect on the calculation; to what extent he does not say. What Mr. Abbott wanted the Senate to understand was that all the protection the refiner had was about 5½ per cent. which might be increased in values by importation. While he has given to us his view that this is all the protection the sugar refiner enjoys, while he would admit, as every one admits, that enormous sums had been made by sugar refiners during that time, the proposition of the Minister of Finance is to give a protection of 20 per cent. *ad valorem* to the sugar refiner under this tariff; and announcing it to the House he heralded it as one of the greatest boons ever given to the Canadian people. It is claimed on behalf of the tariff by hon. gentlemen opposite that we obtain a corresponding benefit for this duty that is paid by the Canadian people. But, before I touch that point, let me show what amount of protection is given by this tariff to the sugar refiners of this country at this moment. I am glad to know the hon. gentleman opposite gave me the figures, because there will be no dispute in reference to them. I find that in the New York *Herald* and the New York *Tribune* of 24th June, 1891, they quote granulated sugar at $4\frac{3}{16}$ cents per pound, or $4.19 per 100 lbs. The Boston *Herald* of 23rd June, 1891, says: "American sugar refining company quote granulated sugar, in lots less than 100 barrels, at $4\frac{3}{16}$, lots over 100 barrels at $4\frac{1}{16}$ cents per lb.," and my hon. friend opposite has himself given the present quotation in the United States as $4\frac{3}{16}$ cents. Now, then, the Canadian price as my hon. friend opposite has stated, and as the member for West York (Mr. Wallace) stated, is to-day or yesterday, or when this change was made, fixed at $4.50 per 100 lbs. The New York and Boston market is $4.19 per 100 lbs., against the Canadian price of $4.50 per 100 lbs.; or, in other words, our prices are under this new tariff, 31 cents per 100 lbs. higher than they are in the protected market of the United States. They have not taken the whole 80 cents per 100 lbs. I grant you, but what the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said, was that the Minister of Finance has given them the power if they agree among themselves to take the 80 cents; and they start out with taking 31 cents according to the quotations given by the hon. gentleman opposite himself. The hon. gentleman opposite has given us the total consumption of sugar in Canada as 240,000,000 lbs., but I will take it at 200,000,000 lbs., and I will call the higher price paid in Canada as compared with the United States, 30 cents per 100 lbs. instead of 31 cents, and then I ask what does that represent to the Canadian consumers of sugar? The manufacturers are charging to-day on 200,000,000 lbs. of sugar $600,000 more than is charged in the United States, even if they never take advantage of their position to a greater extent than they do now. That means that when the tariff is in operation the people of this country pay this $600,000 a year to the manufacturers. But hon. gentlemen opposite tell me: You have a compensating advantage, we are giving employment to the men. I hope we have a compensating advantage, and let us see if we have. The hon. gentleman spoke of the thousands employed in the sugar refineries. Was he speaking at random or had he the figures to prove this?

Mr. WELDON. I said directly and indirectly.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I presume that when the census was taken these refiners, wishing to look prosperous, gave to the census officers the full complement of the men they employed. I have not yet got the census for 1891. I wish we had; we ought to have the returns in our hands now and they would be very useful to us, but I am forced to go back to the census of 1881, and what do I find? I find that, in 1881, we had a sugar refinery in Halifax. We have one there now, I believe; but there is another and its doors are closed. They had a refinery in Moncton; and they had two in Montreal, and they have two there now. In 1881 there were four sugar refineries in Canada, and practically speaking there are about four now. The number of hands employed by the different factories—and remember the number of employés is given by the proprietors of these establishments who are interested in every way in showing they are giving large employment—the total number employed according to their statement was 723 hands in 1881. But gentlemen will say: there has been vastly more sugar refined since then, and in refining more sugar a greater number of hands would be employed. I grant you that, but we can arrive at the extra number of hands which it is necessary to employ for the extra quantity of sugar refined.

Mr. McALLISTER. There has been a sugar refinery erected in British Columbia since then.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). One has been erected there, but I have not heard of any product from it; there are no returns in reference to it. By a process of calculation, which I think the hon. Minister of Finance himself will not dispute, I can arrive at the actual number of persons employed now by these sugar refineries, taking the statement

of the number they employed in 1881 as a basis. How will I do that? The Finance Minister told us in 1881 that there was 78 per cent. of raw sugar imported and 22 per cent. only of refined, while in the year 1889, which was the year he took for comparison, he said we imported 95 per cent. of raw sugar and only 5 per cent. of refined. The difference then between the importation of 78 per cent. and 95 per cent. of raw sugar would be 17 per cent. more sugar which would be refined in the Dominion of Canada in the year 1889 than in the year 1881. That 17 per cent. would be equal to 22 per cent. upon the 78 per cent. raw sugar imported in 1881 and upon the quantity refined in Canada in that year. Therefore, if to the number of hands employed in 1881, namely 723, I add 22 per cent. increase to account for the number required to refine the extra quantity of granulated sugar, it would make 159 more hands employed in 1889 than in 1881. Taking the census of 1881 as a basis and adding the proportionate increase of hands necessary to refine the increased quantity refined in 1889, the total number of hands now employed in these sugar refineries would be 882. The total yearly wages as given by these manufacturers in 1881 was $363,000, and I have to add 22 per cent. additional to that to cover the wages that would be paid on the increased quantity that was refined in Canada in 1889, which would make $79,680 more, or a total of $442,860 per year. I have shown that by the quotations to-day, 30 cents more per hundred pounds is charged in Canada than in the United States, and on a consumption of 200,000,000 lbs. per year that makes $600,000; so that you could afford to pay all these hands which are employed in the sugar refineries at a rate of nearly $500 a year each and then make a saving besides. In other words the $600,000 represents extra cost of sugar to the Canadian people; the amount of wages paid to the workmen in these sugar refineries amounts to $442,860, and if you deduct one from the other you still have a loss of $157,140. The country might, out of the public treasury, pay all the hands engaged in the sugar refineries for doing nothing and then save $157,000 per annum besides. That is the position in which the sugar question now stands, and the Minister of Finance asks us to rejoice with him and to give him credit for having wiped out the taxation that was upon the people of this country with reference to the article of sugar. No, Sir. If he had followed the principle adopted by the United States, which is the example he uses of the highest protected country we have in the world, in the adjustment of their sugar duties, he would find that they give $\frac{5}{10}$ of a cent per pound to their manufacturers, but the hon. gentleman gives $\frac{8}{10}$ of a cent per pound protection to the Canadian refiners. They have allowed the people of the United States to bring in No. 16 Dutch standard free, but our Minister of Finance has reduced the standard to No. 14 under which our people are allowed to bring in raw sugar. Therefore, instead of reducing the protection, he has relatively increased the protection he has given to the refiners. In spite of the fact that sugar is now being reduced in price by the amount that went into the public treasury, the people will still have to contribute a burthen somewhere else. Sugar has still to pay a tax upon the tribute that is placed upon it by those refiners, in asking a higher price than that for which sugar can be imported from a country where the price of sugar is fixed under a protective tariff as it is in the United States. No, Sir, we cannot give him all the credit we would like to give him in this matter; and we have this to say, that while the moral sense of the people of this country would be shocked if a Minister controlling a department should be found varying the terms of a contract so as to make it more profitable to the contractor, and receiving from that contractor at different times sums of money to be used as an election fund to corrupt the electors of this country, and while individual members of Parliament would shield themselves behind the statement that if done at all it was done by the Minister on his own authority and unknown to them—I call to the attention of the hon. gentlemen opposite that, in criticizing the speech of the hon. member for South Oxford, if there was one statement made by him that called for notice at their hands more than another, it was his declaration that it was well known that these sugar refiners were the largest contributors to that corrupt election fund. The hon. gentleman who last spoke should have given some answer to that statement; he should have been in a position either to deny it or to state that it was well founded. Sir, am I to understand that he dare not deny that statement?

Mr. WELDON. Does the hon. gentleman wish me to make a denial? I know as little about it as he does.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance if he is in a position to deny what the hon. member for South Oxford charges?

Mr. FOSTER. You will get the denial in due course.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). A denial of that statement?

Mr. FOSTER. You will get all the denials you deserve, and there will be a good many.

Mr. BOWELL. If you charged it, I think it would receive a little more attention.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Well, it would be a very sad thing indeed if, following upon these people contributing largely to an election fund for the purpose of corruptly influencing the electors of this country, it should be found that a Minister of Finance, not in the secrecy of his own department, but in the broad light of Parliament, should come down with a proposition to so adjust the tariff that those men should get hundreds of thousands of dollars for themselves, if they saw fit to use the machinery provided by him. If the moral sentiment of the community would be shocked by a Minister changing contracts for the benefit of men from whom he had received election contributions, what shall be said of a Minister who would ask Parliament to sanction tariff changes for the benefit of those who were the largest contributors to the fund for carrying the elections of this country? Now, perhaps, I have spent more time on this sugar question than I ought; but my hon. friend was very emphatic in claiming credit for the Government on that point, and I want to give the hon. Minister of Finance full credit for the reduction he has made in the sugar duties. He has thrown off, as the hon. member for South Oxford has said, all the revenue that went into the public treasury, and he has so adjusted his tariff that what was taken out of the

pockets of the people before but did not go into the treasury, it is in the power of the sugar refiners to take for themselves at a greater rate *ad valorem* than they had before. But he is giving the right to the people of this country to use on their breakfast-table sugars under No. 14 when imported from the country of production, while if they import it from any other country they have to pay 5 per cent. upon it, and on refined sugars the people still have to pay $\frac{5}{10}$ of a cent per pound. The hon. gentleman alluded to the argument of the hon. member for South Oxford with reference to the balance of trade, and attempted to account for the balance against Canada. I do not wish to go into a discussion of the subject of the balance of trade. The hon. member for South Oxford mentioned that only to show how utterly unable hon. gentlemen opposite were to grasp the condition of the country. He was showing that for years it was claimed by the predecessor of the hon. Finance Minister, a gentleman from his own province—and his claim was cheered to the echo by all his supporters—that if there was a balance of trade against us, we were on the highway to ruin. His policy was to reverse that condition of affairs; and when, owing to their policy, hon. gentlemen opposite actually did succeed for one year in changing the balance and making our exports greater than our imports, these hon. gentlemen threw up their hats in acclaim, and shouted: "We have managed it; we have made our exports greater than our imports, and we are now on the highway to prosperity." The hon. member for South Oxford referred to that to show hon. gentlemen opposite that since that time there has year after year been an enormous balance of trade against us. The hon. member for Albert argued that these balances were fictitious and could not be relied upon to show the real condition of the country at all; but the hon. member for South Oxford only referred to the matter to show that these hon. gentlemen do not comprehend some of the subjects they undertake to discuss. Now, the hon. gentleman said that we claimed that the National Policy was a failure. Well, we have said that it has not accomplished all that hon. gentlemen opposite claimed for it. Let me ask the hon. gentleman himself a question. I think he himself was reported as saying, in reply to a question of a newspaper man, that the National Policy was a failure and would have to be discontinued. I think that was the view he himself expressed, if he was correctly reported.

Mr. WELDON. That was not my view.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I only know what the hon. gentleman is reported as having said, and if he took that position he would not surely find fault with us when we, who do not admire the National Policy, declare it to be a failure. The hon. gentleman claimed that there were good features in this National Policy. He pointed out that before it was introduced, there had been small industries scattered through all the towns and villages, but that in place of them we had now large factories. He said that in those days in every village you would find a tannery tanning the hides of the whole village. When I went to school I used to be told that the schoolmaster attended to that business in part. But no doubt the National Policy has partly had the effect of wiping out these smaller industries. But if the aggregate number of people that are receiving employment in this country now, under the system of large factories, has increased, the aggregate number of people scattered through all the villages and towns and helps to carry on the different institutions of the country, has decreased. I rejoice in the evidence of prosperity as well as hon. gentlemen opposite, and in any progress made in our manufactures, provided it is made legitimately; but I hold that if you have to bonus a manufacturer to an extent greater than all the wages he pays to the men employed by him, it is a direct loss to the country instead of a gain, and that is a proposition no hon. gentleman opposite can successfully controvert. Hon. gentlemen opposite are hardly fair when alluding to the arguments of my hon. friend from South Oxford with reference to the depreciation of farm lands in Ontario. The hon. gentleman denounced that statement in very strong language. I think he was pleased to say it was untrue, and that he would prove it to be untrue. Now, in questions of this kind it is better not to impute an untruth to an hon. member; it is better, if we can, to admit that he has given an opinion in which he honestly believes, though he may be very much mistaken, and give him the benefit of the doubt. I think an hon. gentleman is all the more bound to do that if he is not in a position to substantiate the assertion he makes by some reliable data. But what is the proof the hon. gentleman gave to show the hon. member for South Oxford was wrong in saying that farm lands had depreciated. He took the report of Mr. Blue and read the total value of improved lands in Ontario compared to what they were seven or eight years ago. Does the hon. gentleman suppose that Ontario is standing still? Does he suppose that no land is being brought, year by year, under cultivation which was not cultivated before? Does he suppose there is no increase in the total acreage of improved land? How does the hon. gentleman's reference disprove the statement made by my hon. friend from South Oxford, which was that individual farm lands have depreciated in value 25 per cent.? The figures given by Mr. Blue do not disprove that statement in the slightest degree. I can assure hon. gentlemen opposite that this is a point on which I do not care to touch, as I find no pleasure in talking about the depreciation of land in Canada, and would much rather be able to rejoice that our lands were appreciating instead of depreciating. But I am forced to say, and I say it with regret, that—let the hon. gentleman attribute it to one cause or another—if I am to believe the statements of loan companies and the farmers themselves, farm lands in many parts of Ontario have depreciated below what they were worth some years ago. I would be only too glad if the hon. gentleman could bring any proof to the contrary, but that he has failed to do. I, however, will not discuss this question at further length, but will leave it to be discussed by hon. gentlemen who will follow me in the debate, and who are more conversant with the matter. No true Canadian can rejoice in the fact that our lands are depreciated, but no true statesman, no true legislator, is justified in living in a fool's paradise and shutting his eyes to the facts. If the contrary be the case, he ought to know it, and face it, and introduce legislation to remedy it instead of imposing burdens upon the people greater than they are able to bear. The hon. gentleman,

in speaking of the exodus, said it was not to be wondered at because England, Ireland and Scotland had to suffer from a similar exodus, and the New England States had lost their population in many parts, and he added that it was a characteristic of the Anglo-Saxon to go westward until he had circled the globe. I hope sincerely that the exodus from Canada is about circling the globe, and is now on the home-stretch back to Canada. The hon. gentleman has given his view in that connection, only it was somewhat marred by the fact that somehow, when the the people of the Western States start on their journey west, they keep within their own boundaries and do not cross over into our territory, and what I lament is the fact that while we are losing our own population we are not gaining any from the other side. It is lamentable, when we take our last census returns, to find that in Canada we are not able to retain our own natural increase of population, but that all the immigrants that come to our country and a percentage of the natural increase of our people have left us and gone somewhere else. That is a question I do not like to dwell upon any more than upon the depreciation of real estate. I do not mention it in a spirit of depreciation, nor did the hon. member for South Oxford so refer to it, but we simply point to the fact and ask that the Government should give it their attention and see whether there is not some way to be found by which a better state of things could be brought about and our young men kept in the country. The hon. gentleman spoke of the English market and of the differential duties which he anticipated would be imposed by the British Government upon farm products, and he said if the British Government would charge other countries five cents or ten cents a bushel on their grain, the English market would be a grand market for us. Are we to understand that the hon. gentleman was put up to answer my hon. friend from South Oxford in order to give this House and the country the first intimation that our Government are about to adopt the scheme of Imperial Federation as their policy? He said he was glad to see that the Finance Minister had given a ray of hope in his Budget speech with regard to an extension of trade with England and then he went on to give his own views of the direction in which legislation would tend to the benefit of this country by Imperial Federation between Great Britain and her colonies, differential duties being imposed by Great Britain on the products we are able to send her, but I do not see, from his remarks, what it is we are to do for Great Britain in return for these differential duties. I do not see what part of the hon. gentlemen's scheme will in any way turn to her advantage. Is it part of the hon. gentleman's scheme that Canada shall, in her turn, open her markets to the manufactures of Great Britain? I put him that question. He has been willing to answer me on several occasions this evening, sometimes without even my requesting him to do so, and might I ask him for an expression of his views on this point? Is he prepared to say on behalf of this Government that they entertain the project of admitting British manufactures of all kinds free into this country?

Mr. WELDON. Will the hon. gentleman say whether he is opposed to such a scheme?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not think the hon. gentleman is as candid as he might be. He has posed as a statesman to-night. He denounced my hon. friend from South Oxford as being no statesman, and proposes to us a policy, in opposition to that of my hon. friend, of differential duties on the part of Great Britain in favour of colonial goods, and he is bound to state whether, as a necessary condition of that policy being adopted by Great Britain, the Government propose to admit English goods free.

Mr. WELDON. I did not say a word about Imperial Federation.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman did not use the term, but spoke of our trade with Great Britain; and will he tell us whether he had not in his mind, when speaking of differential duties, the idea of a federation of Britain and her colonies?

Mr. WELDON. That does not matter.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman is not candid enough to admit that. I think the change predicted here by my hon. friend cannot mean anything else. And in confirmation of this I will just read a report of the hon. gentleman's remarks in a newspaper interview after the elections, concerning the Imperial tariff. He said:

"The time has come when England must choose between abandoning Canada or agreeing to an Imperial tariff that will give Canadian products a preference in the British markets in return for a preference to British manufactures in Canadian markets."

He does admit it. When the hon. gentleman could say so to the newspaper reporters, why should he not be candid enough to make the same statement here when I ask him to do so in the most pleasant manner possible? He continued:

"If England will not do this, annexation is not only probable but appears to be the inevitable destiny of Canada."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Treason.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is a bad shape in which, according to the hon. gentleman, we find ourselves. I do not think there is much hope that British statesmen, in their present state of mind, will give these differential duties, and I am very sure that, whatever our Government might otherwise do, the Red Parlour which controls it will not quietly submit to allowing British manufactures to come in free. I think, therefore, this scheme of the hon. gentleman is rather in the distant future; and I am afraid, if he is a true prophet, and he poses as one to-night, since, having denounced my hon. friend from South Oxford as a false prophet, the inference follows that he must consider himself a true one, our only alternative, according to him, is annexation, and that is a black outlook for this country. He will have to go to Washington. With reference to the English market, a great deal was said during the late election, when we were discussing the policy of the Liberal party and that of the Government, about the British market being our natural market and providing us with an outlet for our products; and it was said that we should do nothing to destroy that market. Why, Sir, if we were to adopt reciprocity with the United States, how would that destroy the market of England for Canadian agriculturists? What is the fact? The British market is as open to-day to

every product of Canada as to those of any other country. It will receive every pound of Canadian produce which we choose to send free, and it is open to every other nation under Heaven just as freely as it is to us. The English market gives us no advantages, but places us in precisely the same position as it does all the other nations in the world. And while I rejoice in the fact that a large trade in many articles is springing up in the mother land, that trade is springing up there simply because it is the best market we could find under existing circumstances for those articles. If under this Government's policy we close forever the American market against our products, we can send them to Great Britain, but we shall not be able to sell them there at as good advantage as we could in the United States if we had free trade with that country. What we want for our agriculturists is to obtain for them access both to the United States and English markets. These markets will not be closed against us until they are closed against other nations. But let us deal a little with this question of unrestricted reciprocity, to which the hon. gentleman alluded in the closing part of his speech. He asked the hon. member for South Oxford to say whether he favoured unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union. At last the hon. gentleman has found that there is a distinction apparently between the two. Hon. gentlemen opposite have hitherto always contended that these phrases mean the one and the same thing. Now, my hon. friend admits that there is a difference; but on rising to speak on the amendment introduced by my hon. friend from South Oxford it was not necessary for the hon. gentleman to ask what his policy is, because the very proposition he rose to criticize enunciates that policy. What is that policy? Why, it is that in the negotiations which this Government have declared they are about to enter upon with the Washington authorities in October next they should be prepared to conduct them in the spirit and on the terms of the most extended reciprocal relations that can be had. That is the proposition which my hon. friend from South Oxford has fairly laid down. There was no necessity for the hon. gentleman asking for an explanation of it, as the amendment fully explains itself. Hon. gentlemen opposite have expressed themselves in favour of reciprocity with the United States in natural products, and they are going to Washington presumably to attain that object. But is there any possibility of their being able to secure from the Washington authorities reciprocity in natural products on the basis of the treaty of 1854? Well, they have been told by Mr. Blaine, the Secretary of State, or they might have learned it from the letter he has written, that he will never be prepared to grant reciprocity on these terms, and that being the case, the House cannot give the Government credit for being sincere in their desire for any measure of reciprocity at all. Why, Sir, what is the position taken by the Finance Minister, who was one of the delegates to Washington, and proposes to go there again. He is going there, he says, to obtain reciprocity in natural products. We know what he thinks with regard to the value of the American market for the products of our farms. As the mouthpiece of the Government he spoke in Toronto, when the House was dissolved, and laid down the policy of the Government on that occasion. What did he then say with reference to the United States market as a desirable outlet for our farm products. He said:

"They talk, Sir, about the natural market. They say the United States is our market. I say that in my opinion the only thing that constitutes a market is demand and supply, and the proper market for a country, the best market, is where there is the greatest demand alongside of the lowest home production to satisfy that demand. Senator Carlisle, who is often quoted by the Opposition, never said a truer thing than in his speech on the McKinley Bill, when, ridiculing the idea of natural markets being necessary, he stated that the best natural market was where the goods that a country produces are required at the maximum. Take that rule and apply it to Great Britain. We have a surplus in agricultural products. Why should we go to a market in the United States where they have a surplus of the same class of products that we have to sell? Should we go to Great Britain, where millions of mouths are crying for food and only a small percentage of the necessary supply is produced at home, where we are not met by hostile tariffs or by vacillating tariff legislation, as we have had in the United States, when once we have set the current of trade in a certain direction to run up against it and throw all things away, a country that is willing to pay and is able to pay, a country that must continue to import for all time? The natural market is not a country that produces a surplus, as does the United States, but Great Britain, which does not produce a surplus, and in which there is a sustained demand."

Now, that is the view the Minister of Finance entertains with reference to the value of the United States market to the farmers of this country. He asks the question: Why should they go to a market in the United States where they have a surplus of the same class of products that we have to sell? Let me ask now: Why did he go to Washington and beg and beseech for an interview if, peradventure, they might in any way get this market of the United States that is of no use to us? The hon. gentleman was not the only one that spoke, for we find that the Minister of Agriculture was at that same meeting announcing the Government policy, and what did he say with reference to the American market? The Minister of Agriculture said:

"It has been stated that the United States is our natural market. I contend that it is not our natural market. I contend that they are our competitors in everything we produce. Everything they produce we produce, and they are our natural opponents with the exception of, perhaps, bananas, oranges and peanuts."

Here the Minister of Agriculture, a member of the Government, declares that the United States market, instead of being a benefit to the people of this country and to be desired by them, is rather the reverse, except, perhaps, in respect to bananas, oranges and peanuts, in which articles, he admits, they would not be competitors. There you have the Finance Minister and the Minister of Agriculture stating that the markets of the United States, even for our natural products, are valueless to us; you have them going to Washington and begging for an interview, after all they said against the Washington Government, going there after all the insulting things they said with reference to the American people, and begging and seeking an interview, and coming home rejoicing in announcing to this House that they had succeeded in so far that Mr. Blaine had fixed a day when they might go back and renew negotiations for a treaty in order to secure the inestimable boom for our farmers of a market for their natural products, a market proclaimed by the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Agriculture to be valueless. Why should they go to the United States for a market? That is the position of hon. gentlemen opposite, of these gentlemen who, three or four days after dis-

solution, appeared upon a public platform and poured contempt upon the idea of the markets of the United States being of any value to our farmers, even if they did get them. These were the same gentlemen who put it into the mouth of the Governor General to say that so great did he consider the boon that might possibly be obtained by negotiations at Washington that they had dissolved Parliament prematurely in order to bring it about. That is the position of hon. gentlemen opposite; and, Sir, if it were not that the honour of Canada is bound up in what these hon. gentlemen do we might view their action, the ridiculous condition in which they have appeared, with a little more equanimity; but, Sir, I hold that the honour of Canada has not been maintained by the course of these gentlemen: I hold that the honour of Canada has been lowered by the action of the High Commissioner. Just let me read to this House, from the papers that have been brought down, one or two extracts from a letter that Sir Charles Tupper wrote to Sir John A. Macdonald from Washington, on 21st April, where he is detailing to him the interview that he had with Mr. Blaine. He says:

"I told Mr. Blaine that I wished, in the outset, to recognize the accuracy of the statement contained in his letter to Sir Julian Pauncefote, which I have seen, in reference to the initiation of the negotiations regarding reciprocal trade arrangements between the two countries: that I believed it arose from the negotiations which had recently taken place between the United States and Newfoundland; and that, upon that being communicated to him by Sir Julian Pauncefote, he had expressed his willingness to open negotiations for reciprocal trade arrangements between Canada and the United States, assisted by delegates from the Dominion Government, the negotiations to be informal, and to a certain extent of a confidential nature, until they could assume a more formal character, if any result were arrived at."

Sir, I say that the High Commissioner of Canada who had declared—and they knew it—that the initiation of all these negotiations was at the suggestion of Mr. Blaine: he who could boldly proclaim that on the stump here ought to have been able to enter into the presence of Mr. Blaine, without being compelled to acknowledge that what he said was not true, but that what Mr. Blaine said in reference to it was true. Sir, I say that Canada is lowered in this respect, and, therefore, we feel more deeply than if any single gentleman had been concerned, however high he might be. And then, Sir, to think of a High Commissioner, a representative of the Canadian people, going to Washington and attempting to secure an informal conference, if possible, with Mr. Blaine, in order to get a reciprocity for this country which the Finance Minister said was of no value, even in the matter of natural products alone. Fancy that man in the presence of a statesman to whom he had gone to talk upon international affairs using language like this:

"I then told Mr. Blaine that I wished to remove the idea, if he entertained it, which had been promulgated in Canada and the United States, that the present Government of the Dominion was not warmly in favour of the most friendly relations with the United States. In an article which I had recently sent over my own signature to the *North American Review* I had undertaken to give conclusive evidence upon that point, and that I need further only refer him to the fact that when Sir John Macdonald, who was one of Her Majesty's Joint High Commissioners, submitted to Parliament for approval the Alabama Treaty, which settled also all the then pending questions between Canada and the United States, he was fiercely denounced by the leaders and press of the Liberal party for having basely sacrificed the interests of Canada in his endeavours to promote the friendly relations between Canada and the United States. I added that I had experienced the same treatment from the same party when I submitted, for the approval of Parliament, the Treaty of Washington of 1888. I was then charged by the leader and press of that party with having conceded everything to the United States and obtained nothing in return, so great was my anxiety to remove all causes of dissension between the two countries."

Fancy the position of the Canadian High Commissioner conferring with the Secretary of State of a great nation like the United States, trying to impress on his mind that he and his party were the great friends of the United States, but the Liberal party were opposed to the Republic and its interests. What had he to do with talking about parties: what had he to do with drawing discriminating lines between parties, even if the lines were true? But that gentleman crouched in the presence of Mr. Blaine instead of taking the manly stand that an hon. gentleman should take in the presence of another. Fancy that man taking that crouching position in the presence of one of the leading statesmen of that country and assuring him of the friendly feeling that he entertained towards Americans. Fancy him doing that after heaping the insults he had cast on that country and that Government, which he offered on the platform in Canada. What did he say with respect to the United States, when speaking at Amherst in March, 1891. He made one of the most insulting statements that it was possible for the citizen of one country to use with regard to the people of another country. He was speaking of the difficulties that the Conservative party had to contend with. He said they had the Liberal party to contend with, the provincial Governments, the Grand Trunk Railway, and a little later he is reported as having said, and I call attention to that—this utterance of the High Commissioner:

"He did not forget the enormous influence of the 65,000,000 of Americans. We had not only beaten our opponents here, but the 65,000,000 to the south of us."

The hon. gentleman thus cast an insult in the face of the whole American nation, stating that they had stooped as a nation to do what he accused the Liberal party of doing, to endeavour to subvert the allegiance of Canada to Great Britain, and cast in her lot with the United States. This gentleman insulted the American people, and then crouched before Mr. Blaine. The papers brought down deal with an important question, namely, that as to duties levied on articles that might be made free in the treaty between the United States and Canada, and in which there would be discrimination enforced against Britain. What do we find in the papers? That the British Government had authorized negotiations to be carried on between Newfoundland and the United States, and a draft treaty was prepared, and under it articles were to be admitted free from the United States by Newfoundland, while those articles were to remain taxed as against Canada, England and other countries. To that document the British Minister gave his consent. I want to point out to hon. gentlemen who may not have read the draft treaty that it was not only with respect to raw products that were to be admitted free but agricultural implements when imported for agricultural societies, ploughs, harrows, and some other manufactured articles. These were to be admitted free from the United States while

they were to be taxed if coming from Canada or England. These discriminations were in favour of the United States, and the British Government were a party to the transaction. It will be found in the same papers that when a protest was entered by the Canadian Government against the completion of this treaty the Secretary of State for the Colonies wrote that they had induced the Island of Newfoundland to promise similar legislation in favour of Canada, and he asked Canada not to stand in the way of Newfoundland, she having carried out their wishes in this respect. Thus, the British Government have expressed their readiness in the interests of one of her colonies to admit manufactures as well as other articles to a certain extent from the United States duty free, while duties were to be maintained against Canada and against the rest of the empire. Complaint had been made that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) did not refer to the loss of revenue. If the hon. gentleman who made the complaint had read the speech of my hon. friend he would have found that he dealt with the question, and dealt with it in a satisfactory manner. Certainly my hon. friend did not shirk it. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) also noted that if we had reciprocity with the United States the Americans would take possession of our markets and ruin our manufactures. How does the hon. gentleman arrive at the conclusion that under free trade between the two countries, with the barriers of each country let down, and the manufacturers in Canada having the same opportunity to buy raw material at the same prices, to employ the same labour, and having a market of 65,000,000 equally with the American manufacturers, American manufacturers would wipe out Canadian manufacturers? Is it not pouring contempt on our people to adopt that line of argument? If we maintain that contention we must admit that the workingmen of Canada are inferior in skill to the artizans of the United States, or that employers there look after their business more efficiently. One or other proposition must be maintained, and to hold either one is to throw discredit on this country. For my part, I submit that reciprocity on this basis has not been tried, and we can only argue from data, and cannot tell the result from actual experience. What data have we to proceed upon? Unfortunately, there are tens of thousands of our fellow Canadians in the United States. In that country, which was to them a new and foreign country, what is their position? Are they in an inferior position? No, Sir. The hon. gentleman knows it, and as Canadians our cheeks should glow with honest pride as we recognize and bear testimony to it. Canadian artizans, Canadian-born, Canadian-educated, have gone to the United States by the thousands and tens of thousands, and these artizans in the busy hives of American industry are holding their own, man for man, with those who have been trained in that country. I ask, Sir, if these artizans go into that which is to them practically a foreign country, and under that disadvantage hold their own with a native-born artizan or an artizan from any other country, why should not these Canadian artizans hold their own in the Dominion of Canada when the products of their labour find a free and open market in the United States—as free as the market for the products which he is manufacturing in the United States at the present time. Do they tell me it is because our manufacturers have not the enterprise, the business capacity and the brain to compete with the men on the other side? Look at what has been done by Canadians in the United States; look at their boards of railway directors; go into their exchanges, go into the business marts of commerce, and there you will find Canadians holding their own with any native-born Americans or with the people from any other country. Why, then, does the hon. gentleman lay it down as a matter settled by himself that if you have reciprocity with the United States in manufactured articles all your Canadian manufactures will be destroyed? The contention will not bear investigation, and therefore it is urged, as my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has urged it in his resolution, that in the securing of this reciprocity you should give instructions to your representatives who go to Washington in October next to treat with the Government of the United States on a broad, expansive, liberal platform, not confined to reciprocity in natural products, which will not be entertained and which hon. gentlemen opposite know will not be entertained, but that you should include manufactures as well. Giving to them that mandate, I ask the hon. gentleman what he fears, and why he does not believe, if it be good for the farmers of this country that they should be brought into free and open competition with the farmers of the United States, it should not also be good that the manufacturers of this country should be brought into free and open competition with their manufacturers to receive the benefit of their market, and giving them in reciprocity the benefit of our market, and letting those who best can prosper under the circumstances. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) refers to letters which he said were written by Mr. Laurier with reference to the finances of the Province of Quebec. He did not know whether these letters were written or not, but if it was true they were written he said that it meant there would be some $2,000,000 added to the burdens of the people of this country in giving additional aid to the various provinces of this Dominion. I do not know whether or not the letters were written either, but I ask the hon. gentleman this: He stands appalled at the very thought of it, but suppose the Dominion Government gave this money, they would be giving it for the benefit of the whole people of these provinces. But the hon. gentleman cannot view this present tariff legislation in the light it ought to be viewed in, namely, that instead of $1,000,000 or $2,000,000 of taxation being scattered over all the provinces for the benefit of all the people in all the provinces a far larger sum is by this tariff legislation placed in the pockets of four or five wealthy monopolists in this country. My friend is perfectly satisfied with that, but, oh! how his righteous soul was indignant as he thought about $2,000,000 additional burden being added to the people of this country, which, even according to his own declaration, would be taken out of the pockets of the people of the country, not to benefit the sugar refiners, but to benefit the whole people. The hon. gentleman could contemplate a tariff sustained and maintained for the purpose of giving to some favoured individuals in this country vast sums of money, and not feel in the least degree shocked about it; but he cannot understand taxation to benefit the people at large. The hon. gentleman

closed his speech with his loyalty. I need not allude much to that. He has denounced my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), but that hon. gentleman did not seem to feel very uneasy about it. I did not feel uneasy myself. If I know myself I believe I am loyal; I never felt it necessary to shout it from the house tops. I took it for granted that every one would believe it, and I am confident that the political party with which I am associated are as loyal as any other people in this country. But, Sir, I think it is unworthy of any man aspiring to be a representative of the people and a statesman to endeavour to draw away public attention from a great question which concerns the welfare of these people, and to try to influence their minds and excite their prejudices against a fair consideration of it, by shouting that disloyalty is contained in it. The Liberal party believe that if we could have more extended and freer trade relations with the great nation to the south of us it would benefit the people of the Dominion of Canada, and believing that, they believe in an honest attempt being made to secure it, and they are willing and anxious to secure it—not for their own glory or renown, not for the sake of attaining the Treasury benches; but they are anxious it shall be obtained and they will be willing and rejoiced if the gentlemen on the Government benches at the present time will accomplish it. In order that these hon. gentlemen opposite may obtain that great boon, we, on this side of the House, have submitted a proposition which will authorize these gentlemen when they go to Washington to confer and negotiate on a broad basis, which may be accepted by the United States, instead of being confined as they have confined themselves by their utterances to a basis which the United States have told them in advance they cannot accept. By the adoption of the resolution moved by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), this Parliament will give to those representatives a mandate to go to the United States to negotiate for trade relations on a basis they may hope to succeed upon, and it will relieve them from being tied up, as they have tied themselves by previous utterances, to restrict themselves to a limited reciprocity in natural products, which they know they will fail in obtaining. The resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford should commend itself to these hon. gentlemen opposite. The very fact of their going to Washington, the very fact of their attempting negotiations at all, proves, notwithstanding their utterances, that they believe Canada requires extended trade in order that she may prosper; and, Sir, these gentlemen must know, despite their talk, that the English market will be open to us after we have obtained this reciprocity as well as now. The Government must recognize, as the agriculturists and the other classes of the country recognize, the value of freer trade relations with the United States. The futile mission of the Minister of Finance to the islands of the sea in order to attempt to develop a foreign trade shows that he recognizes that Canada is in a position where she must have a broader and wider market, and these gentlemen must know, notwithstanding what they say, that the markets of the United States secured on fair and equitable and honourable terms, would be a boon to the people of this country. The Minister of Finance and the Minister of Agriculture may say: What is the United States market to us? But I tell them what any business man knows, that trade knows no favour. A man does not deal with another man, nor a country with another country, simply because of friendship. Trade knows no friendship in that respect, and if the hon. Minister of Finance looks at his own Trade and Navigation Returns he will find that from year to year and down to the present time nearly one-half of the entire trade of this country is done with the nation to the south of us. Sir, it is useless to say that freer trade with a nation with whom we now do about one-half of our whole trade would not be beneficial to this people. Here are two nations side by side engaged in what? The Canadian Parliament engaged in building up an artificial barrier against the United States higher and higher and higher, and the United States Congress on their part building up a tariff wall against Canada higher and higher and still higher, while at the same time millions of money are being expended by both countries for the construction of tunnels and bridges to overcome the barriers which nature has placed between us. We say that if you can by a fair and honourable treaty between this country and the United States remove these artificial barriers which both countries have erected, and allow trade to flow more freely between the two countries, vast and profitable as our trade is now under the adverse circumstances that exist, how much the greater will be the prosperity of the Canadian people when from the channels of trade will be removed the artificial obstructions which the two Governments have created. Sir, it is with the view of benefiting the people of this country that the Opposition have proposed the policy embodied in the resolution submitted to the House, and in accepting that resolution this Parliament will give an opportunity to the Ministry to go to Washington in October to offer to negotiate a treaty on a basis which will secure for them a hearing, while we fear, from an utterance made by one of the public men of the United States, that if they persist in going with their hands tied, as they have been in the past, to a demand for such a treaty as American statesmen have said they will never assent to, their efforts will end in failure, and the people of Canada will not give them credit for a desire to secure reciprocity even in natural products. I regret, Sir, that I have detained the House so long. I must, however, put half the blame on the shoulders of the hon. gentleman who preceded me, to whom I thought I would not be showing sufficient courtesy if I did not deal with the points he brought up. I noted them all down, and have endeavoured to answer them one by one, conscious that a better answer could have been made by others. While I may not have convinced him, I trust that by examining each other's views from our different points of view, we may both find our minds enlarged, and may endeavour to promote legislation in this House which shall be for the best interests of the people of Canada.

Mr. MONTAGUE. After the very eloquent speech of the hon. gentleman, which has been of necessity somewhat lengthy, though not too lengthy, I am sure it would be improper on my

part to ask the House to listen to anything I have to say at this late hour; and, with your permission, I desire to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. BOWELL moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What business does the hon. Finance Minister propose to take up on Tuesday when we meet?

Mr. FOSTER. Mainly the Supplementary Estimates for the current year.

Motion agreed to: and House adjourned at 12.30 a. m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 30th June, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PRIVATE BILLS—RECEPTION OF REPORTS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved:

That as the time for the reception of reports from Committees on Private Bills expires this day, the same be extended till Tuesday, 14th July next, according to the recommendation contained in the seventh report of the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 120) respecting the Salisbury Harbour Railway Company.—(Mr. Skinner.)

Bill (No. 121) to amend the Act to incorporate the Montreal Bridge Company.—(Mr. Desjardins.)

FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 122) further to amend the Fisheries Act. He said: The object of this Bill is to prohibit the use of purse seines in the territorial waters of Canada. The fishermen on our coasts are considerably alarmed at the use of these dangerous fishing engines, which have done such irreparable ruin to the fisheries of the New England States, where legislation has been attempted on the subject, but, I think, not in time. I hesitated before introducing this measure. Last session I mentioned to Parliament the hope I had that, by representation to the Government of the United States, we might obtain a much more satisfactory prohibition, one which would cover more than the territorial waters, and until that is done a good deal of the injury complained of will go unprevented. But, at any rate, the fishermen are most anxious that we shall prevent the introduction of these purse seines as much as possible. I also add a section which is connected particularly with the enforcement of this prohibition, but is applicable generally to the provisions of the Fishery Act. Those members who are interested in fishing districts are no doubt too well aware that it is very difficult to induce fishery officers to take on all occasions that lively interest in the enforcement of the laws which Parliament has imposed upon them. There are many considerations to account for that. An active fishery man is not likely to be a very popular man in his district, and the duties are often performed in a very perfunctory manner, and not in such a way as to thoroughly protect the fisheries; so I propose to amend the general Act by enabling the fishery officer to receive a moiety of the penalty obtained on conviction. At present the Act prohibits a fishery officer from receiving any part of the penalty, and, if we want to obtain vigilance, we will have to give some inducement to active fishery officers, and incidentally to other persons.

Mr. LISTER. You allow a moiety now to any one other than the fishery officer?

Mr. TUPPER. Yes: but the fishery officer is prevented from receiving it.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PRIVILEGE—DIVISION ON JUNE 22ND.

Mr. FLINT. Before the Orders of the Day are called I wish to supply an omission that has occurred in the Official Debates. After the division which took place upon the 22nd instant, regarding the policy of the Government, the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) called attention to the fact that I had not voted. I rose and stated that I had been paired with the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood), and that if I had voted I would have voted for the motion to adjourn. It appears that my remark escaped the notice of the reporter, and was not recorded, and I wish now to make this statement.

SUPPLY—INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a few words on a matter somewhat personal to myself, and upon a matter that engaged, to some extent, public attention the last time I had the honour of a seat in Parliament. It will be recollected by those who were in that Parliament that in the session of 1886 I assailed the then Government, practically the present Government, with mismanagement, misconduct and corruption in the administration of Indian affairs in the North-West Territories. I preferred, on that occasion, about sixty charges against the Government. I based all those charges upon the blue-books submitted by the Government to Parliament and to the people of Canada, and on the reports made to the department, some of which were published in the reports of the department, and some of which were not so published. I preferred those charges openly, in my place in Parliament in the presence of the representatives of the people, in the presence of eight or ten Ministers of the Crown. I did so on the 15th day of April, 1886, and Parliament prorogued on the 2nd of June of that year, nearly six weeks after I levelled my charges against the administration of Indian affairs, and during all that period no member of the Government said a word in justification or vindication of the administration of Indian affairs in the North-

West Territories. Hon. gentlemen were silent, hon. gentlemen were dumb, they opened not their mouths. Six months afterwards, and just on the eve of a general election, a pamphlet was issued. I suppose by the Department of the Interior, or by the Department of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, challenging the correctness of the statements I made, charging me with having garbled the reports, misread the reports, forged the reports. This pamphlet was printed at the Hamilton *Spectator* office, at confidential rates, and scattered broadcast all over the wide Dominion at the public expense. On the eve of the election, three Ministers of the Crown travelled all over western Ontario and visited my constituency, as they had a perfect right to do. I am within the mark when I say that at least one-half the time occupied in the delivery of each speech by those hon. gentlemen, was taken up with assaults upon myself individually, charging me with misconduct, misrepresentation, using forged extracts of the reports, and with all the sins that politicians are known and not known to commit. I sought an opportunity on the platform of defending myself. In my own town where these hon. gentlemen addressed a large audience, I made an application to one of the leading Conservatives in the town for leave to speak one hour in reply, and I was refused. I then made application to have half an hour, and I was again refused. I have had no opportunity of meeting these hon. gentlemen face to face until to-day. When I could not meet them upon the platform I issued a challenge to the then First Minister of the Government, which was published in the daily papers in Toronto, and a copy of which, in the following words, was mailed, by registered letter, to the right hon. gentleman:

"To the Right Hon. Sir JOHN MACDONALD,

"Superintendent General of Indian Affairs.

"SIR,—On the 19th of this month you visited the west riding of the County of Huron on a political mission—as you had a perfect right to do. On the same day you and two of your colleagues held meetings at Dungannon and Goderich, to discuss political questions—as you had a perfect right to do. At both those meetings you assailed me in no measured terms, respecting the charges made against your management of Indian affairs. On the floor of Parliament, and in the presence of the representatives of the people, I arraigned you and your Government for gross mismanagement, for cruel and callous neglect, in your administration of Indian affairs. That indictment was preferred against you on the 15th of April, 1886. Parliament did not prorogue until the 2nd of June. You had thus ample opportunity to answer me before the Commons of Canada. You did not attempt the hopeless task. Six months after I arraigned you, you caused some of your underlings to prepare and issue a pamphlet, which purports to be a reply to the charges I made against you in Parliament. This pamphlet you caused to be printed, not by the Queen's Printer, Ottawa, but at the Hamilton *Spectator* office, at 'confidential rates,' and to be scattered by the thousands all over Canada, at the public expense. Then you visited my constituency and availed yourself of the opportunity, behind my back, to denounce me, to charge me with having garbled the public reports and having preferred false charges against you. But you took good care not to invite me to your meeting, not to give me a chance, in my own constituency, of meeting you face to face and answering your slanders then and there. I now challenge you to meet me, either at Dungannon or Goderich, at any time you may name within one month, to discuss your Indian policy, when I shall prove to the satisfaction of all reasonable men that the charges I made against you and your Government are, in nearly every case, absolutely, in all, substantially correct: that the pamphlets issued anonymously, under your supervision, and which you have not the courage to father, in answer to my indictment and in justification of your conduct of Indian affairs, garbles the official reports, misquotes the official records, misrepresents the official blue-books, emasculates the official returns, and is, in other respects, knowingly, wilfully, and audaciously false.

"I have the honour, &c.,

"M. C. CAMERON.

"GODERICH, 26th November, 1886."

Sir, as I have said, the first opportunity I have had of defending myself is here to-day, and I am glad that it is upon the floor of this Parliament, where I made the charges, I propose now substantiating them to the extent of my humble ability. On the platform, behind my back, and when I had no opportunity of answering, I found those hon. gentlemen were bold and defiant: I found that they had made use of language in respect to me which was not justified under any possible circumstances, and I shall venture to submit quotations taken from the Government organs, of what those hon. gentlemen said of me, and then I shall challenge the hon. gentlemen to make good the charges they so levelled against me. At Peterborough, on the 3rd December, 1886, that elegant, refined and polished French Chevalier, the hon. the Secretary of State said of me: "His political associates are freethinkers—secessionists, annexationists, rebels, felons, traitors;" and that I myself was a "scandal-monger and a skunk." At Hamilton, on 22nd November, 1886, another member of the Government said of me, that I garbled the official reports, I misread the official records, I misquoted the official reports of the Indian Departments. At Orillia, on 2nd December, 1886, the same hon. gentleman said of me, that I was the father of lies. Then the dignified and refined and polished and unctuous Minister of Justice, not to be outdone by the Secretary of State, spoke of me in language that even the Secretary of State hardly ventured to make use of, and which I think anyone listening to the hon. gentleman in the Parliament of Canada will be surprised to find he did use even respecting a political adversary. At Guelph, on 7th November, 1886, that dignified and polished and unctuous gentleman said of me:

"He strung out lie after lie, false quotation after false quotation, garbled extract after garbled extract, manufactured statement after manufactured statement, and out of sixty charges, fifty-nine were deliberate falsehoods."

And again, not satisfied with the polished, and refined, and elegant language the hon. gentleman made use of on that occasion, at Welland, on 16th November, the same hon. gentleman said of me:

"It was subsequently found that these charges were based upon deliberate forgeries and falsehoods. It was subsequently developed that the documents on which these charges were based were the most impertinent forgeries ever put before the public."

Such, Mr. Speaker, was the eloquent, choice, refined and polished language made use of by the Minister of Justice and by his colleagues, such was the language made use of by three Ministers of the Crown, two of them belted knights and one an Imperial privy councillor, and three of them, Canadian privy councillors, speaking behind an adversary's back of what a political adversary said in Parliament. Outside of Parliament, I would say these statements were false and unfounded: inside of Parliament, I will content myself by proving it. I was charged by these hon. gentlemen with uttering deliberate falsehoods; I was charged with making false quotations, I was charged with using garbled extracts; I was charged

with having made sixty charges, fifty-nine of which were deliberate falsehoods and forgeries. If the statements made by these hon. gentlemen are true, I have no business to sit in Parliament; if they are not true, their duty is on the floor of Parliament to offer the humblest apology the English language will enable them to offer for having made use of language so unjustifiable under the circumstances. I propose to prove that the charges I made against the Administration were all true, with the exception of one, and that was substantially true. I will prove it, to the satisfaction of this House, many of whose members were in the old Parliament when I levelled that indictment of sixty charges against the Government. Fifty-nine of those charges, if their own reports are true, if the reports issued by the Department of the Interior and by their agents are true, are literally and absolutely true, if their blue-book which I hold in my hand is true. I will not deal with the whole sixty charges to-day: it is impossible. I will not venture to so weary the House or myself. I will take the first ten of those charges as published chronologically, in the order in which I treated them in my speech, and in which they were treated in the pamphlet issued in reply to my speech. I will then as occasion offers, because as far as I am able to do so I intend to put myself right before this country and before the members of this Parliament, I will fire at the heads of hon. gentlemen opposite the answers to those vile charges in batches of ten or fifteen at a time, and when I have got through, even the Minister of Justice will be satisfied that, to say the very least, he used indiscreet, unwise, unjustifiable language, and I have no doubt he will do more than that, he will express his extreme regret for having so done. I will show further that this pamphlet, issued I dare say under the supervision of the Minister of the Interior, who was then Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, is false from nearly the first page to the end. I will show that, to make a case against me, the pamphlet garbles the reports of the Department of the Interior, that it misquotes the reports, and the reports submitted to Parliament, and I will show that, in order to make a case against me, this pamphlet contains wilful and deliberate forgeries in answer to the charges I made against the Government. I will show that if these blue-books are true, if the returns are true, not only the returns which the hon. gentleman published in the blue-books but returns which the hon. gentleman had not the hardihood to publish in his own blue-books, they sustain every charge I made. Now, as to the first charge challenged, I did not give the language as a quotation from any report but as the substance of Agent McKay's report, and in doing so I made use of the following language:—

"A. McKay, an Indian agent at Grand Rapids, in his report states that the Inspector of Indian Agencies promised to supply them with all they might require, and that they were urged by that gentleman to make their demands on the department for the same, which they did, but they were not complied with. Mr. McColl, Inspector of Indian Agencies in the North-West, writing of the Swan Lake Bands, said that waggons were promised them and that he is apprehensive of serious consequences unless their claims are recognized."

What answer did this pamphlet and the Government make to that charge? The answer which the present Minister of the Interior, who at that time occupied, I believe, the position of Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories and Superintendent of Indian Affairs, ventured to make, not to a quotation from the report, but to the substance of the report which I ventured to submit to Parliament, is as follows:—

"In fact no such reports were ever made. A careful search through all Mr. McKay's reports fails to reveal any such statements as that attributed to the agent by Mr. Cameron."

Here is a direct issue: either the Government was mistaken and the pamphlet was mistaken in so answering my charges, or I was mistaken. Let us see where the responsibility lies. Will the Minister take the trouble to look at page 44 of the report of 1882? Did he ever read the reports of his department? Did he know what they contained? Did he venture to read the reports submitted by his own department before he made those charges against me; and before the Minister of Justice ventured upon the public platform to say that fifty-nine out of the sixty charges laid against the administration of Indian affairs in the North-West Territories were based upon deliberate falsehood and forgery, the Minister of Justice should have read the reports. I venture to say that the Minister of Justice never read one of them: he took the statements on trust, and he ventured to make those statements behind my back without verifying the correctness of the quotations I made in Parliament from the reports of the Indian Department. If the Minister of Justice will take the trouble to read the report, and if the hon. gentleman has not a copy of the report, I will lend him mine and point out the very paragraph. The substance of what I said can be found in the report sent in by Mr. McKay to the Indian Department. At page 44 of the Indian Report for 1882, the hon. gentleman will find the following words:—

"They stated that the Inspector of Indian Agencies promised to supply them with all they might require, and that they were urged by the gentleman to make their demands on the department for the same."

Then, if the hon. gentleman will turn to page 153 he will find what Mr. McColl said with respect to the waggons. He says:

"He is apprehensive of serious consequences unless their claims to their former possessions are immediately recognized by the Government, and the compensation of lands promised in lieu of waggons is granted them. * * * I consider that as the gardens are on a school section, and therefore not interfering with the claims of any settler, it would be advisable to adopt a conciliatory policy towards them by acceding to their request as far as granting the school section referred to, or a portion of it, to them in addition to the Swan Lake Reserve, to satisfy the promises made with regard to the waggons."

Now, I charged that these Indians were dissatisfied because you did not implement your own engagements with respects to the waggons. You said that the author of that speech was guilty of deliberate falsehood and forgery, but I have now read out of your own reports the identical words I made use of, although I did not pretend to give them in that statement as a quotation. Who is right and who is wrong? Is the Minister of Justice right who made these charges on the public platform, or is the individual right who is now addressing the House and who addressed it in 1886 upon the same subject? With respect to those charges I quote further the letter of Poundmaker to the present Minister of the Interior, in which he says:

"It is Poundmaker who takes the liberty of sending you a few lines. We entreat your Honour to send him the grist mill with horse power you kindly presented him at

Cypress. We expected it last summer, but in vain. Let me have the twenty-two oxen you promised my band."

The answer which the Government made to that charge is as follows :—

"Mr. Cameron, with the idea of fairness which pervades his speech, suppresses that part of Poundmaker's letter in which he goes on to say: 'There are here sixteen or seventeen oxen.' The band having received four times as many cattle as their treaty calls for, it was for the Government, not for Poundmaker, to determine whether more should or should not be sent."

Now, Sir, what will you think of Ministers of the Crown charging me with having garbled the reports, if I can prove to you out of their own blue-books that in order to make up this answer to my charge they deliberately and wilfully forged part of the letter which Poundmaker wrote to the Commissioner ; that they left out a portion of it, cut it off in the middle of a sentence, and omitted a material part of it altogether in order to make out a charge against me. From the report for 1882, at page 196, I will show you Poundmaker's letter and what he says with respect to that :

"Let me have the twenty-two oxen you promised my band. There are here sixteen or seventeen oxen."

The Minister, if he was the author of the pamphlet, stopped here and said that was an answer to the charge, but Poundmaker did not stop here, he went on to say the following, which it was found convenient to omit in order to answer my charge :—

"There are here sixteen or seventeen oxen, but we cannot use them as we like. Our farmer is the master of them all. If these cattle were delivered into our hands I hope we would show a good deal more work."

The other parts of the letter I may have occasion to read later, but I submit to you that I have shown that the Ministers were wrong, and I have shown that from their own reports and from the reports of the Department of Indian Affairs for 1882 at pages 194 and 196. I give the pages because I do not believe the Minister ever reads them. I want him to read them now. I then went on and made this charge :

"G. McPherson, Indian agent, says: 'The clothing for the chiefs and councillors was good, except the trousers and shirts, which were inferior and worn out in three or four days.'"

I made some comments on that charge ; I declared it was a scandalous thing that the Parliament of Canada and the tax-payers of Canada should be asked to give enormous sums every year to feed and clothe the Indians, and to give the Indian chiefs some advantages, while at the same time the Government should buy these articles at the highest market price and that they were of such inferior quality that they were worn out in three or four days. The charge was a grave one and deserved the consideration of the Government. If it were untrue I ought to be stigmatized as a man who ought not to be heard to make charges against the Administration.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Wait a moment, gentlemen. If the answer of the Government is untrue and false, will you say "hear, hear" to the Government that you are supporting day after day, if I can prove, out of their own blue-books, that the very words I made use of in my charges against the Government, in this House, are literally the words made use of by George McPherson, the agent of the Government in the North-West Territories, and embraced in this volume of their own reports ? Surely, in such a case, the responsibility does not rest on my shoulders, but upon the shoulders of the Ministers you are supporting. You will find at page 44 of the report of 1882, the report of George McPherson, in which George McPherson makes use of the following language. Before quoting that report, let me mention to the House the answer made to my charge which I last quoted. They say :

"Again, Mr. Cameron has been guilty of garbling. Mr. McPherson does not say anything of the sort; what he does say is that 'an Indian had informed him' to that effect."

If that were true my charge would not have the same weight, but, even so, I do not think it a charge which should not be answered. However it would not have the same weight as if the charges I made were literally, and in the very words I made use of, supported by the reports of the Indian Department. It so turns out that Mr. G. McPherson, the Indian agent, did say so in the very words which I used. Mr. McPherson did not say "that an Indian had informed him to that effect," but he made use of the very words I made use of. At page 41 of the report for 1882, the Minister of the Interior, who never read the reports, will find the following :—

"The clothing for the chief and councillors was good except the trousers and shirts, which were inferior and worn out in three or four days."

Now, if the hon. gentleman will find in this report which I have just read a single word about an Indian having informed Mr. McPherson of that fact, I will withdraw that charge and say that I have not read the reports right, and that I was mistaken. But if he can find no such words at page 41 of the report for 1882, from which I have just read them, the hon. gentleman owes to the country and to the House an apology for so stating. The statement which I have referred to is the very last statement in the report ; there can be no mistake about it, and the author of this pamphlet must wilfully, and with his eyes open, have published what he must have known to be untrue. I said further :

"W. Herchmer, Indian agent, speaking of the Salteaux Band, under South Quill, says: 'Having failed in their neighbourhood, the band have been obliged to sell most of their horses to buy supplies, and are miserably poor.'"

I said that the agent had so reported, and the answer which the Government made to that charge is as follows :—

"Well, most of the Indians are miserably poor. If they were not, they would not need Government assistance. All the Government can do is to keep them from actual suffering. The Government must bring pressure to bear upon the Indians to induce them to help themselves. If they refuse to work and refuse to settle down on their reserves, they must take the consequences."

Now the charge that I made there is admitted to be true by the Government, and what I stated then, and what I state now is : that the enormous sums which we vote annually to feed and clothe the Indians should be sufficient to keep the Indians from this miserable condition, if that money were properly disposed of. Later on in the session when we reach the Estimates, I will be able to show as I have done on former occasions, how a large portion of the sum voted by Parliament to feed and clothe the Indians is expended. It was reported that, notwithstanding these enormous subventions, these Indians had not blankets to cover their nakedness, and that for want of clothing and food they

were freezing to death and starving to death : and yet, my statements to the House are characterized as untrue, when what I said was extracted from the blue-books of the department. Will the Minister of the Interior take the trouble to bring his great mind down to the level of reading his own reports. At page 43 of his report for 1882, he will find the following language made use of by Agent McKay :—

"While I was making the payments this year I was informed by the Indians that they experienced great hardships for want of food during the last winter and spring."

Further in the same report it is stated :

"This was greatly caused by the want of proper medicines and necessary food. They represented that there was great suffering for want of supplies for the destitute of the land."

In the report for 1883, at page 78, Agent Anderson made use of the following language :—

"The majority of deaths during the year have been from consumption, which appears to prevail amongst them. This is owing in a great extent to their want of clothing, which is really lamentable, many of the children going naked, and some adults being barefooted in dead of winter."

Agent McKay in his report for 1885, at page 97, says:

"No supplies of any kind, nor means to procure any for the destitute, sick and aged Indians, have been provided for this treaty since 1880."

Inspector Wadsworth, one of the inspectors of the Indian agencies in the North-West Territories, at page 95 of his report for 1884, states :

"The band number eighty, and bitterly complained of starvation, attributing the sixteen deaths which occurred last year to this cause."

I then pointed out that the gross mismanagement and neglect that characterized the administration of Indian affairs in the North-West were so great that with over a million voted every year for Indians, they were allowed to freeze and starve to death, and to contract such diseases that thirteen in one band died. I further said that Indian Agent McKay stated that with regard to the Indians of the Che-ma-wha-win reserve :

"The harrows and ploughs were lying partly buried in mud and weeds in different places. Some of them have never been used or put together yet, and are spoiling for want of care."

The Government, in reply to my charge, makes use of the following language :—

"The agent does not say that 'the supplies were dumped off in the mud and filth and left there to rot.' That is Mr. Cameron's invention."

Now, I quoted from the Government's own report, and their reply is that the charge is Mr. Cameron's own invention. Let us see whether it is Mr. Cameron's own invention, or the invention of the Minister of the Interior, or an employé of the Minister of the Interior. The hon. gentleman will find at page 46 of the report for 1882 the following language :—

"I arrived here on the night of Saturday, the 12th August, and made the payments on Monday, the 14th. No improvements have been made at this place during the past year. It is a poor reserve for planting purposes, and the Indians take very little interest in doing anything in that line. In going over the reserve on the 11th September, I noticed that no attempt was made to care for the implements which had been supplied to them. The harrows and ploughs were lying partly buried in mud and weeds in different places. Some of them have never been used or put together yet, and are spoiling for want of care."

The charge I made against the Government in that connection was this: I said : Here you have an army of officials in the North-West Territories, who extract from the funds which we vote for the Indians about one-fifth in salaries, travelling expenses, &c. ; and yet you dump off at the wigwams or reserves of these ignorant, illiterate pagans, valuable agricultural implements, which the taxpayers of Canada are paying for, and you leave them there in the mud and filth and dirt to rot year in and year out ; and I am answered by the Department of the Interior with the assertion that that is one of Mr. Cameron's inventions. Now, Sir, my charges against the administration of Indian affairs are based largely upon such acts of gross misconduct. I stated further in that speech that Superintendent Walsh, in his report for 1880, at pages 26 and 27 made use of the following language :

"In some cases persons became so reduced as to render them unable to assist themselves, and I was forced to make small issues of food to save their lives. Following this want of food, and the eating of diseased horses, an epidemic appeared which marked its results by the many graves now to be seen in Wood Mountain."

I pointed out, Sir, what a terrible picture was here drawn by the Government's own agents. I pointed out that the callous misconduct and neglect of the Department of Indian Affairs could be traced by the graves of the Indians on the side of Wood Mountain ; and in answer I am told that those things are Mr. Cameron's invention. Mr. Cameron made sixty of these charges, and fifty-nine of them, the Minister says, are based on deliberate falsehood. I have proved out of the Government's own books that every charge I made is literally true. If I were disposed to pursue the enquiry further, I could quote what Major Walsh and other agents of the department said on this subject. If my memory serves me rightly, the report of the medical man was one of those that spoke so clearly and loudly of the misconduct and maladministration of the department that hon. gentlemen opposite had not the hardihood to make it part of their annual report, and suppressed it until, in the session of 1886, it was resurrected and submitted to Parliament. Dr. Edwards in that report, after specifying several types of diseases from which the Indians were suffering, added :

"And starvation, if the last can be recorded as a disease. I find that in the last three months thirteen deaths have taken place on each reserve, in all twenty-six, a very heavy death-rate ; and from all I can gather, death has been accelerated, if not immediately caused, by the scant supply of food sent out to these Indians."

Again he says :

"I saw several children in the Assiniboine camp worn and wasted, and, unless properly fed, must die in a few days."

Also :

"It may not come within my province to report this condition of starvation, but I am well satisfied that if they were sufficiently fed there would be less tendency to illness among them."

Also :

"I may also add that, from the way they have been allowed to starve, a firm determination was expressed by both Piapot and Jack that as soon as they could travel they would forsake the reserve and go west again."

Let me now point out another matter that did not come under my cognizance then. It was in one of the reports suppressed, and which was only submitted to Parliament after I had levelled my charges against the Administration. On the 23rd

of September, 1882, A. G. Irvine, Commissioner, wrote to the present Minister of the Interior the following letter :—

"North-West Mounted Police.
"Headquarters, Fort Walsh, 23rd Sept., 1882.

"Sir,—I have the honour to enclose herewith copy of a telegram sent this day to the department. The messages from the Indians, as regards their annuity and reservation, I promised to send to you and the department. A reply thereto the Indians now await. I have also to inform you that on my return from Qu'Appelle, I found some 2,000 Indians here. They are all in a starving and wretched condition for the want of clothing.

"The Indians say this is their country, and they intend to remain here. They ask that they receive aid by the issue of provisions. Will you be good enough to impart to me in the form of instructions what your wishes are? In the present starving condition of the Indians, I fear if no food is given them that they may hereafter commit depredations which will bring them into collision with the force. Of course, in case of any depredations the offenders must and will be arrested and punished. It is always possible that such punishment might be accompanied with bloodshed.

"The actual power of the Indians nowhere, in view of future hostility, is certainly not great. But, as it is superfluous to point out to you, an outbreak of any kind would be disastrous and create universal alarm throughout the country.

"As you will observe from my telegram, the supplies of your department will not last more than three weeks; even for that time the issues will have to be made sparingly.

"I trust you will be good enough to reply to this by return of mail.

"I have the honour to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servant,
(Sd.) "A. G. IRVINE,
"Commissioner.

"To Hon. E. Dewdney, Commissioner, Battleford."

Now, one would think a letter like that from an official in the North-West Territories would receive prompt attention. Nothing of the kind. The Indian Commissioner paid no attention to it. There were two thousand starving Indians almost at his door, and he paid no attention to them. Then, on the 2nd of October, Mr. Frank Norman, of the North-West Mounted Police, communicated with the Indian Commissioner at Winnipeg in the following words :—

"Fort Walsh, N. W. T., 2nd October, 1882.

"Sir,—I have the honour to enclose herewith a statement showing the amount of provisions issued to Indians at this post, and also the amount of provisions in store here on the 30th September just past.

"These issues have not been made on my own responsibility, but by orders I have received from the officer commanding the post and of Lieutenant Colonel A. G. Irvine, Commissioner of the Police.

"No regular issue of rations has been made, the amount of provision issued being barely sufficient to sustain life. There are at present three hundred lodges of Cree Indians camped here: these lodges average about eight souls, making a total of 2,400 souls. They are in an utter state of destitution, and are merely existing in a semi-state of starvation.

"You will perceive that were a regular issue to be made those Indians, that the supply on hand of flour would last about to the end of present month, and that of meat, about twenty days.

"I have the honour to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servant,
(Sd.) "FRANK NORMAN,
"Inspector N.W.M.P.
"Acting Agent *pro. tem.*

"To the Indian Commissioner,
"Winnipeg, Manitoba."

Now, Sir, there is a letter on the 2nd of October, and you would think that the second communication from the officials in the North-West Territories in charge of the Indians would be promptly answered. But it was not, and so, on the 19th of October, Mr. Fred. White telegraphed the present Minister of the Interior as follows :—

"Walsh, N.W.T., October 19, 1882.

"To Honourable E. Dewdney.

"Over two thousand Indians here almost naked and on verge of starvation; have been among them for two days; am satisfied many will perish unless early assistance rendered. Please instruct Agent McDonald to come here at once to make payment. I will arrange to have money here in readiness.

(Sd.) "FRED. WHITE."

Now, one would think that would arouse the Department of Indian Affairs from its slumber, but no attention was paid to it. These communications were not even reported to the head office at Ottawa until about three months after they were sent to the Commissioner. These Indians in September were dying of starvation; in October they were dying of starvation; and in the end of October they were still dying of starvation, and no assistance was given by the Government, and no step was taken by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to draw the attention of the head of the department to the condition of the Indians. Therefore, on the 1st of February, 1883, Mr. Frank Norman communicated again with the Commissioner:

"Fort Walsh, 1st February, 1883.

"Sir,—I have the honour to enclose a memorandum I am in receipt of from Surgeon Robert Miller of this place, with reference to the condition of the Indians.

"I have informed Surgeon Robert Miller that it is not in my power to increase the quantity of food to the Indians, as my instructions from the Indian Commissioner are to keep the Indians at Fort Walsh on 'starvation allowance.'

"Your obedient servant,
(Sd.) "FRANK NORMAN,
"Inspector N.W.M.P.,
"Acting Agent.

"E. T. Galt, Esq.,
"Assistant Indian Commissioner,
"Winnipeg."

The instructions from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, the present Minister of the Interior, were to keep the Indians in a state of starvation. While Parliament was voting an immense sum, while the people were being taxed to make good the enormous subventions from year to year, to feed and clothe the Indians, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs gave instructions to keep them in a state of semi-starvation, and they were so kept. Was I not more than justified in charging the Government with cruelty and neglect in their administration of Indian affairs? At last the hon. gentleman did come to their relief. On the 24th of February, he sent the following telegram to Mr. Norman, whose despatch I have already read :—

"Yours of February 1st received (not a word about the September and October letters). Increase rations supply slightly. Purchase two hundred pounds tea, fifty pounds tobacco, and distribute judiciously and where most needed.

(Sd.) "E. DEWDNEY."

2,400 Indians dying of starvation, and almost frozen to death, and the pangs of starvation are appeased by two hundred pounds of tea and fifty pounds of tobacco. Was I not more than right in making these charges of maladministration and misconduct against hon. gentlemen opposite and their officials? Yet I am answered by the statement that the extracts I quoted from the report are deliberate falsehoods and forgeries, and that, too, by the hon. Minister of Justice, who ought to have known better. I quoted further what Mr. McColl, the Indian Inspector of Agencies, said :

"I also notice in the same record that nearly all the bands within this agency have received more axes than they were entitled to under the treaty, and that only two or three bands have received their complement of hoes, spades and scythes, notwithstanding the representation made to the contrary to the department, as well as to the Indians in reference to the matter."

That charge was met by the Government in the following language:—

"The testimony does not sustain the charge. Mr. McColl does not say that any bands had received no hoes, spades, scythes, but that some of them had not received their complement—their full allowance. All necessary implements for these Indians were provided and stored with the agent, who, through an error of judgment, did not issue them in their proper proportions. So soon as the department was informed of this, immediate measures were taken to rectify the error."

It is here admitted that practically my charge is true. But I am answered that it was an error of judgment that the proper implements were not dealt out. It is just such errors of judgment that I complain of. We pay the officials of the North-West Territories very liberal salaries, and when they are guilty of neglect, we are told it is an error of judgment; that it was done in a moment of weakness; that it was an oversight or omission. But it was just such errors of judgment which forced the Indians, at an unfortunate period in the history of Canada, to do what, under other circumstances, they would not have done, namely, take up arms against the constitutional authorities of the country. You will find in the reports for 1883, at page 138, that Mr. McColl further says:

"The councillor states that in his portion of the Island band there are ten families who have only received one hoe apiece, whereas they are entitled to two hoes each by treaty, and that in order to plant their potatoes they were obliged to use old axes with handles driven through the eyes and bent double, so that they could be utilized like hoes."

And at page 139 of the same report, the inspector makes use of the following language:—

"The Indians received fifty large axes from the agent last summer, but they complain that they have not received the number of hoes to which they are entitled by treaty, and therefore they want them, as they are greatly in need of them."

I appeal to the House whether or not hon. gentlemen opposite were justified, on the public platform and behind my back, in assailing me in the manner they did. I appeal to Parliament to say whether or not the statements I made were true, and whether or not the answers made by the Government to my speech in Parliament denouncing them for their misconduct and mismanagement were justified by the facts I submitted. I also said:

"The same inspector further says: 'The potatoes and barley received last spring were half rotten.'"

Recollect that the charge I made was that the Government were supplying these men with barley, potatoes and other seed for seed purposes. The Indians complained of the quality of the seed supplied, and the Indian inspector himself said that those which were supplied were not fit for the purpose. Did the Government admit that, and say it was unfortunate, that it was an error of judgment, that it could not be helped, and it would not occur again? Nothing of the kind. The answer is that

"Seed potatoes and barley were furnished to the Loon Strait Indians, Treaty No. 5, in 1882, and were stored at Dog Head, but some of the Indians did not go for their share, and, therefore, a portion of the seed was spoiled."

If that were true, it would perhaps be a sufficient answer to my charge. If the Indians were too lazy to go to Dog Head to get their potatoes and barley, I do not think the Government would be so very blameable, but if the potatoes and barley which the Government agents handed over to the Indians were half rotten at the time, then no language could be too strong to denounce the gross negligence and carelessness of the Government in relation to that. What the Indian inspector complained of was not that the potatoes and barley were rotten when they were received at Dog Head, but he complains "that the potatoes and barley received for seed last spring were half rotten, and were it not that these were replaced by others from Fisher's River, purchased by themselves, they would not have any crop." That is the potatoes and barley delivered by the Government to the Indians. That is found at page 141 in the report of 1882. What answer had the Government to make to the charge? Was I not right, absolutely and literally right? Was not my statement substantiated by their own agent whose report I have just referred to, and, consequently, was not the statement of the Government absolutely incorrect? I said further:

"The same inspector again says: 'That the councillor complains that the quality of the hats, trousers and shoes received by him were inferior.'"

The answer to that is:

"The clothing for the chiefs and councillors is always carefully selected and inspected, and this is the only complaining councillor in Treaty Nos. 1 and 2."

In the first place, it is not true that this is the only complaining councillor. I have already referred to others, and it is also clear that if, as the inspector says, the clothing received was inferior, it could not have been carefully selected, particularly when it was under Government control, and, therefore, the highest price was paid for it. Agent McPherson, in his report for 1882, page 41, reported:

"That the clothing for the chiefs and councillors was good, except the trousers and shirts, which were inferior and were worn out in three or four days."

And the same agent reports in 1883, page 133:

"The clothing they received was of excellent quality, excepting the trousers, which were inferior."

In 1884, page 96, Mr. Wadsworth reports:

"The trousers and wincey shown in the inventory are of very poor quality."

Yet, in the answer to the charge which I levelled against the Government, it was said that these articles were always carefully selected and inspected, and that this was the only band that complained. I have shown that two other bands complained. I could show that a dozen complained, if I were justified in taking up the time of the House on this occasion. Then I charged that the agent further said:

"John Marcus, one of the councillors of the Cumberland Band, complains that the agricultural implements forwarded by the department for their use were refused to them."

Then comes a paragraph which appears to be part of a quotation, but it is only given as the substance of the report. I said:

"We were under treaty obligations, we were in honour bound to give the Indians these things; they were bought and paid for, yet, when they reached their destination, some wise agent of the Administration would not hand them over to the Indians. Was any enquiry made into this? In so far as I am able to gather from the reports, none was made."

The author of this pamphlet assumed that it was a

quotation, though I only used the first part as a quotation. The Minister of the Interior could see that that could not be a quotation, because it was simply my comments upon the report of the Indian agent. The answer of the Government to that was:

"The band did get all the implements called for under the treaty. The implements withheld were over and above the complement."

If that answer were true, my charge would lose its weight, it would be a charge that I would feel disposed to withdraw altogether, and in reference to which I would state that I was misled by the reports; but, instead of that charge being true, the answer which was made to the charge is absolutely without foundation and false. The hon. gentleman will find on page 146 of the report of 1882 that Inspector McColl says:

"John Marcus, one of the councillors, complained that the agricultural implements forwarded by the department were refused to be given them. These supplies were generally late in arriving at the different places of payments, but even where they had been delivered on the dates contracted for, the agent objected to give them up to the Indians, and also instructed Mr. Factor Belanger to retain them at Grand Rapids until further orders from him, as he was not authorized to hand them over."

Here is the answer of their own agent. The author of the pamphlet says the Indians got all they were entitled to and more, but their own agent says these implements were kept there by the agent and that they were not given over to the Indians. At page 131, the same inspector reports:

"Chief Keetcheekaikake requests that the balance of implements to which his band is entitled be furnished them."

And again at page 142, the same inspector reports:

"Two years ago 100 garden hoes were forwarded to this band, but the agent, considering them unsuitable for that rocky, timbered country, left them in the storehouse of the Hudson Bay Company there until last summer, when they were ordered to be retured to Winnipeg. The Indians are dissatisfied in not having received any agricultural implements this year, especially the grub hoes promised to be supplied to replace the garden hoes."

Is it not thus seen that the charge which I made against the Government is true in substance and in fact? I also pointed out, and this is the last charge I propose dealing with to-night——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). If you like, I will go on with the whole, and there are about 60 of them. I stated:

"He (Mr. Wadsworth) reports as to Mistowasis' band: 'They complained that they did not get treaty pigs, and Wadsworth recommends that Mistowasis and Ahtahkakoop get them.' Mr. Wadsworth says of the Bob Tail Band: 'They complained that there are still due them, under treaty, a cow and bull.'"

The answer is, "That these bands received all that was due them and more." If that were true, my charge was without foundation. Let us see if it is true. Let us test it by the reports of the Government. Let us see what their own agents say, and if that confirms my statement, then the Government were wholly unjustified in issuing this pamphlet, and still more in denouncing me on the public platform in the manner they did. At page 120 of his report for 1883, Inspector Wadsworth says, speaking of the chief:

"He asked for his treaty pigs, more work oxen, another tool chest, and moccasins; also some milk pans."

And, at page 121, speaking of Mistowasis' band, he says:

"I beg leave to recommend that this band and Ahtahkakoop's be supplied with their treaty pigs."

Again, at page 125, speaking of Wahsatanow band:

"They require more oxen and tools, and ask for a grindstone and tool chest. Most of the tools given to the band under treaty have been taken to Saddle Lake."

Again, on the same page, speaking of the Bob Tail band:

"They claim that there is still owing to them under treaty a cow and a bull."

And of Ermine Skin's, on the same page:

"The chief asks for a mower and some carts."

Now, Sir, I have shown to you that in the first ten charges, taken chronologically, and a few others, levelled against the Administration, the statements I made were absolutely true, unless the reports of the department are absolutely false. I have shown that I have not garbled, I have not misquoted, I have not misread those reports; I have shown you in respect of these ten charges, and of three or four others that I made, that every statement I made is literally borne out by the reports of the department itself. I have shown you that I have not "strung out lie after lie, misstatement after misstatement, misquotation after misquotation;" and that out of sixty deliberate charges levelled by me, fifty-nine of them are not "wilfully and deliberate falsehoods." I have shown you, Mr. Speaker, that the author of this pamphlet, and the members of the Administration who undertook to deal with me on public platforms, if anyone is guilty of "distorting, misrepresenting, stringing out lie after lie, misquotation after misquotation," it is not the author of the speech, but the authors of the answers to it. Now, Sir, I cannot, after having spoken so long upon this subject, deal with the balance of the charges now, but I promise hon. gentlemen, if an opportunity is afforded me, that I shall deal with the balance of those charges, and I shall show hon. gentlemen who the men are who deliberately—I withdraw the word deliberately—who ignorantly made these charges against me on the public platform: I shall show who the "scandal-mongers," who the "father of lies" are, and I shall show who the "political skunks" are before I get through with this matter. I say to the hon. gentlemen opposite: Before you level charges of this kind against a political adversary, be sure you are standing upon safe ground; take the trouble, be diligent enough, at all events, to read your own reports, to read what your own agents say. I will now give you a word of advice, that you will do well to heed: ponder over the reports, take them home with you; if you have not got them I will lend them to you, and I will show you the pages in each volume in which the evidence can be found; ponder over them carefully, repent of your sins and transgressions, and if you make an open confession, I may find it in my heart to forgive you.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we shall never be so unfortunate as to deserve the hon. gentleman's forgiveness. The hon. gentleman has made a speech this afternoon which is, in one portion, a continuation of a speech which he made five years ago, and in another portion of it, was a review of some speeches which Ministers made some four and a-half years ago. If the hon. gentleman had intended to put a candid refutation of our speeches before the House, after the lapse of four and a-half years, supported by genuine

extracts from public documents, I am sure the hon. gentleman would at least have given us a few moments notice of his intention to do so, in order that we might have ascertained what it was in our speeches that he was likely to complain of, and have furnished to the House the evidence to sustain our charges, if we were in a position to sustain them, and at any rate, that we might have had documents here to compare the extracts which the hon. gentleman read to the House with the original reports themselves; because the essence of this whole discussion is a charge against the hon. gentleman of having misquoted on a former occasion. When he came to discuss the charge of having misquoted from public documents before this House on this Indian question, if he desired to have a careful examination of that charge and a careful criticism of it by members of this House, he would have made it impossible to charge him now with being guilty of misquoting, by giving us some notice so that we might have had the documents here. The hon. gentleman has carefully refrained from pursuing that course, and it is most significant that he has done so when we consider more especially the history of this discussion from the beginning. Now, it was, as the hon. gentleman says, on the 15th of April, 1886, that he brought these sixty charges against the administration of Indian Affairs, to the notice of this House. The Indian Department was at that time under the management of the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, and the charge was made, as this attack has been made this afternoon, without one moment's notice being given to us; it was made in a carefully-prepared speech, supplied with a multitude of so-called extracts from public documents, not giving a moment's notice to any member of the House that such charges were to be made, or that such extracts were to be read, and at a time when the First Minister, who was in charge of that department, was lying prostrate with severe illness at his home in Earnscliffe. On the 15th April, 1886, that matter was brought to the notice of this House, in an elaborate speech, and with a motion on going into Supply. He was answered as well as he could be on the spot, by persons who had little knowledge of the details of the subject, and went to a vote of the House. But the hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken in his recollection of what took place in the same session, for, no doubt contrary to his anticipation, the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald recovered from that illness in time to be present in the House before the session closed, and to review and deny the accuracy of every one of the charges which the hon. gentleman had made. The hon. gentleman was under the impression when he spoke this afternoon, that Ministers were dumb, that Ministers had no answer to make to these charges; and that the session closed six weeks afterwards, without any one venturing to dispute the correctness of what he had said, and that we sought the platform in his absence and behind his back—an expression which he used a number of times—for the purpose of attacking him, and making what was not a genuine answer to his complaint. But the House did not close within six weeks from that time without an answer having been made, for I find that on the 2nd June, in the same year, Sir John A. Macdonald, being in his place, referred to all these charges in a long address, a portion of which I will read to the House:

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

"I do not know that I would have gained much information by it, because the speech was an elaborately prepared one, in which the hon. member went into a number of details which could not be answered on the spot. So soon as I was aware of the speech made by the hon. gentleman I obtained a copy of it and transmitted it to the North-West. I asked for a report not only as regards the Indians, but in regard to all the matters referred to, and I gave instructions that every charge should be brought up, every statement should be examined into and verified or refuted. In order to do that a great extent of the country had to be traversed. Each charge consisted in a distinct allegation of wrong-doing, a sin of omission or commission. The evidence to meet each charge had to be collected and investigated. Only within the last two or three days I have received additional evidence. I had intended, if my strength had allowed me, to have gone into the whole question, but it would have taken a much longer time to have read the evidence in rebuttal than it occupied to make the charges, and the House would not have listened to me. The speech of the hon. member has been published under the auspices of hon. gentlemen and widely distributed. I shall take care that the answer shall be distributed equally widely. I will let the country see from the evidence that, from the beginning to the end, the speech of the hon. gentleman is characterized by the same want of accuracy as has characterized all the speeches and attacks on everybody and everything made by the hon. gentleman in the House this session. I shall be able to show that to the satisfaction of the country."

The hon. gentleman complains of being spoken of behind his back. I have shown the House that the hon. gentleman's whole attack on this subject was made behind the back of the Minister who had charge of that matter, and who was not able to be in the House in consequence of severe illness, until some weeks afterwards. But when the election campaign came on and his county was invaded by some of the Ministers, of whom I was one, the hon. gentleman complains again that we spoke of him behind his back. I can only say, that from the time when I went into his constituency until I came out of it, I never heard an intimation that he desired to be present at any meeting we should address except once, and on that occasion Sir John A. Macdonald stated, that if Mr. Cameron desired to come and address any meeting at which we were to be present, he should be allowed by all means to do so. The hon. gentleman, therefore, cannot impute any blame to us if the hon. gentleman desired to be heard and was not heard. But I presume, inasmuch as our stay in that constituency was only a stay of a few hours and the election campaign was then on, that hon. gentleman had abundant opportunity to discuss this question after we left. His constituents had read our speeches. We were but casual visitors there, we were wayfarers, and he was a resident of the county; the people knew him perfectly well, and with our statements before them, he had an opportunity of making the most complete refutation which it was in his power to make, and I presume he made it, and I also presume the people decided the question in 1887 after hearing everything the hon. gentleman had to urge. If the result was not satisfactory to him it was by no means our fault. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will call attention again, when the hon. gentleman complains of what we said behind his back, to the fact that, returning to this House at the present session, evidently smarting under the imputations which were contained in our speeches, the hon. gentleman had an opportunity for four weeks of discussing this question in the presence of the venerable statesman who was in charge of that department when the grievances alleged were supposed to have occurred. The hon. gentleman again, with the discretion which he evinced

in 1886, carefully refrained from bringing the subject before the House when the right hon. gentleman who could best answer him was here to give him his answer. I have only to say this afternoon that it would be impossible for any person to have followed the hon. gentleman's remarks, to have compared his extracts and come to the conclusion which he desired us to arrive, that the charges which he made in 1886 were sustained. I have followed some of the hon. gentleman's quotations, and I have been unable to see that the statements contained in the pamphlet issued by the department were in the least degree inaccurate. The hon. gentleman closed, for example, by quoting his remarks in 1886 and asking the House to admit that they were borne out by the department's report. Referring to page 34 of the pamphlet, I find the following as the hon. gentleman's charge:—

"The chief complained that he could not get his treaty pigs, and that he wanted more oxen, a tool chest and milk pans."

The report reads:

"He asked for his treaty pigs, more work oxen, another tool chest, and moccasins, also some milk pans."

There is no indication that any previous application had been made, there was no allegation that they would not be given. The hon. gentleman said:

"Bob Tail's band complained that there was still due them under the treaty, a cow and a bull."

The report said:

"They claim that there is owing to them under the treaty, a cow and a bull."

That turned out afterwards to be an erroneous claim, as are many of the claims made by the Indians. The hon. gentleman said:

"Ermine Skin's band complained that there was due them under the treaty a mower and some carts."

The report said:

"The chief asked for a mower and some carts."

There was no complaint in this regard, there was no suggestion even that they were due them, and so on, all the way through, and this applies especially to the charges made by the hon. gentleman to a great many harrowed listeners, when he declared that out of a band of eighty-eight heads of families and seventeen children under three years, eleven persons had died from starvation. What the hon. gentleman said is this:

"At Oak River, eleven men have died out of eighty-eight heads of families, and seventeen children under three years old. This is very distressing and is hard to account for—the change of diet, owing to the hunting and scrofula, being probably the cause."

The report shows that out of the eleven heads of families, whom the hon. gentleman said died out of starvation, seven had died from drinking too much whiskey, in spite of the strenuous exertions adopted to put down the sale of this deadly Indian poison. Then, in the passage which the hon. gentleman read this afternoon, in which he did quote correctly the passage as regards farming implements, the contrast between the report and the hon. gentleman's statement in 1885 is just as marked as any contrast can be. This is what the hon. gentleman charged, after reading from the report that harrows and ploughs were partly buried in mud and weeds in different places:

"We have an army of officials in the North-West; we have Indian agents, sub-Indian agents, farm instructors, all kinds and classes of men there to look after the interests of the Indians; and yet we find that so little attention was paid to those supplies that they were dumped off in the mud and filth and left there to rot."

The report of the Indian agent is that the Indians take no interest whatever in farming, that they take no care of the implements provided for them—not that they were dumped anywhere in the mud and allowed to rot. The Indian agent says:

"In going over the reserve on the 11th September, I noticed that no attempt was made to care for the implements which had been supplied to them. The harrows and ploughs were lying partly buried in mud and weeds in different places. Some of them have never been used or put together yet, and are spoiling for want of care."

So, instead of this condition being due to carelessness on the part of officials, it appears that the implements had been furnished to the Indians and brought on the reservation, that they had not been cared for by the Indians or even put together or used; and that fact is brought to the notice of the Government by the Indian agent who was accused by the hon. gentleman of dumping them in the ditch and in the mud and filth and leaving them there to rot. Again, on one page of the Indian agent's report, referring to the Salteaux band, under South Quill, he says, that hunting having failed, the band are miserably poor; and the hon. gentleman used this language:

"Miserably poor! With a magnificent donation voted by Parliament, and expended last year, of some $1,400,000. Miserably poor! And why? Because this Government negligently and carelessly permit their contractors to supply these Indians with an article of wearing apparel that lasts them three days."

These are the facts as reported from the report of the Indian agent from which the hon. gentleman appeared to quote:

"The Salteaux band, at Rolling River, refuse to take their new reserve after it had been acquired for them at great trouble and expense. Many of them are now anxious to take it, but I fear the part proposed to be purchased cannot now be had. However, they cost the Government little or nothing, and I have warned them that until they do settle down they will get no assistance."

He goes on to say:

"I do not expect to make of these Indians farmers: a little corn and potatoes will be about the extent of their harvest. There are one or two good men, but the influence of the rest is too strong for them. They have a good fishing lake, and they will have to look to that for subsistence, as they can sell their surplus fish."

These are the people who are said to have been miserably poor, but this not from any fault in the administration of the Indian Department. The hon. gentleman also quoted from Mr. McKay's report for the purpose of showing that the Indians had, as long ago as 1886, made complaints. It was never denied that they were dissatisfied; no one ever knew of Indians who did not complain; the fulfilment of treaty obligations with them was just the beginning, and they required these obligations to be filled to the rest of their days. But Mr. McColl says:

"To say that the Indians are wholly satisfied with the manner in which the terms of the several treaties have been carried out, would be saying what is inconsistent with their character. To complain is a chronic feature of their nature. I am forced, however, to admit, from personal intercourse with them, and from abundant data at hand, that the manner treaty stipulations have been observed in this superintendency in the past has given them just ground for complaint. They have been furnished—by no fault of the Government, which paid the price of prime supplies and implements—with inferior and old worn-out cattle, or cattle too wild for working or dairy purposes, and with supplies of all kinds of the most inferior quality, which would not be accepted at any price by the ordinary consumer."

But when the hon. gentleman, relying on that extract, went on to particular instances to show that the cattle which had been furnished to some of the bands had been worn-out and unfit for use, and hardly fit for food, it was then proven that these were confined to cases in which the band were not entitled to any such supplies to be furnished to them at all. I shall not pretend to follow the hon. gentleman's quotations, which, as I have said, require verification and which he has given us no opportunity in the least to examine. I have, however, to say that any person who will read the pamphlet which the hon. gentleman has denounced and will compare it with the extracts which he has read this afternoon, will come to the conclusion that strong as is the language which was used concerning him in the winter of 1886-87, that language was far within the mark, unless it can possibly be said that instead of being willing to deceive, and anxious to deceive this House, the hon. gentleman himself was grossly deceived and misled: because the statements which he made in 1886, and which he has attempted to sustain this afternoon, cannot possibly be sustained by any kind of evidence from the public documents, or by any kind of evidence which will satisfy any honourable man. The hon. gentleman, in making these charges in 1886 and in repeating them them this afternoon, has been, I am bound to believe, as badly imposed upon as any man ever was in regard to any section of our public affairs.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I must say that I am not a little surprised at the speech addressed to the House by the hon. Minister of Justice in answer to my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Cameron). My hon. friend read a series of extracts from speeches delivered by the members of the Government in the general election campaign of 1887, and he pointed out that the members of the Administration had used very violent, and, in his opinion, altogether unwarranted language against him. I am also of the opinion of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) in regard to this, and I do not think that anything which has been read by the Minister of Justice from the pamphlet which he has in his possession justifies the members of the Administration in the language which they used on that occasion. At the time that pamphlet appeared I took the trouble of comparing some portions of it—I did not go over the whole pamphlet—with the documents that the author professed to quote and with the vindications it undertook to make, and I must say I do not think that pamphlet was an honest production. I do not think that it gave a fair presentation of the contents of the various reports which it undertakes to set out, and I believe that it is open to the charge which the hon. the Minister of Justice has himself made against the speech of the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron). The Minister of Justice has referred to several statements made by the hon. member for West Huron, and amongst others to that statement with reference to the want of care of the agricultural implements which have been furnished to the Indians. The hon. member for Huron made no statements in his speech delivered some years ago, nor did he make any statement to-day that would in any way tend to misapply the language contained in the quotation which he makes. The point made by the hon. member for Huron was not that those implements had been used by the agents, that they had been thrown down in the mud, and that they had not been taken care of, but that here were farm instructors whom the Government appointed and to whom at that time they were paying a large sum of money.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There were none there.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says there were none there, and if that is the case I must say the Government were negligent of their duty and there was want of care and efficiency in the administration of public affairs.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That was not the charge.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says that was not the charge, but I say that is the charge. The charge is that these implements had been furnished by the Government, that they were thrown down in the mud, that the weeds had grown up over them and that they had not even been put together. These Indians are the wards of the Government, and if they did not take proper care of their implements it was the business of the officers of the Government to see that proper care was taken of them. That is the point in the charge of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron), and to undertake to make it mean something else, and to read something else into it, is to pervert the argument which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cameron) has employed. We have been voting very large sums of money for the maintenance of the Indians in the North-West Territories. In my day I think the sum voted was under $300,000, but to-day the vote is four times that amount; and what justification is there for inefficiency or neglect? It is said it will not do to let the Indians starve, you must undertake to provide for them, and farm instructors have been appointed amongst them. The object with which the farm instructors were appointed was to teach the Indians to be self-supporting, and the object of furnishing them with agricultural implements was to teach them how to use these implements and to take proper care of them, and the Government as trustees for the public, and the officers of the Government as trustees for the Administration in that territory, were bound to see that these implements were properly taken care of and that they were not allowed to lie on the ground and to rot. That was the charge made by my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Cameron). He very truly stated that some of these agricultural implements had not even been put together, but he was not charging the Government with having carelessly used them in the work; but was charging them with not exercising proper supervision over the Indians with reference to the implements with which they were furnished and the instructions which were to be given to them. The farm instructors were appointed and the agricultural implements were supplied for the purpose of making the Indians self-supporting, and giving them instruction in agriculture; the vocation by which they were to live. Yet, Sir, that was not done, and the quotation given by the hon. member for Huron shows that it was not done. My hon. friend (Mr. Cameron) has read to-day in the presence of the Administration, extracts from the report of 1882. He gave the number of the page from which he was reading at the time, and it was possible for the Minister to follow him and to see

whether he was reading correctly, or not. He read also the corresponding statement from the pamphlet to which the Minister of Justice has referred, and I think that the House will see that the quotations read by the hon. gentleman went to support his proposition and did not in any way support the statements contained in that pamphlet. I think it is quite clear that the members of the Administration who made personal attacks on the hon. member for West Huron during the election campaign of 1887 did use language towards him which was altogether unwarranted by anything that he had said in his speech, or by anything which he had read from the report of the Minister having charge of the Department of Indian Affairs at that time.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I should like to say a few words in reference to this matter, as at the time these attacks were made by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) I occupied the position of Indian Commissioner in the North-West Territories as well as being Lieutenant Governor, and I was responsible to a great extent for the policy of the Government in connection with the territories at that time. When these attacks were made I took the first opportunity of making enquiry into the matters referred to, and when the speeches of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) were received by us from day to day the statements therein contained caused great astonishment not only to myself, but as well to the settlers of the North-West who were more familiar with the administration of the affairs of the Indian Department than the hon. member for Huron could possibly be. From one end of the country to the other the feeling existed that the hon. gentleman had been most unfair in his criticism of the Indian Department. Subsequent to the meeting of the House in that year I was asked to make enquiries into the allegations made, and to prepare a memorandum in reference to the charges, as they pertained principally to the North-West Territories and Manitoba. This was done by the officials of my department, who had all the documents in their possession. I also gave some attention to the matter myself, and I was surprised to-day when I heard the hon. member get up in his place and state that he had been misrepresented in the answer that had been made. If the hon. gentleman will look at the statements he made in the House and compare them with the reports of the Indian Department, he will himself see that while in many places he did not misquote, yet he did leave out parts of paragraphs or sentences which put a very different construction on the subject he was discussing. That is the case in many instances, I feel sure, from my recollection of the circumstances. When an answer was prepared to the hon. gentleman's remarks, there was no intention of misrepresenting him, and I should be very sorry if there had been any misrepresentation. The hon. gentleman referred to many matters which I cannot recollect now. They occurred in 1882, at a time when, as everybody must know who knows anything of Indian affairs and the state of the country of that time, all the officials of the Indian Department had a most trying duty to perform. The Indians who were scattered throughout the southern country were living sometimes on one side of the boundary and sometimes on the other, most of the time to the south of the boundary. Wherever they could hear of a buffalo, they would pursue it, and when they left we could not know where they would turn up again, whether at Fort Walsh, Wood Mountain or Fort Macleod. In that country, extending over several hundreds of miles, it was impossible to know when to give Indians supplies when they came in and said they were hungry. The police outposts were fitted out with supplies for cases of sudden emergency, when the Indians came upon them, as they sometimes did most unexpectedly. In 1882, the time with regard to which the hon. gentleman complains of my not taking notice of letters which were written to me with reference to the state of the Indians there, we were pressing upon our Indians the necessity of going on their reserves. They had either to do that or go in search of the buffalo; for we were not in a position to provide supplies to keep four or five thousand Indians going. They were not dying of starvation, none of them. The police found their supplies running out, however, and they naturally sent to us for fresh supplies. Some of the Indians did go and settle on the reserves, and others went off to hunt the buffalo. The policy we adopted was to let the Indians know, through agents and every one who came in contact with them, that they must not expect supplies to meet them on the border, but that if they wanted them, they must settle on their reserves, and that policy had the effect of bringing that change about. These Indians, who were then as wild and savage as they had ever been in their lives, are now settled on their reserves, and a great many of them are making their living independently. I am very proud of the success we have met with in this respect in the administration of Indian affairs in the North-West Territories. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) compared the administration of Indian affairs at the time he had charge of the department with what we are doing now. He said that in his time the Government spent about $300,000 a year, while we are now spending a million. That is the case; but, with the exception of one band, there were not, at the time the hon. gentleman left office, any Indians on the reserves. They were just as free as ever they had been, and the Government were not feeding them. Everyone must, therefore, see the reason for the increased cost of Indian affairs to-day. We are now dealing with twenty or thirty reserves, whereas at that time there was only one on our hands. I do not know that I need say anything more in answer to the hon. member for West Huron. It is useless to go into a discussion of every one of these items. In reference, however, to the charge about implements being left in the mud, but especially in reference to the remark of the hon. member for Bothwell that if we had not a farm instructor on that reserve we showed our negligence, I may say that the agency covered by Treaty No. 5 consists of a large number of small reserves, at which the payments are made at stated times during the year. None of the Indians under Treaty 5 are what are called farming Indians, though, if any indicate a disposition to farm, we supply them with tools. In the case mentioned, I presume an application was made to us to supply the Indians with agricultural implements. They were supplied at the usual place where the payments were made, and everything else appears to have been taken away

except the lot of implements which the Indians left in the mud, and which were found there some eleven days after the payments had been made. The reserve referred to stretches along the east and west banks of Lake Winnipeg. The people are not Indians of the plains; they never have been dependent upon the buffalo, and their former means of subsistence have not failed. Consequently, farm instructors have not been supplied. If we had not given them those implements, they would probably have complained, and the hon. member for West Huron would have echoed the complaint here, that they were entitled to those implements and had not got them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would call the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that, with regard to trousers and shirts being worn out in three or four days, the report corresponds with the statement made by the hon. Minister in his speech, and is at variance with the statement made in the pamphlet.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This matter is somewhat old, and my recollection of it is not as distinct as it would have been a few years ago, nor did I know that my hon. friend was going to bring it up. But I think the House will agree with me that it is only natural the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) should seek an opportunity of making the statements he has made to the House to-day. I think it is rather ungenerous, perhaps, on the part of the Minister of Justice that he should have insinuated that my hon. friend had hesitated to make this statement while the late Prime Minister was yet with us. I think if the House will remember the position of matters after the opening of the House, and when the First Minister was ill, they will admit there was not an occasion offered to my hon. friend from West Huron when he could have very well done that. I think instead of that being urged as a reproach against him it should be rather cited in his commendation. The charge made by my hon. friend did not lie particularly against the late First Minister, that I know of. It was a charge against the Government. Perhaps the late First Minister may have had charge of the department at that time, although I think that during the years to which my hon. friend alluded, in which he found most fault with the management of Indian affairs, that department was directed by another member of the Government. Of that, however, I am not absolutely certain. The hon. gentleman, I think, also was not quite fair in stating that the hon. member for West Huron had brought his original motion at a time when the First Minister was not in the House owing to illness, for, although the First Minister was not able to be present at that particular moment, it must be remembered that notice was given of the motion, and that when the motion was reached the First Minister was ill, a fact which my hon. friend could not have foreseen.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The motion was made on going into Supply, without any notice whatever, and the Minister of Public Works, who replied to the hon. member for West Huron, stated, as will be seen on reference to page 730 of the Debates, that the absence of the First Minister was due to illness.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The First Minister was ill; that is my recollection. But the point I take exception to is, that it cannot be fairly charged against the hon. member for West Huron that he made his statement at a time when he could not expect to receive an answer. I do not think that was his object. The hon. member for West Huron tells me he made his motion on the 15th of April, and it was not until the 2nd of June that the House closed; and I find by the *Hansard* that as far back as May 4th the then First Minister was in his place, taking an active part in the proceedings of the House. He, therefore, had ample opportunity for a month before the session closed to reply to my hon. friend, but, according to my recollection, it was not until the closing day of the session that he alluded to the circumstance at all, and then only because I myself brought up some additional information which I had secured from a return, and which was not in the possession of the House at the time my hon. friend made his speech. The information which I brought to the notice of the House then, and to which my hon. friend has alluded to-day, consisted of pressing messages which had been sent concerning the condition of a large band of Indians who were reported to be in a state of semi-starvation. One of those letters was dated the 23rd of September, one the 2nd of October, and one the 19th of October, and during all this time the Government did nothing, although their own agent reported that unless something was done there was danger of an outbreak on the part of the starving Indians. Having brought these facts to the notice of the then First Minister, he replied, and in his reply undertook to deal with the statements made by the hon. member for West Huron. The only point I wish to make just now is this. I have not looked at the extracts quoted from the blue-books quoted by my hon. friend, but I have no doubt what he has quoted will be found there. He has made his statement in the presence of hon. gentlemen, who will see in *Hansard* the remarks he has made and will verify his quotations, if they feel any doubt in the matter; and the hon. gentleman has himself stated that if he has made any wrong statement or misapprehended the meaning of any report, he is quite ready to make the necessary correction. But, as far as I could see to-day, the hon. gentleman has confirmed every statement he made by authorities in the blue-book, and I think he has the right to complain that a document should have been prepared, I suppose, by an officer of the department, with the sanction of the head of the department, to explain away the blue-book in order to meet the charges he made, instead of replying to those charges in the House. I have not got that pamphlet, and do not remember what it is, but I know that it is based, not upon the denial that such things as were charged by the hon. member for West Huron against the Government were in the blue-book, but upon statements of Government officials explaining or denying the charge there made. The hon. member for West Huron is not in a position to say anything with reference to that pamphlet. If Parliament is furnished by the head of the department with an annual report, compiled from reports of the department received from Government agents in various parts of the country, and if in these reports certain statements are made, and if a member of this House, assuming those statements to be correct because they are in an official form, bases thereon a charge against the Government, it is a

very unfair proceeding on the part of Ministers of the Crown that they should take the platform, and accuse the hon. gentleman of dealing in falsehoods, of uttering a tissue of falsehoods, when all his statements were taken from the Government report. The hon. gentleman is charged with falsifying the facts. That is a very strong charge for anyone to make against a member of this House, even a political opponent, unless there be very good ground for it; and it is for hon. gentlemen opposite to prove they had good grounds for such a charge by showing that the quotations made by my hon. friend from the blue-books were not in the blue books. To charge an hon. member of this House, who accepted as authentic the official reports submitted by the head of a department and commented upon them, with being guilty of stating a deliberate tissue of falsehoods, seems to me the opposite of the courtesy that ought to prevail between political opponents, though the battle may often wage warm and strong. There is this point to which I wish to call the attention of the House, that the late First Minister, when he did allude to this matter, in the closing days of the session, made a general denial of the statement of my hon. friend. He did not say that the extracts quoted were not in the blue books, but that they were capable of explanation, and I think he promised to name a commission to enquire into the whole matter. That, I believe he did not do, but he said he had sent off for information on the whole question to the different points, which he would have published. Such a course was taken exception to at the time. I took exception to it, and so did the hom. member for South Huron and the hon. Mr. Blake. They took exception on this ground, that it was unfair that statements made in this House on the responsibility of an hon. member should not be replied to in the House, but that, after the House had risen, there should be a document prepared, in reply to such statement, under official authority, and scattered among the constituencies, the contents of which were unknown to any hon. member. I think that was a reasonable and proper objection. If I remember aright, instead of answering or attempting to answer in the House the charge made by my hon. friend, although the then leader of the Government had ample opportunity to do so, the Government had this pamphlet prepared and distributed after the House rose. I have it not before me. I think I glanced through it, but it is some time ago, and it was upon the statements made in that pamphlet, purporting to be contradictions of the statement of my hon. friend, that the Minister of Justice and other hon. Ministers criticized the statements of my hon. friend as they did. I would ask the Minister now, when he considers it coolly, if he thinks that was fair, if he thinks he would be justified in attacking the statements prepared by officials whose own conduct was brought under review, because they might be called upon by the Government afterwards to say why they made those statements. How was my hon. friend to see whether these statements were true or untrue? He had only the information contained in the blue-books before him. If, subsequently, these officials saw fit to modify their statements, and if afterwards they said: We did not know this of our own knowledge, but took the information from some one else, that would be within the knowledge of the Minister, but the member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) did not know anything about that, no member of the House knew of it, and no one could possibly know of it except the Ministers themselves. It was, therefore, natural that the answer was prepared in that way. I said on that occasion:

"With reference to the main question, it is to be regretted that the First Minister was not in his place when this subject was brought before this House. It is also to be regretted that he finds it necessary to announce, without making a speech openly before the House and the people, where his statement can be scrutinized and criticized, that he will issue something like a manifesto with reference to the management of his department. He said that is necessary because the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) was inaccurate in his statement. I suppose he applies the same remark to those I made. All I can say is that they were based on records brought down from the hon. gentleman's own department and I made them in the presence of the Government in order to be set right, if on any point I was wrong. But, if the hon. gentleman is to go through the papers of the department and select such as he sees fit without giving us any opportunity of scrutinizing them, we should like to know it."

I was conscious at the time that I had quoted, and had made an honest quotation, from a return which was before the House, and I was willing to have my statement challenged. Sir Richard Cartwright, who spoke after me on that occasion, said:

"Will the hon. gentleman issue this document over his own signature, or does he propose to make use of the officers of his department? Because I can see that rather serious inconveniences will arise if gentlemen at the head of departments call upon their officers to issue what is to all intents and purposes a political pamphlet. I do not object to the hon. gentleman making any speech or issuing any declarations when he sees fit, but I do not think officers should do it.

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will take my own course about that; and it will be under my responsibility it will be issued. The hon. gentleman says, the answer ought to be made here. It could not be given here, because we had to trace up the facts and the evidence of the statements of sundry agents which the hon. member for West Huron quoted. We had to see those agents and ask them what they meant. For instance, there was a statement respecting Mr. Lawrence Clark, whom everybody knows. He says that the whole statement in the speech of the hon. member for West Huron is false: he used very strong language in that regard. Sundry clergymen have also stated that they have been quite misled. One of the charges brought was that a certain person had made a certain statement respecting frauds in the department. On being asked why he made that statement, he said the only fraud he knew of was a fraud committed by Mr. Pope Nixon, an officer of the late Government, and that was what he referred to, and not to any recent irregularities. The evidence will show there never was a greater tissue of false statements. I would have been very glad to have laid the evidence before the House, but it was only the day before yesterday that I received it from the far North-West. It will come, however, be published and distributed."

I call the attention of the House to what the First Minister proposed and said. If I interpret his statement rightly it was not that he would prove that what had been found by the member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) in the blue-books was not there, but that the officers who had made those statements would qualify them, and that certain clergymen who had been quoted had written saying that they had been misled. If that were put before the House clearly, that would have had to be taken into consideration, and my hon. friend from West Huron, when he found that a statement had been made which was susceptible of another explanation, or that a clergyman admitted that he had been misled in what he had written, would no doubt have accepted that as a mitigation of his charges. But let the hon. gentleman be fair. The hon. member for West Huron did not know that these

clergymen said they had been misled, and he could not know that certain agents of the Dominion Government had found that information supplied to them by others was not correct; so that, when he is called an Ananias, and is told that he is a liar, hon. gentlemen ought to be prepared to show, from the evidence which was before him, which was the only evidence that he could use—that their allegation is true. That is the only fair and honourable course to be taken towards any political opponent. Let the House see how unfair it was. Mr. Blake replied to Sir John Macdonald, and said:

"We will all be anxious to receive the exculpatory or explanatory statement of the hon. gentleman, but why he should not lay the material now on the Table before publishing it, since he has the material? The hon. gentleman had the right to make, from the evidence that reached him, what charges he chose, but on examining it we find the evidence altogether fallacious.

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I must analyze it.

"Some hon. MEMBERS. Let us analyze it,

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I must classify it under the different charges. You shall get the whole of the evidence: I can assure you of that. I shall have it carefully prepared in narrative form and distribute copies to every member, besides furnishing copies to the constituencies."

The House recognized at that time that it was essential that it should have the opportunity of seeing these outside statements which had been received by the Government and upon which the Government based the pamphlet they issued. That information was denied to the House. The House did not see it. If the House had seen it, if the member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) had seen it and had found that it explained the statements which were before Parliament, it would be different, but nothing of this information was before that hon. member when he made these charges, and I think it was not unreasonable that, having been defeated at the last election, having been left out of the House, he, as an honourable man—for what honourable man will not smart under unfair charges, besides being stamped by a name which is offensive to any man with a sense of honour—should now, on the first opportunity he has had in Parliament since these charges were levelled against him, taken the opportunity to show that he has been maligned, and that he should call upon the Ministers opposite to admit that they had not done justice to him and to ask them why they acted as they did. If there be a difference of opinion, let there be a difference of opinion; and if we are to have political warfare, let us have honest warfare; and if the member for West Huron did misquote, if he did garble, if he did forge, as I think he was charged with doing, from the blue-books, and it can be shown from the authors that he used, from the utterances of the agents, that he had put words in their mouth that they did not use, then he might be fairly charged with great carelessness, if not worse. But if the members opposite are unable to say to-day that what he did charge is not to be found in the reports of the different agents, they are not justified in stigmatizing him as a man whose word is not to be taken, because some of the agents or other authors, when being asked personally to send in a report, after excitement had been created in this matter, modified their statements so as to say, over their own signatures, that when they made these statements they were misled in the matter. I think the House can see how the matter stands; I think the House, composed of honourable men, will realize that the member for West Huron was perfectly justified in making the vindication of himself which he did make in his speech to-day.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think the observations that have been made on the other side of the House are almost a complete vindication of the course pursued by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) in his speech on this question some years ago. It must indeed be very gratifying for the member for West Huron to find that the Minister of Justice and the Minister of the Interior now complain, after having spoken on this subject before, after having hurled epithets at that hon. gentleman, that he did not give them an opportunity, that he did not give them time, that he did not give them notice. They had already spoken on this question, they had pronounced upon this question, they had gone before the people, behind the back of the member for West Huron, and had pronounced upon his conduct and upon his course in reference to this subject. The member for West Huron made an elaborate speech on this occasion, a speech carefully prepared from the documents published by the Government, and out of their own mouths he has established the truth of the allegations that he made against the Government. He has also the satisfaction of knowing that the members of the Government complain that they have forgotten the charges they made against him, that they are a continuation, as it were, of the matters treated in their reports, and they plead for mercy now, after having gone from one end of this country to the other and scattered these reports against the member for West Huron, and after having loaded him with all sorts of opprobrious epithets, they now come humbly, almost apologizing to this hon. gentleman for having done so. It must be a great gratification to the member for West Huron to have this vindication from the gentlemen who maligned him on that occasion. Now, I notice in this book that was published at that time by the department—I have only had a little time to look into it, but I notice that there are some things in this book that should not be there; I notice things concerning the Indians that I do not think it is the duty of the department to put in a book at all. For instance, I find on page 30 a statement that the Indians have a chronic habit of grumbling. Now, what good can this possibly do? Is it by such a policy that the Government are going to conciliate the Indians—publicly telling the Indians that they are in the habit of grumbling? Then the Minister of Justice made a statement to the same effect to-day. Is this going to promote that harmony that should exist between the Indian tribes and the Government of the day? I think the Government are doing something that is calculated, perhaps, to do a greater injury to this country than they are aware of. I think that our Indians should be treated with greater consideration than this, and when they ask for things that are necessary, things that they require, they should not be answered: You are continually grumbling, you are asking for what you have no right to get. This language is calculated to stir up bad feelings on the part of the Indians towards the Government of this country. The Government should be very careful in their dealings with the Indians, and endeavour to consider their feelings and not seek to irritate them, or to create an unpleasant feeling on

the part of the Indians towards the Government. The people of this country desire that the Indians shall be kindly treated, and they are opposed to the practice of the Government in throwing out imputations against the Indians that are calculated, perhaps, to do great injury to this country. Now, I am very glad to notice that the Minister of Justice almost took back all the epithets that he applied, in his campaign speeches, to the hon. member for West Huron. The member for West Huron, when he comes before this House to address it on any subject, always does so in a manner that does himself great credit, indeed. He is one of those members of the House who carefully prepares his speeches, he gives information to this House, and on this occasion he has given information to this House that apparently the heads of the department were not aware of. They have probably not given as close study to the reports of their own agents as has the member for West Huron, and it must be very gratifying to him to find that they now come here, after he has made his speech, complaining that they had not an opportunity of verifying the facts so that they might be able to reply to him.

ENFORCEMENT OF THE FISHERY LAWS.

Mr. LISTER. Before the House goes into Committee, I desire to bring before the attention of the House some matters to which I wish to address myself for a few moments. It is a matter of very great importance to a very large section of the community, so important, indeed, that I feel justified, under the circumstances, in calling your attention to it. I desire to say to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that I fully approve of the Bill of which he has given notice to-day, namely, to divide the fines that may be inflicted for any infraction of the fishery laws of this country between the Government and the inspector, provided he is the prosecutor; and I, for one, hope that the effect of that legislation will be an incentive to these officials to act, and will induce them to be more vigilant and to enforce as far as possible the fishery laws of this Dominion. I speak with a knowledge of the facts when I say that in very many instances these particular officers discharge their duties in a perfunctory manner. It is well known that the salaries which they receive are such as will not justify them in giving that time and attention to the discharge of those duties which the law expects from them: the consequence is that the law is disregarded, that every day in the year it is broken, and the result is loss to that section of the community; and as I stated before, I believe the hon. gentleman's Bill will be a remedy to this evil. Now, I do not propose to speak in any way as censuring the Government or the administration of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, because, after reading the reports of that department, and being somewhat familiar with what is going on, through the reports of the deputies and otherwise, I honestly think that the department and its officials are fairly trying to carry out the provisions of the law. But a large portion of the fishermen of this country have what they consider grievances, and it is their privilege and my duty, if asked to do so, to endeavour to bring these grievances before the Government, with a view to having them remedied. I need hardly say to the House that the fishery industries of this country, and particularly the fresh-water industries, because it is to those fisheries I propose to exclusively allude, are of very great importance indeed, in a material sense, and it behooves the Government of the country to do all it can to prevent the destruction of our fishing interests, to satisfy themselves that the manner of fishing is not more destructive than can be compensated by the enormous reproductive power of the fish. I say, unhesitatingly, that it is the duty of the Government, with a view to the proper protection and preservation of the fisheries, to enact such laws and take such legislative steps as may be necessary in that interest. The House is, of course, aware that the great inland fisheries of the Dominion are to be found in the Province of Ontario, namely, in Lakes Ontario, Erie, Huron, Superior, and the Georgian Bay. In those great inland waters are to be found whitefish, trout, pickerel and herring, all having great commercial value, and it is but proper and right that every step that can possibly be taken, everything that can be done for the protection and preservation of that great natural wealth, should be done by the Government and this House. In order to form some opinion of the great wealth that is contained in those waters, I would refer hon. gentlemen to the statistics which have been furnished by the officers of the department. My remarks will refer entirely to Ontario, and hon. gentlemen will remember there are the Provinces of Manitoba, British Columbia and Quebec in which this industry also prevails. In Ontario the boats and vessels engaged in this industry number 1,650, the value of these vessels $256,568, the number of men employed is 3,528, the value of the nets is $218,191, and the value of the product last year was $1,983,123. In 1869 the total value of the product was only $190,203, or an increase in twenty years of $1,772,920. Looking for a moment at the revenue from the fisheries of Ontario, I find that the amount received in rents, licenses and fees last year was $23,666.96, or more than double the revenue derived from any other province in the Dominion including Nova Scotia, New Brunswick or British Columbia. The next largest revenue yielding province was British Columbia, and it yielded a revenue of $11,367.50. Looking for a moment at the expenditure I desire to point out that the expenditure for all purposes connected with the fisheries in Ontario last year was $14,539.87, leaving a net revenue to the Government of $9,127.09. This is the only province, with the exception of British Columbia, that pays a revenue to the Government more than sufficient to meet the expenses of management. What I have stated is sufficient, I think, to satisfy hon. members that the industry is a very large and growing one, and if the Government, or the Minister at the head of the Department of Fisheries is able to do anything to increase the productiveness of the fisheries, to protect them and to make them more lasting, it is his bounden duty, in the interest of the people, to do so. But the complaint of a large section of the fishermen is, that the fishing is carried on by gill-nets and pound-nets. The fishermen complain that fishing with gill-nets and pound-nets is destructive, particularly that with gill-nets, that if that system is continued it will inevitably lead to the extermination and absolute destruction of the fisheries of this country, and it is with a view to calling the

attention of the Minister of Marine to this important fact I take the liberty of addressing the House to-day. In Georgian Bay the fishing is altogether by gill nets; in Lake Huron, on the other hand, the fishing is by pound-nets. In order to show the destruction caused by gill-net fishing I refer hon. gentlemen to pages 85 and 92 of the Minister's report for this year. Mr. Wilmot, in his report to the department, says, on page 85:

"At the present time a great deal of dissatisfaction exists among wholesale dealers and their customers, owing to the fish not being in a sound condition for food, especially when arriving at destinations long distances from the fishing grounds. The cause of this, in my opinion, is largely due to the use of the gill-net. The present system of operating the gill-net by the ordinary run of fishermen is to have two to four gangs set in different localities; these are lifted alternately, usually remaining in the water from three to four days, but in case of rough weather the fishermen cannot reach them, and the fish are not removed for a much longer period. The result is that a large proportion of the fish, when taken from the net, are in a somewhat decomposed state, and it stands to reason that their condition will not be improved by the time they arrive at the important fish markets, such as Toronto and Buffalo, to be sold to the retail dealers of Canada and the United States, after having been kept for a week or more. It is well known that a large percentage of the fish taken by the gill-nets are unfit to be shipped fresh. If in good order when caught it would profit the fishermen to ship them in that state, as they command a much higher price than when salted. The reason that such a large number of fish are salted is, simply because they are not marketable to ship as sound, fresh fish. The effect of the salt put upon them for curing purposes temporarily hardens the fish, deceives the buyer, and leads the consumer to the mistaken idea that they are wholesome, when in a great many instances they are really unfit for human food. * * * I am of the opinion that the gill-net is much more destructive than the pound-net, and its use as at present practised must eventually exterminate the salmon trout and whitefish. In districts where extensive fishing is carried on by means of gill-nets many miles of fishing grounds are covered, and while the meshes of these nets are made sufficiently large (say, 4½ or 5 inches) to capture the most marketable fish, they allow the poorer classes (such as the sucker, the mullet and the ling, averaging 2 pounds in weight, and for which there is no demand) to escape."

On page 92 he says:

"From the foregoing explanations, it will be observed that, with gill-net appliances and their facilities for easy removal from feeding to spawning grounds, it is a very difficult matter for the fish to escape being caught. A deplorable fact in connection with this system, and one very much to be regretted, is that a large proportion of the fish caught by means of the gill-net are taken off the spawning grounds at a period when they are not in marketable condition."

It is alleged by all writers on fishing subjects that the pound-net is a very destructive net, and referring to this and to the particular locality that I have in view, namely, a portion of Lake Superior, I beg to say to the Minister that if pound-nets can be at all justified, he has licensed too many of them on the particular section to which I refer, and if pound-nets are to be licensed at all there should be as few licenses granted as possible and the nets should be kept a long distance apart. It is contended by those who are engaged in the industry that these pound-nets give the fish no chance to escape, that they are put in the run-ways of the fish, are kept going day and night, and that the effect of this system of fishing has been to almost destroy the seine fishing in Lake Huron and the other lakes to which I have alluded. I would point out to the House that the seine fishing is a system of fishing which employs a large number of men. It means a very considerable expenditure of money, it means a large number of votes, and take it from every standpoint so far as the public are concerned, it is the best system of fishing. On the other hand the pound-net fishing and gill-net fishing employ very few men, because after the first expenditure for the outfit the expense of carrying on the fishery is comparatively light. As I have already said, it is contended by the seine-net fishermen that the effect of the pound-net and gill-net has been almost to destroy the seine-net fisheries on the shores of Lake Huron and the rivers running into the lakes. It has been noticed for the past four or five years—for six or seven years probably—that as the pound-nets have increased in number the catch of the seine fishermen has been reduced from year to year, until it is safe to say that within the last two or three years the catch of the seine fishermen has been comparatively very little. For the purpose of bearing out the statement which I make in this regard I will take the liberty of reading a letter which I received from a seine fishermen living in the County of Huron, on the other side of the line dividing the County of Huron from the County of Lambton. He says:

"DEAR SIR,—As we, the seine fishermen of the Grand Bend, have seen by the newspapers that you have been inquiring in Parliament for information with regard to the pound-nets in the lakes with a view to have them removed; it is the earnest wish of the seine fishermen that you would push it forward as there is about sixteen pound-nets at or near here which have ruined the seine fishing. There are three or four seine fishermen who dropped fishing, and more to follow, on account of the pound-nets. Sir, as you may not be aware how the thing is done allow me to inform you. A party in Port Huron came here last year and engaged some Canadian men to work the nets as their own, but the firm sends their steam-tug around twice a week and take away nearly all our best fish to Port Huron, and the Canadians take the small fish ashore and if they cannot sell them they bury them—as they have no salt to cure them—and so they are lost. They are set so close to the shore that it prevents the fish from running their natural course, and if it is allowed to go on for a few years longer it will ruin all our fish. It is only one mile from the shore where the fish are set and they are generally placed opposite the County of Huron between the Grand Bend and a place called Bayfield, about fifteen miles from here. The last agent when the fishing did not pay, took his pound-nets over to the States and brought them back in the spring and set them. The take generally consists of whitefish, salmon trout, sturgeon and pickerel. It is the Americans who are making the money and not the Canadians, and the Americans are depriving us of our fish. As the inhabitants are all eye-witnesses to the occurrences above mentioned, it can be proven, and we hope you will do what you can in the matter. At present there are six seines at work, four men to each. Any further information you may need I shall be only too happy to give you."

I think, Sir, I am safe in making the statement that in the fyles of the Fisheries Department will be found petitions sent to the Minister of the Department year after year pointing out the injurious effect of the pound-net fishing, and asking that either the pound-net should be abolished or the number of licenses reduced. The letter I have just read is only one out of a large number I have received from different sections of the country where the seine fishermen are complaining all alike that the effect of the pound-nets and gill-nets is to destroy the fishing ground along the shores of these lakes. I hope that when the Minister takes this matter into his consideration he will see his way to largely reduce the number of pound-net licenses, if not to abolish that system of fishing altogether. I can fully understand that when applications for pound-net licenses are put in, influences are brought to bear on the Minister which in some cases are hard to resist, but if the belief is that these nets

are not in the interest of the fishing industry, and that they are destructive to the fish, then a bold stand should be taken by the Minister, and a policy decided upon which will preserve our fishing industry to us. I desire to call the attention of the Minister to the fact that pound-net licenses have been granted for Lake St. Clair. I think that is a most unfortunate thing. If there is one fish more choice than another, found in the fresh water lakes and rivers of the country, it is the black bass. Lake St. Clair is the home and the breeding ground of the black bass, and if the system of pound-net fishing is continued on Lake St. Clair, it is safe to predict that the time is not far distant when no black bass will be found in that lake. Black bass is the fish of the sportsman in this country, and it is a notorious fact that they have, within the last few years, become exceedingly scarce. There can be no possible reason why that fine fish should be allowed to be caught by the ton in pound-nets, instead of being caught by the fishermen with the ordinary seine-net or by the hook and line of the sportsman. The Province of Ontario, or the Dominion of Canada, does not get one copper's worth of advantage for all this black bass caught in Lake St. Clair, because, without any exception whatever, it finds its way to the Detroit and Buffalo markets.

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

After Recess.

Mr. LISTER. When the House rose at six o'clock, I was attempting to point out to the Minister of Fisheries the objections to granting licenses for pound-net fishing in Lake St. Clair, and I desire as strongly as possible to emphasize those objections. I stated, and I now repeat, that that lake is the home of the black bass—that the spawning grounds of the black bass are there; and I would add that it is the resort of thousands of sportsmen from all parts of this continent during the fishing season. On the Plats Canal entering into Lake St. Clair there are club houses, hotels and residences, where through the heated season there is a population, floating and stationary, of many hundreds of people, if not thousands. The experience of the past few years, since these pound-nets have been allowed to be used in fishing in Lake St. Clair, is that the black bass have been gradually becoming fewer each year, until to-day it is with difficulty that a person fishing with a rod can get a supply of fish there at all. In addition to all this, all the fish caught in Lake St. Clair are at once sent to the markets of Detroit and Buffalo. I venture the assertion that in the cities of Toronto, London, Kingston or Montreal, or any other city in this Dominion a person would find great difficulty to-day in purchasing a black bass. The business of fishing with pound-nets has fallen altogether into the hands of American companies. There is a great fishing combination in the United States. There is the Manitoba Fishing Company, incorporated under the laws of the State of Michigan, in which J. W. Gauthier is one of the principal stockholders, as well as the Buffalo Fish Company and the Detroit Fish Company. These large and powerful companies have succeeded in getting control of the principal fisheries on Lake Huron and Georgian Bay. In proof of this statement I would refer the House to pages 97 and 98 of the report of Mr. Wilmot, a gentleman well capable of giving an opinion upon the question under discussion, where he uses these words:

"Before closing this report I beg to call your attention to the fact that in former years wholesale fish dealers, with moderate capital, were stationed at different points, such as Collingwood, Meaford, Owen Sound and other places, and purchased from time to time the fish brought to market by the fishermen of Georgian Bay; but I regret to say that an extensive fish company, composed of American capitalists, have bought or squeezed out all the local dealers, and now have a complete monopoly of the fish caught in these waters. * * * As the Georgian Bay is the main source of fish food for the Province of Ontario, and the Buffalo fish monopoly now have complete control of it, it is only reasonable to assume—in fact the present aspect indicates that Canadians will only be enabled to secure supplies of salmon trout and whitefish at a very high market price, and only then when there is an over-supply for the American trade.

"In conversation with interested fishermen at various points, and in the vicinity of Wiarton (the main export depot of the American fish company), I find that considerable dissatisfaction exists among Canadian fishermen on account of the privileges which American capitalists have usurped, and which they claim must soon drive the Canadians out of the trade of exporting fish altogether."

There is no question that this portion of Mr. Wilmot's report is fully warranted by all the facts of the case. Gentlemen living in any of the cities of this Dominion will bear me out in the statement that in those cities it is almost impossible to obtain fresh fish that are fit for food. I understand that Americans are not allowed to take out licenses in their own names; but they evade the law by getting some poor fellow to take out a license in his own name, though having neither the capital nor the appliances for fishing and not intending to fish, and perhaps only employed in the establishment of one of these companies as an ordinary workman. Such a license enables one of these American companies to catch fish in Canadian waters and take them into the United States free of duty, because they make a declaration at the port to which the fish are shipped that all their fishing appliances belong to American citizens. The consequence is that while we grant a license to the Canadian, he is not its owner, but only the trustee for the American citizen. American fishermen can thus take their fish into the United States free of duty, while Canadian fishermen are met at the border by a duty which makes it exceedingly unprofitable, particularly to a small fisherman, to engage in the business. There is a case within my own knowledge of a fisherman taking $3 of fish to Port Huron, where, before he got through he had to pay $2.90 in the shape of duties, entry charges and other expenses, the payments thus amounting nearly to the value of the fish in our market. Now, I maintain that a license ought not to be granted to any person unless he can show to the satisfaction of the department that he is able and intends to go on and fish on his own account. It is not right that the law should be evaded as it is and honest fishermen driven out, because under existing circumstances it is impossible for local fishermen to compete with those great companies who throw every obstacle in their way. Speaking for Lake Huron, I can say that these Americans do not give any employment whatever to Canadian fishermen. They take out a tugboat from Port Huron, the property of a large fishing firm there, run it alongside their net, and load the fish into the tug. The men on the boat do all the work, there is not the expense of a single dollar among Canadians; the Americans

receive all the advantage, to the prejudice of the fishermen of our own country. Our seine-net fishermen declare that they can produce satisfactory evidence that the effect of pound-net fishing has been almost to destroy fishing on Lake Huron, so far as seine-nets are concerned. These men are entitled to have their complaints investigated, and if they prove to be well-founded, then I think the Minister of Fisheries will feel it to be his duty to do something to relieve the fishermen from the disadvantages under which they labour. Pound-net fishermen are scattered all over the shores of Lake Huron and Georgian Bay. It is almost impossible for the fishery overseers, if they felt so disposed, to maintain a proper supervision over the fishing. Many of them live a long distance from where the fishing is going on; many of them are poorly paid; and they do not, as a matter of fact, visit these fisheries as often as they ought to. The consequence is that the regulations of the department are utterly disregarded. And in many other places, if not disregarded, they are but indifferently observed. Take, for example, the case of Mr. Gauthier. He is a Canadian citizen living in Windsor. He is a member of what is known as the Manitoba Fishing Company, a company incorporated under the laws of the State of Michigan. I believe he is the principal stockholder in that company, and I am told that this gentleman has hundreds of miles of fishing privileges, on Georgian Bay particularly. Now, as a Canadian, he takes out a license, and as an American, a member of a joint stock company, he gets his fish into the United States free of duty. Now, I charge here that Mr. Gauthier has for years utterly disregarded the fishing regulations of this Dominion. He has utterly ignored the fishing laws of this Dominion, and only the other day I have reliable information that this gentleman's foreman was convicted of obstructing the main channel of the Spanish River with a pound-net, by putting a pound-net across the mouth of the Spanish River. The Spanish River is resorted to for the purpose of spawning; and not only did he put a pound-net across the mouth of the river, in defiance of the law, but he placed it there during the close season. He was also convicted of using nets with illegal meshes, and of not removing stakes at the expiry of the fishing season, and of fishing in the close season; and I have in my possession—I do not know whether it is in the department or not—an affidavit made by one Pears, which reads as follows:—

"SPANISH RIVER STATION,
"ALGOMA, April, 1891.

"I, George Pears, of the Township of Shadden, in the District of Algoma, do solemnly declare that on the 13th day of April instant I received a letter from Mr. John Andrew, J.P., of Spanish River Mills, directing me to go carefully over the fishing grounds of the Spanish River and seize all nets found in the water. In accordance with those directions I went over the grounds on the 15th April in company with Nelson Couture, John McHugh and Alfred Folz. We found three pound-nets set, two between Gauthier's Fishing Camp and Buswell's Mill, and the third north of Green Island. The ice around them had been kept cut clear through the winter, so that the pounds could be lifted to take out the fish. There were four others—leads, hearts and trunnels—the pounds having been lifted some time previous (I was told by George Gauthier, the fishing guardian). I seized the whole, leads and all, and brought three pound-nets to Spanish River Station, where they remain. I notified Mr. Chamberlain, manager for C. W. Gauthier & Co., that I had made the seizures. I also notified George Gauthier, the Fishery Guardian at Algoma Mills, the latter in writing. When I seized the three pound-nets I found that two had been lifted that morning before I got there, and I saw C. W. Gauthier's fishermen lifting the remaining one. I followed them to the camp and found several hundred weight of live pickerel being packed in the freezer, apparently for shipment. Being in the close season, I seized the fish also, but as I had no means of removing them I left them in Gauthier's fish-house. Folz was present with me at this time. Chamberlain said, in reply to my remark that it was the close season for pickerel, that they were not caught that day (the 15th inst.) I said they were taken out of the net to-day, whereupon he said they were, and that they had a right to them. Two of the nets seized have an illegal mesh, viz.: one is 2½ inches extension measure, and the other 3 inches, the regulation being not less than 4 inches.

"And I make this declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, and by virtue of the Act respecting extra-judicial oaths.

(Sd.) "GEORGE PEARS."

I understand there is other evidence, which possibly may not be in the hands of the department, showing the facts to be as set forth in this affidavit. I maintain that when a man like Mr. Gauthier, who has received great favours from the Government in the matter of licenses, deliberately and wantonly breaks the plain provisions of the law with which he is perfectly familiar, the first act of the Government ought to be the cancellation of his license. But, although this man was fined, and his nets seized—for I am bound to do Mr. Tilton the credit of saying that immediately on getting the information he telegraphed the officers of the department to destroy the nets—still Mr. Gauthier's boat, the *City of Windsor*, happened to be there, and before the order of the department could be carried out, he had got on board the most valuable of the nets and took them away. That is the way this gentleman shows his respect for the law passed for the preservation of fish of this country. Not only that, but his brother, George Gauthier, is a fishery overseer.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Not now.

Mr. LISTER. Well, he was. He is also in the employ of the Customs Department as a landing waiter. This gentleman, who was employed by the Government for the purpose of seeing that the law was observed, himself embarked in the business of fishing, and was convicted of having fished during the close season, of having fished in the Spanish River contrary to law, and of having fished with a net the meshes of which were smaller than the regulations allowed.

Mr. BOWELL. To what officer is it the hon. gentleman refers? I was not paying attention at the moment.

Mr. LISTER. Gauthier.

Mr. BOWELL. Where?

Mr. LISTER. At Georgian Bay; but I am glad to know that the Department of Fisheries dismissed him on the first of this month. But if he wantonly disregarded his duty as a fishery overseer, you may fairly infer that he will be found faithless in his duty as an officer of the Customs Department. Mr. Gauthier, having these fishing appliances, having his brother an overseer of the fisheries, disregarded the law completely, being confident, no doubt, that his brother would protect him; and it is well known at Georgian Bay that this company have been acting in this way for years, both Mr. Gauthier and his partner being known in that country as the fish pirates of Georgian Bay. I can only repeat that, so far as this man is con-

cerned, it is the bounden duty of the Government to cancel his license at once. I do not think it is in the interests of the fishing industry in this country that one man should have licenses over such an enormous territory as this man has. This is a matter which the department should investigate most thoroughly; and if I am here another session, I shall deem it my duty to ask the department to lay on the Table such papers as they may have respecting the matter to which I have referred. There are one or two more questions I would like to bring before the attention of the hon. Minister. As he knows, there is a fish hatchery in Sandwich, and another in Newcastle, and there is also one in the city of Ottawa; and I see by the report of Mr. Wilmot that he recommends the establishment of one upon the Georgian Bay. I would remind the hon. Minister that Lake Huron is one of the largest lakes in the Dominion, that it is one of the waters from which the largest quantity of fish is obtained; and I believe it would be in the interests of the fisheries, if upon some point of Lake Huron a fish hatchery were established. In order to plant the pickerel in Lake Huron, the man in charge of the fish hatchery at Sandwich has to go up to Lake Huron, he is not always there at the time when he is able to get the spawn. It is a matter of very great importance to my mind that we should have a hatchery, not only upon Lake Huron, but also upon Lake Superior, and I would urge upon the Government the necessity of doing this, if it can be done at all. There can be no doubt but that these hatcheries have had a wonderful effect on the fisheries in this country. The fishermen report, not only on Lake Erie but on Lake Huron, that the result of this work is already apparent, and they strongly feel that it should be continued and extended as far as possible. I would advise the Government that, in the spring, before the close season has expired, some fishermen should be permitted to fish in Canada, so that the ova could be obtained. I believe it was found this year when the fishing commenced that the male fish had disappeared to a great extent while there were any quantity of female fish, and thus it was impossible to get the male fish to impregnate the ova, and the result of that is no doubt a great loss to our own fishery. If those gentlemen had gone through there a week before, a great number both of male and female fish could have been obtained, but strange to say the males had disappeared, leaving the females. What the fishermen ask is that the gill-nets should be abolished entirely and that the whole question of pound-net fishing should be thoroughly investigated and reported on; and I would suggest that Mr. Wilmot, or some other man thoroughly acquainted with fishing in the inland waters, should be empowered to visit the fishing ports of the Province of Ontario and take all the evidence on that subject he could, and see how far the complaints which are made are well founded. We ask that the number of pound net licenses shall be greatly reduced, and that the pound-net license for Lake St. Clair shall be entirely abolished, and that the mesh of the pound-nets shall be made larger than it is. The fact is that, with the mesh which is now used, the Detroit fishermen catch a small whitefish which is not fit for the market, take it to Detroit and put it on the market as Detroit whitefish, when really it should not be on the market at all. We ask that the violation of the law as to the size of nets and as to the close season shall be punished by cancellation of the license, and the destruction of the fishing plant, and also that licenses shall be granted to Canadians only on proof that they can own the necessary appliances, and that if any licenses so granted are held in trust for an American company they shall be cancelled. We also ask that the fishery inspector shall have the power to investigate all cases of this kind. I trust that, before the House meets next year, the Minister will see his way to appoint a commissioner to investigate all the complaints of the fishermen, and then the Government and the House will be in a better condition to deal with the question.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) has given strong evidence in support of what I have often urged upon the Government that there should be a closer inspection of the fisheries on the Georgian Bay generally, though, of course, that would entail a greater expenditure than is made at the present time. I acknowledge that it is a very difficult question. I do not understand the proposal of the hon. gentleman that the gill net should be abolished in favour of the pound-net, for our experience is that the pound-net has always been regarded as the most destructive of all. I hope the Minister will deny the statement made in reference to Mr. Gauthier, because, if that person has any license covering any part of the coast of the Georgian Bay, it is something new to me. As I understand, the licenses in the Georgian Bay are given to boats only. If any special privilege has been given to this person, it should at once be remedied. There is another evil to which I may refer, and that, perhaps, is as extensive as the one referred to by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister). It is that many of these fish companies buy the fish direct from the fishermen and, as they are able to take them into the United States free of duty, they divide the amount of duty with the fishermen and thus induce the fishermen to sell them their fish.

Mr. LISTER. They cannot do that, because it is only the owner of the fishing plant who is enabled to get the fish into the United States free of duty.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I have understood that they divide the amount of duty with the fishermen, which gives our fishermen a bonus and enables these men to get their fish into the United States free of duty. The result is the same. The fish are sent to the other side, and the supply from our own waters is lost to us. What is really needed is a more careful and closer inspection, and that, of course, means a larger expenditure of money. I think the Government are entitled to some credit for having made some progress in this direction, but I think they hardly appreciate the value of the fisheries on Lake Huron and the Georgian Bay, and that, while a great deal has been done for the sea coast fisheries, comparatively little has been done for the fisheries in our inland waters, and consequently a great loss has taken place which it will be hard to repair. I think some plan should be adopted by which the present system under which our whole trade is passing away to foreign waters should be changed and the evil should be obviated. I fancy it might be done by revising the system of

granting licenses. Of course, we cannot prevent our fishermen selling their fish to foreign dealers, but no undue advantage should be given to others over our own people, and I think that fishing licenses should be granted with that view. This is a subject on which I have spoken again and again in this House, but perhaps the suggestions coming from the other side to-night will be better received than any coming from this side. I would urge a more strict supervision in the Georgian Bay and Lake Huron on the part of the Fishery Department.

Mr. SPROULE. I would not occupy the time of the House on this subject but for the fact that my constituency reaches to the Georgian Bay, and that I have had a number of communications this session and also in other sessions in reference to a more strict revision of the fishing regulations there. I very gladly endorse the statements made by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister). I do not think he has overrated the importance of the fishing in the Georgion Bay, Lake Huron, and the same may be said in regard to those portions of Lake Superior with which I am acquainted. The town of Meadford is one of the important fishing stations on the Georgian Bay, and I have information not only from the fishermen but from others who are conversant with this subject, regarding the necessities of the situation which, I think, it would be well to take into consideration. The first point is in regard to the size of the net mesh. I cannot say that we are troubled with the difficulty spoken of by the hon. member for Lambton, that is, the use of pound nets in the Georgian Bay—at least so far as I am aware ; but there is some trouble from the small size of the mesh. If my memory is correct I think they are four inches and a-half by regulation, but they are generally found to be only four inches and a quarter. The fishermen have a habit of boiling their nets in a solution of saponica, which causes them to contract until they are barely 4 inches ; this will catch very small fish, in fact whitefish and salmon trout are caught with this kind of a net, and the result is, this practice having been carried on for several years, that the Georgian Bay has become largely depleted of fish ; and whereas a few years ago the ordinary size of fish brought into Collingwood and Meaford weighed about four to four and a-half pounds, now they average from two pounds to two and a-half. Besides, the fishermen have to go further from the shore almost every year, and the fishing grounds which a few years ago were very remunerative, are now scarcely worth operating on account of the disappearance of these fish. Another practice that is detrimental to the fisheries, is that of collecting fish in the boats and when coming towards the shore the fishermen commence to clean those fish into a box and dump the offal into the lake. This is said to pollute the water and destroy the fish ; whether it is so or not I cannot say, but some say it does. Then, when the boat reaches the shore they hand over the last box full of offal to an establishment where soap is made, and represent to the agent at that particular locality that they brought to the shore all the offal that was collected during the time they were out. This practice is said to be very detrimental to the fish. Another point is that during the close season the spawning grounds, which are largely frequented by fish, are near the shore where the water is shallow, the fishermen set their nets, and the steamer plying in Georgian Bay for fishing protection is unable to reach them owing to shallowness of the water. They set those nets after dark and leave them until near daylight, when they put their fish into a waggon and take them to Owen Sound where they are kept in a freezer until the close season is over and then sold. Now, it is suggested that the use of freezers be prohibited during the close season. They have been used for years, and one of them had an existence even in the town of Owen Sound where the fishery inspector lives, and these operations are carried on without his knowledge. Therefore, it is suggested that these freezers be shut up, and then there will be no inducement for fishermen to fish during that season of the year, because they would be unable to put their fish on the market, and if they are not frozen they will spoil before the close season is over. In addition to that, it has been suggested that there should be a fishery overseer to look after the fishery inspectors. This overseer should possess magisterial authority to try cases in a summary way on the spot ; he might fine offenders and confiscate their nets. It has been suggested that when violators are convicted more than once, their fishing license should be withdrawn. This, it is thought by some, would be a remedy, and I believe it would. Now, these are some of the points in which the law is defective. I fully agree with what has been said by the hon. member for Lambton regarding the fishing laws on the other side over our own, which virtually bring the fisheries of our country under the control of American fishermen. Americans rent boats, or hire them for a comparative trifle, and they have nearly all the fishing boats on the Georgian Bay engaged in their employ to-day ; and those who still retain their own boats sell their fish to the Americans at whatever figure the latter are pleased to give, because the former can get no other market for them. The Americans have an advantage over them of a cent a pound on the fish in their own market. There is a firm in the town of Meaford, the Messrs. Mackintosh, who have been carrying on fishing in the Georgian Bay for a great many years, and they are so handicapped in the business that they are absolutely obliged to sell to the American fishermen, because they cannot compete with them. The price of fish is better on the American side, and the Americans who operate in the Georgian Bay, ship from Wiarton to Buffalo, or direct to Buffalo, and get the advantage of the enhanced price. To meet this difficulty, it has been suggested that there should be an export bounty on fish. I do not know whether this would be advisable or not, but if some means could be devised by which our Canadian fishermen could reap the advantages of their own fisheries, it seems very desirable that it should be done. The fishing industry is a very important one, and if we have not better protection for our fisheries, I believe that in a short time they will be almost destroyed, not only in the Georgian Bay but in Lake Superior, where the fishing is carried on. There is another practice which obtains largely during the close season, in the fall of the year, around Midland, that is the practice of catching whitefish and salmon trout, putting them in boxes and labelling them pike or black bass, and shipping them under that name. This, it is thought, could be prevented by closer

inspection. The member for Lambton suggested that in view of the fact that the fishing interests were so important there, it would be as well that there should be a fish hatchery established at some point on Lake Huron. I may say that some years ago I applied to have a fish hatchery established somewhere in the East Riding of Grey, and I did so because I found that a large quantity of ova was collected for the fish hatcheries around here, including, I believe, the one at Ottawa and another at Newcastle. As this ova was carried from Meaford, I thought it would be the best place to have a fish hatchery established, because they would then only have a short distance to transport the ova, and when the fish fry were ready to put in the lake again, it would save the trouble of taking them so great a distance and leave them in a better condition. I think there ought to be a fish hatchery established somewhere in that vicinity. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, although he has always promised me that he would consider it, has never been able to see his way clear to establish a fish hatchery there up to the present time. I hope he will do so before long. I may say that the people in our section feel so strongly upon this question that not only have those who are engaged in the fishing interest taken it up, but the merchants in the various towns and the County Council have taken it up, and have memorialized the department regarding the necessary changes in the law. I have submitted those representations to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries who very kindly informed me that he was about to introduce a measure that would deal with this subject, and that every attention would be given to the suggestions made in various quarters which would, as far as possible, cure the evils complained of. In view of the fact that this subject has come before the House at the present moment, I thought it due to my constituents that I should speak on this question and present their views to the Government.

Mr. EDGAR. There is one point that occurs to me which seems worthy of some attention, and which is one of very great importance in reference to the fish supply of the cities and towns of Ontario. Now, until I heard the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) speak, I was unable to account for a most extraordinary circumstance in connection with the fish supply for the city of Toronto. Some years ago it was quite possible to obtain daily the most delicious fresh whitefish, either from Lake Huron or from Lake Ontario; but for some years past it has been almost impossible to purchase in Toronto, from any dealer there at retail, any whitefish which are fit to eat. I have often complained about that matter and spoken to dealers in regard to it. The fish brought down from Lake Huron on ice and sold, are not like whitefish, but are like suckers, and are unfit for food. I can now understand, from the description which the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) has given the House of the mode of catching these fish, why this is so. Of course, if the fish are caught in gill nets and allowed to remain in the water dead some days and nights, they are unfit for human food when brought out and put on ice and sent to Toronto and other cities of Ontario. I do not think many subjects come before the Minister of Marine and Fisheries of more importance than this one of the food supply of the large cities of the inland provinces, and if, as the hon. gentleman for Lambton (Mr. Lister) says, it is within his knowledge that this gill-net fishing is so productive of that result that large numbers of fish when taken out are unfit for food, having been dead for a long time; and if Mr. Wilmot has strongly reported against this system of gill-net fishing, as is alleged, I sincerely trust that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will take some steps to abolish it, so that the people of this country may again be proud, as they were formerly, of the delicious whitefish of our inland lakes. There was no fish of which we were more proud in Toronto than our whitefish, and we would tell strangers that we had fish better than salmon and even better than any fish that came from the sea in our whitefish. It is not once in ten times that a resident can now obtain whitefish fit to eat in Toronto. It is a very serious question and should be carefully considered in that light.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). I think I understood the member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) to say that there were too many fishing licenses granted on Lake Superior.

Mr. LISTER. Lake Huron.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). I have only to say this in regard to pound-nets and gill-nets: Very many hon. gentlemen are not aware that there are inland waters where it is impossible to catch fish with pound-nets. The waters are too deep to fish with those nets, and consequently gill-nets must be used. Pound-nets are only used near the shore and in the bays of the great lakes. In Lake Superior, for instance, pound-nets cannot be used outside in deep water, and, therefore, gill-nets must be used. They float deep in the water, and it is the exception that fish are dead when taken out. During a few days in stormy weather fishermen are not able to visit their nets, and, consequently, some dead fish are found in them. I quite agree with the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) in the recommendation for a fish hatchery on Lake Superior. Since I have been a member of this House I have brought the subject to the notice of the Minister of Marine, and I hope he will see his way clear to give us what we ask in that regard. With respect to the net, I think that if an universal mesh was used, at least in our district, it would be satisfactory to our fishermen. I was rather amused to hear the hon. member for Lambton speak of the recommendations fishermen make. My experience in the District of Algoma, where probably the greatest inland fishery in Canada exists, is that the fishermen, instead of wanting to have any of their privileges curtailed, want to fish all the year round, and the great difficulty in that district is to see that they do not commit illegal fishing. With regard to the fishing in Lake Superior—with Lake Huron and Georgian Bay I am not so familiar—the department to-day has one of the most efficient and energetic officers it could possibly obtain. The official who preceded him was changed some time last year, and the present overseer has undoubtedly shown himself to be a capable and energetic officer, and I think the department will find, after they have had some experience of the gentleman who now occupies the position, that it has made an excellent change. I will be sorry to see gill-nets done away with, because it would destroy the means of livelihood of many people on the

shores of Lake Superior. In the lower lakes, which are more shallow, fishermen can use pound-nets where they can drive stakes into the mud bottom, but in Lake Superior, where the water is deep and the bottom is rocky, it is impossible to fish with pound-nets. So, I hope the Minister will take the matter into consideration and will consider the position in which we in the western part of Ontario are placed, and consider well before adopting the suggestion of the hon. member for Lambton. I trust the Minister will find it in his heart, and the revenue of the country will permit him, to give us a fish hatchery on Lake Superior, because that is the largest fishing industry in the province.

Mr. McNEILL. I desire to say a word or two in regard to a branch of the important subject brought up by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), and that is the condition of the fish when they are put on the market. I have no doubt whatever, from the statements made in the report read from Mr. Wilmot, and also from what has been said by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), that these representations are perfectly correct. The fish when brought to land to be shipped by railway, by the large fish companies that purchase the fish, are often as regards many of them, I venture to say the bulk of them, hardly fit for human food. I do not speak of anything of which I do not know, because I see these fish brought down three or four times a week close to where I am living, and I often go with my boat alongside the tug when she is landing the fish, and ask for fresh fish. They are however so inferior in quality when brought down that I have given up purchasing them altogether in the warm weather. The fact is, the fish lie so long in the water in these gill-nets before they are taken out that they are often putrid, and a rough test is, I am told, employed in many cases as to whether the fish is a marketable one or not, and it is simply whether the man handling the fish can push his thumb through it. If the fish will stand that rough test, and if it is not such a fish that you can put your thumb through, it is considered reasonably good and it goes to the ice along with the others. A great many of these very inferior fish are salted, but, as the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) has said, I believe it is almost impossible to get a really fresh fish in any city of this Dominion during the warm weather. It is exceedingly difficult to know what measures should be adopted to ameliorate this condition of things, but to talk about doing away with gill-nets altogether seems to me to be an impossible proposition. As my hon. friend beside me (Mr. O'Brien), and as my hon. friend from Algoma (Mr. Macdonell), have said, you can fish in deep waters, so far as I know, in no other way than with the gill-nets. You cannot fish with the seines and you cannot use pound-nets in deep water; and, therefore, it seems to me that we are obliged to allow the fishermen to use gill-nets; but I would very earnestly urge upon the Minister to turn his attention to that question, and to see what can be done in the way of improving this condition of things, for, as I have said, the fish put upon the market are often scarcely fit for human food. It is due to the Department of Marine and Fisheries that I should say that the department deserves very great credit for the efforts it has made to protect the fishing interests in the Georgian Bay. The work they have got to do is a very invidious work, it is a work in which they are very much opposed by the fishermen, and it is a work that I must, in all fairness, say the department has set itself to do well and thoroughly. I very much appreciate the fact that the department is this year supplying a much better vessel than the *Cruiser* to enforce the close season, and for the fisheries protection service in the Georgian Bay. The *Cruiser* was not such a vessel as she ought to have been; but, nevertheless, the department deserves credit for sending her there in the first place. And I am glad to find that as soon as it was found that the *Cruiser* did not do all that was expected of her, the department substituted for her a vessel which I believe will be thoroughly efficient for the service.

Mr. TUPPER. It is perhaps well that I should say a few words on this very interesting discussion which has taken place to-day in reference to important matters connected with the fisheries. I hope the discussion will result in some good to the fishermen. The subject is by no means a new one; the question in relation to these gill-nets and pound-nets, and the matter afterwards referred to in reference to the protection of the fisheries, are subjects which have been grappled with by the Department of Fisheries for a very long time. They have been considered at great length, and very full enquiries have been made into them year after year by the department. In the United States and in other countries we find that they are equally interested in the problems which have been put before the House to-day, and indeed in all countries the ingenuity of the fishermen has been extraordinary in devising better and more efficient means, not only for catching fish, but for evading the fishery laws also. Every hon. member in this House, particularly if he comes from a fishing district, knows well that if all our fishery officers were exemplary men, anxious to do their duty, and to do it without fear or favour, we would still by no means have a perfect record to show in regard to the protection of the fisheries. It is almost impossible, even in a much smaller country than this, and with much smaller waters to guard, to prevent poaching and evasion of the laws. That is particularly seen in the British Isles, where they have by no means the enormous difficulties to contend against that we have here. In Great Britain, with their coast guard service, and their very heavily-paid fishery staff, with officers at almost every point around these isles, if you take up the annual report of the fishery inspectors for England or Scotland or Ireland, you will find that notwithstanding that fine after fine has been imposed, and that boats and gear are destroyed almost without number, yet they annually deplore the great increase in the difficulty of enforcing the fishery laws. The truth is—and this is the greatest difficulty to contend against—that no matter how hon. gentlemen may speak in this Chamber in regard to the manner in which the law should be carried out, yet the sympathy of the community as a rule is all with the fishermen. They know that the fishermen have a hard life at the best—certainly on the coast this is true, and to a large extent also on the great lakes, as I am informed—and so much is that sympathy with the fishermen that in the event of a detection of the violation of the

fishery regulations—and when an officer has incurred the ill-will often of his neighbours and former friends by catching the fisherman in the act of breaking the law—he brings him before a magistrate only to find that the sympathy of the community for the fisherman is represented in the breast of the magistrate, and a nominal fine, by no means deterrent, is imposed, and the same infraction of the law continually occurs. Now, then, all I would claim is, that admitting that in every district in Canada cases can be brought showing laxity on the part of our officers, and showing room for improvement, yet we have been accomplishing much in the past few years. While a great deal of the money spent on the protection of the fisheries is practically lost, because of the difficulties in the way of the officers, or the carelessness of the officers, who receive so small a reward for their services as fishery officers in general do receive, yet we have accomplished a great deal of good, as may be gathered from the annual report of the department. Take, for instance, the Georgian Bay, to which reference has been made. During a very short time the *Cruiser*—a boat by no means fitted for the work, as experience has shown—has destroyed miles of nets, and we have been enabled to do with that *Cruiser* what it was found impossible to do by the hired vessels previously. In former years these fishery officers, placed over a very large area, were in the habit of going to great expense in fitting up a special tug for a special trip, and the result was that an enormous bill was run up for camping outfits, &c., and not a poacher was caught. The men who were violating the law got the news in advance, and before the fishery officers could reach them the offenders had gone away. The *Cruiser* has to a great extent stopped that. It has not been stopped to the extent I should like, but certainly the log of that ship, during the short time she has been at work, has been very satisfactory; and I believe that of late there is evidence to prove that the effect of that has been wholesome; it has come to be understood in the district that it is not safe to violate the law. The hon. member for West Lambton spoke at considerable length with respect to gill-nets and pound-nets. That subject has been very extensively treated in the annual reports of the department. The hon. gentleman referred to the report of Mr. Charles Wilmot, who made a very careful enquiry into that subject, and whose report I have caused to be inserted in the annual report, in order that I might, if possible, obtain the very views which have been expressed to-day, and that the department might have the co-operation of the gentlemen representing the large and important districts interested in the solution of the question. Hon. gentlemen will see in the deputy's report to me a review of the suggestions of Mr. Wilmot; and it is not denied that there has been great destruction and loss of fish, both from gill-nets and pound-nets. The loss in the case of gill-nets is nearly always after a storm. If there has been rough weather, the gill-nets being placed, as they generally are, at great distances from shore, and the owners' boats not being able to reach them, the fish caught by the gills in these nets die, and become useless for any purpose; so that a great loss, of course, occurs—a loss not only of the fish, but of the spawn. It has also been found, in the case of pound-nets, that immature fish in great numbers have been taken. But there is some exaggeration on this score. While what the hon. gentleman says is true, that these fishing engines are dangerous, we must remember that the fisherman, on the other hand, claims that he has a right—and outside of our legislation he certainly has—to devise the best ways and means of accomplishing his object, that is, to catch the fish he desires to sell out of common waters in the most convenient and least expensive manner possible. We have to meet that spirit and deal with it, and no legislature hitherto has attempted to throw any difficulties in the way of fishermen, unless after the most careful and thorough enquiries it is discovered beyond all cavil that some restrictions are necessary. I speak with great diffidence of these inland waters. We have not the same difficulties to face on the sea coasts. The experience of some of the neighbouring states shows us that these land-locked waters, which were formerly full of fish, will, in course of time, become exhausted. It is entirely different on the sea coasts, because the deep-sea fish can almost defy, as they have done for many years, the ingenuity of man. The pound-net is a device that was invented in the United States for similar waters to those to which reference has been made to-day, and our fishermen naturally have adopted the means which have been so successful in the waters of the United States. One of the difficulties met with in dealing with this question, particularly in two of the large lakes to which reference has been made, Lakes Huron and Erie, is the claim that in the waters contiguous to the United States it would be unfair to unduly hamper in that respect Canadian fishermen, who have to compete with American fishermen a few miles distant; and while Americans allow all such devices, such as pound-nets and gill-nets, as will take the fish in the quickest possible manner, any greater restriction imposed upon the Canadian fisherman would result in more profit going to his American competitors. That is not altogether a tenable argument; but to some extent it has force, and the Government in that regard have endeavoured, unsuccessfully as yet, to ascertain whether it is not possible to have a joint action with those states bordering on the great lakes. The common danger concerned to those states as well as to Canada has been fully placed before the authorities of the United States, and I understand that a commission last year went fully into this subject, and that it is still engaging the attention of the state legislatures. I am told, however, that it is a very difficult thing, and history confirms the statement, to carry through those legislatures regulations interfering very much with the operations of the fishermen—the fishermen there, as in this country, exercising considerable influence and control over their parliamentary representatives. I was speaking of the want of sympathy which the department receives as a rule in the different localities. The hon. member for Lambton spoke of the sportsmen. They have a strong case in claiming that all regulations should be enforced; but one of the bitterest complaints made by the fishermen is that these regulations too often are made in the interest of sport, and interfere with the legitimate operations of fishermen, which are necessary to maintain life. These difficulties are appreciated and understood, and the first step which it seemed necessary to take was to ascertain whether we could secure joint action or co-operation on the part of the neighbouring states to make more per-

fect regulations. The report sets out the representation which has been made to the United States Administration through the different states, and I will not longer refer to that. This report, criticizing Mr. Wilmot's suggestions, says :

"He has, however not dealt with two aspects of the question, which must certainly enter largely into its consideration before a satisfactory conclusion can be reached. The first is that to adopt a system of pound-net fishing to the exclusion of gill-nets would throw the business of fishing into the hands of extensive operators and capitalists——"

The hon. member for West Lambton has inveighed to-day against a man of whom I know but little, Mr. Gauthier, who is an extensive operator, and who would no doubt benefit largely if these views were adopted.—

—"and as a result paralyse that branch of the industry carried on by means of gill-nets, and in which the aggregate capital invested amounts to a very large sum, beside throwing out of employment a considerable number of our population who now fish for a living by means of gill-nets."

Then the difference in opinion as to pound-nets and gill-nets is given. and it is stated that a well equipped pound-net with boat, new, ready to set, costs $1,000, while a fisherman can equip himself with a boat and a quantity of gill-nets for $500. Another important feature has been pointed out by the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Macdonell) who is so well able to speak with reference to Georgian Bay, and that is, that it would practically put a stop to their fishing altogether, as you require a certain bottom for the stationary engines known as the pound-nets. There they are staked and fixed, whereas with the gill-nets they can fish over any bottom, and, as a rule, they fish in deep water where the pound-net cannot be used at all. We also met with another difficulty mentioned in the report, appended to Mr. Wilmot's report, a difficulty, however, with which he deals very ably. That is the difficulty that the different overseers and such men as would certainly testify, if a commission were issued, hardly agree upon anything. That is the universal experience. Look at all the commissions in England which have been issued in late years and past times, and it is a remarkable fact that when they have gone to the fishing localities and asked the men of experience, who would be supposed to have studied the matter very thoroughly, it is found impossible to obtain from them any system or any line of action upon which they will all agree. Each fisherman has his own way and ideas, and, as a rule, it has been found almost impossible to obtain from them any definite opinion upon which legislation can be based. Take the history of lobster legislation on the coast. The regulations have the merit of being according to theoretical ideas in this regard. They follow on the lines of experienced officers who, in other countries, have dealt with the subject, but it was remarkable, under that commission, that it was impossible, not merely to obtain any general line of action supported by the fishermen themselves, but by men who have had the greater advantages of travel and education. I refer to the capitalists and the factories. They all disagreed as to what should be done. So we find the position is surrounded with difficulties. The discussion to-day will no doubt be of assistance to us in arriving at a proper conclusion. I have not yet had an opportunity of considering the results of the deliberations of the chief officers of the fishery districts who met here a short time ago to discuss such matters as these. The hon. member for Lambton alluded to the value of our fisheries, and it is encouraging to know, that notwithstanding these inventions and notwithstanding the ingenuity of the fishermen in finding out every year more accurately the haunts of the fish and the best means of catching them, the fisheries of Ontario are of almost untold wealth, and the value of the fish caught is increasing year by year, and that, notwithstanding the regulations that may be imposed by the country to the south of us, there is an enormous amount of money made out of our fish. With reference to the revenue, while it is large, because year after year the operations are extended and licenses increase, and, I may add, owing also to greater vigilance exercised and more fines imposed, the revenue collected is not collected with the mere object of obtaining a revenue. The hon. gentleman alluded by way of contrast to the much smaller revenue in the Maritime Provinces, where the expense is almost equally great, but I may mention this fact that the license system does not obtain in Nova Scotia, except in so far as it is necessary for the same purposes, as in the case of inland waters, with regard to trap-nets for mackerel and so on. There the fee is imposed, not for revenue purposes, but in order to prevent too many applications and applications not *bonâ fide* being made. The feeling in those districts is that the time is not yet come when we can impose any license on coast fisheries or the inshore fisheries, as restriction of fishing will not increase the number of fish annually visiting our shores. Their haunts are far off and unknown, and it by no means follows that if we are very careful in restricting fishing to certain licensed individuals, that those fish would not be taken by the different competitors from Newfoundland and the United States and elsewhere. Consequently the revenue is a mere bagatelle ; but, nevertheless, there is protection by the enforcement of the law with reference to rivers and inland streams, not so valuable as those west but covering considerable extent of territory. The department, I know, is in a position to be very adversely criticized, because this question is one which presents great difficulties, not merely in this country but in all other countries, owing to the desire, elsewhere as well as here, to interfere as little as possible with the fishermen, and to move cautiously with regard to this unknown science as to how far we should enforce prohibitory legislation. With reference to Lake St. Clair, as I have explained across the House, in answer to questions, I have continued the policy that I found in force when I took charge of the department. The wisdom of it is fairly open to criticism. We state in the report that an effort has been made not to increase these pound-nets. So far, I am not aware that I have infringed upon the rule. In referring to Lake St. Clair, it was shown that the licenses were not more than they were in 1885 ; and if I could enforce my my own wishes in that respect, I would restrict them to a considerable extent. The difficulty in dealing with that water is that the regulations are not enforced on the other side. The argument often addressed to me to permit fishing, even in the close season, there, is that no such season is observed on the other side. With reference to another very important subject, which would occupy a great deal of time, if it were thoroughly threshed out,

and to which the Government has been giving considerable attention, as will be seen by reference to the report—that is the operation of one feature of the McKinley Bill—the object of that is, just as the hon. gentleman shows, the result will be to place the control of our inland fisheries, or a large portion of them, in the hands of the American dealer, and to take them out of the hands of the Canadian dealer, and I must confess that object has been, to a considerable extent, accomplished. The officer there alludes to certain facts. The hon. gentleman mentioned well-known facts regarding the Buffalo Fishing Company and their large operating fish concern, and he showed that they controlled the fisheries by mock bills of sale, mock leases and so on, whereby, for nominal consideration, they receive from the Canadian fisherman a transfer of his net. That enabled the American fish dealer to make his entry into the United States, and to show that these fish, though caught in Canadian waters, were caught in American nets. Under those circumstances, they go into the American market free. The hon. gentleman recommends as a remedy for that that no licenses should be granted unless the department is satisfied that the applicant can carry on the business himself, that he is a free and independent fisherman. On reflection, I think the hon. gentleman will see that it is hardly practicable. In the first place, the Canadian is a free and independent citizen, and, if he applies for a license, it is a rather invidious thing to tell him that he has to satisfy the department on that subject.

Mr. LISTER. In many instances, the American fisherman brings over his nets, but the license is taken out in the name of some one who never owned the nets at all.

Mr. TUPPER. That may be so; but that is not the information which I have. I have made a very large enquiry on that subject, and have ascertained from all the fishing points what the practice is, and our officers say that the almost universal practice is what I have stated. But, after this fisherman had taken the line which the hon. gentleman suggests, we would have no means of following that up, and of ascertaining or checking what he is doing after obtaining the license, and whether he is carrying on his business for himself or for anyone else. I have known these fishermen to come to Ottawa to make their objections, and I must say with great force. I admit the force of the contention on the other side, and it would, no doubt, be a good thing if we could keep the cream of the fisheries or the profit in our own country which the American dealer now takes from the Canadian dealer. But the fisherman says he has a right to give his labour to whom he pleases, and, if he were not, he would be entirely prevented from enjoying the benefit of the market for which those fish are intended. These fishermen have urged with great strength many reasons for allowing them to take care of themselves, and to deal, if they choose, with the American dealer, provided he will deal with them on better terms than a Canadian dealer, or to deal with a middleman, who can operate in the American market more advantageousiy than the Canadian fisherman, for the reason which the hon. gentleman has pointed out, that the Canadian is met with the duty while the American is not. Another member from the Province of Ontario who spoke evidently did not appreciate the point made by hon. gentlemen opposite or he would not have wondered why this fresh, delicious whitefish is not to be found in the markets of Ontario. In the province from which I come, where we are surrounded by magnificent fish, by codfish and halibut, and all those fish which are so much more delicate and substantial than even the so-much-praised whitefish, where enormous catches are made, where the vessels come in loaded down with these fish, still it is often difficult to get a fresh fish in the market. The fish are bought up by the exporters and the local trade has to take its chances. Thus the tendency being towards the export across the lakes from these western cities, and the men who come over with tugs, as we have heard, taking the fish to the other side, shows that the markets for those fish are other than those in the cities of Ontario. It is not that the fish are less. They are not less. On the contrary, the catch is increasing. Of course, there is worse luck in one year than in another, and the fishermen have to go here and there to catch their fish, as the season changes; but the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) has shown that the catch has been increasing, and that the number of licenses granted to the fishermen has increased. I was pleased to observe the very natural and very healthy desire on the part of each representative of a fishing locality to have a fish hatchery established at once in this locality, and I can tell those hon. gentlemen that it is only owing to the modesty of other members of this House that we have not twenty or thirty more of such applications. For myself, not professing to have had enough experience to give my own opinion to the House, I can say—and it will be giving an unbiassed opinion—that I think the success in the fish hatcheries in the inland waters has been greater than in the neighbourhood of the sea coast. At all events, it is not so easily demonstrated that it has been successful when the fish may wander out to the great expanse of the Atlantic Ocean, as it is to specify the result in the land-locked waters of our inland seas. The evidence of that is the increased attention and the enlarged expenditure which have been made by the United States from year to year. I believe that Canada was the pioneer in the establishment of fish hatcheries, and yet, while our expenditure here is a mere bagatelle, only $35,000 for all these great seas, we find that the United States Congress spend half a million a year on the fish hatcheries, in addition to more than $300,000 spent by the different States of the Union, and the results in many of the States have been enormous. We are handicapped in our operations by the small scale upon which our operations are conducted. It seems to be the almost universal testimony that, in order to succeed in the artificial breeding of fish, the contributions of fry to the different waters each year should be on an exceedingly large scale, or it would be better not to have them at all. The one difficulty in meeting all these requests has been hinted at by one hon. gentleman, and that is the question of money. That question, of course, has met the Fisheries Department in more places than one, but the compliance with these demands for fish hatcheries would require a very large expenditure. The day may come when Parliament may take a larger view of such subjects and may consider that the Government would be

justified in extending a system which, though it has been tried on a small scale and in a few places, has fully justified the expenditure and the attention given to it. There is another question of a personal nature to which the hon. gentleman has alluded. He referred to the neglect on the part of some of the fishery officers. I have taken stern measures with many of them, and sometimes they have seemed almost too stern. But every one knows that there are cases where officers receiving a mere nominal sum do not deem it worth while to incur all the risks that an officer must incur in carrying out the fishery laws. The hon. gentleman mentioned one of the fishery officers. Well, the department learned that that officer had been disregarding the responsibilities of his office and had broken the law himself, and had been fined: as soon as those facts were officially reported and substantiated, the services of the officer were immediately dispensed with. With regard to the proprietor himself, Mr. Gauthier, all that I can say is, that the matter is not closed. As soon as the facts were represented to me that this gentleman, having a license to fish in our waters, had so utterly disregarded the rules and regulations of the department as to set his pound-nets across the Spanish River, for which no authority had been given whatever, we took the regular steps to ascertain immediately whether the representations were true, with the intention of cancelling at once all his rights; and hon. gentlemen do not desire that any other course should be adopted in such a case. At present, the defence alleged is that Mr. Chamberlin, formerly the foreman, and perhaps now foreman of Mr. Gauthier, had done this without his sanction and without his knowledge, and an enquiry is now being proceeded with to ascertain the correctness of the statement as to whether this man did or did not have the sanction of his employer. I can assure the hon. gentleman that we shall insist that the officers do their duty, and I will be only too glad to receive from him any information he has in such cases, and will act upon it. I may say that lately we have found, in dealing with this question to which reference has been made, that it is a very useful thing to take one official out of his district, altogether, and send him suddenly into another district, and *vice versa*. The same reasons that would induce one official not to act would not exist in a case of another official. On several occasions I have tried that plan with success, although we keep each officer in his own district, as a rule, and give him power as a justice of the peace over a large extent of territory, his own particular district being defined in the departmental instructions. Cases have occurred in Georgian Bay where this plan has stopped effectively, for a time, that species of abuse to which allusion was made, where fishermen have concealed certain fish in boxes and have sold them under other names. The hon. gentleman will pardon me if I mention, before sitting down, another difficulty which concerns the Fishery Department to-day. As everyone knows, in order to protect our waters, which are of such an enormous extent, we require, not merely the staff that we have, but a staff and an expenditure that this country could not afford. Indeed, no country, apparently, has yet found itself able to patrol and guard thoroughly its own waters in the right season, so as to prevent violations of the fishery regulations. However, I will take note of the suggestions made by the hon. gentleman to-day, and the spirit that has prompted him to make them, and I hope that we will be able to carry out his suggestions, so as to render these fishing apparata as little harmful as possible, consistent with the public interest, and that great vigilance will be shown in the districts referred to for the protection of the fisheries.

ADJOURNMENT FOR DOMINION DAY.

Mr. TAYLOR. I wish to refer briefly to a matter which is causing considerable anxiety, not only in the House, but out of it—that is, as to whether this House should sit to-morrow or not. I have just received the following telegram from Belleville :—

"Will the House be in session to-morrow? Please answer Belleville station immediately.

"H. CORBY."

I find there are some members present who, in case the House does not sit to-morrow, wish to leave by the 10.45 train this evening. On Thursday last, when the Minister of Public Works moved that when the House adjourned it should stand adjourned until Tuesday at three o'clock, there was more than one suggestion that the House should stand adjourned until Thursday. Several objected to that, and I made a few remarks, stating that I thought it was due to the people of the Maritime Provinces and the North-West that the House should sit on Tuesday, and if necessary on Wednesday. But to-day many members are representing that as to-morrow is private members' day, and but little business of importance can be done, the House had better not sit to-morrow, and I know there is a general feeling to that effect on this side of the House; and I have also heard the same opinion expressed by some hon. gentlemen opposite. I think the matter had better be finally settled now, so that if the House does not sit to-morrow those who wish to leave on the 10.45 train this evening may do so.

Mr. KAULBACH. It was very kind on the part of the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), on Thursday last, to take the interest he did in his friends from the Maritime Provinces and British Columbia, or those representing constituencies by the sea, to propose that this House sit for the dispatch of business to-morrow (Dominion Day), feeling, as was very true, that they had a desire to dispatch the work of the session, and get to their respective homes as early as possible. It having been acknowledged and concurred in at the time by an hon. member from British Columbia, caused me to be silent, although I did not approve of it, and was not in accord. Hearing considerable dissatisfaction expressed since, by various members of this House, I felt that this matter ought to be brought up for reconsideration, and I am very glad indeed that my hon. friend has done so. There are many reasons why we should observe Dominion Day, when we consider the many benefits, since 1867, the British North America Act conferred upon this fair Dominion of ours. The most potent is for the respect and high esteem in which we held our grand old chieftain, who was the father of Confederation, and whose death we all so deeply deplore, and who, were he with us, would recognize

this Dominion Day as our great national holiday, and assist in doing honour to it in every particular. I think, as members of this House, we should be the very first to set the example in observing the day. Therefore, I propose that we do not sit to-morrow for the despatch of business, but that we adjourn until Thursday next, and make to-morrow a gala day as far as possible.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If there was any intention at all of keeping Dominion Day as a holiday it is most unfortunate that it was not decided long ago. A large number of members have returned at great personal inconveniece to be present here to-day, and to assist in carrying on the business of the country. Now, if we make to-morrow a holiday, not merely will to-day be practically thrown away, but to-morrow will be practically thrown away, and a great part of Thursday as well, and you might almost as well sacrifice this whole week. More than that, a very important committee has been summoned for to-morrow in consequence of their being unable to sit to-day. There, again, there will be a serious loss of time, and I must say for my part that under the circumstances I think, after the decision of the Government to the effect that they would sit to-morrow, it would be a very unfortunate thing if they should be induced now to alter their determination.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. When this matter was before the House on Tuesday last it was discussed with a view to adjourning to Tuesday or Thursday of this week, and the expression of opinion was that we might adjourn until 3 o'clock on Tuesday, as was done, and the other days might be used as ordinary days for the business of Parliament; but I must say that since that was done, and during to-day especially, a great many members who were disposed to say that Dominion Day might be used for the business of the House, have expressed a different opinion. They hold that to-morrow should be observed as Dominion Day, not because if the House sat hon. members could pass a few notices of motion or matters of that kind, but because it is Dominion Day. A very large number of members have expressed the opinion that, after well considering the matter, they believe, although inconvenience may be caused to some hon. members who have been compelled to remain here, they should observe Dominion Day as it will be observed all over the Dominion. The Government were of the opinion that we should observe it if possible, but seeing that members of the House thought otherwise they did not object; but seeing the feeling that now prevails in the other direction, that we should not sit to-morrow, but observe it as Dominion Day, a day set apart to celebrate our political state as a Dominion, the Government are willing to accede to it. Under the circumstances, and as it was recommended that we should sit on Saturday to make up the loss of Wednesday, I think the House should observe to-morrow as Dominion Day, and the Government are ready to do so, and do it with great pleasure.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the House has been deceived by the course taken by the Government. There are many hon. gentlemen on this side who live at a distance from here, and if they had been aware that the intention of the Government was not to sit to-morrow they would have opposed sitting to-day. I was anxious to go to London, but I could not go on a single holiday, and there are many members living at a distance who are in a similar position. Why were we brought here to-day if the intention was to make to-morrow a holiday. When the Ministers spoke about a meeting on Tuesday every hon. gentleman thought it was a choice between Tuesday and Thursday. No one for a moment supposed that to-morrow was to be taken as a holiday if we were to meet to-day. If hon. gentlemen feel strongly as to keeping the day as a holiday, and serving their country better outside of the House by attending sports elsewhere than by working here in the public interests, they should have expressed their opinion when the matter was under discussion. There is a fair prospect that under any circumstances we are likely to be here into August, and hon. gentlemen opposite apparently wish us to remain here until September. I may say for myself that I am opposed to making to-morrow a holiday. I suppose that our Roman Catholic friends regarded yesterday as a day of religious observance, or I would have been in favour of sitting yesterday. But to take more holidays than are absolutely necessary in the state of the public business is a monstrous proceeding. We should have been called together in February last, but instead Parliament was dissolved and we were sent to the country. We were called here at the most inconvenient season of the year, at a season when every man's private business requires his attention. We have been called on to make great personal sacrifices at this season for the purpose of promoting the political interests of hon. gentlemen opposite; and now, after stating last week that we were to meet on Tuesday and continue to sit during the week, it is proposed to change that decision; but the proper time to consider it was when the subject was under discussion before.

Mr. MASSON. I am surprised that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) should object to to-morrow being observed as a holiday. I am very much surprised that any loyal Canadian should object to that day being a holiday. It is declared to be a statutory holiday all over the country, and it would be strange indeed that this House of Commons should override the statute in that respect and declare that day should not be a holiday when all over the Dominion it would be so kept. When the discussion took place as to the adjournment from Friday till Tuesday or Thursday objection was raised to the two days, and I do not think there were many members deceived. If the hon. member for Bothwell was deceived it was certainly not by anything said by the Minister of Finance or of any member of the Government stating there would be a sitting on Wednesday. Some hon. members suggested that the House should sit on Monday as well as Wednesday, and all this was due to the anxiety expressed by hon. members from a distance to hurry through the business. But as to the importance of sitting to-morrow in order to hurry through business, how much will business be advanced? Some private Bills will be advanced a stage or two and nothing more will be done. The business of the House will not be brought to a close one hour sooner by sitting to-morrow, and it is not only the consensus of opinion in the House but in the country at large that Dominion Day should be observed as a holiday.

Mr. FRASER. I trust that what was understood and acted upon when we parted on Friday will be carried out. I was very much struck by a remark made by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), who said he knew of no better way of honouring the day than by members sitting here and transacting public business. The hon. gentleman who spoke last seemed to think there was no understanding, or that nothing of this kind had been said. Either the hon. gentleman's memory must be defective or his loyalty must have carried him away. I am as loyal as any man, and I am ready to come here and work to-morrow, for I am far from home, while some hon. gentlemen can go home almost daily. It is very well for hon. gentlemen who can leave here at half-past ten at night and be home to-morrow with their friends, to observe the day there, but when members come hundreds of miles, and when the weather is not that of February, they are entitled to some little consideration. There is no reason why we should not sit to-morrow and do good work, and if hon. members wish to go home they can do so, and there will be a sufficient number left to transact public business. I, for my part, will see that I give no adverse vote to the Government which would prevent them from carrying on the business expeditiously. The proposition made by the leader of the House to-night shows a very vacillating policy, and I am much surprised at it. It was distinctly understood and stated by the Minister the other night that we should meet on Tuesday and continue to sit Wednesday, Thursday, Friday and Saturday, and had it not been for that understanding there are gentlemen here who would have gone home until Thursday, and it is not fair to them that a further loss of time should be proposed now. In the first place, the session is so late that we should meet here to do work, and in the second place it would be a breach of faith with the members of this House who accepted the statement of the leader of the Government that we should sit to-morrow. I shall vote that we meet to-morrow, because if we do not it is quite clear that very little business will be done this week.

Mr. MULOCK. The reason assigned by the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson) that we should adjourn over to-morrow is one that has evidently come to his mind since the discussion of a few days ago. He now rests a claim for the observance of Dominion Day as a holiday on the grounds of loyalty, but I will point out that in 1885 the Government did not deem it disloyal to sit on the 1st of July. The hon. member was in the House at that time. If he took part in the duties of the House on Dominion Day as a further proof that loyalty was not much in these days I may state that in 1885 the Government which sat on the 1st July did not sit on the 4th July, and now we find them in 1891 saying that it would be disloyal to sit on the 1st July. I think we had better argue the question from the standpoint of our duties to the public and our duties to ourselves. I would like to call the attention of the Government to the fact that there are only two days in the week now for private members, and if the House does not sit on Wednesday does the Government propose to give Saturday as a private members' day?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). On Thursday last a number of members wished to have an adjournment until next Thursday, in order that we might have an opportuity of returning to our homes, but many members on the other side of the House stated they were willing to come here to-day at three o'clock and continue on working all the week, Saturday included. The members who wished to get home yielded to the sentiment of the House at that time, and we have been kept here doing nothing since then in order to allow those who live nearer Ottawa to make a visit home. These gentlemen are now much more loyal than they were last week; and I would like to know when they got their loyalty. They knew last Thursday that to-morrow was Dominion Day, and surely they were as loyal then as they are now. The leader of the House then told us distinctly that the House would meet to-day and sit each day during the week, and it is a gross breach of faith with us if the proposition is now carried out that the House shall not sit to-morrow. I hope the Government will have sufficient firmness and stability to maintain the position which they took with regard to this matter, and that they will not go back on the distinct and positive statement they made to the House that we should sit from Tuesday during the remainder of the week, Saturday included.

Mr. KENNY. There is a very general opinion and a very natural desire on the part of the members of this House that the business of Parliament should proceed with all the dispatch which is consistent with the faithful and intelligent discharge of the duties which the people sent us here to perform. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has referred very feelingly to the members who live at a distance, and I desire to say, as one of the members of this House who live at a much greater distance from the capital than the hon. member for Bothwell, that on many previous occasions when short adjournments had been suggested I know that the members from the Maritime Provinces and from the distant western sections of the country have not objected to these adjournments, because it enabled their colleagues who live nearer to Ottawa to spend a few days at their own homes. My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), during the course of the remarks he has just made, has stated that if we adjourn for to-morrow it will enable the gentlemen who live within easy access of Ottawa to go home and spend the great Canadian festival with their families. I do not think it would be possible to find a better argument in favour of adjournment than that which is given by my hon. friend. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) also tells us that we shall be here until some date in August, and if that is the case there is no great pressure of public business to-morrow, because it will be a private members' day; and, as has been remarked once before during this discussion, the prorogation of Parliament will not be expedited by one hour by us sitting to-morrow. As one of those members who live at a distance from Ottawa—a much greater distance than the hon. member from Bothwell does—and as one of those members who may have suffered by these frequent adjournments as well, it is my opinion that as this public holiday was made and proclaimed by the Parliament of Canada, as it will be observed as a holiday from Halifax on the Atlantic to Vancouver on the Pacific, as every Custom-house and post office will be closed, and as

every civil servant connected with the public service will have his holiday. I think that we, the House of Commons of Canada, should also keep Dominion Day as a holiday. The senior branch of the legislature has in this respect shown us a very good example by adjourning over Dominion Day. With all deference to hon. gentlemen opposite, and though quite as anxious as any hon. gentleman who sits on that side of the House to get through the business, at the same time I think we should recognize and observe our great national holiday, and not sit to-morrow.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the statement made by the hon. Minister of Public Works has been misunderstood. In the report of June 24 it is stated:

"Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government have considered the fact that there are two holidays next week, and we believe that if we took Saturday of next week, thus having Tuesday, Thursday, Friday and Saturday, then the two holidays would not deprive Parliament of more than one day's work. Therefore, when the House adjourns on Friday we shall ask the House to adjourn until Tuesday at three o'clock, and then sit during the remainder of the week, except on Wednesday, which is Dominion Day."

I think it is quite clear from this that the intention stated by the hon. Minister was that we should have to-morrow as a public holiday. But in view of the announcement made by the hon. member for Bothwell that we are going to sit here during the whole of July and the greater part of August, I think we can afford to take a holiday now and then, and I believe it will be satisfactory to this House and the country that we should observe to-morrow as a public holiday.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman who has just spoken professes to read the conclusion to which the Government came on 24th June; but the hon. gentleman dealt with the House rather disingenuously, because he read the first statement made by the leader of the House before the discussion took place. But in that discussion the sense of the House was so manifestly against the suggestion of the Minister that he distinctly retracted his first statement, and at the close wound up in these words:

"I think the hon. gentleman may not have understood what I said. From the feelings expressed it appears that the House should, when it adjourns on Friday, stand adjourned until Tuesday at three o'clock, and then sit all next week."

That was very clear; every hon. gentleman understood the determination come to; no one protested at the time, and the members who come from the Maritime Provinces made their arrangements consistent with the understanding that they should stay here and discharge their public duties. There are some of us who would have given a good deal to be able to go and carry out business appointments which we had made; but in consideration of the late period of the session, the enormous amount of work to be done and the necessity of coming to a speedy prorogation, we waived our private views and desires and consented to meet here on Tuesday, on condition that we should sit all week and make up the lost time on Monday. If we go on debating as we have been doing to-night we shall make our loyalty somewhat of a burlesque. To say that a man who goes to a lacrosse match is a loyal subject, while one who attends to his public duties is disloyal, is a strange test of a man's loyalty. The late Prime Minister made it a test of our loyalty to sit on Dominion Day and attend to our public duties, and hon. gentlemen will consider his views as something of a test. We shall be dealing with the country in the most loyal way by staying here and attempting to discharge our public duties. I have heard the argument used many times that by adjourning over for a day we shall not lose any time. That may be believed by the younger members; but it will not be believed by those who have been here for a number of years. Some hon. members in this House make their attendance in Parliament a pleasant interlude in the week. They come late in the afternoon of Monday or on Tuesday morning, and leave on the 4 o'clock train on Friday, and then they think they have discharged their duties. The consequence is that the session is prolonged for three or four weeks more than it ought to be. And as for the meetings of this important committee, hon. gentlemen know well that owing to our not being able to get a quorum we have not done in two or three weeks more than ought to have been done in as many days; and if this adjournment takes place there will be not only no meeting of the committee to-morrow, but hon. gentlemen know that it will be impossible to get a quorum on Thursday morning. Possibly you may get one on Friday, and then some hon. gentlemen will go off on Friday afternoon for their usual holiday jaunt over Saturday, Sunday and Monday, returning possibly in time for the sitting on Tuesday morning. This thing is getting beyond bearing to the members from the Maritime Provinces, British Columbia and the North-West, who are compelled to stay here all the time. I think we have been rather long-suffering in this matter. We do not wish to object to reasonable adjournments, but the thing is being carried too far, and our good nature is being imposed upon.

Mr. DENISON. The hon. gentleman has referred to what took place on the 24th of June. By reference to the report for the 26th of June it will be found that Sir Hector Langevin moved:

"That when this House adjourns to-day it stands adjourned till Tuesday next at three o'clock in the afternoon."

Showing that there was no intention to adjourn over till Thursday; but there being no remark made by the hon. Minister of Public Works in regard to meeting on Wednesday, the inference is that we were not to meet on Wednesday.

Mr. McNEILL. I think my hon. friend who addressed the House the last but one will agree that there are few members in this House who desire to get home more than I should; there are very apparent reasons for that; and I must say that, actuated by that motive more than by the desire for business, I was very glad when I heard that the House was going to sit to-morrow. But on thinking the matter over, I must say that there is a very great deal to be said for the view that it is scarcely the thing for the Commons of Canada to set the example of ignoring the national holiday. If we have done it once before I think that is the very strongest reason why we should not do it again.

Mr. MULOCK. Why?

Mr. McNEILL. Because we are simply making a habit of it. If there were some exceptional reason why we should sit we might do it; but if we con-

tinued to sit on Dominion Day I think it would be a most unfortunate thing.

Mr. MARA. Notwithstanding what the hon. member for Toronto has said, I certainly was under the impression that an agreement was entered into by both sides of the House that the House on meeting to-day should sit every day during the week, including Saturday. Now, I will not yield in my loyalty, either to the Dominion or the Empire, to any man in this House, but I do not think I would sacrifice either by sitting to-morrow. Let us bear in mind that this is an exceptional session. Circumstances over which we have no control have lengthened it, and the least hon. members living in the vicinity of Ottawa should do is to see that we should sit every day, and not take holidays simply because they are thereby afforded an opportunity of going to their homes. We ought to bear in mind that this is not a matter of sentiment. It is not, so far as British Columbia is concerned or the Maritime Provinces. The members from these provinces cannot go home. We had this session to leave our homes in the middle of April, and, in all probability, we will have to remain here until the middle of August. The time has arrived when the House should take some method of dealing with holidays, and not have so many statutory holidays. If a holiday comes on Tuesday there is no session on Monday, simply because members cannot go home and return, and thus two days are lost for nearly every holiday. There is also too much time wasted in this House. We had the whole of this afternoon taken up by an hon. gentleman in dealing with statements he had made in this House six sessions ago. I do not think that our time should be wasted in this way, and I am of opinion that we ought to sit, not only to-morrow, but every Saturday until the House rises.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS.

Mr. McNEILL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a word in explanation of the vote I gave the other night on the amendment of the Finance Minister to the motion of Mr. Jamieson. I find that it has been assumed that in supporting the amendment I voted against a reference to the people. That is a strange misconception, for I had not only voted but spoken in favour of a reference to the people that evening. I am still, as I have always been, in favour of referring this question to the people, and although I am neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet I venture to say that this question will eventually be disposed of in that way. It is, however, I think, quite right that before the question is submitted to a popular vote the electors should be placed in possession (to the fullest extent possible) of information calculated to assist them in arriving at a sound conclusion on the subject. I cannot doubt that the investigations of the commission that is to be appointed will result in placing before the public a body of most important facts, which will be of great service in enabling men to make up their minds as to the merits of the question. And I would, therefore, have supported the amendment of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance unhesitatingly, but for one consideration, and this was that I had promised my temperance friends to support a resolution for immediate reference to the people. This pledge I felt I must keep, even though on reflection I was convinced that the wisest course would be to have the report of the commission published for the information of the people before the vote was taken. I could vote for a reference to the people and also for the commission. But I could not vote for the commission and the immediate reference consistently. But when Mr. Jamieson, as the mouthpiece of the temperance party, rose in his place and told us emphatically that he was instructed by the Dominion Alliance to say that they were opposed to a reference to the popular vote I felt that I was thereby formally absolved from any pledge as to reference I had given; that my statement as to immediate reference was no longer binding and that I was quite free to follow my own inclination and vote for the commission. But I hold my own views as to the advisability of a reference to the people as strongly as ever I did, and will always be prepared to support such a policy.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid the hon. gentleman is rather transgressing the rule. This is a question of personal explanation, which should be made on the Orders of the Day being called, and can hardly be made on a motion to go into Committee.

Mr. McNEILL. I bow to your decision.

Mr. WATSON. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has paid very close attention to the debates to-night, and, no doubt, will act on some of the suggestions that have been made. I wish to call his attention to a regulation made recently, based on the report of Mr. Wilmot, who was sent to Lake Winnipeg to investigate and report as to the state of the fisheries in this lake. The department have seen fit to restrict companies licenses for commercial purposes to fishing within certain waters. I find that commercial licenses are granted to fishing companies for the purpose of exporting fish, and then there are domestic licenses granted the Indian and settlers to fish for domestic purposes. I claim that the people who catch fish under the domestic licenses should be allowed to export the fish, as well as the large companies. Last year the Indians and half-breeds and some of the settlers caught fish which they sold for export, about half whitefish and the balance pike and pickerel, and the sales amounted to some $25,000. These fish were caught in the winter time after the ice was formed; but, under the new regulations, it is proposed not to grant any except to companies who are able to invest large sums in building ice-houses to preserve the fish and to fish in deep waters. I hope the hon. Minister will see fit to allow the people who catch fish under these domestic licenses the same privileges with regard to export for all the fish they can catch under the ice as foreign companies.

Motion agreed to; and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Auditor General's office—Additional amount to cover outlay for clerical assistance (Governor General's warrant) $1,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In connection with this, probably the Minister of Justice would now be in a position to state what conclusion the Government have arrived at as to the matter to

which I called the Minister's attention some time ago, as to restoring the power inadvertently taken away from the Auditor General in the compilation of the statutes.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. A Bill will be introduced in a few days to restore the Act to its former position.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it is time to call attention to the abuse in obtaining money on Governor General's warrants. The statute authorizing the issue of Governor General's warrants lays down certain expressed conditions, and there is a laxity growing up in regard to the issuing of those warrants. I very much doubt if all the warrants issued this year are within the spirit of the Act. I am quite aware that last session a number of warrants were obtained in disregard of the Act. The subject had been discussed in Parliament, and, instead of the discussion doing any good, it seems to have resulted in larger warrants being issued this year than were issued last. There can be scarcely any greater violation of the privileges of the people, especially on the eve of Parliament, than the issue of Governor General's warrants, unless they are for purposes which are undoubtedly within the spirit of the Act.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I entirely concur with the observations made by the hon. gentleman. There is no doubt that the practice which has grown up is wholly at variance with the provisions of the Act. The Governor General's warrants ought never to be made use of, except upon some extraordinary emergency, which could not have been foreseen. I see that a large portion of these Estimates have been provided for by Governor General's warrants. Take, for instance, the fortification of St. John's Gate, Quebec. Was there any unforeseen injury occurring to the wall? Was it blown up, or was it only the ordinary decay?

Mr. FOSTER. Would it not be better to discuss these items as they occur, instead of running through the whole of the Supplementary Estimates?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am not running through the whole of the Supplementary Estimates, except to illustrate the point I am making. The law authorizes the Governor General's warrants to be used in certain cases. Those are altogether different from the cases in which it has been used here. The hon. gentleman has used the Governor General's warrant to make expenditures which should not have been made, except upon an appropriation asked for in the House. I have looked over the whole of these Supplementary Estimates, and I am referring to these instances in order to show that these items do not at all fall within the rule laid down in the statute for the issue of Governor General's warrants.

Mr. FOSTER. This item I think does fall within that rule. Mr. Martin, a clerk in the office of the Auditor General, resigned his position, and that was entirely unforeseen by the Governor General or the members of the Government. The work had to be done, the salary voted for Mr. Martin was not available, and this extra work had to be paid for. I think there was nothing irregular in that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think my hon. friend will see that it would be better to have put this under the head of "Unforeseen Expenses." I think we vote something like $50,000 for "unforeseen expenses," and I think this amount should rather have gone under that head than have been paid by a Governor General's warrant. I do not think the amount voted for "unforeseen expenses" has been expended.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think the vote was so large as $50,000. I think it was about $20,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would rather see a vote of $50,000, as it formerly was, and see it used for these small contingencies that must arise, than I would see the Governor General's warrant used for such purposes. There is no doubt that the power to issue Governor General's warrants has been abused.

Mr. MULOCK. I would call the attention of the Government, and of the Minister of Justice particularly, to this fact: This item is included with a number of others in a statement brought down to the House of the Governor General's warrants and expenditures thereon, in accordance with the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Acts. The item in question is one included in this statement, and it appears that warrants have been issued to the amount of $1,310,876.38. Those warrants could only be properly issued if there was an urgent demand for the expenditure, and that the urgency was one which, in the public interest, was so strong, that the Government could not wait until Parliament met, that it was an unforeseen demand upon the exchequer, and that the other conditions which the statute lays down were complied with. We find, however, that only $750,000 of the amount granted under these warrants was spent, so that nearly $600,000 in excess of what was required was authorized by Governor General's warrants. We want no better proof than that of the laxity with which this power is now used. The Governor General is induced to sanction expenditure to that amount, and yet the expenditure was not wanted, it was not urgent, it was not necessary in the public interest to the extent of nearly three-quarters of a million dollars. I think that if this evil—for it has become an evil now, a perversion of the powers vested in the Government by the statute—if this evil is perpetuated it will have to receive, I think, more emphatic attention than a mere discussion in Supply, which is all it is likely to receive this session.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I will just read the section relating to the use of the Governor's warrant:

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

Now, I think it is perfectly clear from that provision that the hon. gentleman has used the Governor's warrant where it was not warranted by the statute.

Mr. FOSTER. That is covered by the provision for unforeseen requirements.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is clearly the idea that is provided for by contingencies. The hon. gentleman is using the Governor's warrant for purposes that never were contemplated by the law.

Mr. FOSTER. That could not be covered by contingencies, because there was not contingencies enough for the purpose. Contingencies were voted last year on the estimate of the Auditor General for what he thought he would require, taking into account the permanent clerks that we had. In the course of the year one of the permanent clerks resigned, and in his place the services of this clerk were required. The circumstance was unforeseen and it had to be met, and I think it is fully covered by the wording of the statute.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If there is an appropriation made for the office which the clerk holds for twelve months, and he resigns before the time is up, the balance of his salary, of course, reverts to the Government, and may be used to pay his successor.

Department of Fisheries—Further amount required for contingencies.....$800

Mr. FLINT. Will the Minister explain this item?

Mr. TUPPER. This $800 is made up largely of items for the printing of the Herring Report; also, by the cable correspondence in connection, both with Behring Sea and Newfoundland matters, for which we had no vote.

Department of Justice—Further amount required for contingencies.....$3,000

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This sum is to make up the usual amount which has been required for contingencies in my department. In previous years the whole sum has been provided out of the general vote for contingencies, which we were allowed to draw upon as long as the whole sum is not exceeded. But last year the practice was adopted of having a specified sum for each department, and, in consequence, I am obliged to ask for this amount.

Department of Indian Affairs—Further amount required for contingencies..$2,000

Mr. DEWDNEY. There were some unexpected travelling expenses that were not provided for. It is very difficult to control contingent expenses in Indian affairs. The field extends from the Atlantic to the Pacific. This year contingent expenses have been almost one-half less than they were the year before, but we want $2,000 to make up extra expenses which we were forced to provide for.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of the Interior contends that the contingencies in his department are much less than they formerly were; but I would remind him that the expenses of the Department of Indian Affairs are increasing very rapidly. If the Minister will compare the cost of the administration of Indian affairs now with the cost five years ago I am sure he would be surprised at the tremendous increase of expenditure. The expenditure is many thousand dollars over what was quite sufficient five years ago. In this department the management of Indian affairs in the city of Ottawa is becoming onerous. I am not able to say that it is unnecessarily large, for I have not that knowledge of details that would warrant me in making that statement, except by comparison: but taking the expenditure of earlier years as evidence, I think there has been an increase of late years that is not warranted by the circumstances. The Minister refers to travelling expenses. On that point I would say that I have had occasion to look into the allowances made for some of his officers in connection with travelling expenses, and they are on an extremely liberal scale. Inasmuch as part of these expenses is charged to the Indian fund, I think that Parliament is specially bound to be careful and watchful, and see that there is no waste in the slightest degree of the trust fund belonging to the Indians. I had occasion to move for a return upon this subject a short time ago, and I have it in my hand now—an account showing the allowances made by the Minister or his predecessor, in 1885, for the travelling expenses, such as he refers to, of one of his agents, a Mr. Dingman. I would mention to the hon. gentleman that the amounts charged were for sums amounting to three times the actual disbursements made by the officer. I say that the return which I hold in my hand, giving in details moneys paid to one of the hon. gentleman's officers for an investigation made by him, contains items paid by the department, a portion of which I presume were charged to the Indian fund, as the Minister stated in answer to a question put to him during this session, to an officer who conducted the investigation held in the village of Sutton, amounting to three times the actual disbursements made by that officer.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think the return shows the amount paid for the work. Mr. Dingman had to visit the township of Sutton on three or four occasions, owing to the illness of the Indian agent, the complaint against whom he was investigating. The amount which the inspector received was the regular allowance provided by Order in Council, and which every officer receives when he is away from headquarters on duty. What his expenditure was I have no means of knowing; but I am quite sure he received only that to which he is entitled, because if he had claimed any more the Auditor General would not have paid him. In regard to the general question as regards the expenditure of the department, I admit the expenditure has increased considerably during the last six or eight years. In 1882 the staff at headquarters was composed of the Deputy Minister and 19 clerks; in 1890 it was composed of the Deputy Minister and 35 clerks; but a technical branch has been added since 1882, consisting of two or three surveyors, who are kept constantly busy. The Indian fund has increased by $331,000; the business of the department has increased over 100 per cent.; the volume of business passing through the accountant's branch, judging by the number of payments made, increased during those years about 400 per cent.; while the correspondence of the department, as shown by the letters, increased 100 per cent. Consequently, hon. members must see that although our staff has increased the business has increased in a far greater ratio.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think so.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman permit me to make a suggestion with a view to meet the necessities of public business? Some three or four

days ago, when speaking about public business, I pointed out the necessity of passing these Supplementary Estimates so as to make payments for work already done and debts already incurred—services which have been fully rendered and which ought to be paid; and if we enter during the consideration of one item of these Estimates into a review of the Indian Department, and when we come to another item review another department, we will make no progress. It is very important we should pass these Supplementary Estimates, and that they, with those items of the Estimates we have already passed, for Civil Government and Legislation, should be embodied in the form of a Bill, and this Bill be passed through both Houses, and assented to. Otherwise, when to-morrow comes, and after, there will be no money to pay for services which must go on. Under these circumstances I asked that to-day should be given to the Supplementary Estimates. We came together at three o'clock and have wasted eight hours up to the present time, so far as business is concerned, and if we are to enter into a review of every department on items that are not here mentioned and which are not connected with it, we shall certainly not get through these Estimates for a long time. I ask the Chairman to enforce the rules, and I ask hon. gentlemen to cheerfully comply with them, so that we may get through the items; otherwise, I shall be under the necessity of asking the House to adjourn all matters of debate on the Budget and stick to those Estimates until they are through. I am making only a reasonable request, and I hope it will be complied with.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not think there is any disposition on the part of the Opposition to discuss the items at greater length than is required, but if the Minister of Finance thinks this is a matter of such urgency——

Mr. FOSTER. I do not want it to be considered that I am putting this forward as a matter of urgency; it is a mere matter of business. Surely an hon. member will not ask us on Supplementary Estimates for the current year, when the regular Estimates are yet to come up, and also Supplementaries for the next year, to enter into a review of the whole Indian Department. I am not pressing this as a matter of courtesy or urgency, but as a mere matter of business. But, in regard to getting these items through with such little discussion as will thoroughly ventilate them, that is a matter of urgency, and I ask hon. gentlemen to bear this in view.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I take it in that way. It is no doubt important to get these items through and have them embodied in a Bill, in order that the public service may be regularly conducted. But whose fault is it if this is not done?

Mr. FOSTER. It is not mine.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Certainly it is yours, or rather it is the fault of the Government of which you are a member. The Government dissolved the House at a time when they thought it suited them, they brought on the election when they thought fit, they called Parliament together at the most inconvenient season, when it was not possible to have the Estimates fully and properly considered; and that being the case, the hon. gentleman must not urge, as a good reason why the Opposition should forego their duties and not ask information, the urgency of the case.

Mr. FOSTER. I beg your pardon; I was not raising any objection to asking particulars regarding the item under discussion. I merely called attention to the fact that none of the items before the House involved a discussion of the whole policy of the Indian Department.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not think the hon. gentleman desires to do so. Certain information is nevertheless required regarding the items. Hon. gentlemen opposite must remember the fact that if inconvenience arises by amounts not being paid before 1st July it is a fault which lies wholly with the Government, and not with the Opposition.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think there is a general disposition to facilitate the work of the session and pass the Estimates, but I do not think, when the Minister of Finance calls on the Chairman to exercise his authority, he adopts a very wise measure to further public business. It is not desirable, nor will the proceedings of the House be facilitated by doing it. Calling members to order on little items of this kind will not facilitate the business of the House. That is all I want to draw attention to.

Mr. MULOCK. After this waste of time, brought about by the interruption of the Minister of Finance, I will now proceed with the item I was considering, and I hope the gentleman will not delay this business further by again interrupting me as he did this moment. I do not propose to review the whole policy of this department, nor was anything I said fairly open to any such observation. The Minister of Finance is evidently a little excitable this evening over something, I do not know what; at all events, he does not appear to be in his usually cool and calm state of mind.

Mr. FOSTER. I am as cool as a cucumber.

Mr. MULOCK. Then the hon. gentleman will not be excused if hereafter in this discussion he makes such a mistake as he did already. In the account to which I refer, and to which I called the attention of the Minister of Interior at the commencement of this session, he says that the Auditor General is to blame if any larger sum was paid to Mr. Dingman than was disbursed. I presume he will qualify that statement by saying, "unless the payment was based upon some regular allowance."

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. I would submit, then, that in cases like this it is not fair to the Indian Fund that a larger sum should be charged against that fund for travelling expenses than is really incurred. We are bound to be careful in the administration of that fund.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Is that the report in your hand which states that there is a certain amount paid for a secretary and for rent of an office out of the Indian Fund? The return, as far as I recollect, shows that these travelling expenses were not paid out of the Indian Fund.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister says that the department allows $3.50 per day for board, and as these agents are travelling many times a year there are thousands of dollars spent in that way. A

portion of that comes out of the Indian Fund and a portion out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund. Most of the time spent by Indian agents in this work is perhaps spent on reserves, where the agent perhaps does not have to pay one cent for board; if he pays anything it is perhaps a very trifling sum, and if you allow $3.50 per day to the officer for board, the rate he will be charged at a first-class hotel, while he is on the reserve, you will see that you are making a very liberal addition to the salary of the officer and making a very unnecessary charge against the Indian Fund or against the general revenue of the country. I therefore object to the allowance of $3.50 per day to the inspector for board, in addition to all other supposed or possible expenses, when he has not incurred that expense. In the case under notice there is an item of $101.50 for board, and a portion of that, I do not know how much, was incurred while the inspector resided in a small village. He never paid any such sum as that for board; at the very outside he paid one dollar per day, and so you have allowed him three times what he has expended. A portion of that, I presume, is charged against the Indian Fund; if not, so much the better; but whether charged against the Indian Fund or the money of the country generally, I object to it as an expenditure that is simply an addition to the salary of the agent, and which makes it an object to the agent to prolong his enquiries, because the longer he is engaged in that service the more money it will be in his pocket. One of these agents got large sums of money in such a manner as this, and he must have cleared a handsome addition to his income by this liberal allowance. Without saying anything further at the present time, I hope it will not be necessary to again press this matter on the Minister.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Before this discussion closes it would be well to say, and the hon. gentleman must appreciate it, that it is very difficult to discriminate between one officer and another. This per diem allowance has been paid for years to the public officers when travelling; and I have no doubt, as the hon. gentleman says, that on some occasions the officers do make a little out of it, but there are other occasions when they lose by this allowance. I believe the inspector gets $3.50 per day, but all the officers do not get that amount. Where agents visit reserves on special work in the North-West they only get $2 per day. That is all regulated by Order in Council.

Mr. MULOCK. An Order in Council can be wrong, and this is one that ought to be amended.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Orders in Council can be wrong, and if it is thought advisable they can be rectified. The amounts which are paid for travelling expenses all over the Dominion are paid out of the general revenue and not out of the Indian Fund.

Mr. MULOCK. This very officer, Mr. Dingman, received last year for travelling expenses $1,606.86, and another officer $825.

Mr. DEWDNEY. He is the inspector, the only inspector we have got.

Mr. MULOCK. If he is the only inspector a great deal of his time must be spent in the vicinity of the reserves, and if you pay him $3.50 per day for the time he is on the reserves you are increasing his salary by $500 or $600 a year. That is not justifiable, and you are inducing him to be dilatory in the discharge of his duties as well.

To provide salary for Mr. T. D. Green as Technical Officer..... $900

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the meaning of this, "technical officer"?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The salary was voted in the Estimates, but his name was not put in as intended. He is a surveyor in the Indian Department.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). He has been there for several years.

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; he was in the Department of the Interior for some years, but I think he joined the Indian Department about eighteen months ago.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). You had an appropriation before to cover his salary.

Mr. DEWDNEY. It was voted in the Civil Government estimates last year, but his name not being put in the Estimates he was unable to draw his salary, because it was above the maximum of his class in which he was put under.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman did not quite hear, perhaps. I asked what was meant by "technical officer"?

Mr. DEWDNEY. He is a Dominion land surveyor.

Mr. FLINT. I see an item of $2,300 to cover the cost of printing Indian treaties. I would ask if they have been published and will be placed in the hands of members, as they will be of great historical value.

Mr. DEWDNEY. They will be printed. Many of them are very old, and have almost gone to pieces, and it is almost impossible for the clerks to decipher them. There are 680 pages, with 69 lithographic plans, occupying 111 pages, and all the treaties from the early days to the present time will be included.

Mr. FLINT. Will they be placed in the hands of members in sufficient number to be distributed to libraries?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I trust that none of the treaties have been overlooked. I was myself searching for a treaty with the Six Nations Indians of the date of 1762, but I could not find it, either in the hon. gentleman's department or in the office of the archives. I trust that the archives have been thoroughly searched as far back as that date, and that all the treaties will be included in the work. I agree with the hon. member for Yarmouth that this is a valuable work, and that a sufficient number of copies should be printed to be supplied to libraries, where our Indian friends as well as others would have access to them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I see it stated here that the treaties go back to 1680. I do not know to what extent the hon. gentleman has collected treaties. There are two modes in which he may have proceeded. One is to publish all the treaties that may have been made with the Indians in the name of the sovereign of England; the other is to publish those relating to Indian tribes now found in British North America. The hon. gentleman,

going back to 1680, goes back I suppose to the period when Lord Howard, acting as Governor of New York, entered into a treaty with the Six Nations, and I apprehend that he purposes including only those treaties made by the Crown with Indians who are now found in British North America. For instance, there are treaties with the Seminoles, the Cherokees and other southern tribes, entered into by the Americans and by proprietors on behalf of the British Government at a very early period. Then, there were a number of Indian tribes who at the time of the revolution came from the United Steates and settled in Canada; amongst these were the Six Nations, to whom my hon. friend has referred. They have on several occasions entered into treaties with the Government of Great Britain. A number of these treaties I think exist in manuscript form in the Indian Department, but all the treaties are not there. There are treaties with these Indians which will be found among the New York historical documents. Whatever form the collection assumes, it ought to be complete; but if the hon. gentleman confines it to treaties in the department it will not be complete in any form.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think this matter is worth considering. I will have an examination made, and if we have not all the treaties in the department it will be a matter for consideration whether we can obtain them elsewhere.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Coleman's History of New York contains some. I think all of them will be found scattered through the New York historical documents. Some made with the Delaware Indians may be found in the Pennsylvania archives, which are here in the library.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The collection is not in print yet, I presume?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What the hon. member for Bothwell says is important, and I think the House will be willing to give a sufficient amount to make the collection complete; it ought to be complete. For instance, treaties made with the British Government by Indians who came to Canada at the time of the War of Independence might have a bearing on the present rights of those Indians. Some of them are anxious to have a full understanding of what was guaranteed to them in days gone by, and if circumstances have altered since it will be easy to point that out to them. I think the Minister ought to avail himself of all sources to find these treaties, one of which I know is not in his own department or in our archives, so that we shall have a complete record, which would be satisfactory to the Indians and also of great historical value to the country.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I remember very well one treaty made with the Six Nation Indians, before they left the State of New York, to which they attached very great importance; that is one in which they were recognized, not as subjects, but as allies of the sovereign; and they claim still to be allies and not subjects.

Mr. MULOCK. A short time ago the hon. Minister of Finance made an allusion to my hon. friend from West Huron (Mr. Cameron). He stated that the day had been wasted. I presume he had reference to the discussion on the subject of the Indians raised by my hon. friend. That hon. gentleman has now appeared in the Chamber, and I think the Minister ought to say it to his face or withdraw it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. While this item is under discussion I might inform the hon. Minister of the Interior that a letter was sent to me from the County of Bruce in reference to Indian affairs there. It is signed by a gentleman of the name of Creighton. I know nothing of the matter personally; but I know that there are a good many Indians up there. This is a complaint made against the agent by Mr. Creighton, and I will read what he says:

"In March, 1889, Thomas McVittie was brought before James Muir, Esq., of Port Elgin, charged with giving liquor to Indians. It was proved on oath by two witnesses that it was Joseph Allen that had sold the liquor. Agent Allen tried to make the court believe that Joseph was employed by McVittie, but failed to prove it. Mr. Muir asked the agent why he did not bring Joseph there to prove that he was employed by T. McVittie. The reason he did not bring him was that he was the agent's son. The agent got him away until the time had expired for the prosecution. He gave them two bottles in the space of an hour."

This is the statement that Mr. Creighton makes in a letter over his own signature sent me to-day. I do not know Mr. Creighton except by name, but I bring this up in order to have the matter sifted. The other day I submitted a letter sent to me from that locality, and I told the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), who, I am sorry, is not here, that I was going to bring this matter up. He made some remarks on that occasion in reference to the Indians. Now, I do not know the Indians out there, but I have always had the opinion that they are a peaceful class of citizens, orderly and respectable; but the hon. member for Bruce, referring to the charges I brought before the House, spoke in this way——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I believe the hon. gentleman is out of order. We are discussing an item to which this has no reference.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The hon. member for North Bruce intimated to me that he proposed bringing that question up himself; then it will be a better time for the hon. gentleman to make his remarks.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I wish to give the hon. member for North Bruce full opportunity to explain. I wish to keep him right, and the Government right, on this question.

Mr. AMYOT. We are on item No. 8, which covers the subject the hon. gentleman is raising, and it would be much shorter to allow him to go on.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am speaking to item No. 8 with regard to the contingencies of the department, and I just wish to read the questions which the hon. member for North Bruce put the other day. The hon. gentleman then asked:

"Since he has been acting as Indian agent, has Mr. Allen's conduct been such as to cause the department to give any credence to these charges? Are any of these charges of which the department has any cognizance preferred by Indians? Are baseless charges frequently preferred against Indian agents by Indians? Is it within the knowledge of the department that the last of these charges preferred against Mr. Allen is ridiculously untrue?"

I just wanted to take this ground, that I do think members of this House should speak very guardedly in dealing with the Indians. If there is anything calculated to stir up strife in the different communities, it is the habit that hon. members have,

occasionally, in speaking disparagingly in regard to Indians. I was very much grieved to hear the Minister of Justice do that to-day and the hon. member for North Bruce do it the other day, and I wish to put a stop to that practice, which, I believe, will do a great deal of injury, considering we have so many Indians among us.

Mr. SPROULE. It would be equally out of place for the hon. gentleman to speak in an insinuating way against a gentleman outside this House, who has borne the highest character for probity for many years.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have not said a word against him and scarcely know him. I only read the statements made by Mr. Allen.

Mr. SPROULE. I refer to the questions put by the hon. member for South Grey, which really implied charges against Mr. Allen, the Indian agent for North Bruce.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I had nothing to do with these letters. They were sent me for the purpose of being investigated, and the names of the parties were appended to them. I know nothing of the character of these charges, but I know the people by name, and am entitled to bring their charges before the House. If I were a friend of Mr. Allen I would equally bring them forward here, where they could be defended; and I would not be friendly to Mr. Allen to go behind his back and make those charges in the department, where there will not be the same opportunity to answer them.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. gentleman say that he knew of his own knowledge that a respectable man like Mr. Allen would be likely to lay himself open to those charges?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do not know whether he would or not, but if any man is slandered I want to have him put right.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think there are more proclamations issued by different governors during the early part of this century which may have a bearing on these treaties and surrenders. If those proclamations were printed in the blue books they would perhaps throw light on some of the treaties. Some will probably be found before the United States became independent, which have a bearing on the Indian treaties.

Mr. FRASER. I presume these treaties will include those of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick as well.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

High Commissioner's Office—Additional amount for contingencies.....$1,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would suggest to the Minister of Finance that this is precisely one of those items that it would facilitate business to allow to stand. There are two or three of these items which will create considerable discussion, though the amounts may not be large.

Mr. FOSTER. Then we will not get the Supplementary Estimates as a whole further advanced.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I only suggest this in your own interest. Any of these can be amended, and it makes no difference.

Item postponed.

Mr. LANDERKIN.

Privy Council—Contingencies.....$ 4,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the explanation of that?

Mr. FOSTER. The statement I have is that the telegraphic accounts, the telegrams to London, England, on Imperial questions, have been very heavy, that there is an increase in the work of the office, that the number of references is increasing largely, and that the amount of copying required has increased very largely. From 1886 to 1890 the amount of copying has increased from four million and a-half words to seven million and a-half words. That takes in a very large number of temporary clerks, and I think the estimate last year was smaller than in the preceding year.

Hon. W. W. Sullivan, Chief Justice, P.E.I., six months salary as Judge of the Vice-Admiralty Court, P.E.I.....$ 300

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Last year this was proposed by the Minister of Justice on the ground that the chief justice of Prince Edward Island, who discharged the duties of Admiralty judge, should be placed on the same footing as the judges in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, who were paid $600 a year for discharging that duty. I should like to ask if the Minister of Justice has considered and is prepared to report on the application made in reference to the previous incumbent of that office. The late Chief Justice Farmer, who died in 1890, discharged the duties of judge of the Vice-Admiralty Court for sixteen or seventeen years—during which he never received any special pay from this Parliament to the extent of a dollar, while his successor receives $600 a year. Of course the same rule should be made to apply to the late chief justice, but I do not understand that any such claim is made, but that the Minister has been asked to grant a few thousand dollars on account of the service he rendered. It is true that during some of those years he had very little of this work to do, but in other years there was very important work before him. Some American ships were seized and condemned, and in some years very large ships were seized and long arguments took place before the late Chief Justice Palmer. His services should have been recognized in his lifetime, but they were not, and I understand that an application has been made by his family to the Minister of Justice, asking that, as the Government has recognized the right of the present chief justice to be put on the same footing as those in the other provinces, some consideration should be made for the services of the late Judge Palmer.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have considered the subject fully, but I am not in a position to give the hon. gentleman an answer this evening. I have to consult my colleagues on the subject. The representations made have been carefully considered, and I must say that they have my full sympathy.

Miscellaneous Expenditure, Administration of Justice, including North-West Territories.....$6,000

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The expenditure this year has been larger than usual, and this item is to make up the actual expenditure. The amount has been increased principally by some three or four items of litigation. There was one in the Supreme Court between the Attorney-General of Ontario and myself to settle a disputed point between the pro-

vince and the Dominion, which cost $900. There was also an investigation as to the conduct of a County Court judge which cost $900 more. There was also a special report of evidence in a capital case which cost $280, and there was another constitutional case in the west.

L. A. Audette, for services in connection with Exchequer Court report..... $300

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Mr. Audette is the registrar of the Exchequer Court, and he has in course of preparation the Exchequer Court reports, which are to be published in a series similar to that of the Supreme Court reports. The registrar of the Supreme Court receives $600 for the Supreme Court reports, and I am asking half the amount for the registrar of the Exchequer Court.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Will they cause half the work?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am informed that it will amount to about two-thirds of the work. One volume has been issued, and another volume is in course of preparation.

Mr. AMYOT. What will be the cost of these reports?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The same as the Supreme Court reports, which I think is $3.50 unbound, and $5 bound.

Mr. AMYOT. I understood last year that the cost would be reduced.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It was reduced to $2.50 unbound.

Mr. AMYOT. With this difference, that they published two half volumes instead of one volume. I do not see the difference between paying $2.50 each for two volumes and paying $5 for one, except that it costs more to be bound and is therefore dearer in the end.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is the same size as that for which the higher price used to be charged.

Mr. AMYOT. We ought to know what the price of these volumes is to be. It is rather dear to pay $5 each year for them.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will ascertain the correct price.

Mr. FRASER. I understand that this amount will be continued to Mr. Audette, and the series of reports will be continued from year to year?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Dominion Police..... $500

Mr. LANDERKIN. What is the strength of this force?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is one commissioner, one inspector, two sergeants and twenty-seven men.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Have there been any appointments to the staff within the last two years?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes; four or five a year; the staff is changing all the time.

Mr. AMYOT. Does the Government intend to utilize this force to protect the witnesses in the investigation now going on before the Committee on Privileges and Elections?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the committee is able to take care of them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I understand that a number of volunteers from Victoria have been sent up into the district of Nanaimo, acting as a police force. Are they paid by the Government as a police force while they are there, or by whom are they paid? What functions are they performing there? Is there a riot, or disorder, or disturbance that requires their presence at that particular point?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The force was sent up in the usual way, on an application made by three magistrates to the officer commanding. They were not paid by the Government, as it is not usual in such cases that the Government should provide pay for the men. They were paid by the municipality or by the local authorities. There is a question upon the paper which is being put by my hon. friend from Vancouver Island (Mr. Gordon), the answer to which will afford all the information that the department have.

Penitentiaries—Dorchester—To pay for land for penitentiary purposes..... $3,100

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is to purchase a piece of marsh land in front of the penitentiary and add it to the farm. Most of the penitentiary property is upland, and the marsh lands, which extend in front, are very fertile. The upland, on which the penitentiary is situated, is rough and rocky, although a valuable property, on account of being covered with firewood. This is used almost exclusively at present. This marsh land, the warden thinks, can be bought at $72 an acre, which is a cheap rate, and it will be very convenient for prison purpose, and will enable the authorities to raise crops that they are not able to raise now. The land is also well furnished with a good stream of water, and the prison at present has to be supplied by a large tank containing water brought from a great distance.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Justice will perhaps remember that some time ago I called his attention to the work being done at the Dorchester Penitentiary, the manufacture of woodenwares in competition with free labour. On that occasion the Minister of Justice explained as one reason—I do not know whether it was his main reason, though it was a large portion of his argument—that the Government felt warranted in continuing that work on the ground that they were first in the field, being engaged in that industry before it had begun by free labour. Since that discussion I have received a communication from the firm I referred to during that debate, and they assure me that the Minister was in error—that there had been established industries of that character in Canada long prior to the Government entering upon that sort of work. I merely rise now to ask the Minister whether, in view of his having attached a good deal of importance to the supposed priority on the part of the Government, he would, during the recess, look into that matter; and, if so, I think my correspondents will give him information which will show him that the reason which he advanced as one reason for the Government continuing this business does not in fact exist. I think it will be shown that long before the Government was in the

business in question it was carried on in the Province of Ontario to a very considerable extent.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I did not intend to give the hon. member to understand the other night that when the prison machinery was erected there were no private establishments making woodenware. What I intended to say was that several of these establishments which are now complaining of over-production had come into existence after the machinery there was set up, and therefore the Government was not responsible for the over-production that is now complained of. I think that statement is strictly correct; I have a recollection of meeting these gentlemen in my office, and that point was fully discussed.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice whether he intends to endeavour to provide other labour for the prisoners, if possible, and to drop that kind of business my correspondents are complaining of. Since the discussion that took place, those whom I speak for have taken very strong ground upon the matter. I have received communications from Toronto and from persons engaged in labour generally. There is a principle involved in the question, and I think, if I may venture a bit of advice, that it would be very satisfactory, both to the Government and to free labour, if the Government would, if possible, utilize its convict labour in such a way that it will not come into competition with free labour. Now that the question has been raised, I would ask the Minister whether, during the vacation, or in the near future, he will endeavour to remove the objections that have been made in this respect.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would not like to promise the hon. gentleman that we will dispense with the machinery and abandon that kind of work. If it is possible by any means to keep the prisoners employed without interfering with free labour we will do so to the greatest possible extent.

To pay J. Dingwell, County Attorney of Cornwall, for professional services and disbursements.....$172.68

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is in connection with the Controverted Elections Act. When election petitions were being brought in, the Cornwall judge reported certain persons guilty of corrupt practices, and it became, under the statute, a duty to prosecute for the penalties. The prosecutions were carried on, like all other prosecutions, by the provincial authorities, but the Government of Ontario claimed that it was but fair that this Parliament should provide for the expenses attending those prosecutions. Acting upon that view, I incurred these expenses.

To pay C. H. Masters for drafting criminal law, and for other expenses in connection therewith, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act $250

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. When the work of preparing the Criminal Code was undertaken I found that Mr. Masters had prepared a great deal of material for a work upon the subject of criminal law, his investigation being particularly confined to criminal procedure. I was very glad to avail myself of the work which he had made on this subject. He is one of the barristers of the Supreme Court.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the Minister who has charge explain the item of $10,000 for printing voters' lists. If these were for the general election perhaps he will explain how it became necessary to print them, as I presume they would be in stock.

Mr. FOSTER. I think this amount is for printing the voters' lists as required for the election, and any payments made will appear to the credit of the Receiver General.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Were lists obtained by candidates which were not paid for?

Mr. FOSTER. No. Any of the lists sold will appear as receipts.

Mr. MULOCK. It is clear that this item should not be pressed on the attention of the Committee. The Minister of Finance thinks that it may be for a certain purpose, but he is not able to give more information than appears on the face of the item. The voters' lists are required to be printed under the general Franchise Act, and we are not warranted in voting $10,000 when no Minister can tell us the purpose for which it is to be voted.

Mr. FRASER. We had to pay for every copy we obtained, and I cannot therefore understand why this item of $10,000 should appear for printing.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Did I understand the Minister of Finance to say that copies of the voters' lists had been issued for which payment was not made?

Mr. FOSTER. I said quite the opposite—that payments had no doubt been made, and the receipts would appear under the head of the Receiver General. The expense of printing the lists is to be met by the Government, and if we sold the whole $10,000 worth this item would appear as a debt to the Government, while among the receipts would appear the amount we received for payment.

Mr. McMILLAN. Was this the case in regard to all the counties or only in regard to some of them, because the lists have not been revised since 1887.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I understood the Minister of Finance to say that this item represents so many copies sold.

Mr. FOSTER. What I stated was, that this amendment was for voters' lists printed for the election. They were distributed throughout the different ridings and were paid for—that is, those which were distributed; I do not know what proportion were paid for—and the receipts will appear to the credit of the Receiver General.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Were the lists for the whole 211 or 212 electoral divisions reprinted?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know whether it covers the whole of them or not. I will obtain what information is necessary for the Committee, and I will bring it down on concurrence.

Mr. BARRON. I understood the Minister of Finance to intimate that the lists were sold. That is the law, and anyone who wants a list can obtain one for five cents for each polling division. It is generally rumoured that our opponents were able to get their lists for nothing. I know in one Riding in Ontario the boast was made by our opponents that they had not to pay for the lists. The revising officer has lists for sale apart from those for sale in Ottawa, but application was not made to him by our opponents because they said they could get the

lists from Ottawa for nothing. I do not say that is the case, but it is the rumour prevailing, and there is a general opinion throughout the country that we are not all treated equally, so far as the lists are concerned.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that when investigation is made it will be found that this is simply a rumour and not a fact. I suppose, if any one could get the lists for nothing a Minister might be expected to do so. I used a great many, but I paid for them, and others have done the same. It is not the fact that they are given away. It may be true that some persons received them free, if friends sent them and paid the expense.

Mr. BARRON. Do we not receive five copies each free of charge?

Mr. FOSTER. They come from the revising officer and not from the department here.

Mr. BARRON. I have received some lists from here and a bill has been sent to me.

Mr. DENISON. I got four or six copies from the revising officer, but I had to pay for all I obtained from Ottawa, and they amounted to about $50.

Mr. INGRAM. I paid between $30 and $40 for lists.

Mr. MULOCK. The Finance Minister supposes that perhaps this item was incurred for printing voters' lists for a general election. If I remember rightly, the Secretary of State intimated to the House that there would be a revision of the voters' lists before a general election. I find in the statement of Governor General's warrants an item: July 10, 1890, Franchise Act Legislation, $10,000. Is this the same $10,000 we are discussing now?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know, but I suppose it is; that is a Governor General's warrant.

Mr. MULOCK. If that is the item we have under discussion now, the Minister will see that the explanation he has offered will hardly be a correct one. The Secretary of State then gave the House to understand that there would be a revision before the general election, and how comes it that there was a warrant in 1890 for printing the voters' lists for the next election. Was it in contemplation in July, 1890, that there would be another revision before another election? The House had only adjourned for a couple of months then, and according to this statement Parliament had hardly prorogued when the Government had to get a Governor General's warrant to get ready for an election. Was there a change of programme after the Secretary of State had made that statement in the House? It is a most extraordinary thing if the Government had decided in July, 1890, that they were going to have a general election on the voters' list of that year.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the hon. gentleman sure of the date?

Mr. MULOCK. The date is given in the return I have before me. If there is no explanation the item had better stand.

Mr. FOSTER. Let it stand if you wish, but it has got to be paid.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes; but we are paying altogether too much for this Franchise Act. There is a quarter of a million dollars paid for it this year, and here is another ten thousand.

Mr. FOSTER. Let the item stand.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I notice that this amount would give to each electoral district about $50 in addition to what has already been received by the revising barrister.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The item stands.

Cost of leather trunks for members as per resolution of the House.. $5,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It may be there is a resolution of the House, and if so I did not observe it, but I do desire to record my protest against this folly. I do not think it is compatible with our dignity, nor does it add to our dignity in the eyes of the public at large, that we should be supplying ourselves with leather trunks. The old trunks may have been bad enough, but they were only intended as receptacles for the box of stationery, and were good enough in their way. I do not think this item should ever have appeared before us.

Mr. FOSTER. I quite agree with you.

To promote the Dairy Interests of Canada in affiliation with Experimental Farms, including establishment and maintenance of Branch Experimental Stations.....$10,000

Mr. McMILLAN. This requires some explanation. I see there are $20,000 placed in the Estimates for the same purpose. That is a very large amount, and I think that we should have some explanation as to how this money is expended.

Mr. HAGGART. The $20,000 is for next year: there is only $5,000 in the Estimates for 1890 and 1891. This is for salaries for seven travelling dairy commissioners visiting cheese factories in Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia: holding meetings $1,700, travelling expenses $1,500, cheese and butter-making apparatus for experimental dairy station $3,500, printing and stationery $200, expenses of shipment of dairy products in connection with experiments $500, and there is another item of expense on the Central Experimental Farm in connection with the new dairy building and experiments in the piggery, which are new branches undertaken since the last Estimates were made.

Mr. McMILLAN. Does this $10,000 refer to the past year?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes; that is the amount due up to to-day.

Mr. McMILLAN. By whom was this money expended last year?

Mr. HAGGART. There were seven inspectors travelling last year.

Mr. McMILLAN. Were they in the cheese interest or in the creamery interest?

Mr. HAGGART. The cheese interest, I think. The full account of it is given in the report of the Dairy Commissioner at page 132.

Mr. McMILLAN. I have looked over the report of the Dairy Commissioner but I have not observed that in it, although it may be contained therein. It is rather peculiar that when such a large sum is spent in the Province of Ontario already it should be necessary to incur the expense here. In the Province of Ontario the Dairymen's Association, assisted by

the Ontario Government, has established an experimental station for cheese-makers to get a good education, and I think it is folly to have two rival teachers sent out in one province, one from the Dominion and the other from the local Government.

Mr. SPROULE. In our part of the country these men are very much appreciated. I think their operations this season have been confined to the examination of milk and instructing factory men to test it. After they have spent a few weeks at one factory they go to another. They have visited the counties of Grey and Bruce, and I think also Simcoe, and the people of that section appreciate them very much, and I think the money is well spent. In connection with this subject, I am informed that the item we had last year for the Dairymen's Association and the Horticultural Association has been dropped this year. I think that is a great pity, because it is a small amount, and it was used to great advantage last year.

Mr. McMILLAN. The hon. member for East Grey is not correct. The item of $5,000, instead of being dropped, has been increased to $20,000. I would ask if all the teachers were from the Experimental Farm, or if some were from the Dairymen's Association, and assisted by the Ontario Government?

Mr. SPROULE. I think three out of five were selected from the hon. gentleman's part of Ontario. They were good, practical men.

Mr. McMILLAN. I am sorry we have not the hon. gentleman as Minister of Agriculture. We have no one to answer for that department, and the hon. gentleman has to take the place of the Minister.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). The hon. gentleman who talks broad Scotch forgets that these instructors were not confined to the Province of Ontario at all. They were instructors for the Dominion, and they went about the whole Dominion instructing.

Mr. McMILLAN. Well, if I do speak broad Scotch I am not ashamed of it or the country I came from, and I am not afraid to put any question to this House in broad Scotch just as well as the hon. gentleman who refers to it.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). I claim the right to be Highland Scotch, and I admire any man who stands up for his nationality. At the same time, I did not know the constituency the hon. gentleman represented, and I referred to him by the only distinguishing feature which I observed about him.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think the work referred to by the hon. member for South Huron has been eminently satisfactory for the Province of Ontario. Before these instructors passed around we had creameries and cheese factories in our section that have done great service, and I am happy to be able to state that a creamery in the South Riding of Grey has attained such perfection that Mr. Adam Brown states in his report that it was awarded the first prize for butter at Jamaica. I think the work of improving dairying can be safely left to the promoters of these creameries alone; experience will be found to be a better teacher than theory. The men in the creamery business who have devoted themselves intelligently to their business have acquired such a standing that if the Government, instead of employing these lecturers, gave a bonus to the creameries, I do not know but they would do a great deal more good.

To complete the distribution in Canada of the two-rowed barley purchased for seed purposes, and to purchase specimens of two-rowed barley grown in Canada for experimental purposes (Governor General's warrant) $2,000

Mr. LANDERKIN. How has this turned out?

Mr. HAGGART. I think it has been a losing speculation, so far as the monetary part is concerned. The total amount expended was $22,058; the proceeds of sales, $13,093; balance, $8,964. The receipts for barley in 1891 were $2,911, less expense of sale of barley, and purchase for experiments in reference to brewing, $1,872. There are 150 bags still on hand.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It would be satisfactory if the hon. Minister would state to us what the total expense of running this farm is for the year, and what is the value of the products of the farm sold?

Mr. HAGGART. I shall be able to give the full information on the main Estimates.

Mr. FRASER. Might I ask, while this experiment has been a loss financially, whether the two-rowed barley is likely to prove a success as a crop in this country?

Mr. HAGGART. From the information they have in the department, they think it is a great success in the country.

Mr. MULOCK. I wish to point out that this item is a Governor General's warrant again.

Mr. HAGGART. It is a lapsed amount.

Mr. MULOCK. I see that it was issued on the 18th of December for $2,000. On the 1st of May, according to this statement, you had expended only $1,200. On the 1st of May I presume you had distributed all the barley you are going to distribute this year. Why, then, did you ask for any more money than you expended? You have no barley distributed after the 1st of May in Canada.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to know where, and for what purpose?

Mr. HAGGART. A lot of bills came in, and there were experiments in reference to brewing with the two-rowed barley, costing $1,872, and there are some other accounts coming in.

Mr. MULOCK. Is this Government endeavouring to develop brewing?

Mr. HAGGART. It was engaged in finding what the value of two-rowed barley was for making malt for brewing purposes.

Mr. MULOCK. Then I understand that this Government is paying out money to develop the brewing interest—to show that this barley is good for making beer.

Mr. McMILLAN. I think there is $450 in the main Estimates to be paid to the brewers for that purpose.

Mr. McMULLEN. Where were the brewing experiments performed?

Mr. HAGGART. I think one in England and one here.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Was there any experiment made in London last year by the Carling brewery?

Mr. HAGGART. There may have been last year.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I see $402 were paid for that purpose.

Mr. MULOCK. Is it mentioned in the Estimates?

Mr. HAGGART. I believe it is in last year's accounts.

Mr. MULOCK. It is very unsatisfactory to have nothing definite. The Minister ought to be able to give information when supplies are asked for.

Mr. HAGGART. I think you will see it in the Public Accounts.

Mr. MULOCK. I am not complaining that the hon. gentleman himself has not the definite information, because he cannot be expected to give information on a subject he is not conversant with, but the deputy head or somebody else ought to be in the precincts who could furnish the information.

Mr. HAGGART. He is here.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman was asked to state definitely whether or not the Carling brewery had made these experiments or not in London. He said he thought so. That is not a very satisfactory answer.

Mr. HAGGART. There were no experiments this year, but there is an amount of $400 in the Public Accounts for that purpose last year.

Mr. MULOCK. Has there been any report made with regard to these results?

Mr. HAGGART. I have not the report here, but there was one.

Mr. SPROULE. There was a bulletin issued of which hon. members got copies.

Mr. HAGGART. I will get the information for the hon. gentleman. There were tests made in England, but I did not think hon. gentlemen would want to know the details. The barley turned out to be excellent for malting purposes.

Mr. MULOCK. Was there a report issued giving the information?

Mr. SPROULE. The report was issued this summer in bulletin No. 7 to the members of the Farmers' Institutes throughout the country.

Mr. McMULLEN. Who was right? The hon. Minister says the report did not come from England and the hon. member for East Grey says it is in No. 7.

Mr. HAGGART. The report from England is not here yet; the other may be here and may have been distributed.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The comparative values of the two barleys are stated in the account presented to the Government by the Carling Brewing Company. Whether such was published in the documentary form and distributed I know not.

Mr. ROWAND. Were these tests made from barley grown from the product of the seeds of last year?

Mr. HAGGART. From barley grown in Ontario from the seeds of last year.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is it in view of the importance attached to two-rowed barley the Government decided to increase the duty on malt?

Mr. McMILLAN. There was more seed grown and distributed than the seed brought from England. There was a quantity of seed obtained from farmers in the neighbourhood of Wentworth. Was it that or the seed brought from England that was tested?

Mr. HAGGART. I understand the seed sent from England was the seed grown in this country.

Mr. ALLISON. Was any brought from England to complete the distribution in Canada? Was the barley referred to in this item that which was brought from England?

Mr. HAGGART. The barley that was grown in Canada was sent to England for the purpose of being experimented upon, to see what kind of malt it would make.

Mr. ALLISON. The item says to complete the distribution in Canada. Was this grown in Canada or England?

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. gentlemen wants to know if this is to pay for the barley brought out or the barley sent back.

Mr. MULOCK. I think the confusion arises from the fact that in this item there are two separate transactions placed together. This is an item for $2,000, to distribute two-rowed barley exported and to pay for experiments on Canadian barley. If there had been two items instead of one there would have been no misunderstanding. Further, I observe that the words used are:

"To complete the distribution in Canada of the two-rowed barley purchased for seed purposes."

I should like to know if this barley was to be sown in England or here?

Mr. BOWELL. This was purchased in England: it was sold to the Canadian farmers at the cost to the Dominion Government. The cost of distributing that barley throughout the Dominion was paid for out of the Dominion treasury, and the farmers were not charged for the distribution.

Mr. ALLISON. Was not $2 a bushel sufficient to pay for the whole expense?

Mr. BOWELL. No; it was not.

Mr. ALLISON. Then it must have been very expensive barley.

Additional amount required for Experimental Farms.....$7,000

Mr. McMILLAN. We require some explanation of this. There have been large expenditures made on these experimental farms. When we were asked to agree to establish these farms it was stated that $120,000 would be sufficient to establish the Central Experimental Farm, and that another $120,000 would establish all the branch farms, and yet we find that about $600,000 has been voted up to the present year. We were told that $120,000 for the Central Experimental Farm would put up the buildings, purchase the horses and implements, put up the experimental heating house, provide the heating apparatus, put up

houses for the manager and staff on the farm, and yet we find that more than double that amount has been spent. On the Central Experimental Farm $326,373 has been spent, and, if you take off the amount for maintenance, it leaves about $284,000 spent in establishing that farm. I think it is time a halt was called in this, because it is more than twice the amount it was stated it would cost, and is about $40,000 more than we were told would establish the Central Farm and all the other experimental farms. We want to know what has been done with this $7,000? There was $110,500 voted last year for these farms.

Mr. HAGGART. The items of this $7,000 are these: Stock for Experimental Farm, Indian Head, N.W.T., $2,500; stock for Experimental Farm at Nappan, N.S., $1,800; printing account for bulletins, $1,500; extra office work in connection with distribution of bulletins, $700; forest trees and tree seeds, $500, making the total of $7,000.

Mr. DEVLIN. Is attention given to the publication of the bulletins in the French language at the same time as in the English language?

Mr. HAGGART. The bulletins are put in the hands of the French translators as soon as the English edition is printed, and they are issued immediately afterwards.

Mr. DEVLIN. I ask this question because complaint is made that sometimes these bulletins in French are received when they are too late to be of practical value.

Mr. CAMPBELL. In reference to the bulletins, I think that is a splendid plan of giving information to the farmers. I strongly approve of that, but I think the Minister of Agriculture ought to distribute these bulletins more numerously. This last year the Ontario Government are sending the bulletins from their experimental farm at Guelph to every member of the Farmers' Institutes in the province free, and I think these bulletins should be freely distributed all over the Dominion. They contain a great deal of valuable information, and there is no use in going to the expense of establishing these farms and acquiring large information, and then withholding it from those who could make use of it and derive great advantage from it. Therefore, I think the bulletins should be printed by the thousand and scattered broadcast. The cost of distributing them after the type is set is very trifling, whether the number printed is 1,000 or 20,000, and it would be well for the Minister to authorize one copy to be sent to every member of a Farmers' Institute throughout Ontario.

Mr. McGREGOR. I understand the department is anxious to send the bulletin to anyone who sends his name. I am informed that some members have not yet sent in their names.

Mr. SPROULE. Professor Saunders has stated that if the Farmers' Institutes would send in their names they would be supplied. I know that in the County of Grey the Farmers' Institutes have been supplied since last year. These bulletins are much larger than those issued by the Ontario Government, and are consequently more costly, but the number distributed is only limited by the number of names received. For many years in succession we have given the information to the Farmers' Institutes in the County of Grey, and to others outside of those institutes, who send in their names.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Are the bulletins which are issued here and those which are issued in Ontario similar?

Mr. SPROULE. No.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I put in some 250 names, about two years ago, to be alternately supplied with these bulletins if there were not enough issued every year for each. Do I understand that these names would be in the hands of the director, and that he would continue to supply them? If not, it might be necessary to send in another list of names.

Mr. HAGGART. The director informs me that when once these names are on the mailing list they are kept there. There are about 30,000 printed in English and 5,000 in French.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It seems to me the chief means of distributing this information ought to be through the ordinary newspapers. Of course, a certain number will be printed, but you could hardly undertake to supply the 600,000 farmers of the Dominion of Canada with this information in the form in which it is prepared. What is of special interest to the agricultural population will be in time discovered by the press, and it is in the interest of the press to publish whatever is of interest to its readers, and the press must remain the chief organ for imparting information of this sort.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I heartily endorse that sentiment; that is the proper way of distributing this to the people. It could be done more cheaply by the press, and would reach a greater number of farmers.

Mr. SPROULE. I think that some time ago, when the press was asked to print this information, some of the papers refused to do so. It was supplied to those newspapers who promised to print it. When the subject was up in the Farmers' Institute in our part of the country they distinctly expressed their wish that the bulletin should be printed in bulletin form, so that they could keep it as a matter of record from year to year.

Jamaica Exhibition — Governor General's warrant..... $15,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears to me that this is an extremely objectionable mode of using the Governor General's warrant. The Government knew that the Jamaica Exhibition was going to take place before we parted last year. It was their duty, if they wished to take part in it, to have asked a vote for that purpose of a sufficient amount. I do not think this is at all a proper mode for using His Excellency's warrant, nor does it at all conform to the provisions of the statute to that effect. I should like to hear why the hon. gentleman has had recourse to it.

Mr. HAGGART. I know of no reason, except that the expenditure was largely in excess of the amount voted last year, which I think was $5,000. The expenditure altogether is very nearly $20,000. Of this sum over $7,000 was for freight, and two or three officers were over there with Mr. Brown.

Mr PATERSON (Brant). What amount of salary did the Commissioner receive for his services?

Mr. HAGGART. There is no salary in this vote, that I am aware of.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Was it purely honorary?

Mr. HAGGART. I do not as yet know that he is going to get any salary.

Mr. FOSTER. In the Supplementary Estimates the House will probably be asked to acquiesce in an item for Mr. Brown's services.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Were not his expenses paid out of the $5,000 appropriation.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Was he appointed with the view of giving him nothing?

Mr. HAGGART. I think a part of this item of $15,000 is to pay his expenses.

To pay Mr. Stephen Selden's claim (with six years' interest) for statistical services in accordance with a decision of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia....$400 52

Mr. FOSTER. I think this is to pay for services that were performed many years ago in connection with the statistics for the Province of Nova Scotia, a work which is now done by the Dominion. This claim has been before the Dominion Government and afterwards was brought before the courts, and the courts allowed the claim, to a certain extent, recommending that it be paid with interest for six years. Interest was claimed on the amount that was claimed from the first, which must have been shortly after Confederation. The Minister of Justice reported that the judgment of the court ought to be carried out, and that interest for six years ought to be allowed.

Census..... $50,000

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). When will we be able to get some idea of the results of the census with reference to population?

Mr. HAGGART. I think, probably, at the beginning of August we will be able to give you the population.

Mr. FRASER. Will this cover the whole expense of taking the census?

Mr. HAGGART. No; that is to supplement the vote of last year. There will be a vote next year. I think the estimated cost of the whole census is between five and six hundred thousand dollars.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. First and last, I dare say it will come to that. I would like the Minister of Finance to tell me where the vote is to be found which was taken with reference to this Jamaica Exhibition.

Mr. FOSTER. I am sure a vote for $5,000 was taken. At first we supposed that the expenditure would probably come to $10,000. We thought that an exhibition could be made in Jamaica for that amount, and $5,000 were voted the year before last as preparatory. Then, when we had got the space and the department had entered into the work of gathering exhibits, so many were brought forward that it overran our original estimated expenditure, and so this vote of $15,000 has been added. The exhibition will cost about $20,000. The original vote was in 1889-90.

Quarantine..... $8,460

Mr. LANDERKIN. Do the same regulations prevail in reference to vaccination on the ships going out? Awhile ago passengers in the intermediate and in the steerage were all obliged to be vaccinated, and the passengers in the saloon were exempt from the operation of the Vaccination Act. I would like to know if that is continued?

Mr. HAGGART. I believe vaccination is compulsory for steerage passengers.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What is the reason that small-pox could not as easily get into the saloon as into the steerage? Why do you exempt one class of passengers in the ship and compel others to be vaccinated?

Mr. HAGGART. I do not know.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do not think that one class of passengers should be vaccinated and not another. If small-pox broke out it would spread all through the passengers, and I know of no means of protecting them except by vaccination. If we are going to make fish of one and flesh of another, the people should know it. I remember a gentleman who lived in my riding who crossed the Atlantic and was vaccinated. He was attacked with blood poisoning, and was laid up a long time. He complained severely that due precautions had not been taken in selecting the vaccine virus used. I do not know but that he had probably good ground for action against the Government if due precaution was not observed. It is highly desirable, if we are going to make this invidious distinction between classes in a vessel, that at least due consideration should be given to the quality of the virus, and if we are going to do this at all, it should be done thoroughly. Intermediate passengers have been almost in rebellion, and have held indignation meetings and protested against being vaccinated. Whether there has been any change in this regard to the regulations I do not know. The Government is responsible if they permit impure virus to be used which may result in injury, as was the case in the young man to whom I have referred who was quite healthy. What is the policy of the Government in this matter?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The person who performs this operation is not responsible to this Government, for he is the surgeon on board the vessel, and the virus is everything it should not be. My brother-in-law came over here on a business trip, and was sick two or three weeks on account of being vaccinated on board ship. If this has to be done, it should be done by a Government official who is responsible. Many of these ship surgeons I would not allow to perform such an operation on any of my own family, and, if under the regulations it must be done, all on board should be treated alike. I have been on board a vessel where there was nearly a mutiny, and where the passengers refused to be vaccinated unless all on board were vaccinated.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it the case, as the hon. gentleman has stated, that a distinction is made between the different classes on board?

Mr. HAGGART. I do not think the department has any control, for the vaccination is done

by the ship surgeon. On arrival at the quarantine station here it is compulsory among the steerage passengers that they should be vaccinated, and only the steerage passengers. I do not know why the distinction is made.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Who makes it compulsory? Care should be taken that the officer who performs the operation does so with pure vaccine virus. As regards the operation, anyone can perform it; but the great point is the purity of the vaccine virus, and if it is done by authority of the Government, the Government must see that pure virus is in the hands of the physician. It should be compulsory on all on board if we wish to secure efficient protection, but above all the Government should know that pure virus is used.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I understand that the medical officer at Grosse Isle would not take a certificate that a steerage passenger had been vaccinated, or the testimony of a recent vaccination mark on his arm; and he informed them that unless they were vaccinated they would have to go into quarantine for a certain length of time. That statement was made to me by several parties who crossed the Atlantic and complained to me about this injustice. They also complained that the ship surgeon did not vaccinate them when starting on the voyage, for they would then have got well over the effects before reaching land. An instance was given of a mother with two or three children who were vaccinated a short time before landing, and they were obliged to remain a few days in Quebec instead of proceeding on their journey. This subject should engage the attention of the Government, and if it is necessary to thus protect the people they should all be placed on the same footing.

Mr. HAGGART. There is no doubt that Dr. Montizambert, medical superintendent at Grosse Isle, will have the best medical virus in the country. Vaccinations are performed by the ship surgeons on the way over. It is required from every passenger who lands either in the United States or Canada that he shall have signs of vaccination or have been vaccinated shortly before he lands, or he must be vaccinated shortly before his arrival here. That regulation applies only to steerage passengers. Saloon passengers neither in the United States nor this country require to be vaccinated; and the reason here is that a saloon passenger would never come over by the Canadian route if he was required to be vaccinated.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am informed that it is not the officer on ship board but Dr. Montizambert of whom the people complain, for although they offered to furnish vaccination certificates, he would not accept them. This is not in regard to steerage but intermediate passengers, I think; but as to that I am not sure. I was about to bring this matter up a year or two ago and the present Minister of Agriculture then told me the reasons why the saloon passengers were not vaccinated; but the saloon passengers should be put on the same level as other passengers, and all should be allowed to show a certificate that they were vaccinated. What is the necessity of vaccinating them if they have good marks on their arms? Why not put them all on the same basis and allow them to produce a certificate from a qualified medical man? If you do this you will do away with an invidious distinction and with all this bickering which arises on nearly every ship which comes to Point Lévis.

Ex-Constable G. H. Harpur, balance of pension to 30th June, 1891, on account of Rebellion of 1885..... $814.60

Mr. MULOCK. What is the explanation of this item?

Mr. DEWDNEY. G. H. Harpur joined the North-West Mounted Police on the organization of the force, on the 3rd November, 1873, and served continuously for nine years, during eight of which he held the rank of sergeant. Mr. Harpur who had volunteered for service on the outbreak of the Rebellion of 1885, was sent from Battleford to Clark's Crossing, to communicate to General Middleton the condition of affairs at the former place. On his return journey, in attempting to save the life of the horse of an Indian who accompanied him, he jumped into the water and was thrown from his feet by the running ice and carried some distance down the stream, the weather being bitterly cold. It was impossible to light a fire without bringing the Indians, who were numerous on that route, down upon them, and he was compelled to ride the 50 miles to Battleford with his clothing frozen upon his body. He was under hospital treatment for some days, but accompanied the column to Cut Knife where he was specially mentioned for his bravery and dash, although at the time suffering from rheumatism. For nine months after the rebellion he was confined to his bed with acute rheumatism and inflammation of the lungs. During the following winter he was laid up for six months from the same cause, and every subsequent winter has been confined wholly to the house and frequently to his bed. A medical board, composed of Senior Surgeon Jukes and Assistant Surgeon Paré, sat upon his case on the 15th of October, 1890, and reported that he was "suffering from paralysis of the extensor muscles of the right hand, from chronic rheumatism and from sciatica, which conditions he affirms, and which we, from the evidence laid before us, are constrained to believe, have resulted from the great fatigue and exposure to which he was necessarily subjected in the performance of the very arduous and important duties devolving upon him as a special constable during the Rebellion of 1885, and that the conditions to which we herein refer, absolutely incapacitate him from earning his own living, either by ordinary labour or as a clerk." An Order in Council was passed, 18th December, 1890, granting Harpur a pension of 60 cents per day from 1st July, 1885. The amount due him under this Order in Council, to 30th June, 1891, was $1,314.60. As he was in extreme need, $500 was at once paid him from the appropriation of last session for "Pensions payable on account of Rebellion of 1885, to Mounted Police, Prince Albert Volunteers and Police Scouts," leaving a balance of $814.60 to be provided by supplementary estimate.

Mr. MULOCK. Then I understand that this constable who did military service in the suppression of the Rebellion of 1885, had his case for the first time under consideration of the Government in 1890, and that the first decision arrived at was in December, 1890?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The board was held by the surgeons on the 5th December, 1890.

Mr. MULOCK. So that until October, 1890, or whenever after you paid him, he had received nothing by way of compensation for wounds or injuries sustained in 1885, and five years after the injuries were received the Government finds he was entitled to $1,304. Is that correct?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. Then it discloses an extraordinary state of affairs. If the reasons set forth in the paper which my hon. friend has just read are the only reasons for compensating him, surely these reasons existed five years ago. I would ask the Minister of the Interior when first there was a claim made on the Government for this pension?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have not that information, but I can get it.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it should be brought down. Do not understand me as being against the country doing justice to this claimant. The paper which the Minister has read shows, if it shows any thing, either that this man never made a claim until 1890, and in that case the Government was not to blame, or what is more probable, that he has been making a claim all these years and only in 1890 was his claim adjudicated upon. I would like the Minister who is charged with this matter to give us a full, frank and candid statement as to when this person applied for compensation, as to when adjudication was first had upon his claim, and as to whether the board at one time disallowed it and subsequently reopened and allowed it. If the facts, as set forth in this paper, are correct, and I must suppose they are, and if this man has been incapacitated all these years, it is incredible to my mind that he should have never made a claim for compensation until the fall of 1890. I think it will be found that the Government has adjudicated upon this claim previously and refused it, but that they afterwards decided to make the allowance. I have had occasion before this to complain of the manner in which those poor men have been dealt with here, and I think this case affords a very fair opportunity to see whether claims are reopened after being decided. If this case has been reopened there are other cases that require to be reopened also. Last year I had occasion to submit to the House two cases that called for action, and I was met with the statement that they had been adjudicated upon, although in one case the person staggered here from the hospital and was permanently incapacitated by reason of the services he rendered in defence of the country. It is incomprehensible that this claim has been standing for five years and has never been adjudicated upon until now.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I will be glad to get the hon. gentleman all the information I can.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to have the item stand until we get the information.

Mr. DEWDNEY. All right let it stand.

To provide for repairing fortification wall at St. John's Gate, Quebec, (Governor General's Warrant) $1,081.90

Mr. MULOCK. Why was the Governor General's warrant issued for this?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I will give the hon. gentleman the explanation which I gave to the Council when the order was passed. The architect of the Corporation of Quebec, Mr. Baillairgé, made a report to the Department of Militia stating that the water percolated through the wall, and when the frost came the wall became very dangerous to life, and that it was absolutely necessary that the Government should repair the wall immediately, or the Corporation of Quebec would have to do it on the account of the Government. In consequence of these facts, I sent the architect to make an estimate. I submitted his estimate and the facts to the Council, and the work was done

Mr. DEVLIN. When was the work commenced and when finished?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It was about December when the information came to us, and as soon as we could get our men to work we did so, and it is all completed.

Resolutions reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1.20 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 1st July, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 123) to revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Oshawa Railway and Navigation Company, and to change the name thereof to the Oshawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Madill.)

Bill (No. 124) to further amend the Act to incorporate the Great Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Mills, Annapolis.)

NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE—REPORT *RE* COMMISSIONER.

Mr. DAVIN asked, When the report of Mr. Fred. White, Comptroller of the North-West Mounted Police, who was commissioned to make a departmental enquiry into the conduct of Lawrence W. Herchmer, Commissioner of the North-West Mounted Police, will be laid on the Table?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I understand the report has not yet been completed, but it will be laid upon the Table when it is completed.

SISSIBOO RIVER—DREDGING.

Mr. BOWERS asked, Does the Government propose continuing the work of dredging the channel of the Sissiboo River, Digby County, N.S., during the year 1891, which was under progress during the season of 1890, and will the same be pursued to completion?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. An attempt was made to dredge this river last season, but the material to be removed is so hard and of such a

nature that special plant would have to be procured to do the work, a plant which the department does not possess.

TARTE-McGREEVY ENQUIRY—COUNSEL.

Mr. McMULLEN asked for the name or names of counsel retained by the Government in connection with the enquiry in regard to the charges made by Mr. Tarte, now being conducted by the Committee on Privileges and Elections? 2. What is the rate of remuneration to be paid to each of such counsel?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The names of the counsel retained on the enquiry are Messrs. Osler, from Toronto, and Henry, of Halifax. I am not quite prepared to give the hon. member this afternoon the other details which he asks for, and it may be better that the question should stand in order that I may be able to inform him, besides those particulars, of the instructions which those gentlemen have received.

LANGEVIN BLOCK—CONSTRUCTION.

Mr. MULOCK asked, What amount has been paid to Charlebois & Co., since 30th June, 1890, on account of construction of the Langevin Block?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The amount of $16,500 has been paid on account of the main contract, masons' work, and $10,000 on account of the contract for iron staircases.

Mr. MULOCK asked, What was the rate of freight charged by the Government for carriage of sandstone used in the construction of the Langevin Block, Ottawa, from Newcastle, N.B., to Ottawa? 2. What was the quantity of stone so carried? 3. Has the whole amount of the freight on said quantity been paid in cash to the Government?

Mr. BOWELL. The quantity of stone carried over the Intercolonial Railway for the new departmental building in Ottawa was 1,063¾ car loads, of 24,000 lbs. each, at $20 per car. The charges amounted to $21,275.39, which were paid over by the Grand Trunk Railway from time to time as the stone was forwarded.

RAQUETTE PIER, N.S.—CONTRACTS, &c.

Mr. BOWERS asked, Has the Government yet entered into any contract for constructing a new pier at the Raquette, Digby, N.S.? If so, what is—1. The contractor's name? 2. The contractor's price? 3. The name of the superintendent or overseer on the part of the Government? 4. What is to be the superintendent or overseer's compensation or salary? 5. At what time is the work by the terms of the contract to be completed? 6. What is to be the depth of water at the outer end of pier?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In answer to the first part of the question, yes—John Nicholson. 2. $475.78. 3. John Welsh. 4. $2.50 per working day. 5. On the 18th May, 1892. 6. 16 feet.

SAULT STE. MARIE WHARF.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. LISTER) asked, What arrangement is there with Mr. Plummer, for services in connection with the Government wharf at Sault Ste. Marie? If paid by salary, what is it? If by portion of fees collected, what proportion? What amount has been returned to the Government, as fees collected, up to the end of 1890?

Mr. TUPPER. By Order in Council Mr. Plummer receives $100 a year out of the dues collected from the Government wharf at Sault Ste. Marie, as salary. He had returned no fees collected up to 1889, and he claimed that the original agreement made with him had not been carried out by the Government, and he gives that as an excuse for not paying in the fees. My department has called on him for an immediate return of the dues collected, independent of any claims set up as to salary, which will receive consideration. The fees are payable to the Receiver General at once.

N. SASKATCHEWAN IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron) asked, 1. Did the Government of Canada authorize and instruct in 1883, the late C. J. Brydges, Esq., to have certain improvements made in the navigation of the North Saskatchewan River? 2. If so, did he undertake and complete the work? 3. How much money was set apart for the work; where and when, in what bank, and at whose credit was the amount deposited? 4. Had the Government report or reports made to them, showing the amount expended upon the work? If so, how much was expended? 5. Is there a balance due the Government? If so, how much? 6. Is the balance under the control of the Government? If so, have they claimed it? If they have not claimed it, why not? 7. Do the Government intend to close this account, by claiming the balance to its credit?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. To the first question the answer is, yes. To the second question, the answer is, yes. To the third question the answer is, that $25,000 were advanced to the Hudson Bay Company, through Mr. C. J. Brydges, from March, 1883, to October, 1884. There was an Order in Council passed for that purpose. In reply to the fourth question, I may say that $23,890.55 was expended on the work. To the fifth question, there is the sum of $1,169.54 balance due to the Government. To the sixth and seventh questions the answer is, that Mr. H. E. Brydges has been requested to deposit the amount to the credit of the Receiver General, but it has not yet been done.

MAPLE SUGAR—PRODUCTION.

Mr. GODBOUT asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to grant a bounty with a view to promote the production and refining of maple sugar in this country?

Mr. FOSTER. It is not the intention of the Government to grant a bounty with a view to promote the production and refining of maple sugar in this country.

CENTRAL EXPERIMENTAL FARM—EXPENDITURE.

Mr. McMILLAN asked, What is the total sum spent annually by the Government upon the Central Experimental Farm since it was established to the first day of July, 1890? Also, the total sums spent upon each of the other Experimental Stations up to 1st July, 1890?

Mr. HAGGART. I suggest that the hon. gentleman put his question in the form of a motion, as considerable work is required to provide the information. Mr. Mara has placed a similar motion on the Notice paper. The clerks in the Agriculture Department are preparing papers in answer to it, and as soon as they are down, I will furnish the hon. gentleman with the information.

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS—INTEREST.

Mr. CHRISTIE asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to raise the rate of interest in the Post Office savings banks to 4 per cent., for the benefit of depositors and of the Dominion?

Mr. FOSTER. It is not the intention of the Government to raise the rate of interest in the Post Office savings banks to 4 per cent., for the benefit of depositors and of the Dominion.

CHICAGO EXHIBITION—INVITATION TO CANADA.

Mr. AMYOT asked, Whether Canada has been invited to take part in the approaching exhibition at Chicago? And, whether it is the intention of the Government to take the necessary steps to enable Canada to take part in this exhibition?

Mr. HAGGART. Only a few days ago the Government received an invitation, through the American Consul General, Colonel Lay, from the President of the United States, to assist in a World's Columbian Exhibition in 1893, and the matter is at present being considered by the Government.

ELECTIONS IN NAPIERVILLE.

Mr. MONET asked, Whether the Government has been informed that Charles Bédard, Esq., notary of the village of St. Rémi, and revisor of the electoral lists for the County of Napierville, took a very active part in the last two elections which took place in the County of Napierville on the 5th of March and the 9th of December last; that the said Charles Bédard acted as a general caballer; that he obstructed the free voting of several electors; that he lodged certain electors and gave them food and drink; and that he even gave various sums of money to certain electors to bind them to vote for the ministerial candidate? Whether the Government will dismiss this employé, if he is found guilty of corrupt practices before a competent court as the law now requires; or whether the Government intends to soften the rule in this case?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Government have not the information which is stated in the question. The revising officer is not an officer of the Government.

LATE ELECTIONS—SENATORS AS CANDIDATES.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Did any senators resign to become candidates at the late election? If so, who were they? Did the Government ask them to resign? Were they elected? If not, have they been recalled to the Senate?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Only one senator was a candidate at the late election, and he was the Hon. Mr. Howlan. He was not asked to resign, he was not elected, and he has been recalled to the Senate.

FORMATION OF THE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. MULOCK asked, Did the Minister of Justice or the Hon. Mr. Abbott, after the death of Sir John A. Macdonald, advise or suggest to His Excellency the Governor General that Sir Charles Tupper be asked to form a Government?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is a question, Mr. Speaker, which I think we ought not to answer.

KINGSTON POST OFFICE.

Mr. AMYOT moved for:

Copies of the annual report of the Postmaster of Kingston, including the year 1889, and containing a list in detail of the several lessees of the boxes in the Kingston Post Office; also copies of the list of the said lessees for the said year 1889, containing the names of the said several lessees for the said year, beginning at the letter "B."

Mr. HAGGART. I may state in answer to the hon. gentleman, that there is no such information in the department here.

Mr. AMYOT. I will let the motion stand while I compare this answer with the other answer given to a previous question.

Motion allowed to stand.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Return giving:—1st. The number of Chinese immigrants that have entered Canada since the date of the last Return ordered by the House, specifying: (*a*) The ports at which said Chinese immigrants were entered; (*b*) The amount of duty or head-money collected; (*c*) The number that entered by virtue of return certificates; (*d*) The number of return certificates issued during the same period, and the number of Chinese that during the same period passed through Canada in bond to destinations out of Canada. 2nd. The number that entered Canada as belonging to the Diplomatic or Consular service of China. 3rd. The number of Chinese that entered Canada during the same period, either as tourists, men of science, students or merchants. 4th. Copies of all correspondence, if any, between the Imperial Government and this Government, or between this Government and the Government of China, if any, or between the Government of British Columbia and this Government, or with any labour organization, or with any company, corporation or person, having reference to the Chinese Restriction Act or suggesting amendments to the same.—(Mr. Gordon.)

Correspondence, telegrams, letters, reports and other papers relating to the proposed "additional property accommodation" of Intercolonial Railway at St. John, N. B.—(Mr. Davies, P.E.I.)

Copies of all correspondence, reports, paper writings and documents respecting the seizure and sale of the schooner *Marie Eliza*, in 1887, by the Collector of Customs at Rimouski.—(Mr. Langelier.)

Copies of all reports of engineers respecting the proposed Soulanges Canal, showing the number of sections into which the work is to be divided, the length of each section, the quantities of the several classes of work in each section, and detailed estimates of the cost of each section; the whole to be accompanied with a continuous tracing or plan and profile of the whole line, showing the several sections and the structures of each section.—(Mr. Mousseau.)

Statement showing the amount of Dominion notes in circulation, May, 1891, and amount of gold and guaranteed debentures held in security on said date for redemption of said notes. Also statement showing the proportion of such gold reserve held by the Minister of Finance and Receiver General, and the proportion thereof held by any chartered Banks for such redemption. Also statement showing the arrangements made with such Banks, under which they hold such gold reserve.—(Mr. Mulock.)

Copies of all correspondence and all documents, or other information in the possession of the Government, relating to entire horses stationed at the Central Experimental Farm, or at any other of the Experimental Farms in the Dominion of Canada.—(Mr. McMillan.)

Copies of all petitions, correspondence and other documents respecting the late change in the Postmastership in Lobo Post Office.—(Mr. Armstrong.)

1. Copy of original plan and also of alteration made to Kingston Dry Dock, showing the additional excavations, crib work, extra masonry and additional iron works in caissons, together with the quantities of each class of extra work paid or undertaken to be paid for, and the rates of payment for the said extra work. 2. Copy of the Order in Council dated 5th July, 1890, concerning the contract for the building of said dry dock.—(Mr. Amyot.)

Return giving the dates of the publication and of the distribution of the English reports, bulletins, and other printed matter of the Central Experimental Farm, from its establishment up to the 1st June, 1891; also, the dates of the publication and of the distribution of the French reports respecting the same subject and for the same time.—(Mr. Devlin.)

Copies of all correspondence, letters or telegrams addressed to the Auditor General with reference to the payment of accounts as rendered to the Auditor General by the Returning Officer of the Electoral District of the East Riding of Elgin; also the names and post office addresses of the Returning Officer, Deputy Returning Officers, Poll Clerks and Constables for the Electoral District of the East Riding of Elgin; also the respective amounts as claimed by each; the amount actually paid to each up to date, including amount of balance, if any, as rendered by the Returning Officer in his original account to the Auditor General.—(Mr. Ingram.)

Return showing: 1st. The names of all permanent clerks in the department of Public Works, their duties and annual salaries; 2nd. Names of all extra clerks in the said department, their salaries, and the kind of work performed; also copies of their Civil Service examination certificates; 3rd. The names of all persons doing extra work outside of the building; and the nature of work, giving the names of ladies and gentlemen separately; 4th. The names of mechanics or others employed in the Government workshops at Ottawa; 5th. The names of all messengers employed in the said department, either permanent or temporary; 6th. The number and names of all labourers employed by the said department since January last, in and around the buildings under Government control at Ottawa, including Rideau Hall, stating the kind of work performed and wages paid.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Copies of all correspondence, papers and documents relating to the appointment of Customs Officers at Crystal Beach and Point Abino, in the Township of Bertie, and Carroll's Landing, in the Township of Humberstone, in the County of Welland.—(Mr. German.)

Copies of the report of Thomas Munro, Government Engineer, upon the Manchester Ship Canal.—(Mr. Mulock.)

ADJOURNMENT—DOMINION DAY.

Mr. DENISON moved that the House do now adjourn. He said: I make this motion on the ground that by sitting to-day we are setting a very bad example to the people of this Dominion when we make of this day a statutory holiday and then fail to observe it. We are also setting a bad example to all the employers of labour throughout the country by not observing the holiday we call on them to observe, and we, further, are showing scant courtesy to our own national day. I therefore move, seconded by Mr. Cochrane, that the House do now adjourn.

House divided:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Baker,	Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Beith,	Mackintosh,
Bergeron,	McDonald (Victoria),
Bowell,	McDougald (Pictou),
Cameron (Inverness),	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McKay,
Casey,	McNeill,
Charlton,	Marshall,
Coatsworth,	Masson,
Cochrane,	Miller,
Cockburn,	Mills (Annapolis),
Corbould,	Moncrieff,
Daoust,	Paterson (Brant),
Denison,	Patterson (Colchester),
Dewdney,	Ross (Dundas),
Dupont,	Ryckman,
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Skinner,
Gillies,	Sproule,
Gordon,	Stairs,
Henderson,	Stevenson,
Hodgins,	Taylor,
Ingram,	Trow,
Kaulbach,	Tupper,
Kenny,	Tyrwhitt,
LaRivière,	White (Cardwell).—50.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Joncas,
Allison,	Langelier,
Amyot,	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Armstrong,	Laurier,
Bain,	Leduc,
Béchard,	Lippé,
Bernier,	Macdonald (Huron),
Bowers,	Macdonald (King's),
Bowman,	McGregor,
Brown (Chateauguay),	McLean,
Brown (Monck),	McLeod,
Burdett,	McMillan,
Campbell,	McMullen,
Carroll,	Mara,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Mignault,
Christie,	Mills (Bothwell),
Davies,	Monet,
Davin,	Montague,
Dawson,	Mousseau,
Delisle,	Mulock,
Desjardins (L'Islet),	O'Brien,
Devlin,	Perry,
Fauvel,	Rider,
Flint,	Rinfret,
Forbes,	Rowand,
Foster,	Sanborn,
Fréchette,	Savard,
Gauthier,	Scriver,
Geoffrion,	Semple,
German,	Simard,
Godbout,	Thompson (Sir John),
Grandbois,	Truax,
Guay,	Vaillancourt,
Haggart,	Weldon,
Harwood,	Welsh,
Innes,	Yeo.—72.

Motion negatived.

SUB-COLLECTOR, PELEE ISLAND.

Mr. ALLAN moved for:

Copies of all correspondence, letters and telegrams relating to the removal of F. B. McCormick from the office of Sub-Collector, Pelee Island; and copies of all letters, telegrams and telephone messages relating to the appointment of J. H. C. Atkinson to take charge of said office; also all copies of correspondence relating to the dismissal of Atkinson, and the reinstatement of McCormick.

He said: The subject of this enquiry has excited considerable discussion on the part of the people of Pelee Island and of the south riding of Essex, and has excited no little attention in the whole County of Essex, where all the facts and circumstances connected with this extraordinary shuffle in a public office are very well known and understood. The correspondence and papers asked for relate to this charge, and I have made my motion broad enough to cover all papers, correspondence, telephone messages and telegrams, relating to this whole matter, and trust they will all be brought down. The facts are simply these:

Mr. F. B. McCormick was appointed Collector of Customs in Pelee Island, not only against the wishes, but in spite of the very strong remonstrances of the people of that district. That feeling of dissatisfaction developed into a very strong opposition to the parties who secured his appointment, and the Government who were responsible for it,—a feeling which manifested itself at the very first opportunity at the polls. At the elections in June last, for the Province of Ontario, the first Liberal majority was recorded on that Island in favour of Mr. Balfour, M.P.P., a result which was said to be due largely to the dissatisfaction felt by the people with this appointment. And, Sir, the significance of that vote cannot be mistaken, for I have only to point out that Pelee Island previous to that contest, had always given a majority for the Conservative candidates and the Conservative party. At one election the entire vote of the Island, with the exception of one vote, went for the Conservative party. Coming down to the recent contest, the unexpected dissolution of Parliament, the sudden appeal to the country, and the midnight attack which hon. gentlemen opposite made upon the voters of Canada, the Conservative party found this Pelee Island matter unsettled, and the election had not proceeded very far when the party in that riding became alarmed at the news received. Unrestricted reciprocity was not only a powerful and potent factor in that contest, there as elsewhere, but the news came from all parts of the Island that unless Mr. F. B. McCormick was removed, instead of that Island going solidly Conservative, the candidate who now has the honour to address this House would practically sweep the Island. It was at this exciting and critical period of the contest that an act unworthy of the Government, and unworthy of the politicians in that riding, was committed. The people were made to believe that Mr. McCormick would be removed from his situation. Letters were shown throughout the Island, one purporting to be from the late First Minister, promising that Mr. McCormick would be at once and permanently removed and a person satisfactory to the people appointed in his place. Other letters to the same effect were also circulated, and the word given to the people that, if they would only support the Government candidate, a change would be made which would be satisfactory to them. I want to direct the attention of this House and the country to the extraordinary action of the Minister of Customs on that occasion. I say his action was extraordinary, and it will be his duty to explain it to the House and to the country. We find—at least, I believe I have evidence to prove it—that hon. gentleman, during a political contest, telegraphing from one part of Ontario to a party who had nothing to do with the office, that a collector had been appointed for Pelee Island. Pelee Island is an outport of Amherstburg, but the Minister of Customs telegraphed to the collector at Windsor:

"Inform J. H. C. Atkinson that he has been appointed Collector of Customs at Pelee Island."

That message was sent about the 20th February, when the election contest was at fever heat. Mr. Atkinson was a prominent man on the Island and was taking a prominent part in the contest. He was a pronounced advocate of unrestricted reciprocity; and we had the spectacle of the Minister of Customs wiring to the Collector of Customs at Windsor, who had nothing to do with Pelee Island, to inform J. H. C. Atkinson, with whom I presume the Minister of Customs had had no previous correspondence, that he was appointed collector of Pelee Island. I do not think the Minister of Customs could delegate authority by wire, and whatever was done should have been done through the Collector of Customs at Amherstburg. We find that the Collector at Windsor telephoned to Pelee Island, for there is a telephone between the two places, informing Mr. Atkinson that he was appointed Collector of Customs there, and on the strength of that telephone message, the office was handed over to him. I endeavoured to elicit some information from the Minister of Customs in regard to this matter by a question which I put on the Notice paper, and, while I do not intend to differ with the hon. gentleman on a question of fact, I will require him to explain his apparent contradictions. I asked:

"What is the name of the present sub-collector on Pelee Island? At what date was he appointed? Has he continuously discharged the duties of that office since the date of his appointment? Was any other person appointed sub-collector at that outport, or in any way instructed to discharge the duties of that office during the present year? If so, what is his name, the date of his appointment, and the amount of his salary, and is he still in the employ of the Government?

"Mr. BOWELL. The name of the present sub-collector on Pelee Island is F. B. McCormick. He was appointed on the 1st December, 1888. Mr. McCormick has not been continuously discharging the duties of that office since the date of his appointment. No other person has been appointed sub-collector at that outport. Mr. J. H. C. Atkinson was requested to perform the duties of sub-collector on Pelee Island during the absence of Mr. McCormick, who had been ordered to report for duty at Windsor.

"On the 28th of April, 1891, Mr. McCormick was instructed to resume his duties as sub-collector on Pelee Island, and Mr. Atkinson to be paid for the time he had acted as sub-collector, at the rate of $400 per annum."

The hon. Minister states that no other appointment had been made. I will ask that hon. gentleman to explain his telegram, of which I have a copy. The people of Pelee Island were assured that a change would be made; they were assured of it by these letters which I have and this telegram which I will read, and I desire to know by what authority this office was handed over. The Minister of Customs sent a telegram, not dated from Ottawa, but I suppose during his campaign tour through the country. This is a copy of the telephone message which was received:

"February 21, 1891.

"J. H. C. ATKINSON.

"The Minister of Customs has ordered me to inform you that you are appointed Customs Officer at Pelee Island in place of F. B. McCormick.

(Sd.) "MILES COWAN,
"Windsor."

Mr. Atkinson remarks upon that:

"I telephoned answer to Cowan accepting office I also wrote to him and also the hon. Minister of Customs by the next mail leaving the Island, accepting the office."

Here is a copy of the reply:

"OTTAWA, 26th February, 1891.

"J. H. C. ATKINSON, Esq.,
"Pelee Island.

"SIR,—The hon. the Minister of Customs is absent from Ottawa, but your letter of the 21st instant will be brought under his notice.

"Your obedient servant,
(Sd.) "E. L. SANDERS,
"*Private Secretary.*"

Now I propose to read what purports to be a copy, and which I believe to be a copy, of the telegram sent by the Minister of Customs from Norwood. If this was a forgery, then this office was offered on the strength of a forgery to Mr. Atkinson. Mr. F. B. McCormick told people on the Island that he had been removed, and he at once left the Island. He was to report at Windsor, but instead of doing so I saw him on nomination day at Kingsville, and I found that he was going up and down the township lines and the side lines of Essex working for the party that had removed him from office. If he was ordered to report at Windsor, he went to Amherstburg, and he said he was going to discharge duties in that office, where they have already three collectors, though the business is less than it was when one collector did the whole work. This is a copy of a letter which confirms the telephone message upon which the office was given to Mr. Atkinson :

"COLLECTOR'S OFFICE,
"WINDSOR, ONT., 21st July, 1891.

"J. H. C. ATKINSON, Esq.,
"Pelee Island, Ont.

"SIR,—I telegraphed you this morning informing you that the hon. the Minister of Customs had appointed you Customs officer on Pelee Island, and I now send copy of his telegram to me :

"'NORWOOD, February 20, 1891.

"'To COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, Windsor.

"'Inform J. H. C. Atkinson that he has been appointed Customs officer on Pelee Island in place of McCormick removed, and order McGlashan back.

(Sd.) "'M. BOWELL.'

"I remain, your obedient servant,
"MILES COWAN,
"*Acting Collector.*"

This is the telegram on the strength of which the Customs collector stated that McCormick was removed and Atkinson was appointed. McCormick announced that fact on the Island and on the mainland, and every effort was made, and I suppose with a great degree of success, to secure for the Administration voters who were antagonistic to the Government on account of this appointment. This is an extraordinary spectacle. If it be not true, if these despatches are forgeries, the Customs collectors knew that there was a usurper on Pelee Island. On the strength of these messages, the office was handed over to Mr. J. H. C. Atkinson, and I say that the conduct of the hon. Minister on that occasion was unprecedented. We often hear hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House talk about British precedent. Why, Sir, do people imagine or believe that a member of the British Parliament, a member of the British Government, Lord Salisbury or any other distinguished man, during an election contest, would trample upon the appointing power in this way, and make an appointment for the purpose, as I believe, of deceiving the electors? Such, Sir, I believe to be the conduct of the Minister of Customs on that occasion. It will be his duty to explain the extraordinary haste with which he made this appointment; it will be his duty to say why this telegram was sent at a time when he was, probably, stumping his own riding, or the riding adjacent to his. I believe this extraordinary telegram was sent in order to influence the honest electors of Pelee Island after they had declared, a large number of them, that they would not support the Government candidate as long as that appointment continued. They had assurances of prominent men in that riding, they had the letters that I have mentioned, they had also the statement and the action of the Customs authorities of Canada, removing, apparently, the old collector and substituting J. H. C. Atkinson in his place. Now, the next information we have in reference to this matter is a letter written by Mr. Atkinson to George Gott, collector at Amherstburg, who has authority over this office. Pelee Island is an outport of Amherstburg, and after taking possession of the office, it seemed to be Mr. Atkinson's aim and effort to secure proper instructions as how to conduct that office. He says :

"I wrote to Geo. Gott, Esq., Collector of Amherstburg under whose survey this port is, on the 3rd May, 1891, for instructions. I received the following letter :—

"'CUSTOMS, CANADA,
"'COLLECTOR'S OFFICE,
"'AMHERSTBURG, 14th March, 1891.

"'J. H. C. ATKINSON, Esq., Pelee Island, Ont.

"'SIR,—I beg to acknowledge yours of the 3rd instant, and in reply to state: I have no official knowledge of your appointment to the office at South Port. I direct all papers to the sub-collector, therefore if any change has taken place without my knowledge, the proper person receives the letters, papers and packages. I was astonished at the time I heard of changes being made, that I, the collector under whom said port is operated, and in whose survey South Port is situated, not being made acquainted with the matter. If any official orders should be received by me from the department in regard to the appointment, you will be immediately apprised thereof.

"'I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
"'COLLECTOR.'"

That purports to be a copy of a letter from George Gott, Amherstburg, who expresses his surprise that any change should be made in the office of collector at the outport, which is under his district. Now, Mr. Gott, no doubt, was very much astonished when he addressed his complaint on that occasion to the wrong party, when he knew that some person had got possession of that office in an illegal way, and I think it was his duty to have called the attention of the Minister to that circumstance at that time. But, as a matter of fact, Collector Gott and all these collectors were in the ring, they understood the plot, they were working in order to secure the vote of the electors of Pelee Island, and he purposely, no doubt, kept quiet on this subject until long after the election. The next document I will present consists of notes communicated to Mr. Atkinson :

"Having received no instructions from either Ottawa or Amherstburg, at the opening of navigation I went to Windsor on 7th April, and called at Custom house ; could get no instructions there; telephoned Collector, Amherstburg, who informed me that he could give me no instructions. I then wrote to the Minister of Customs as follows:—

"'HON. M. BOWELL, Minister of Customs,
"'Ottawa, Ont.

"'DEAR SIR,—On the 21st day of February, 1891, I received the following telegram from Mr. Miles Cowan, acting Collector of Windsor, viz.: 'The Minister of Customs has ordered me to inform you that you are appointed Customs officer at Pelee Island in the place of F. B. McCormick.

(Sd.) "'MILES COWAN.'

"I also received a letter from Mr. Cowan stating: 'Your telegram dated at Norwood, 20th February, 1891, which read as follows, viz.: Inform J. H. C. Atkinson that he has been appointed Customs officer on Pelee Island in place of Mr. McCormick removed, and order McGlashan back.

(Sd.) 'M. BOWELL.
"'For MILES COWAN, Acting Collector.'

"I at once took possession of what of the office I could get, and have since acted for your department on the Island by giving clearances and accepting duties. I have called for instructions and have not received them as fully as I should, and now apply to you to give them to me.

"Yours truly,
"J. H. C. ATKINSON."

The next communication was a letter from the collector at Amherstburg to J. H. C. Atkinson, dated on the 29th of April, as I wish the House to remember, after the election was all over and the excitement had subsided. Mr. Gott was a very active man in that contest, and I shall refer to that matter before I sit down. Now, to show that he was in this plot, here is a letter dated the 29th April, some time after the election. He allowed Mr. Atkinson to remain at his post, the man who, he states, had usurped the office and taken possession of it in an illegal way, and he now calls upon him to surrender the same:

"SIR,—I have to request you to cease acting as an officer of the Customs until you are legally authorized to do so. No person can have any right to act as an officer of the Customs until duly appointed, or until the office had been regularly handed over to him. I am responsible for the actions of all officers of Customs in my survey. I stated to you before that when I received any instructions about you, I would let you know; therefore, if you have taken possession of any Customs books, papers or other property of the office, you must at once deliver the same to F. B. McCormick, sub-collector of South Port. I know no other person on Pelee Island as an officer of Customs but him. You must understand I am personally responsible for any irregularity that may occur (if any). I therefore feel that I cannot allow the interests of the Customs Department on Pelee Island as now conducted.

"I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
(Sd.) "GEO. GOTT,
"*Collector.*

"I have handed to officer McCormick a copy of this.
"GEO. GOTT, *Coll.*"

This, Mr. Speaker, was evidently written on the collector's own account. He does not state that he was authorized in any way to request that the office should be vacated. He does it on his own account; he is collector and is responsible for the actions of all officers of Customs in his survey, a point which would have been well taken if it had been taken as soon as the collector knew about it. I have other documents which will throw light upon this matter. One is as follows:—

"CUSTOMS, CANADA,
"COLLECTOR'S OFFICE,
"AMHERSTBURG, 30th April, 1891.

"J. H. C. ATKINSON, Esq.,
"Pelee Island.

"SIR,—The following is a copy of a letter of instructions I have received from the hon. the Commissioner of Customs, received since I sent a letter to you on the 29th instant.

"'CUSTOMS DEPARTMENT, CANADA,
"'OTTAWA, 28th April, 1891.

"'GEO. GOTT, Esq.,
"'Collector of Customs, Amherstburg.

"'SIR,—I am instructed by the hon. the Minister of Customs to inform you that, pending further investigation by a special officer of the department, the intended appointment of Mr. Atkinson as sub-collector of Customs on Pelee Island will remain in abeyance. You will, therefore, instruct Dr. McCormick to resume his duties as sub-collector on the Island until further instructed.

"'As soon as the special officer's report is received, such action will be taken as will be deemed most in the interest of the revenue and the people of the Island. Notify Mr. Atkinson and Dr. McCormick of the contents of this letter, and pay Mr. Atkinson for services rendered by him at the rate of $400 per annum.

"'I have the honour to be, Sir,
"'Your obedient servant,
(Sd.) "'J. JOHNSON.
"'*Commissioner.*'

"I have, therefore, to request you to call at my office at your earliest convenience, so that I may take account of your services.

"I am, Sir, yours respectfully,
"COLLECTOR."

Here is a copy of Mr. Atkinson's reply to Mr. Johnson's letter:

"PELEE ISLAND, 2nd May, 1891.

"GEO. GOTT, Esq.,
"Collector, Amherstburg.

"SIR,—Your letters of the 29th and 30th April have been received and contents noted.

"Yours truly,
"J. H. C. ATKINSON."

As I have pointed out, on April 28th when the hon. Minister had no political axe to grind, we find that he is animated by laudable interest in the revenue and the people of Pelee Island. Although the hon. gentleman perhaps did not know the extent of the plot, it was certainly very indiscreet and improper for the Minister of Customs, or any man in his station, to make an appointment in that way. The hon. Minister may not have been aware of the desperate efforts that were made in the South Essex contest, of which this matter is only one instance; but I submit that it is the duty of the Minister of Customs to explain to this House and to the country, and particularly to the people of Pelee Island and of South Essex, who have been deceived in this matter, why a telegram was not sent from Ottawa, the seat of Government, but from Norwood, and a public office handed over from one party to another to secure votes, and while I obtained the majority of the votes, I did not get the vote I expected, on account of these efforts of the Conservative party to secure a victory in South Essex. I have another matter in connection with this affair which shows the length to which these men proceeded at Pelee Island. The telephone between the mainland and the Island is under the control of the Government. It was well known to the political party to which I belong that it was very dangerous for us to communicate with the island by telephone; still in some cases we were obliged to do so. In regard to this collectorship business, I find—or the person who was temporarily appointed there but not really appointed, found—there was a telephone message intercepted at one of the stations, and that message was used by the Conservative Association of the town of Leamington. Complaint of the matter has been made to the Government or to the proper officer, the inspector of the Government telephone system, but no action has been taken. I propose to read an affidavit in regard to the way this telephone system is conducted, and to show the injustice and insecurity of the manner in which it is operated, to which the attention of the Government has been called. The affidavit is as follows;—

"PELEE ISLAND, ONT., May, 1891.

"1. I, John Finlay, J.P., do solemnly declare that on the 28rd day of May, 1891, I was personally present at the interview between J. H. C. Atkinson and F. B. McCormick, at the latter's residence at Pelee Island in the County of Essex, Province of Ontario.

"2. That J. H. C. Atkinson requested Mr. McCormick to give him information with regard to the interrupting and copying of a conversation which has passed between the

said J. H. C. Atkinson and W. D. Balfour, M.P.P., on the 24th day of February, on the telephone cable between Leamington and Pelee Island.

"3. That F. B. McCormick did at first positively refuse to give the requested information, on the ground that he did not wish to get any person into trouble over the matter.

"4. That after some conversation regarding the matter, F. B. McCormick made a formal statement as follows:—'That on the 26th day of February, he, F. B. McCormick, was informed by Wm. Prosser, Fishery inspector, Leamington, that a copy of a telephone service conversation between J. H. C. Atkinson and W. D. Balfour, M.P.P., had been sent from station No. 2 of the telephone line between Leamington and Pelee Island to Mr. Smith, druggist, of Leamington, and secretary of the Conservative Association there. That he, F. B. McCormick, did see the said copy and learned that the conversation was intercepted at station No. 2 by a Miss Quick who was then visiting with the family of the operator, Wm. Grubb. That Miss Quick made an affidavit to the correctness of the said copy before him, F. B. McCormick. That he believed that the operator at station No. 2, Wm. Grubb, was aware of the transaction after the fact.'

"And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true and by virtue of the Act respecting extra-judicial oaths.

"Made and declared before me this 26th day of May, 1891. } JOHN FINLAY, J.P.

"JAS. I. SRIGLEY, Sen., J.P. for Essex."

I read this affidavit for the purpose of showing that the attention of the Government has been called to it, and I propose to put a question on the Notice paper asking what action the Government intend to take in regard to this very serious matter. That is not a private telephone company, but is under the control of the Government, and the attention of the Government has been called to this misconduct, as is proved by a letter of acknowledgment. The reason I bring this complaint in here is to have it placed on record, for the matter is going to be followed up. It is simply scandalous that a telephone office should be used in this way. It is well known in Essex by the Reformers that, during an election contest, we cannot use with any safety the telephone line to Pelee Island; and we have the fact in evidence, it may be important or not, that a conversation was intercepted, used by the local Conservative Association, and subsequently reported to the Dominion Government. In order to show that the attention of the Government has been called to this matter, I will read the following letter:—

'J. H. C. ATKINSON, Esq.,
"Pelee Island, Ont.

"DEAR SIR,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter on the 20th ultimo. The matter will be inquired into at once, and I will advise you of the result as early as practicable.

"I am, dear Sir, yours faithfully,
"F. N. GISBORNE, *Supt.*"

Nothing more has been heard of this matter. It was reported to the Government that there was evidence that such a conversation was intercepted and probably used. The parties complained to the proper officer, but, so far, they have been unable to obtain satisfaction. Now, Sir, these are serious charges, they are charges in which members on both sides of this House are interested. Most certainly the telegraph and telephone and post office service should be held sacred in this country. So far as that telephone line in Essex is concerned, we now know to our sorrow in many cases that it has not been so held. I do not know that I have anything more to say at this stage, except to call the attention of the Government to the conduct of the Collector of Customs in that riding.

Mr. BOWELL. Who signed that last letter you read; you did not tell us where it is from?

Mr. ALLAN. It is signed F. N. Gisborne, Superintendent of Government Telephone Service, Department of Public Works. I state, Sir, that I believe the course of the hon. Minister is unprecedented. I do not think it would be possible for him to find such conduct as his justified by the conduct of any British statesman. I do not believe that in the United States any politician would do such a thing at any time, not even during an election contest. We find the hon. gentlemen opposite stating that they copy British precedents, but I venture to say that neither in England nor in the United States would it be possible to find a precedent for their conduct. However, we very often experience that if there is anything bad in the United States' system of Government, hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches copy it. They have copied the National Policy and the Gerrymander from the United States, and they are to-day, by their course of conduct, ushering in what I believe to be that most pernicious principle, namely, that to the victors belong the spoils. In our section of the country, and I believe it is the same all over Canada, they have encouraged paid officers of the Dominion to go out and take an active part in election campaigns. In the riding of South Essex, the collectors of Customs took the stump from the start to the finish of the contest. Mr. Gott, collector at Amherstburg, was an active worker in the campaign; he is not a speaker and he did not take the stump, but he was an active worker. Mr. McCormick, who was collector of Customs, and who was ordered to report at Windsor, took an active part, as did also Dr. King, of Kingsville, and Mr. Scott, of Leamington, two collectors of Customs. It is a matter of regret to me that civil servants of this Dominion should be allowed to act in this way. I deplore the day when the Government of this country placed upon the Statute-book the right of these men to vote, for I believe that we are drifting into a system which will lead to the adoption of the very worst feature in the American system, that is, the principle that to the victors belong the spoils. I believe that these public officers should be neutral, and that they should not take any part in an election campaign. I would not expect, of course, that every person appointed to every paltry office in this country should lose the right of citizenship; that is too much to expect, but the line should be drawn somewhere. If a person accepts an important position like that of collector of Customs—whether he be Reformer or Conservative, I don't care which—it should be the policy of both sides of this House to prevent such a man from taking an active part in elections. I refer especially to the County of Essex, because I know of my own personal knowledge what did take place there, but I believe the same system obtains everywhere else over the Dominion. Every one of these officials I have referred to were active and bitter partisans, doing all they could against the Reform candidate. Not only was this the case with the four collectors of Customs, but it was also the case with other officials in the office. One gentleman was so active, and so much in the secrets of the party as to what the Red Parlour was able to do, that he thought it safe to put up money on the result, and he lost four or five hundred dollars on the result in South Essex. That showed that he was prominent in the secrets of the party workers, because on the

face of it South Essex should have gone for the platform the Liberals advocated by at least 500 majority. But this officer knew that there were such influences as public works and the Red Parlour, and he was so much in the secrets of the party that he lost four or five hundred on the result of the contest. I say that it is due to the people of Pelee Island, due to the County of Essex, and due to this House and to the Dominion of Canada, that the Minister of Customs should give an explanation of his extraordinary conduct in this matter.

Mr. BOWELL. Mr. Speaker, there can be no objection to bringing down such correspondence as is in the Department of Customs, and I dare say also, such as can be found in the Department of Public Works. The hon. gentleman has a great deal more correspondence in his possession than I ever saw or heard of. The hon. gentleman is quite correct in much that he has said in reference to the feeling on Pelee Island, but there are one or two statements which he made which it would have been better had he verified them by facts. In the first place he stated—and I mention this because it refers to one who is no longer here—he stated among other things that in addition to the letter or telegrams which he read of my own, a letter was also sent by the late First Minister to the effect that if they would vote for the Conservative party, and against the hon. member himself, Mr. McCormick would be removed from the Island and another officer substituted in his place. Whether that be correct or not I am not prepared to say, for the reason that I never had any conversation with the late First Minister in reference to the appointment of Mr. McCormick, or the substitution of Mr. Atkinson during the short period in which he performed the duties of sub-collector on Pelee Island. I doubt very much whether, knowing as I do the cautious manner in which the late First Minister carried on correspondence of that kind, that he ever wrote such a letter. He may have written a letter. I am not prepared to say that he did not, as I repeat I know nothing about it, but I question very much whether any letter can be produced containing the promises which the hon. gentleman has said were contained in that letter. I shall say no more in reference to that matter. The statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Allan) is quite correct with regard to the difficulties which occurred upon the original appointment of Mr. McCormick and the feeling which existed on the Island at the time. Mr. McCormick—after the death of the elder McCormick, who was, I think, his uncle, but I will not be positive about that—was recommended to the department as being a man of education, and a man well fitted for the position to which he was appointed, and which was worth about $300 a year. A protest was at once entered by the people of the Island against that appointment. They declared the doctor, for certain reasons which they gave, to be unfit, morally and otherwise, for the position. I made full enquiry at the time, and found, to my satisfaction, that the opposition to the doctor arose more from family difficulties than from any want of knowledge or ability on his part to perform the duties of the office. Constant letters of complaint, and, if my recollection serves me aright, petitions demanding his removal were received by the department from the people there. I made enquiries through the inspector, Mr. Mewburn, who certainly will not be accused of being one of those monstrous Tories to whom the hon. gentleman has referred. He was one of the appointments of the Government of Mr. Mackenzie, and he is just as strong in his views and sentiments as the hon. gentleman who has addressed the House. But I will say this for him, that I believe him to be an honest and straightforward officer who conscientiously performs all the duties of his office. His report was that Dr. McCormick was performing his duties on the Island efficiently. Still, the rebellion continued, until I promised more than a year ago that I would make further investigation, and, if possible, make a change and appoint some one who would suit the people. At the time to which the hon. gentleman refers trouble had arisen, but not, so far as my knowledge goes, to the extent which the hon. gentleman has represented. I did order, not the dismissal of Dr. McCormick, but his removal to another port. That Mr. Gott may have felt a little chagrined at not being informed of what was done by the department may be perfectly true. There are many persons who, from the position they hold, think that whenever the head of the department or those who have the responsibility at headquarters, make a change, they should be consulted or should be notified of it. Dr. McCormick was ordered to report for duty at Windsor, where at that time an additional official was required. The hon. gentleman tells us that he did not go there. That was a matter that I knew nothing about until some time afterwards.

Mr. ALLAN. He did not stay there. He may have gone there.

Mr. BOWELL. I subsequently heard from Mr. Gott that he was at Amherstburg, and that he preferred not going to Windsor. A notice was given to Mr. Atkinson to perform the duties of the office. I think the hon. gentleman was quite correct in saying that my letter to Mr. Atkinson stated that he would be appointed. I was not in the city of Ottawa when that was sent, and the probabilities are that he would have been appointed, notwithstanding the fact, of which the hon. gentleman informs us, that he was a great admirer of himself and the unrestricted reciprocity—I was going to say fad, but I do not desire to be disrespectful—the principles of unrestricted reciprocity which the hon. gentleman was advocating, and on which he was contesting his election at that time. But I found the rebellion against him still greater and the objections to him much more numerous on the part of the people than they had been against Dr. McCormick. When the papers come down, the hon. gentleman will see the petitions were large and numerously signed; I do not vouch for their respectability, but I take it for granted that all the farmers and residents of that island are respectable people. After looking carefully into the whole matter, as there was such diversity of opinion, and as I had no positive information in the department of malfeasance of office on the part of Dr. McCormick, I decided that I would reinstate him in the position, and send an officer to make full investigation into all the charges made against him, personally as well as officially; and that, if it should be found that he had been guilty of any of the charges, I would remove him alto-

gether from the service, and appoint some one else instead. It is quite evident that the people of the Island, for what reason I do not know, would scarcely be satisfied with anyone; and I can only come to this conclusion: that it would be much better to send a stranger there, although the patronage which is supposed to belong to those who live in the immediate locality would thereby be taken from them, though I do not believe in all cases that it is at all advisable, in the interests of the revenue, that in every case the parties living in the immediate locality should be consulted as to the person who should be appointed to the position of revenue officer—from the fact that if a collector of Customs or a preventive officer, or any person having to do with the revenue, particularly the Customs revenue, and with smuggling and violation of the law, has many friends in the locality, he is too apt to neglect his duty and befriend them at the expense, if not of the revenue, at least of the service and the law.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It seems that the daylight protectionists are nocturnal free traders.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is not original. I know he is philosophical; but I protest most solemnly against his stealing the utterances of my hon. friend who sits behind him. I have a distinct recollection of the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) giving utterance to precisely the same language a few years ago, and I have no doubt he was quite honest in doing so, however wrong the sentiment may be in principle. I do not know anything of the action of the officers to whom the hon. gentleman has referred. What course Mr. Gott or Mr. King took in the election was unknown to me. I never had the pleasure of meeting Mr. King but once in my life. In fact, if asked what his politics were, I could not have answered; but I suppose Mr. Gott would have recorded his vote, if at all, in the Conservative interest. I do not know whether he did that or not, or whether he took any active part in the election; but if he did so, he did nothing more than many other Customs officials throughout this Dominion, who worked in the interest of the party with which the hon. gentleman is connected.

Mr. McMULLEN. No, no.

Mr. BOWELL. Of course I could not expect the hon. member for North Wellington to believe what I say.

Mr. McMULLEN. We do not expect any other statement from you, at any rate.

Mr. BOWELL. There is a species of insolence on the part of the hon. gentleman, which it would be unparliamentary to properly refer to. I reiterate the statement I made, that if the officers in the south riding of Essex worked against the hon. gentleman, I was not aware of it. If they did they did no more than many others who worked in favour of the party my hon. friend supports. The hon. member from Wellington may deny that if he pleases.

Mr. McMULLEN. Give us the names.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not propose to stand here and be catechised by the hon. gentleman. I make the statement, and if the hon. gentleman can controvert it, let him do so. But let him ask any hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island, whether officials connected with the Customs there did not work, and work energetically against the Conservative party in that Island.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I fail to know it.

Mr. BOWELL. Does the hon. gentleman pretend to say he knows the action of every officer on the Island, whether a preventive officer or other officer, or whether in Charlottetown or elsewhere?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman appealed to members from Prince Edward Island, and I answer him by saying that my knowledge of the Customs officials there is not limited, and I know none in Prince Edward Island who supported the Opposition candidates.

Mr. YEO. I also come from Prince Edward Island, and I know none.

Mr. BOWELL. I have heard of a case in which a man was accused of stealing a horse, and only one man swore to the fact, when the accused told the judge very seriously that he could bring a dozen men who would swear that they did not know it, and did not see him stealing the horse. I think my hon. friends are exactly in the same position. When I receive complaints demanding the dismissal of an official because he worked for his own party, I positively refuse to comply on the ground that the law gives Customs officials the right to vote and work in the interests of their party, and I lay down the principle that it would be dangerous to adopt the view which the hon. member for South Essex takes, when he says that to the victors belong the spoils. Of course, I believe that in all cases when there is a vacancy, that vacancy should be filled by the party in power from its own ranks; but I presume what the hon. gentleman means to imply is that we should adopt the principle which obtains in the United States, and which did obtain before Confederation in Prince Edward Island, namely, that upon the accession to power of a new Government, every officer opposed to it should be dismissed from his position and another appointed.

Mr. ALLAN. That is what it will come to.

Mr. BOWELL. Why should it come to that?

Mr. ALLAN. By the course the Government have taken.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman did not, during the whole of his speech, cite an instance of an officer who had opposed the Government having been dismissed for that reason. Neither did he give any instance in which a political opponent of the Government had been removed from office and a supporter of the Government put in his place.

Mr. McMULLEN. I will give you one in a few minutes.

Mr. BOWELL. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman wants to obtain a pretext—thinking that the time is not far distant when his party will be in power—which will justify his party in carrying out the principle he advocates. I know nothing of the information the hon. member for Wellington may give the House, but I venture to make this assertion: that he will furnish no instance in connection with the Customs Department of an officer having been removed for political reasons, since I have had control of it, at any rate. I challenge him to furnish any such instance. He may instance cases of which I know nothing, and I am confident that in any cases he will mention there are other reasons than those of a political character

which prompted the removal. There have been men removed, as I stated in the answer I gave in connection with the Intercolonial Railway, for having been insolent to their superior officers and for having been intoxicated while on duty. These are good reasons for dismissal. Such instances may have occurred during an election contest when party feeling runs high, but party excitement is no justification for the insolence of any official towards those who are over him. I know nothing of the telegrams to which the hon. gentleman referred. I never heard of any conversation through the telephone being used for political purposes, and if any such be brought to my notice or that of my hon. friend and colleague, the Minister of Public Works, we will give it the fullest possible consideration and punish any one who has betrayed the trust reposed in him in so responsible a position as that of a telephone or telegraph officer under the control of the Government. As to the charge made against all these officials, of being in a ring or plot, I have nothing to say, for the simple reason that I have no knowledge whatever of the kind. My whole conduct in connection with this Pelee Island business has been directed by the reasons I have given; and I can assure the hon. gentleman that if I had the same thing to do over again, I would not hesitate for one moment, under the circumstances, to repeat my action, and I tell the hon. gentleman if Mr. McCormick is found to be what some members of his own family have represented him to be—if he be as bad as they say he is, I shall take care, if I remain in the Customs Department, to have him removed. If I find, however, that the feeling is simply of a personal character, I shall not deem it my duty to recommend to my colleagues his dismissal. And it is just as well the hon. gentleman should understand that the feeling against Mr. Atkinson is just as strong, if I am to believe the petitions sent to the department demanding—for that is the manner in which the people of Pelee Island treat their officials—to have him removed, as it is against Dr. McCormick. I have no reason to think that Mr. Atkinson is unfit for that position. I believed it to be in the interests of the revenue and the Customs Department that Mr. McCormick, at the time, should be removed to another sphere of usefulness where he would be away from those personal feelings which are so strong against him, and another man put in his place. I found, however, that the personal feeling was just as strong against the person who was recommended for the position, and, under all the circumstances, I felt it was only a matter of justice to Mr. McCormick that he should be reinstated, as the other gentleman had only been temporarily named and not appointed by Order in Council. I did use, I doubt not, the word "appointed," but, under the circumstances, had I reflected, I would not have done so. The gentleman named was placed in the position by a letter from the head of the department and not by an Order in Council, so that it rested with the head of the department to remove him in the same manner. I shall not reply to the hon. gentleman's tirade against the officials. So far as I know, they perform their duty. If they had worked against him, I do not think I would have said they did not do their duty in that case, but that, however, is a matter of opinion. So long as the law gives Customs and other officials the right to record their votes, and they do so in an inoffensive manner, without insulting their opponents or members belonging to the other party, I shall never interfere with them. It may be a question, as the hon. gentleman says, whether any official should be given his franchise. That is, I admit, a disputable point, and when the House decides that officials shall not vote, it will then become the duty of any Government to remove them should they violate the law in that respect. But, so long as they have the right to vote, I shall not individually find fault with them as long as they simply record their vote and exercise their franchise in a legitimate and gentlemanly way.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is not the complaint. The complaint is that they have taken the stump.

Mr. BOWELL. I have already told the hon. gentleman that I am not aware of that, and if the hon. gentleman lays down the principle that men in the employment of the Government should be removed for taking the stump either for or against the Government, I am inclined to think that there are a good many of his friends in the Dominion who would lose their positions. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but human nature is the same in the Grit as it is in the Tory.

Mr. LAURIER. You should make the punishment the same on each side.

Mr. BOWELL. I have no doubt that, if the hon. gentleman were in power, and his friends were to advocate his policy, and try to keep him in office, he would keep them in their positions, and that, in his quiet and pleasant manner, he would turn out of office every one who spoke against him. That is the interpretation which I put upon his statement, because we all know the course which the hon. gentleman will take whenever he crosses the floor, which I hope he will not. The hon. member will have these papers brought down. He has made a mountain out of a very small mole-hill. I do not begrudge the hon. gentleman the feeling that he owes his election to the appointment of this man at a salary of $200 or $300, but, surely, if by our action we could transform the opinions of all the Conservatives in the country and lead them over to the other side, hon. gentlemen opposite should thank us for doing so. It is the first time in my many years of political life that I have heard Liberals complaining of the Government for making people their friends. I will endeavour, if I live long enough, to visit that Island, which I believe is a garden situated in the midst of a lake, in order to see that the people there are re-converted to the true faith, and that they do not vote for the hon. gentleman again.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). We have been hearing lately of so many questionable transactions on the part of the Government that a new case, when it is brought forward, seems not to strike the House with the force it otherwise would, but I think you, Mr. Speaker, must agree with me that this is a very serious charge, and that the idea of prostituting one of the public departments so as to disarrange the public service for the purposes of an election is a charge which should receive serious attention at the hands of this House. The Minister of Customs virtually admits that my hon. friend (Mr. Allan) has presented his statement truthfully and fairly, but he says he has tried to make a

mountain out of a mole-hill. The Minister has had the reputation of being a very efficient man at the head of his department, but I fear he will lose his reputation in connection with this matter. What are the facts of the case? He takes exception to the statements made in the letter which was alluded to, and says he does not know whether that was so or not. My hon. friend says this letter was used among the electors with the intent of influencing the election. The Minister said he does not know anything about it, and that is the only answer. Here is a sub-collector of Customs at Pelee Island who is so obnoxious to some of the people of that island that they object to support the Government candidate, provided this officer is retained in his position. That came to the Minister's knowledge. He frankly admits that it came to his knowledge before this, and that he took the precaution of enquiring into the charges against this officer in order to see whether the objection taken was owing to his neglect of public duty, or was due to personal pique or private malice on the part of some who had feelings against him. The result was that he ordered Mr. Mewburn, the inspector of Customs, to visit that outport and report, and the Minister of Customs states that the report was that Mr. McCormick was discharging his duties in the public interests and in a satisfactory manner, and that any feeling against him was a local feeling and the result of a family feud that had sprung up there. Consequently the Minister left him in possession of his office. He did not deem that the fact of some of his relatives not desiring him to retain that office was a sufficient ground for removing him as long as he was discharging his duties satisfactorily in the public interest. If that is so, and no one finds fault with that, how comes it that, when he had already judged that man to be a proper man to retain in office, when he had the report of the official whom he sent there that he was a proper man to retain there, how comes it that, with no subsequent violation of duty on his part, the Minister of Customs, who had stood by this officer from 1888 to 1890, thinks proper on the eve of an election to remove that officer and appoint another in his place? Is that the way in which the Customs Department is administered? He does not deny that, from a village in the County of Northumberland, away from his department, away from his duties, he telegraphed, not that an appointment was intended to be made, but that the appointment of Mr. Atkinson had been made in place of Mr. McCormick, and that Mr. McCormick was to report himself at Windsor because they wanted an extra man there. Mr. Atkinson then assumes the position, but Mr. McCormick does not report to Windsor where they wanted additional help, but, in violation of the Customs rules and regulations, and by a clear act of insubordination, Mr. McCormick goes to the port of Amherstburg, where the Minister does not say he is required at all; and then, because he has been insubordinate and has not performed the duty he was ordered to perform, instead of his being punished, we find he is reinstated in his position, while the man who was appointed in his place is summarily dismissed. Is that the way the Customs Department is worked; that servants who are insubordinate and refuse to obey the demands of their superiors, are to be rewarded by being restored to their position again? Now, then, he says that Mr. Gott, the collector at Amherstburg, of which Pelee Island is an outport, might have felt a little chagrined about this, but he wanted them to understand that the heads of the department might do as they pleased in reference to this matter, but he was not bound to consult them. Does the Minister of Customs want the House and the country to understand that this Mr. Gott, who is the officer at Amherstburg, in which district Pelee Island is an outport, who himself says, as he has stated in the letter that was read by the member for South Essex, that he is responsible for the action of the sub-collector at Pelee,—does the Minister want us to understand that he is at liberty to appoint a man to that position without notifying the officer at Amherstburg, without receiving any instructions from him, and placing that man Atkinson in possession there, while the collector, under whom he worked, to whom he was responsible, who was responsible for his work, has no official communication in reference to that matter at all, and refuses to give him any instructions with reference to it? Sir, the action of the Minister of Customs was this: with the view, as I verily believe, of influencing the election, he placed this man, irresponsible, according to his own showing, in that outport of Pelee; that man was there giving clearances, acting in the name of Her Majesty, receiving Government fees, discharging the duties of the position, and he is there without any authority or responsibility to any one, and without any instructions from any one. That is the position in which the Minister has declared this matter to stand. Sir, the House, I think, will admit that of the many transactions of a questionable nature that have been brought to their notice, this, perhaps, is the most questionable of all. Viewed from whatever point you may view it, viewing the fact of the dismissal and the removal of a man against whom, he says, there was no charge of neglect of public duty, the subsequent insubordination of that officer after his removal, if we are to accept the testimony of the Minister; then after that his reappointment over this other man that had been placed there, and this man only being removed, because, as the Minister says, there were complaints against him as well as against McCormick. Well, he says he intends to send an officer up there to look into this charge against McCormick, and if he is really blameworthy, he intends to have him removed. Why did he not send his commission up before he removed Mr. Atkinson? Why did he not investigate the charges against Atkinson, the recently appointed man, appointed by himself? Why did he not give him an opportunity of an investigation? Why is he summarily dismissed, when receiving a salary at the rate of $400 per annum, while McCormick, against whom the charges are made, and made so strong that he had him removed during the election, was appointed in his place? Sir, I think the position of the Minister of Customs will not bear investigation on that point. They talk about the American system. What has that to do in reference to the cause of the dismissal of Atkinson, that the Minister of Customs should have referred to it? What is that but the American system? Is it the Canadian system? Is it the British system, that a man who is appointed by a Minister to a position in the Civil Service of Canada, shall, without any charge being proved against him, without an investigation

being made, be summarily dismissed? Is that British precedent? Is that the administration of Canadian affairs? But that is what the Minister has done in this case. He appointed a man. He says there have been charges against that man; he has not investigated them; but without investigation, simply upon the charge, he has dismissed that man from the public service. Are the public servants of Canada holding their tenure of office on so slight a thread as that the Minister may one day appoint them and a few days after discharge them, without any charges being made against them by any one, without any charge being sustained or admitted to be sustained against them? No, Sir, the House must admit that it is a questionable transaction, that the hon. member for South Essex has made his point, that the Minister of Customs was not above using his official position in order to influence an election in one of the ridings of this country, even though he demoralized the public service, the service of his department, in order to accomplish it, and has been guilty throughout it of irregularities in the removal of Mr. McCormick and reappointing him, after insubordination, to the same position, and in the appointment of Mr. Atkinson and his subsequent dismisal without any charge being alleged against him. Sir, the Minister of Customs seems to justify these men as having acted properly and rightly in the discharge of their official duties. These different Customsofficers, we have been told, went through the County of Essex appearing on a public platform and using their influence in the contest upon the Government side. He claims they had a perfect right to do so, and he instances the alleged fact that officers were found doing that on the other side, and so far as he was aware they have never been discharged. He was unfortunate in citing the case of the officers of Prince Edward Island, unfortunate, at least, from the circumstance that two of the prominent members from the Island were unable, from their own knowledge, to substantiate that statement which he had made. He alleges that on the Intercolonial Railway, at some place, men may have been dismissed who were taking an interest in elections. The two hon. members from that province state that these men were not dismissed because they took an active part in political matters, but because of insolence to superiors. Sir, we can understand that when the Government wish to discharge a man, they may, perhaps, be able to find some reason that will justify the action to themselves; but whether that be the case or no, the fact remains that this man Atkinson, appointed by the Minister, discharging the duties assigned him by the Minister and, so far as the Minister knows, discharging those duties efficiently and well, is summarily, without any cause being proved or established against him at all, removed from his position. Sir, I need not enlarge further on that point. It is well that it is not a controverted point. It stands in all its nakedness before the House, as presented by the hon. member for South Essex, a shocking transaction in its own character, as viewed I trust by the majority of the members of the House, and I regret that the Minister of Customs himself has not been able so to view it.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether he approves of Ontario officials taking part in provincial or Dominion elections, either on the platform or otherwise?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If the hon. member were not a new member, I think the Speaker would call his attention to the fact that he is not discussing the question at all. At the proper time and in the proper place, I will give the hon. gentleman the answer he wants.

Mr. INGRAM. In rising to ask the hon. gentleman this question, I believe that I am performing a public duty. A few years ago I entered the Provincial Legislature of this province, and I contended then, as hon. gentlemen are contending now, that civil servants should not be permitted to take part in elections. I am acquainted with the gentleman whose name has been brought before the House to-day, Mr. McCormick. I have known him for a number of years, and I believe he is competent to fill the position of collector of Customs for Pelee Island. I know also that there is a local prejudice against Mr. McCormick on that Island, caused by family quarrels and other things of that character. I do not pretend to justify the course taken by the Minister of Customs in this case, nor do I intend to condemn the Minister of Customs for his action on this occasion. I have thought it best to wait until the evidence was brought down to this House, in order that I might be in a position to judge whether he has done wrong or right. While a member of the Local Legislature I called the attention of the Government of this province to the fact that many civil servants were taking part in elections. I believe civil servants who are drawing money from the public treasury have no right to take part in elections, while I hold they have a right to cast their ballots in favour of whomsoever they please; but if they go beyond that, they were not doing their duty and should not be permitted to remain any longer in the service. The Government told me: Why did I not use my influence with my friends in Ottawa and have them carry out these views? I contend that so long as a man is in the Civil Service he has no right to go on a public platform and discuss public questions.

Mr. MULOCK. What about Sir Charles Tupper?

Mr. INGRAM. I do not look on the High Commissioner as an ordinary public servant. I believe he was quite justified in the course he took in the last election, knowing that if the hon. gentlemen opposite came into power he would immediately cease to hold that position. If hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared, and if this Government is prepared, to frame a law that will deprive civil servants of the power to take an active part in elections, I am prepared to support it. But what astonishes me most is that hon. gentlemen opposite should rise in their places and condemn this Government for the very acts that are committed by the Provincial Government, which they support, and against which they have not a word to say. Hon. gentlemen opposite, when civil servants of the Local Government take part in their elections, should first condemn them for doing so, and then they could consistently ask the Dominion Government to prevent the civil servants of the country taking part in the elections.

Mr. McMULLEN. From the time I first had the honour to sit in this House, down to the pre-

sent moment, I have never noticed a more flagrant case of impropriety charged against a Minister of the Crown than that brought forward to-day in connection with transactions at Amherstburg. It is quite clear that the Minister of Customs was very anxious that Mr. Wigle, who was running in that constituency, should be elected, and he was quite prepared to do any amount of wriggling in order to bring about that result. He was prepared to do anything if he could possibly bring about a change of votes, which would result in the election of the Government candidate. The Minister of Customs is a wily man and one who has been long in office, and no doubt he has skilfully kept his own name out of the ring, but at the same time, he managed to make the people of Pelee Island acquainted with his views, and sought if possible to secure their votes in favour of his particular friend at that time. The hon. gentleman, when he last addressed the House, mentioned me by name and challenged me to name a case in which a Government servant had been dismissed because he had opposed the Government. I will give a case. I admit it does not belong to the hon. gentleman's own department, but to the Post Office Department, and I am glad to notice that the Postmaster General is listening to my statement. I remember a case in Orangeville. A man had carried the mails from the station to the post office for over eight years, a man against whom no word of complaint had been laid, a man who discharged his duty efficiently, and a man who had carried the mails 19,000 times from the station to the post office, and the Postmaster General cannot out of all his correspondence bring forward any proof that a tittle of complaint had been made against him. About November 15th last he applied for a renewal of his contract. It was renewed for four years from January 1st last. But a very short time before the elections he was notified that his contract would end in ninety days. The reason, no doubt, was simply that he was not prepared to declare himself in favour of the Government candidate. He was dismissed in accordance with the notice he had received. He applied to the department for a reason why his appointment was cancelled, and from that day to this he has never received anything to show that a complaint was made. Of course, there is a clause in all contracts providing that the Government can at any time cancel a man's appointment if they see fit so to do, for reasons best known to themselves; but in all justice to a civil servant who has served his country so long, the Postmaster General should have given him the satisfaction of knowing if any complaints had been made against him. The hon. Minister would not go so far as to say there were or were not complaints made; but he was summarily dismissed from his position, after the contract had been renewed and he had prepared himself with a vehicle to enable him more efficiently to discharge his duties. This man was dismissed because he was not prepared to support the Government candidate then running in the constituency. There is a case, and I challenge the Postmaster General to place before the House all the particulars in regard to these cases. I am aware that the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) knows a little about this case; his name is mentioned in the letter I have before me. The Government have been asked for explanations and have been written to by several parties—I will not name them—in order to obtain an explanation, but none has been given. Moreover, the candidate running in the interests of the Government in that constituency declared that the appointment of the mail carrier between the post office and the station would not be made until after the election, and he held the appointment in his hand, and the other had been dismissed. The Minister of Customs challenged me to name a case, and I have given one, and it is one that is not creditable to the Government or to the department.

Mr. BOWELL. Why do you not quote correctly? I challenged you to give an instance from the Customs Department. I said nothing about any other department.

Mr. McMULLEN. You said I could not give an instance in connection with the Government.

Mr. BOWELL. No; and I am not prepared to admit that this is an instance.

Mr. McMULLEN. You spoke generally at first and afterwards you spoke in regard to the Customs Department. My hon. friend did not pay hon. gentlemen opposite a compliment when he said that no member of the British House of Commons or the British Government would be found mixed up in a transaction of this kind. I admit that, and it was no compliment to compare them with the class of Canadians in the Government at the present time. They would not consider it a compliment if they read the remarks of my hon. friend from Essex on this matter. I contend that the course adopted in dealing with all petty offices of this kind had been clearly shown to be for the purpose of trying to keep the party in power, and the standard of political morality has been lowered and lowered until it has descended to a level when a petty official occuping the position as mail carrier from the station to the post office, at a salary of from $60 to $190 a year, is removed because he will not vote for the Tory candidate. It is quite clear that hon. gentlemen opposite wish the country to understand that they intend to follow the principle to the victors belong the spoils. It is quite evident from the case brought before the House by my hon. friend from South Essex (Mr. Allan), that a gross outrage was perpetrated in his constituency, but it did not succeed.

Mr. ADAMS. I desire to reply to the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) and to teach him a lesson in prudence so far as regards attacks on the Government. I found in my county that nearly every official was the opponent of myself, who was running in favour of the Government of the day. The most important positions in my county were held by prominent Grits, as we call them, or Liberals if you like to call them, and the county from one end to the other was honeycombed by Government officers appointed by the Liberal Administration, or by the sanction of my opponent, Mr. Mitchell. Those men fought their way from one end of the county to the other with petitions soliciting votes for my opponent, and they canvassed from platform to platform, and from parish to parish, and hounded the Government of the day although they were in receipt of salaries from the Government ranging from $1,200 to $500, and some of them even down to $100 per annum. I recognize the great principle that these officials had a right

to cast their votes in what way they pleased; but the moment they took to the public platforms, the moment they went from village to village to oppose the policy of the Administration of which they are the servants, then it is the bounden duty of the Government—no matter what Government may be in power—to dismiss those public servants who attacked the Administration from which they received their salaries.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Or who supported it, either.

Mr. ADAMS. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says "or who supported it." I may tell the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that if the official who acts this way is a supporter of the Administration he takes his position in the palm of his hand, and he is liable to dismissal. That is a clear principle; but if the official is in the employment of the Government in power, if he is a servant of the Crown, what right or what justification has he to take the platform against a supporter of the Government, and to hawk round a requisition up north and down south, and for hundreds of miles in the interior of the country, soliciting names to that requisition which guaranteed to the opponent of the Government the confidence of the electors, and which, if sufficiently signed through their canvassing would return the opponent of the Government at the polls? Let me call the attention of the House to a further fact in connection with this matter. A census enumerator was appointed on my recommendation by the Minister of Agriculture, and in the recent election contest I found my opponent declare on the platform and with uplifted hands, that if the Government were defeated in the contest, he, as a follower of the Liberal party, guaranteed to the people the dismissal of this census commissioner; and further, that every official in the county holding office under the present Administration would be immediately ejected from their offices. My opponent declared that if the Liberals were returned to power no Liberal-Conservative would any longer hold an official position in the County of Northumberland. If that be a correct declaration of the principles of the Liberal party, if that be a declaration which guides the policy of the Liberal party throughout the country; then the remarks of the hon. gentleman who last spoke are in exceeding bad taste coming from his lips, and I think that the Government should be censured for keeping in office men who are traducing the principles of the Government, and the policy of the Government, and the acts of the Government from every platform; men who are condemning the Government and holding them up to ridicule and scorn, and vilifying and maligning every public act which the Government does. In my opinion, these officials, instead of being recognized by the Administration of the day, should be immediately removed from office, and the policy should be established that in future any person holding an office in the gift of the Crown or under the Executive of the country must keep neutral in an election contest. He should vote for whomsoever he pleases, for no person has a right to take from him his franchise, and no power has a right to influence him to the right or to the left, as his conscience may dictate; but the very moment an official takes the platform and attacks the Government, during an election campaign, then that moment dismissal should follow. I have contested two elections in my county, one in 1887 and one in 1891, and, during the election of 1887, I found that Government employés, receiving large salaries from the Crown, were the most active, bitter, unrelenting and determined opponents of the Government and of myself. They followed me from parish to parish in my county, and endeavoured to refuse me a hearing in certain parishes. The lighthouse keepers especially, as also the brother of Mr. Mitchell, while others went from place to place to try and refuse me a hearing, by disturbing the audience. And yet, after all this, these men hold their position to-day, and there is not one word from the lips of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House about the conduct of these officials in opposing me.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I desire to say a word or two in answer to the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), who ventured the statement that the Government had dismissed, because of his political leanings, the contractor who carried the mails from the railway station at Orangeville to the post office in that town. That statement rests upon no other foundation than the imagination of the hon. gentleman himself.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have his letter here.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I care not what letter the hon. gentleman has. I happen to be thoroughly acquainted with all the facts connected with this matter, and I will frankly tell the hon. gentleman what all the facts are. About a year ago when it was known that this contract would expire in the month of October, I think, I wrote the Postmaster General and I asked that this contract should be put up to tender, in order that an open field might be given to all persons in that locality who desired to tender for the carrying of the mails. The Postmaster General answered me that that course would be pursued, but through some inadvertence in the office it was not done, and the contract was renewed to Mr. Mann, who had been the contractor, as the member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has said, for the preceding eight years. When that course was taken I remonstrated with the Postmaster General, and upon my remonstrance he cancelled the contract after it had run for about three months, and advertised for new tenders. Mr. Mann had the same opportunity then of obtaining the contract as every other gentleman in that locality had, and the contract was awarded to the lowest tenderer at a saving to the country of $55 per year. Mr. Mann's price was $230 and the price obtained by the present contractor is $175. That is the whole story of this contract from beginning to end, and the hon. gentleman can see if he wishes to that the contract was not cancelled because Mr. Mann was a Liberal in politics. So far from that being the case, I believe that Mr. Mann was a supporter of Mr. Wm. Henry Hunter, who was the candidate in Centre Wellington at the recent election. The contract with Mr. Mann was cancelled, simply because, through inadvertence in the Post Office Department, the opportunity which other gentlemen in that locality desired to have of tendering for the contract was denied to them, and when this mistake was rectified and the decision was arrived at to call for new tenders, the lowest tenderer was awarded the contract. That is

the whole story in connection with the mail carrying contract at Orangeville.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) would have very little to complain about if he knew the difficulties which I, the Government supporter in the great district of Algoma, had to contend against. During my recent election I found that I had not only to fight a whole army of Ontario Government officials, but also had to fight an army of officials appointed by the present Administration. I found some of the postmasters appointed under the present Administration were adverse to the interests of the Government, and I found that to the extent that where notices of meetings were sent out in my district to be distributed to the people, they were held back by the postmasters until after the date for the meeting had expired.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That's a very common thing.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). No doubt it is, but it should not be a common thing by any means if the postmasters would perform their duties, and particularly so when the postage was paid upon these notices. I found more than that. I found that a postmaster in the District of Algoma was using the mails for his own business purposes. When I brought that to the notice of the Administration, what answer do you suppose I got? It was not that the man should be dismissed summarily, although he was a political opponent of mine and of the Administration of the day. They simply said: We cannot dismiss a man for that thing; something stronger must be brought against him. It was the same with other officials in that district. Every one of them without exception, I will venture to say, did not lose an opportunity to do what they could, not for me, a supporter of the Administration, but for the Opposition. The hon. member for North Wellington has nothing to complain of. I have very much more to complain of than he has, and I feel it strongly.

Mr. McNEILL. I move, seconded by Mr. Wood, of Brockville, that the House do now adjourn. I think this would be a fair compromise.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman cannot make such a motion in the midst of a speech.

Mr. McNEILL. I would ask who was speaking?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman had not finished his speech.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman had resumed his seat.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). I am willing that the House should lose the rest of the speech.

Mr. LAURIER. Some members rose desiring to speak on that motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. I did not see anybody rise.

Mr. DEVLIN. I have something to say.

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

After Recess.

Bill (No. 77) respecting the Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company (Mr. LaRivière) was considered in Committee and reported.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 60) respecting the Lake Erie, Essex and Detroit River Railway Company, and to change the name thereof to the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company.—(Mr. Denison.)

Bill (No. 86) to incorporate the Brighton, Warkworth and Norwood Railway Company.—(Mr. Cochrane.)

Bill (No. 89) to incorporate the Kingston and Pontiac Railway Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Renfrew.

Bill (No. 90) to amend the Act to incorporate the Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Cochrane.)

Bill (No. 93) to incorporate the Ontario and New York Bridge Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 94) respecting the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. COCKBURN. Before the Orders are proceeded with, I rise to a question of privilege. I hold in my hand a copy of the *Daily Examiner*, a paper published at Charlottetown, P. E. I., dated Thursday, the 25th June, 1891, and bearing, as its motto, the following quotation from Euripides: "This is true liberty when free-born men, having to advise the public, may speak free." Following this guiding star, I find under "telegraphic news, special despatches, tunnel correspondence," these words, dated Ottawa, June 25:

"In moving for correspondence regarding the tunnel, Davies made an excellent speech from a Prince Edward Island standpoint, avoiding all party politics, stating the Island's case powerfully, and made an admirable impression. Cockburn, one of the Toronto members, who is the present buffoon of the House, and who had evidently more than he could carry, attempted, in reply, to show that the Island was indebted annually to the Dominion by $600,000."

Further on, the zeal of the honourable reporter had carried him so far that, in speaking of the appointment of the Royal Commission, he used these words:

"A good deal of noise and personal talk was indulged in during the debate. Several members were under the weather."

Now, I am rather at a loss to know what to do under circumstances like these, but I appeal to you, Mr. Speaker, as the guardian and representative of the liberties, privileges and rights of members of this House, to say if no means can be adopted, when members who endeavour honestly to do their duty in this House are blackguarded in this way, to put a stop to it. I find the paper, or rather the sheet, is on file in the reading room, and I think any man who could send a telegram of this kind or any paper that would receive it is no longer fit to be placed on the files of our Journals. I have not the slightest doubt that my friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) knows nothing about this matter. He is too honourable and too high-minded a gentleman to have anything to do with it directly or indirectly, though I have been given to understand that this is an organ supporting him personally, but I think it right to state, in his absence, that I am as sure as I stand here now that he had nothing whatever to

do, directly or indirectly, with this baseless and foul calumny.

Some hon. MEMBERS. What is the paper?

Mr. COCKBURN. It is a little fly-sheet called the *Daily Examiner* and published in the thriving town of Charlottetown, and its guiding star is, "This is true liberty when free-born men, having to advise the public, may speak free."

Mr. AMYOT. Is it a Tory paper or a Grit paper?

Mr. COCKBURN. Really, I do not know. I was not aware that the paper was in existence. If this is a specimen of the papers published in the Island, I think the Island would be better without them.

Mr. LANGELIER. They say it is the principal Tory organ of Prince Edward Island.

Mr. COCKBURN. I have been given to understand the very opposite, but I do not think it matters very much on which side of politics a sheet like this is. It will only hurt the side it supports. I have brought this matter up in order to ask counsel of our Speaker as to whether there is no means under our constitution by which a stop can be put to blackguardism of this kind.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think I can throw a ray of light on the question as to which side of politics this newspaper belongs to.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think I must interrupt my hon. friend, as there is nothing before the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I shall not keep you long; I shall only occupy one moment.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND TUNNEL.

House resumed consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Davies for correspondence, &c., relating to the surveys for and construction and cost of a submarine tunnel between Prince Edward Island and the mainland.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is not my present intention to interfere with the just rights of Prince Edward Island in any form, but in connection with this question I may say that I find that the Charlottetown *Examiner* received in the last year of grace, according to our Auditor's report, $131.70 for advertising, and $1,537.50 for printing, so that, if my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) wants to deal out even-handed justice to this pestilent Tory sheet, the means are in his hands and in those of the Government.

Mr. McLEAN. In rising to address this House for the first time, I do so with a great deal of diffidence, especially as the subject under discussion is one of very great interest to the county I represent in this House, as well as to the Island from which I come. When the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), made his speech the other day, in asking for the papers in connection with the proposed tunnel between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, I listened to him very attentively, and I was very much pleased with the speech he made on that occasion. I think he laid the matter before this House in a very plain, reasonable and modest way, from a Prince Edward Island standpoint, and if there was any fault at all to be found with his speech, it was that he did not put the case of Prince Edward Island as strongly as he might have done, or as strongly as I believe he would have been justified in doing. The figures he used on that occasion to specify the amounts contributed by Prince Edward Island to the general revenue of the Dominion, I think, were underneath rather than above the mark. I notice, in looking over the blue-books, that the hon. member for Queen's did not take into consideration the amount contributed to the Dominion treasury from Excise, which amount I find is $185,000. I think he gave the amount contributed from Customs correctly, as $4.60 per head of the population, or for a population of 125,000, the sum of $575,000. But he seems to have omitted the amount contributed from Excise, which is $1.48 per head, or $185,000. Adding these two amounts together, allowing that the people of Prince Edward Island contribute as much per head as do the rest of the Dominion, they contributed to the general revenue, from Customs and Excise, the sum of $760,000. I may say that the remarks I would have made before this House at that time, had I spoken on this subject, would have been quite different from what they will be to-night. I was very much surprised to find that the opposition to this measure, as soon as it was moved, came from the hon. member from Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn). Sir, I believe that figures were never taken from the blue-books which did a province more injustice than the figures used by that hon. gentleman did to the Province of Prince Edward Island. It would be unreasonable for me, if I were attempting to-night to make a speech on the temperance question, to go to the blue-books and say that the city of Toronto from which that hon. gentleman comes, was the most drunken city in the Dominion of Canada. I have never been in the city of Toronto. But I could go to the blue-books and I could prove to this House just as conclusively as that hon. gentleman proved that Prince Edward Island had only contributed the sum of $400,000—I could prove to the satisfaction of this House, taking the blue-books as they stand, that the city of Toronto consumed more liquor per head of the population than does any other part of the Dominion. I find on referring to the blue-books that the city of Toronto pays a duty on spirits of $801,341; on malt liquors, $8,056; on malt, $155,676, which sums together amount to $965,083. Now, I do not give these figures to show that the people of Toronto are addicted to the use of spirituous and malt liquors more than any other part of the Dominion, but I want to show that if I took the blue-books and gave the city of Toronto credit for drinking the amount of liquor produced in it, I should be pursuing an argument on the same lines as the hon. member for Centre Toronto the other night, when he showed that the city of Toronto paid more duty into the Government than the whole of the Maritime Provinces together. I want to show this House that duty was paid in Toronto on liquor that the people of Toronto never drank. The liquor was scattered over the whole Dominion and the parties who consumed it paid not only the duty on the liquor, but they paid the cost of manufacturing it, they paid the profits of the

wholesale dealer and of the retail dealer; therefore I claim that every province that imported any of that liquor from the city of Toronto, contributed to the revenue of this country just in proportion to what they drank. If I were to show from these figures —and the figures I have quoted will show it—that for each man, woman and child in Toronto, they consumed 10 gallons of spirituous liquor and 24 gallons of malt liquors, that would not be correctly stating the fact. I do not claim that it is so, and for that reason I want to show this House how ridiculous it is for any hon. gentleman to go to the blue-books and try to prove that a province, because it does not contribute directly to the revenue, is, therefore, a drag upon the rest of the Dominion. Taking the blue-books and referring to the Province of Ontario in another way, I think I can show this House, that Ontario does not stand in that proud position that the hon. gentleman would lead this House to believe. I have taken the provinces as provinces to show the population, the value of the imports, the value per head of the imports, the value of the exports, the value per head of the exports, the Customs duties, and the Excise duty, and the amount contributed per head in each province :

Province.	Population.	Value Imports for Consumption.	Per Head	Value Exports.	Per Head	Customs Duty.	Excise Duty.	Customs and Excise Duty per Head.
		$	$ c.	$	$ c.	$	$	$ c.
Prince Edward Island.	125,000	585,859	4 69	887,755	7 10	160,223	43,119	1 63
Nova Scotia	500,000	9,304,148	18 61	9,468,409	18 94	2,288,337	318,712	5 21
New Brunswick	370,000	6,620,394	17 89	6,977,855	18 86	1,505,337	312,320	4 91
Quebec	1,700,000	45,485,026	26 76	44,348,693	26 09	9,952,451	2,793,543	7 49
Ontario	2,200,000	43,684,687	19 86	28,314,586	12 87	8,356,683	3,914,727	5 58
Manitoba	125,000	2,555,285	20 44	988,384	7 90	649,027	253,320	7 22
British Columbia	80,000	4,387,486	54 84	5,763,467	72 04	1,078,507	143,875	15 28
North-West Territories	150,000	142,699	0 95	.....	.....	24,342	.....	0 16
	5,250,000	112,765,584	21 48	96,749,149	18 43	24,014,908	7,779,616	.....

Average value imports per head	$21 48
do exports do	18 43
Average Customs duty do	4 60
do Excise do do	1 48

Prince Edward Island imports, estimated at	$2,685,000
do do exports do	2,303,750
do do Customs duties, estimated at	575,000
do do Excise do do	185,000

Now, I want to show by these figures how unfair it is to go to the blue-books and take this mode of calculation. Every hon. gentleman in this House knows that the reason why British Columbia is credited with $15.28 per head, is because the goods that come to British Columbia are imported there directly, instead of being imported to other provinces and redistributed. To show how ridiculous those figures are when taken from the blue-books, and not explained to the House, I may say that in 1889-90, the years these figures are taken, Prince Edward Island imported only $585,859; whereas in 1872, or nineteen years ago, before Prince Edward Island came into the Dominion, she imported $1,801,935, or over three times as much as she is credited with importing last year. I quote these figures to show how ridiculous is the position that the hon. gentleman from Centre Toronto wished to put Prince Edward Island in, by the figures he quoted the other night. I leave it to himself, and I give him these figures, and I think I can safely say that he will not find a false figure in the lot, even although they are taken from the blue-books, and he must have seen them all. I thought when we came to submit the question of the tunnel to this House, whatever other province we might find opposed to the project, it would not be the Province of Ontario. I have taken the trouble to prepare statistics to show the House how much Prince Edward Island imports from Ontario. Of flour, we imported to the value of $335,000; of farm implements, and I believe this is far below the mark, $150,000; organs and sewing machines, $20,000; pianos, $10,000; of waggons, I have the amount down as $30,000, but to my astonishment, when I made enquiries from some of the manufacturers, I found that a friend of mine in Summerside, Mr. McLeod, imported last year from one Ontario manufacturer waggons to the amount of $26,000, and the Island imported from Ontario sundry other goods to the extent of $440,000. I believe that I am actually far below the correct figures in those I have given. It is, however, difficult to arrive at really satisfactory figures with respect to the trade between the Island and the mainland, but undoubtedly the total imports from Ontario amount to $985,000. I claim that if we were looking for favours for the Island with respect to the tunnel scheme we should appeal to Ontario, and I will attempt to show the House the grounds on which we could do so. The Province of Nova Scotia exchanges goods with the Island almost to the value of what she receives; New Brunswick does the same. In the case of Quebec this is not done to the same extent, but she exchanges goods largely with the Island. But to Ontario we contribute yearly $100,000 more than we export from the Island to all countries outside of the Dominion. According to the blue-books, Prince Edward Island exported to countries outside of the Dominion products to the value of $887,755, while we imported from Ontario goods to the

value of $985,000. I, therefore, claim that if we were looking for favours from the provinces, we could fairly appeal to Ontario. Ontario differs from any other province in regard to Prince Edward Island in that Ontario scarcely buys one dollar's worth of Island produce, whereas Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Quebec are customers for the products we raise. To Ontario alone have we to send hard cash, and that province is the one interested in seeing that the Island should obtain the best market possible for its products. For these reasons, I repeat, we should look for sympathy from Ontario if we were looking for favours. While we expect the support of every hon. member from Ontario and from Quebec, I believe we will certainly obtain the support of every member from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, because they know our position better than do the representatives of the other provinces. The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) in speaking of the Island made a very ridiculous statement when he said that the few eggs and potatoes raised were not of sufficient importance for the Dominion to consider the desirability of building a tunnel from the mainland to the Island. No doubt he led many hon. members to suppose, members who know the hon. gentleman very well, and he has, I understand, a very good reputation for calculating and putting figures in their proper relation if he is disposed to do so, that the Island is not capable of exporting much produce, but only of importing goods to the value of $585,000, according to the blue-books, and, therefore, the item of exports should not be considered in this question. I have gone over the exports of the Dominion for 1890, and I was surprised to find that the Island exported to countries outside of Canada more potatoes than did all the rest of the Dominion. I will give the hon. member for Centre Toronto the figures. The exports of potatoes for 1890 by Canada to countries outside of the Dominion amounted to 1,458,797 bushels. Of this quantity Prince Edward Island shipped 749,049 bushels, while the whole of the other provinces shipped 709,000 bushels. Hon. members may be led to believe that 749,000 bushels was the total quantity the Island had to export; but such was not the case. The Island exported that year to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick 350,000 bushels, and there was produced of starch 1,600 tons, each ton representing 200 bushels of potatoes, or in all 320,000 bushels. So that the exports of potatoes from Prince Edward Island really aggregated 1,419,849 bushels. This was not an extra year, as all hon. gentlemen who are farmers know, and when the accounts come in for the year which closed yesterday the figures will be found far to exceed those I have given. Now, as to the amount contributed to the general revenue by the Island, the people of the Island have not complained that they are paying more than their share to the revenue. That is not the reason why I point out that the Island contributes as much per head as do the other provinces, but whenever this question is brought up, and it is alleged that the Island is a beggar and contributes $600,000 less to the Dominion treasury than she receives, it is desirable to point out that this is not only wildly inaccurate but that if true it should be no reason why the terms of Confederation should not be fulfilled. That is the reason I bring it up. In 1886 a statement showing the amount contributed by the Island, was prepared by Messrs. Sullivan and Ferguson, who were appointed a delegation from the Provincial Government on a question of winter communication, to the Secretary of State for the Colonies. This statement shows the amount contributed by the Island, and I cannot do better than read it to the House. After the speech delivered by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), who put the case very clearly from the Island standpoint and very moderately, I was quite willing to leave the question as it was then submitted to the House, although I might have supplemented his remarks by adding a few figures which I thought he had omitted. The statement to which I refer says:

"The difficulty of arriving at an absolutely correct calculation of the amount of dutiable goods which the people of Prince Edward Island consume cannot fail to be appreciated, yet the undersigned submit that there are several methods by which it may fairly be estimated. It must be premised that the people of the Island are very large consumers of dutiable goods, for the reason that, being chiefly engaged in agriculture and fishing, their manufactures are very small as compared with the rest of Canada, valuing, according to the last census returns, only $31.33 per head to $72.63 per head of the other provinces.

"In proof of the assertion that the people of the Island are principally engaged in agriculture and fishing, the undersigned would again advert to the census returns of 1881, which show that (the North-West Territories not being included)—

"One-half the area of Prince Edward Island is cultivated.

"Only one twenty-fifth of the other provinces is cultivated.

"Prince Edward Island has a population of 51 to the square mile.

"The other provinces only 4·72.

"Prince Edward Island owns 55 head of live stock for every 100 acres of improved land.

"The other provinces only 28.

"In field products, Prince Edward Island raises to the acre of improved land 108¾ bushels.

"The other provinces only 61¼ bushels.

"From the fisheries, Prince Edward Island produces $17.08 per head value.

"The other provinces $3.55.

"The people of the Island are generally in comfortable circumstances, in proof of which may be adduced the amount of deposits per head in the Savings Banks, which averages $16.59 for the Island against $7.66 for the rest of the Dominion.

"These figures clearly prove that the people of Prince Edward Island, from the fact of their not being extensive manufacturers, are under the necessity of using imported goods to a large extent, while the fertility of their soil, the value of their fisheries, and their general independence, demonstrate their ability to purchase. This being understood, the undersigned submit the following calculations, designed to show that the imports of dutiable goods into the Island are very much larger than suggested by the Committee of Council, and consequently the contributions to the revenue proportionately greater."

They take three methods of arriving at the amount that is paid into the general treasury by the people of Prince Edward Island. The first method takes the average revenue of the Dominion They say:

"METHOD 1.

"The average revenue of the Dominion from Customs and Excise, for the three years ended 30th June, 1884, was $27,603,479. The population of Prince Edward Island to that of the whole Dominion is in the proportion of 1 to 39·7. Upon this ratio, the Island's share of the Customs and Excise revenue would amount to $695.301.

"METHOD 2.

"In 1872, the year before its admission into the Union, Prince Edward Island imported directly from countries beyond Canada goods valued at	$1,372,581	
The duty on which amounted to	.....	$184,227
And from Canada, goods the growth and manufacture of other countries, valued approximately at	428,354	
The duty on which amounted to.....	.....	89,168
	$1,801,935	$273,395

That was according to the duties levied before Confederation, which were only 11 per cent. There was, I believe, a duty 2½ per cent. on account of the railway being built, but as there was a large free list, the average duty did not amount to 13 per cent. They go on to say :

"It will surely not be argued that, in thirteen years, with a large increase in population, the Island's imports from countries outside the Dominion have decreased from $1,801,935 to $822,966, or over 45 per cent., yet this would appear to be the contention of the Committee of Council.

"In 1861 the imports of the Island amounted to $1,021,669; in 1872 they had increased to $2,439,064, or at the rate of 138·7 per cent. At the same rate, its imports from countries beyond the Dominion should have increased from $1,801,935 in 1872 to $4,304,824 in 1884, which, at the present average tariff (free and dutiable combined) of 18·64 per cent., would give a Customs revenue of $802,419.

"METHOD 3.

"It is a well established principle that the imports and exports of a country bear a reasonable relation to each other. The imports of the Island for the ten years preceding Confederation aggregated in value £3,543,147 sterling. The exports in the same period, £2,559,091 sterling, showing that the imports exceeded the exports by about £100,000 sterling, or $500,000 annually. The imports of the Dominion for the last seventeen years aggregated in value $1,732,983,486; the exports in the same period, $1,390,946,803, showing that the imports exceeded the exports by about $20,000,000 annually, or in the same proportion, according to population, as the imports of Prince Edward Island exceeded the exports in the years already quoted.

"The exports of the Island have steadily increased during the last twenty-five years. In 1861, it exported to all countries goods valued at $793,810, which had increased in 1872 to $1,497,058, or at the rate of 88 3-5 per cent.

"In 1872, the Island exported to countries beyond the Dominion goods valued at $722,333, which had increased in 1884 to $1,310,039, or at the rate of 81¼ per cent.

"Apply this rate of increase to the Island's imports from countries beyond the Dominion in 1872, and we have as a result for 1884, imports valued at $3,267,509.

"But the figures contained in the Dominion Trade and Navigation Returns do not represent the total exports of the Island to countries beyond the Dominion, inasmuch as a considerable proportion, being shipped through Nova Scotia and New Brunswick territory, is credited to the exports of those provinces. The annual export of horses from the Island to the United States is not less than 1,500, valued at $150,000. The Dominion returns for 1883-84 credit the Island with only 256, valued at $27,486. This is but an instance of many. A considerable part of the large trade which the Island does in eggs with the United States, is credited to New Brunswick, while fish and potatoes, which are largely exported to Newfoundland, St. Pierre and the West Indies, are, much of them, credited to Nova Scotia, being shipped by way of Halifax. In view of these facts, it would be within the mark to estimate, as indeed the Committee of Council admit, that the Island's foreign export trade has doubled since 1872. Apply the same rate of increase to its imports from the countries beyond the Dominion, as they stood in 1872, and we have, as a result, for 1884, imports valued at $3,603,371, yielding under an 18 64-100 per cent. tariff, an annual revenue of $671,668.

"The exports of Prince Edward Island, since Confederation, have increased in a much larger ratio than have those of the Dominion, as the following figures will show :—

"The total exports of the Dominion for 1871-72, were $82,639,683, for 1883-84 exclusive of the Island, $90,096,437, or an increase of only 9 1-42 per cent., as against 100 per cent. by which the Island's exports have increased in the same time.

"To recapitulate the results of the various methods:

"Method 1	$695,301
"Method 2	802,419
"Method 3	671,668
"Average annual contribution by the Island from Customs and Excise	$723,129

Mr. McLEAN.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to show the House that by the three methods which they adopted, the total results they bring out are so nearly alike that I think none of them can be very far astray and that they can be admitted by this House as being as nearly correct as it is possible to get them. The first method of calculation gives a revenue of $695,301, the second $802,419 and the third method $671,668, and if we strike an average it gives us a total of $723,129 that Prince Edward Island contributes in Customs duty and Excise. It will be remembered that the hon. gentleman from Toronto (Mr. Cockburn), leaving the amount of Customs and Excise out altogether, gave us credit for $200,000 received from various sources, and if we add that other amount, $723,000, we have a total of over $900,000 contributed by Prince Edward Island. I claim that this is far nearer and more in accordance with the returns given in the blue-books than the amount mentioned by the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn). If I were to carry out the calculations and take the ten years before we went into Confederation I could show that from 1862 to 1872 and from 1872 to 1882 and from 1882 to 1891 there was such an increase in the goods imported by Prince Edward Island that we would have imports amounting to $4,756,000, and the duty at the rate we paid last year would be $1,608,937. I do not claim that these figures are correct, because we all know that Prince Edward Island purchases more goods of the manufacture of the Dominion of Canada since we went into Confederation than we did before. But because the hon. member for Centre Toronto did not find that Prince Edward Island did not pay any duty on sugar in the years I have quoted, it is not fair to say that the people of Prince Edward Island did not consume any sugar in those years. Nor was it fair on his part to say that because he found that Prince Edward Island paid very little Excise duty on tobacco, there being only two factories on the Island, therefore the people of Prince Edward Island do not consume any tobacco. I believe that the people of Prince Edward Island consumed a portion of the liquor manufactured in Toronto; but because the hon. gentleman found that there were no distilleries on Prince Edward Island it was unfair to claim that Prince Edward Island did not consume any spirits or malt liquors at all. It is eighteen years to-day since Prince Edward Island entered Confederation, whether for good or for evil. The people of that Island have never complained of the amount they have had to pay; but they do complain that the Dominion has not carried out the pledges made to Prince Edward Island at that time, with regard to winter communication. Whatever else the members of this House may disagree upon, they will agree that the terms of Confederation, so far as Prince Edward Island is concerned, have not been carried out. That is the grievance of the people of the Island, and they resent the imputation that they have not contributed their share to the general revenue. They have paid all they have been asked to pay; they have contributed all that the contract made with them at Confederation called on them to contribute; and they ask in return that this great

Dominion shall carry out the pledges it made to Prince Edward Island at that time. This is the question before the House at the present time. But for the speech of the hon. member for Centre Toronto, I would not have troubled the House with the array of figures which I have read to-night; but I think I am only doing my duty to the people who sent me here in resenting any imputation that the people of Prince Edward Island do not consume as many goods per head as the people of the rest of the Dominion. They do not, it is true, manufacture as much or import as much from abroad as they did before Confederation; but I am satisfied that if the hon. member for Centre Toronto enquired among the merchants of Toronto, he would find that a great many of the goods imported there from Great Britain and the United States, find their way afterwards to Prince Edward Island. Mr. Speaker, a tunnel is believed by the people of Prince Edward Island, and by a good many people outside of that province, to be the only means by which the terms of Confederation can be properly carried out. In the memorandum submitted a few days ago by the hon. Minister of Finance, we find that world-renowned engineers have pronounced the construction of a tunnel under the Straits of Northumberland to be feasible. There are three estimates made of the cost of the work—one a little over $5,000,000, one about $8,000,000, and one about $11,000,000. I do not think, with the information before the House at the present time, that I could take it upon myself to say which of these tunnels the Government should give to the people of Prince Edward Island. I claim that in constructing this tunnel the Government would not be giving it to the people of Prince Edward Island alone. The trade done with Nova Scotia and New Brunswick is of as much service to the people of those provinces as to the people of Prince Edward Island. In equalizing the prices of farm products alone, it would have a beneficial effect on Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. But to the people of Prince Edward Island it would be the means of giving a market, and extending the time during which that market would be available. Now, I say that both parties in this House are pledged to give Prince Edward Island efficient communication, summer and winter, if it is found possible to do it within a reasonable amount; so that the only question for this House to consider is whether the amount necessary for the construction of a tunnel is a reasonable amount. I cannot do better than show this House the loss which the people of Prince Edward Island sustain in being unable to ship their products to market. In Prince Edward Island, as hon. gentlemen belonging to the Maritime Provinces know, although it may not be so well known in Provinces like Ontario where they have an early harvest, our harvests come in very late. Last year, for instance, our harvest was not housed until the middle of October, owing to the unusual wetness of the season. In ordinary seasons we are not able to complete harvesting our grain until the 1st of October. In that respect we are placed in a different position from the other provinces. Prince Edward Island raises more potatoes to the acre than any other province of the Dominion. A great many farmers raise as much as 2,000 bushels, and some as much as 4,000 bushels. The farmers of this House can understand how long it will take a farmer to house from 2,000 to 4,000 bushels of potatoes in the fall of the year. An hon. gentleman the other evening, in speaking of a railroad, remarked that in some parts of the Dominion the people did their fall-ploughing at the very time that the people of Prince Edward Island housed their potatoes. The people of Prince Edward Island have a very short time in which to do their fall-ploughing; in fact, in seasons like last year they get scarcely any done at all. During the month of October, when the farmers are housing their potatoes, the markets in the United States and in the neighbouring provinces are low and the most of the potatoes that find their way to the Boston, New York and Philadelphia markets go there before they are housed at all. They are shipped to these markets at a time when the products of those countries come into competition with them. It is the 1st of November before any potatoes are shipped in quantities outside of those shipped to the Maritime Provinces. This being the case, as a merchant doing business in Prince Edward Island, I find that whereas you can charter a vessel to take potatoes to Boston in October at from 12 cents to 15 cents a bushel, at the time the market is likely to be of any service, as in November or December, these rates go up to 18 cents and sometimes as high as 25 cents a bushel; and as soon as the 1st of December arrives, every hon. member in this House knows that in the Gulf of St. Lawrence insurance rates go up from 1, 2 to 4 or 5 per cent., and sometimes it is not obtainable at all. These expenses have all to be charged against the products of our farms, which are shipped to the neighbouring provinces and the United States. Again we know that, from the 1st of November until the middle of December, the people of the Island have only six weeks in which to ship 1,500,000 bushels of potatoes; and any hon. gentleman who will give this matter a moment's attention will understand how hard it is for us to send 1,500,000 bushels of potatoes to a near market like the neighbouring provinces or to the United States and find a profitable sale for it, while the people of the Island are competing with each other in these markets. It is well known that sometimes we ship a good many of those potatoes to the Halifax market, which is the market, to a fair extent, for many of our products. It is also well known, and the hon. members from Halifax will bear me out, that sometimes after westerly winds have prevailed for several weeks, which prevent our vessels reaching their destination, an easterly wind sets in and as many as 70,000 to 80,000 bushels of potatoes arrive in the Halifax market in the one day; and you can understand, Sir, how hard it is for our people, who have no shipping advantages, to have to face this state of things, for they have to make all their shipments in the fall season, within a space of six weeks. If they do not ship in the fall season, they have to house their potatoes until the spring, so that during the winter, while the markets in the United States and the neighbouring provinces may rule very high, the people of the Island are as much excluded from them as if there were no such markets in existence; and besides, in a great many cases, fully 25 per cent. is lost of the quantities they have to store in their cellars before they can be shipped. Again, we have only a market in those places from the middle of May to the middle of June, because then the markets fall off;

and if not shipped in the previous fall, the potatoes have to be shipped in a very short time in the spring of the year, so that we are obliged to compete against one another. And what is true of potatoes applies to all other Island products. Those are some of the disadvantages the people of Prince Edward Island have to contend against, through not having the means of getting their products to market. Another loss which the people have to sustain, and which was not touched upon by the hon. member for Queen's, probably because it was not so plain to his mind as to the mind of a merchant, is due to the fact that the imports to the Island—and its imports amount to about $3,000,000 per year—must be brought in during the month of October, or, at the very latest, before the 1st of November, in sufficient quantities to carry us over until the 1st of May of the following year, so that we are obliged to import six months in advance and carry those goods over during all that time. I claim that there is at least a million dollars worth of goods carried over to the Island from October to May, which we would not be obliged to carry were we provided with continuous communication with the mainland. We lose the interest on that money, and more than that, a great many of these goods, in all probability, might have been purchased at lower rates during the winter months. Any business man will know that under those circumstances it requires twice as much capital to carry on the same amount of business in the Island as on the mainland. Take, for instance, a man engaged in the flour trade, and there are 75,000 barrels of flour imported into the Island during the year. A merchant doing business at Pictou can order a carload of flour in Ontario within four or five days of the time that his stock runs out, and is not obliged to import to any extent in advance, whereas on the Island we have to import in October sufficient flour to carry us over until the spring, instead of importing it as we require it. I admit that the cost of the tunnel makes the undertaking a very serious one; but, on the other hand, it would confer more than commensurate benefit to the people of Prince Edward Island and of the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick; and I believe that if the question were submitted to the people of the two latter provinces they would be quite satisfied to support the scheme provided it can be accomplished for a reasonable amount of money. And it has been declared by those world-renowned engineers who have pronounced upon the subject to be feasible. I believe also we would have the good will and assistance, not only of the men doing business in these provinces and who know the advantage it would be to them as well as to the Island, but that even the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn), when he comes to think the matter over, will not be so unfair, representing, as he does, one of the largest constituencies in one of the largest provinces of this Dominion, as to take the stand that because the Island is our smallest province it should not get what is its right; and I am confident even he will give his support to the scheme when the House is called on to vote the money. The Government lose at present the cost of the winter service over what revenue we derive from that service, which amounts to $15,875. They lose also the interest on the cost of the steamer, which amounts to $5,438; and the depreciation and insurance of that steamer amounting to $29,000 a year, and the summer mail subsidy amounting to $5,500, which would not be required if we had the tunnel. That makes a total annual loss of $55,813. Now, there is a loss on the Prince Edward Railway of $105,000 per year. If we had the tunnel built and were in continuous communication with the rest of the Dominion, that loss would be reduced by $75,000 per year. I will explain how that reduction would take place. Any hon. gentleman at all familiar with Prince Edward Island knows that the railway runs almost from one end of the Island to the other. It runs within at least ten miles of each shipping place. It runs from Tignish to Alberton, from Alberton to Summerside, from Summerside to Charlottetown, thence to Georgetown and Souris, all being shipping ports. At present, suppose a man, doing business in Souris or Georgetown, wishes to have a carload of freight carried over to the mainland, he ships to the nearest shipping port; and I venture to say that the loaded cars hauled on the railway are not on an average hauled a distance of over twelve to fifteen miles. For instance they will go from St. Peter's Bay to Souris, or from Morell to Mount Stewart, or from midway between Tignish and Alberton to either Tignish or Alberton. If we were placed by means of the tunnel in communication with the mainland, these cars, instead of being brought to a shipping place and the freight then transhipped on board vessels would travel the whole length of the railway from the place where loaded to their final destination. Not only that, but I claim the tunnel itself would give a revenue of about $75,000 a year; and I further believe, in case that revenue be doubted, that if the matter were submitted to the people of the Island, they would allow a rate to be imposed on the goods passing through that tunnel, which would, beyond doubt, bring the revenue to $75,000 a year. I claim again that if the tunnel were completed, it would increase the trade of the Intercolonial Railway by furnishing it with additional traffic to the extent of $100,000 over and above what the Intercolonial Railway receives at present. Take the articles of potatoes, or oats, or any of the classes of goods shipped from the Island. Any hon. gentleman who will consider for a moment, will know that it is almost tempting a loss to ship from 3,000 to 5,000 or 8,000 bushels of potatoes in a vessel, when they are not actually seasoned, because if we commence early in the season we have to ship the potatoes right out of the field, and if we house them that entails additional cost. I believe that four-fifths of the potatoes shipped from Prince Edward Island to Boston, New York, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, would pass over the Island railway first, and then go through the tunnel, and then pass over the Intercolonial Railway, and be the means of increasing the traffic on the Intercolonial Railway to the extent of $100,000 over its present traffic. If I am right in these figures, they amount to $305.000 per year, which this Government would receive if the tunnel were built, and I claim those figures are pretty nearly correct. I believe that if the Prince Edward Island Railway were in connection with the Intercolonial Railway to-day by any means, the Island railway, instead of showing a loss of $105,000 per year, would be a paying institution, because, if it does not pay at present it is on account of the hauls being so short. For that reason, I claim that, if these figures are right, or nearly right, the terms of

Confederation can be carried out with Prince Edward Island without any material loss to the rest of the Dominion, and I sincerely trust that, when this question comes up, we will have the votes of hon. members on both sides of the House, and that they will not claim that, because Prince Edward Island is the smallest and most insignificant province of the Dominion, the terms made by the older and richer provinces with that province shall not be carried out. A point was raised that this was not a party question. I claim that it is not a party question, but it was a live issue on the Island, as the member for Queen's said, at the last election, and I for one do not wish to deny it. Hon. gentlemen can understand that the question of the tunnel was in this position. The people of the Island were not sure whether the engineers would pronounce it feasible or not, whether the estimates would show that it would cost $5,000,000 or $25,000,000, but they expected that this Parliament, after the reports of first-class engineers had been received, if those reports showed that the tunnel was feasible and could be built for a reasonable amount of money, would deal honestly and fairly with the Island. There were letters and telegrams received from gentlemen on both sides of politics, and I will trouble the House by reading some of them. There was the following letter from the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald to Senator Howlan :—

"EARNSCLIFFE,
"OTTAWA, 6th February, 1891.

"MY DEAR HOWLAN,—In response to your pressing request with respect to the tunnel across the straits, I desire to repeat that, under the present circumstances, the Cabinet are not in a position to deal with the question. If, as I believe, the country will continue to give us its confidence, the Ministry will, under my guidance, take the matter up without delay. I understand that Sir Douglas Fox is of opinion the scheme is a feasible one. The chief thing still unknown is the cost of construction. I fully appreciate the nature and extent of the obligation incurred by the Dominion to maintain continuous communication between the Island and the mainland. We have tried to carry this out by the *Stanley*, but of course she cannot fight against the elements. So, if the cost comes within a reasonable amount, such as Parliament feels itself justified in incurring, I shall be prepared to submit the question for their favourable consideration.

"I am, yours sincerely,
"JOHN A. MACDONALD."

I claim that that was just such an answer as we might expect, the question being in the position it was at that time. The right hon. gentleman did not know, when the estimates of the engineers came down, whether they would be such as could be entertained. We have a telegram from Sir Charles Tupper to Hon. D. Ferguson :

"I regret deeply that it is impossible for me to go to the Island as the *Stanley* cannot cross, and I dare not attempt the Capes. I have satisfied myself that the tunnel can be made for six million dollars, and you may rely upon all the aid I can give to that important and necessary work.

"AMHERST, 28th February, 1891."

I claim that this is quite a proper telegram. Sir Charles Tupper knew exactly the terms upon which Prince Edward Island entered the union, and he knew that these terms had not been fulfilled, and that the expenditure of $6,000,000 would place Prince Edward Island in a similar position to that of the other provinces—in such a position that they would feel, as they have not yet felt, that they are part and parcel of the Dominion, that they are truly a province of the Dominion in every respect, and that every dollar's worth of taxation placed upon the rest of the Dominion they should assume their share of. They have not felt that yet, but if they have this communication afforded them they will not hesitate to bear their share of the burdens of the whole country. We also had a telegram from the leader of the Opposition. I always heard, before I saw him, that he was a man of honour and stood high in this country. We know, of course, that he must stand high before he could occupy the position he does to-day. Since I came to this House, and since I have seen and heard him, I have come to the same conclusion—that he is an honourable and high-minded man ; and it is clear that he knew that this would be a live question in the Island at the last election. Here is a telegram from the Hon. Mr. Laurier to L. H. Davies, Esq. :

"I am in favour of the tunnel, provided the surveys show the scheme is reasonable and practicable."

That telegram is quite correct and proper. He knew the terms upon which the Island entered in as well as other hon. gentlemen did, and this telegram is quite correct and proper. Then there is a telegram to the editor of the *Guardian*, and I am quoting these telegrams, not to find fault with them, but to show that on both sides these gentlemen knew that this was a live issue, and made these statements not to influence the election but as a promise to carry out the terms of the union. This is a letter from the Hon. Mr. Laurier to the editor of the *Guardian* :

"DEAR SIR,—I have your favour of the 2nd February inst. I hardly would have thought that an expression of opinion as to the construction of a tunnel to connect the Island of Prince Edward with the mainland should be required from me. Every man who has given any attention to the condition of things and the necessities involved by the entering of the Island into Confederation must admit that such a tunnel must be constructed if the thing is reasonably practicable. The first requisite is to have an accurate survey and reliable estimates. I am only sorry that these were not obtained long ago.

"W. LAURIER."

This puts the two political parties in this House in exactly the same position. They both realized that the terms of Confederation had not been carried out, and those letters were written to show their willingness to have the terms carried out, so soon as an opportunity offered. In conclusion, let me say that I would not have troubled the House so long but that I felt that I would not be doing my duty to the county I represent and the Island from which I come, did I not place this matter fully before the House, and I have endeavoured to do so fairly and honestly, as the case presented itself to me.

Mr. PERRY. The other night I was trying to make a speech when the hon. gentleman rose who has now addressed the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Louder.

Mr. PERRY. I do not think that gentleman is very deaf and I think he can hear me ; I am sure he can. I intend to divide what I have to say into two parts—one as to the consideration of the question itself, and the other to address a few words to my friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn). Really, I sympathise with that gentleman. I felt sorry when he had to attack a Tory newspaper published in Prince Edward Island and condemn it. I was also sorry to hear his friend the Tory member for King's County (Mr. McLean) give him such a tongue-lashing, and I

think he might well exclaim: Save me from my friends. I will first pay some attention to the tunnel, because I think it is of more importance to the people of Prince Edward Island than all the gas which may emanate from the hon. member for Centre Toronto. The question of a tunnel has, from the time I entered this House, agitated the people of Prince Edward Island. We had a question for some years of a subway, a metallic tunnel, but some time last summer the scheme was found to be impracticable; and Senator Howlan, who was the manager and agitator of this scheme, commenced to agitate the building of a tunnel as the most feasible scheme to enable the Government to carry out the terms of Confederation which were signed between them and Prince Edward Island. During last fall and winter Senator Howlan had some correspondence with certain engineers on that subject. One of the engineers was Sir Douglas Fox, of London. I am told one of the ablest engineers in the world, who was assisted by Mr. Palmer and Mr. Bayne. Sir Douglas Fox has made a report on the subject, and the Minister of Finance told us the other day that he had made an estimate. I do not know whether the Government have a good report; I cannot say, as I am not in the secrets of the Government. I do not know whether they have a report in full. We are told by the Minister of Finance that Sir Douglas Fox made an estimate for a 12-foot tunnel, a 16-foot and an 18-foot tunnel.

An hon. MEMBER. Will the hon. gentleman speak a little louder?

Mr. PERRY. If hon. gentlemen opposite cannot hear they had better come over on this side of the House. No one is so deaf as those who will not hear. If the hon. member opposite will keep quiet I will get through sooner. I think it is the part of a gentleman, when an hon. member is addressing the House, to behave himself, and if he does not know better I will teach him. As I said before, it is not for me to say whether the estimate for a 12-foot tunnel is correct, or whether a tunnel of that size is sufficient for the traffic between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. It is not for me to say whether we require a 16 or an 18-foot tunnel. I leave that to the engineers; but I do say that the Government, having decided to spend a few dollars in trying to ascertain a proper estimate from an engineer, we have a right to ask the Government to tell us whether a 12-foot tunnel is sufficient to carry on the traffic between Prince Edward Island and the mainland; and we have a right to ask them to tell us whether a 16 or an 18-foot tunnel is required to carry produce and passengers between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. I am not aware whether the Government have pronounced themselves upon it; I dare say they would do so if we were on the eve of an election, because this question has been made use of in the Province of Prince Edward Island, as a general rule, on the eve of an election. We know very well that it was made use of in 1887 as a means of endeavouring to return members supporting the present Government. They failed. We know very well that in the last election it was made use of to support the candidates of the Government; we know very well that the Government induced Senator Howlan to resign his seat and to run for the House of Commons, with the understanding that if he was defeated he would be reappointed to the Senate. He came to the province fortified with a tunnel scheme; he supposed that nobody else in the Island could speak in favour of the tunnel but himself, and he found he was mistaken. The people in Prince Edward Isand are so much in favour of a tunnel that every candidate for or against the Government was pledged to support it. Senator Howlan was defeated; he got his reward and was reappointed. But, Mr. Speaker, the fact that Senator Howlan was defeated does not show that the people are not in favour of a tunnel. At that time every Liberal in Prince Edward Island expected, as they had a right to expect, that there was going to be a change for the better in the management of Dominion affairs. Sir, we expected that the present leader of the Opposition would lead the Government; he surely will do so if there is going to be a day of salvation for this country. Well, Sir, knowing the present leader of the Opposition to be a man of honour, the Liberals of Prince Edward Island, and even the Tories, trusted him—we have the acknowledgment of one of the rankest Tories in Prince Edward Island that the Tories of Prince Edward Island have every confidence in my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. That was enough to satisfy the Liberals and Tories of that province that if the Liberals got into power, having the word of the leader of the Opposition to that effect, we were satisfied the tunnel would be constructed under his administration, if it were found to be practically feasible, and to cost within a reasonable amount. Sir, the leader of the Opposition has not pledged himself any stronger than did the late right hon. gentleman who had the honour of leading this Parliament for so many years. I am not going to take the trouble of reading his letter; it has been read by my hon. and learned friend from Queen's County, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies); it has been read by my friend on my left, the member for King's County (Mr. McLean), and I am not going to trouble the House by reading it again. The House has also heard the telegram from the High Commissioner, and that telegram must mean something. When Sir Charles Tupper penned that telegram to Mr. Ferguson, in Charlottetown, who was then a candidate in the interest of the Government, with a view of trying to secure the election of that hon. gentleman, surely he meant to carry out his promises. We know well that he was sent for by the Dominion Government—they have acknowledged it—in order to help the Government to secure their re-election; and when he got through with his campaign in the west he was sent down to the east to influence the election on behalf of the Government. Well, Sir, he did not reach Prince Edward Island; he could not reach it—and why? Because there was no tunnel. If there had been a tunnel the High Commissioner would have gone to Prince Edward Island and he would have been able, I suppose, to get some of the candidates returned to support the Government, and perhaps the whole of them, because he is all-powerful, although I doubt very much whether he would have been able to bribe the electors of that province. I know that he is a great hand at making promises, but it requires more than promises to bribe the electors. I hope and trust that when the people of my county allow themselves to be caught by chaff like that it

will be in a moment of weakness. Now, I contend that the Government are morally bound, if they can see their way clear, to build that tunnel, if it can be built for a reasonable sum. If it is not going to cost more than $6,000,000 they are not only bound to build it, but the people of Prince Edward Island will hold them to it; and I tell the Government now that they need not be surprised if the Government of Prince Edward Island enters a suit against them for damages to the extent of $8,000,000 or $10,000,000 if they do not soon commence that work. Hon. gentlemen opposite know very well that promises have been made. Are they going to allow the honour of Canada to be trampled upon? Are they going to allow the whole world to frown upon Canada because she will not carry out her sacred compact with the smallest province in the Dominion? I was expecting the other night, when the member for Queen's made his address, that the Minister of Finance would stand up here and tell the country what the policy of the Government was going to be, or whether they had come to any understanding or conclusion on the matter; but we did not hear one word from the Government. We merely know that they have had an estimate from Sir Douglas Fox as to the cost, but we do not know whether they officially consider the scheme to be feasible. We know that some of them think, including Senator Howlan, that the scheme is a feasible one. Sir Douglas Fox has said so, but I complain that we have not got officially the opinion of the Government upon that point. Perhaps they have got these papers in their pockets; and while I am on that subject I want them to produce the information which I asked for on the 12th May last, for certain documents, certain statistics from the Department of Marine, showing the yearly cost to the Government of carrying out, in an inefficient and slovenly way, the means of connection between Prince Edward Island and the mainland; and I want to show by those papers that the yearly expenditure of the Government in carrying out winter navigation will be very nearly the interest that we would have to pay on five or six million dollars to build the tunnel. But to my sorrow and surprise, I have not yet obtained those papers, although six or seven weeks have elapsed. The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) the other night gave figures that I believe are in the return. I believe that he got them from some member of the Government, and if he can have these figures, while I, a member interested in the building of the tunnel, and a member having made a motion in the early part of the session, only thirteen days after the meeting of the House and four or five days after we had been in session, and when the time of our sittings could be almost counted in minutes, it does not reflect credit on the Government. What are the Minister of Marine and his subordinates doing in the department? I offered him my services gratis the other day, and if he would allow me to have the use of these papers I could make a compilation in a few hours. How could the member for Centre Toronto tell us that only seventy passengers came to and went from the Island, unless he had seen the papers or return, or unless the Minister had told him? Have we come to this, that a member who is not interested in a certain project can obtain information to enable him to reply to a member representing a different province, and thwart his views and wishes? I do not believe this should take place. I consider the Government bound in honour to build the tunnel if it is feasible. That it is practicable we know; the cost we do not know. We know the cost of a 12, 16, or 18-foot tunnel. I contend it is the duty of the Government to ascertain which of these three sizes is required for the Island tunnel. I do not stand here to say that either the 12, 16, or 18-foot tunnel is sufficient. It is the duty of the Government to find that out. The people of the Island, moreover, demand that the Government shall, before the close of the session, announce themselves squarely on this question, and state whether they are going to adopt any of these sizes, and whether they are going to commence operations as soon as practicable, or whether they are going to give up the project. Our people do not intend to give up the agitation for a tunnel, or the agitation to force the Dominion Government to carry out the terms of union which three representatives of the Dominion Government signed in 1873. What were we told by the Colonial Minister in 1885, when delegates from the Island laid at the foot of the Throne a memorial from the people of the Island, signed unanimously by both Houses of the Legislature? Lord Granville said:

"As I stated in the earlier part of this despatch, although Her Majesty's Government is unable to take the question out of the hands of the Dominion Government, and although I have not seen more than a *prima facie* opinion as to the feasibility, at a moderate cost, of the proposal for its solution, I hope that it will be found to admit of a satisfactory settlement. On the one hand, the expectations of the province in regard to the establishment of a constant and efficient communication with the mainland have not been fulfilled."

Those words mean a great deal. Lord Granville told the Government of Canada that their promises had not been fulfilled, that the terms of union had not been carried out, and that they owed it to the Island to carry out those terms. If the Government want to carry out these terms of Confederation they will not do it by the steamer *Stanley* or any other steamer, although I am bound to say that the *Stanley* is a very fine boat, and I doubt if any other boat could be built to perform the service any better; but all who are acquainted with the navigation of the Straits of Northumberland know there are certain times during the year when a steamer cannot cross. Much information will be afforded to the House if we had the return for which I moved on 12th May. We would know how many trips the steamer made; when she commenced and closed; the number of days she was in ice at different periods; how long the people of the Island were without their mails; whether on a certain day the steamer was eight or ten days in the ice five or six miles from shore, and the passengers had to take their lives in their hands and walk over the ice to the shore, facing the danger of drowning? But I suppose the Minister of Marine expected this question would be disposed of before this information was obtained. If that was his idea, I do not think it is much credit to him or to the Government. Lord Granville proceeded to say:

"But on the other hand, the Dominion Government has shown that it has made considerable efforts to improve the communication, in the face of serious physical difficulties during the winter season. There seems to be reason for doubting whether any really satisfactory communication by steamship can be regularly maintained all the year round, which makes it all the more important that

the proposed 'metallic subway' should receive a full, and, if feasible, favourable consideration on the part of the Government of the Dominion."

That is very friendly advice given to the Government by Lord Granville—advice which the Government should attempt to carry out. The noble Lord proceeds to say :

"The establishment of constant and speedy communication by rail would be a great advantage both to the province and to the Dominion, and I should suppose that the development of the traffic on the Island railroads, and of the capabilities of the province generally, would produce a large direct and indirect return on the expenditure.

"It would reflect great credit on the Dominion Government, if, after connecting British Columbia with the eastern provinces by the Canadian Pacific Railway, it should now be able to complete its system of railway communication by an extension to Prince Edward Island."

This was sound advice. Up to this time the Government have not taken a single step towards carrying it out. It is true they have estimates from Sir Douglas Fox; I suppose they have had them five or six weeks, but we have not heard anything in regard to them. The Government has not told the House what the estimates contained besides the cost, for we have so far received very bald information. I expect, before the session closes, that the Government will come forward and tell the House whether they are going to build the tunnel or not. Much has been said by the hon. member for King's with respect to this matter. He has dealt more particularly with figures than he has dealt with anything else, and his figures were so numerous and extensive—I will not say they were not to the purpose—that he has left very little for me to say on that score. I wish to show now the great hardship and great loss to the people of Prince Edward Island through the want of having direct communication with the mainland, summer and winter. The potatoes which we grow on the Island, and which are one of our chief articles of export, are not worth so much as the potatoes grown in Nova Scotia, and for what reason? Simply because the people of Prince Edward Island are not able to reach the markets in time to get a fair price. The time that our potatoes should reach the market would be during March and April, and at that time we are not able to send them across, while the people on the mainland, who ship their potatoes to the United States at that time, get the best price for them. I will read to the House a table which will show the effect of this. In 1889 Ontario shipped 102,253 bushels of potatoes, which realized $66,615, or 65 cents a bushel; Nova Scotia shipped 672,872 bushels, which realized $355,655, or 52 cents a bushel; Manitoba exported 90,858 bushels, which realized $47,059, or at the rate of 47 cents a bushel; New Brunswick exported 350,846 bushels, realizing $161,482, or 46 cents a bushel; Quebec exported 169,845 bushels, which realized $76,507, or at the rate of 45 cents a bushel; and Prince Edward Island exported 1,294,056 bushels, which realized $343,177, or 26 cents a bushel. This shows conclusively that it takes two bushels of potatoes in Prince Edward Island to realize as much money as one bushel sold in Nova Scotia—and why is that the case? It is because we have no tunnel, because we have no means of transporting the potatoes from the Island to the mainland at that time of the year when we should be able to take advantage of the market. That shows that the people of the Island are labouring under a great many disadvantages. But there is more than that. Our merchants in the fall of the year have to import goods very largely; in fact, they have to provide themselves with stock for the whole winter, and the result is that they are paying heavy interest on large amounts, as they have to carry a large quantity of goods in their shops for the winter season; whereas if they were in daily communication with the mainland they could get these articles across as they wanted them, and the people of Prince Edward Island would be able to buy the articles which they consume much cheaper than at the present time. I wish now to show the House the quantity of the produce in Prince Edward Island, and even if you deduct a large amount for home consumption you will find that there is still a large amount of agricultural produce to be exported. According to the census of 1881 we find that there were grown in Prince Edward Island oats to the value of $3,538,219, 6,042,191 bushels of potatoes and 1,191,817 bushels of turnips. These are only a few items, but they show that Prince Edward Island is a productive country, and the only means which the people have to make a little money and to pay their debts and become a little comfortable is by what they can obtain from the land. My hon. friend the member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) told us the other day in his jokes—certainly his jokes did not please me very well, and I do not know how he pleased others, but I suppose he pleased himself—he told us that the Island paid in revenue and Customs and Excise only $190,000 a year, and that we should be satisfied with the expenditure of that $190,000, and that that is all we should have. The rumour went abroad some time ago that the hon. gentleman was sure to get a seat in the Cabinet, and if that is the case the Lord help poor Prince Edward Island. If the time has come when the administration of public affairs is to be left in the hands of such narrowmindedness as that, all I have to say is: God help the country. If each province is only to get according to the revenue it pays in Customs and Excise as shown by returns, I am sorry to have to tell the hon. gentleman that his Province of Ontario is going to come out very short indeed. I find from the returns that in the year 1881 the average per head paid by the population of Quebec in Customs and Excise was $7.29 per head, and in 1884 it was $7.54. The Province of Ontario in 1881 paid $4.78 per head in Customs and Excise and in 1884 it paid $5.14 per head of the population. If the narrowmindedness of the hon. gentleman's policy is to be carried out, then the Province of Quebec would have to get a refund of $3 per head of its population each year, for over twenty years, and if that was the case where would Ontario be found? Why, Sir, if Ontario had to turn to now and recoup Quebec to the amount of twenty or twenty-five million dollars where would the hon. gentleman's policy be? If the member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) is going to carry out that policy, and if that policy is to be applied to little Prince Edward Island, he must apply the same principle to the larger provinces. I hope that in future the hon. gentleman will be a little more charitable, and a little fairer, and that he will sleep to-night and get up to-morrow morning with a sense of doing justice to the smallest province of the Dominion. If the hon. gentleman had been

brought up in the climate of Prince Edward Island and had been fed upon its products he would never have in his breast such narrowmindedness as that; he would follow the principle which is our motto in Prince Edward Island—*Parva sub ingenti*, which means, I suppose, that the smaller one should be protected by the larger one. But according to my hon. friend's policy, the dear help the little one in the bonds of the big one. I think I have read enough to show that Prince Edward Island is not such a despicable little country—that it does a great deal to keep Ontario, that it has a large trade with Ontario, that it buys a great deal of flour, machinery, waggons and other goods from Ontario, perhaps amounting to $100,000 a year, perhaps $200,000, perhaps half a million; I have not the statistics here to show. Let me tell my hon. friend that a tunnel from Prince Edward Island to the mainland will not be for the accommodation of the Island alone, but for the accommodation of travelling agents from Ontario, who are there every day in force trying to cross. Sir, they have overdone their manufacturing in Ontario, and they must find new markets somewhere else; but my hon. friend is so narrow-minded that he will not let the people of Ontario come to Prince Edward Island. How can we pay our bills to the people of Ontario? Can you show me one instance where a Prince Edward Island customer of an Ontario manufacturer has dishonoured his bill? Echo will not answer. And how did they pay their bills? By selling their potatoes and paying twenty-five cents a bushel for the privilege of sending them to the United States market; by paying two dollars on a barrel of mackerel; by paying thirty per cent. on their horses. This is the way the people of Prince Edward Island are handicapped, and they must go to the United States to find a market. The hon. Minister of Finance may go to the West Indies, he may go to China, if he wishes, he may go all over the world, to endeavour to open up new markets for Canada; but he will not do it; it is impossible, and all the brains and power of the Government will not enable them to alter the geographical conditions of the world. The United States will always be the nearest market for the people of Prince Edward Island. We are asking the Dominion of Canada to carry out the sacred compact made with Prince Edward Island, so as to enable our people to compete with the Dominion; but, Sir, we hear not a word from the Government. The hon. Minister of Finance will not stand up and tell us what they intend to do. If there were another election I have no doubt he would come to the people of Prince Edward Island and make them believe that to-morrow or some other day they would go on with this tunnel. But I do not want this tunnel to do service in another election. Let us have fair-play and justice; that is all that the people of Prince Edward Island are asking for. If the Dominion of Canada does not intend to carry out its pledge with Prince Edward Island, in the name of common sense cut us adrift. We are not afraid to go on our own way; we were a successful and happy people before we entered Confederation. But we are handicapped now, and we are inclined to find fault with the Government. They tell us: Why do you not send members to support us? If you had elected Senator Howlan, no doubt the tunnel would be built. The men sent to this Parliament were pledged to support a tunnel, and I have yet to learn that every man in a province must be a Government supporter before that province can obtain justice at the hands of the Government. If that is the policy of the Government, and I must say it looks very much like it, let us know it. But let me give the Government this bit of advice, that the sooner they make up their minds what they are going to do in this matter, the sooner Prince Edward Island will prepare for the alternative. I am not going to say what it is; but let me tell the Government that we do not intend to sleep over our rights. Although we are a small people, perhaps not more than 120,000, we know how to look after our rights, and our rights we will get. We have the Colonial Minister to advise fairly and squarely what to do in this matter, and there is no fear but that we will get justice. It may take some time, but the day will come when the people of Prince Edward Island will get justice, and that may be much sooner than my hon. friends on the other side expect. It may happen before this session closes, perhaps before next session, that the hon. gentlemen now occupying the Opposition benches will occupy the Treasury benches, and if they do the tunnel is going to be built. I believe that if the Opposition got into power to-morrow, they would go to work honestly to carry out the terms of Confederation between the Island and the Dominion, and the tunnel is the only means that I know of by which the terms of Confederation can be carried out. Although the Government pretend to be so deaf as not to hear a word when a man shouts at the top of his voice, still they know very well that the terms of Confederation have not been carried and cannot be carried out without a tunnel or something like it. To send a steamer to cross from Georgetown to Pictou is not carrying out the terms of Confederation. The crossing by the Capes is not praticable in winter. A sub-way was spoken of for several years, but it is a fizzle; it has fallen to the ground. The only satisfactory means is a tunnel, and we have an engineer of the world-wide reputation of Sir Douglas Fox stating that the construction of a tunnel is perfectly practicable. We have also the promise of the late Sir John A. Macdonald that if practicable and if the cost would be within a reasonable amount, he would, if returned to power, advise his supporters to build the tunnel; we have the telegram of Sir Carles Tupper stating: "I am now satisfied the tunnel can be built for $6,000,000, and you may depend on me doing all I can to support the scheme." Having all these promises, is it anything but reasonable that the people of Prince Edward Island should call upon the Government to give them the opportunity of realizing the expectations thus held out to them? I have yet some faith that the Government is going to build this tunnel. They have already some little money engaged in it. I suppose they paid some money to Senator Howlan when he went on that mission to England. I do not know how much they paid him, but the Government of the Island paid him $400 and the people have a right to know what has been done with that $400. I do not mean to say that Senator Howlan did not make good use of it, but we have a right to know what the estimates are, and whether the Government are sincere, and when they are going to begin.

Have the Government satisfied themselves that the scheme is practicable and that it is within our means to build it? The people of Canada, if they have paid $1,000 or $2,000 towards this business, have the right to know what has been done with the money. They are entitled to know whether the sending of Senator Howlan to England was only a farce, or whether the Government were really honest in their intention to ascertain whether this work was feasible and what it would cost. I contend that the people of Prince Edward Island have a better right to expect the building of the tunnel than the people of Nova Scotia had to expect the building of the Chignecto Ship Railway, which is going to cost fully as much or more than the contemplated tunnel. There was no obligation on the part of the Government to build that railway, nor was there any immediate want of it, for the Straits of Canso will let any vessel out from the shores of Prince Edward Island or New Brunswick or into those shores. But that is not the case with the Island, which is completely isolated at present; and it would be far more reasonable for the Government of Canada to spend $5,000,000 or $6,000,000 in building the tunnel and thus carry out the terms of Confederation than to spend the same amount of money in building this ship railway, concerning which there was no obligation whatever. I do not find fault with the people of Nova Scotia for getting all the money they can, and they appear to believe that they have a right to suck from the Government all the milk they can get. It is nothing but railroads here and railroads there with them, but while I wish them luck with their railways, I would like to see every other part of Canada equally well treated; and I protest against this tyrannizing over the smallest province of the Dominion. Our Island has paid her fortieth share of our $270,000,000 public debt, and we have to bear our share of interest on that money; and what are we getting in exchange? Hon. gentlemen opposite need not cast up to me that Canada has built a railway for us. That matter has been explained by my hon. friend from King's, the railway belongs to the people of the Island. We were charged $3,500,000 in the financial statement between the Island and Canada at the time of Confederation, and if the Government had not built that railway we would be drawing 5 per cent. on that amount, or $165,000 annually from the Dominion exchequer besides the amount on which we are drawing interest now. That goes to show that the railway was built at our own expense. The Government may say that they are sinking $50,000 or $60,000 a year in it. No wonder. If there was constant communication with the mainland that road would pay, because there is no country in the Dominion more productive than the Island. Every mile through which that road travels is renowned for its fertility. Now, with respect to the statement that we pay less into the Dominion exchequer than we get, a table was made up in 1885 by the delegates we sent to England, which shows that we paid into the Dominion Exchequer $153,913 a year more than we get. The Committee of the Privy Council was at that time composed of Mr. McLellan and Sir Alexander Campbell, and they reported that we got yearly from the Dominion $723,129. Now any one who examines the blue-books knows that, in 1873, at the time we entered Confederation, when we had a tariff of 12½ per cent. our revenue was something like $400,000. At that time we had a population of 81,000, which has since increased to 115,000 or 120,000. And what has been the increase of the tariff? More than 100 per cent., and in some cases 150 per cent., and if you will make the calculation in this case, you will find that the revenue of Prince Edward Island must be $1,000,000. Again, the revenue of the Dominion, yearly, is about $40,000,000, and the population of Prince Edward Island is one-fortieth that of the Dominion; and I am sure every hon. gentleman must admit that Prince Edward Island consumes as much per head of the population as any other province in the Dominion. If we do not import direct from England, we import from Quebec, Montreal, Ontario, St. John, N.B., and Halifax, and you will find, Sir, that our contribution to the revenue will be in the vicinity of $1,000,000. That being the case, we have a balance against the Government of over $200,000 per year, which, in eighteen years, amounts to a very snug little sum, and what will it be in the future? The Government cannot boast that they have ever done much for the Island. They cannot boast that they have built any great works there. It is true they have built a very valuable breakwater at Souris, but that is not the only thing required on the Island. There are many other things required, and let me tell hon. gentlemen opposite that Prince Edward Island is part and parcel of the Dominion, and, I would ask, is she to be tyrannized over because she is the smallest province? I trust the Government will act magnanimously and do its duty, and that is all we ask. All we ask is for a certain measure of justice. We want no favours, but we want our own or, at all events, a part of our own; and I have yet some hopes that the Government will, in the future, see their way clear to doing us justice. If the Government think they require an addition to their number, and if they will to-morrow set to work earnestly to build that tunnel I will give them my support.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PERRY. Let us see how honest and sincere you will be on that side of the House, and whether you will carry out what you say. I am afraid those are crocodile tears and that they resemble the "hoo-hoo" of the owl. I hope my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) will have a good sleep to-night and that, when he wakes up, he will not find he has been too badly hit. When he began to read from that newspaper, I thought he must be reading from the *Patriot*, which is a Grit newspaper, but I found he was reading from the *Examiner*, one of the most rabid Tory papers, a paper which is subsidized by this Government at the rate of $2,000 a year, and one for which my hon. friend from Toronto has given his vote. Is he prepared to swallow and endorse all that? I will have some charity for him and will not say much to him. What is he going to say to my friend from King's County (Mr. McLean)? I never heard such a skinning as he got from his Tory friend. I suppose it was sweet, because it came from a Tory, but, if it had come from a Grit, I suppose there would have been a row. I hope my hon. friend has a different opinion now as to the capacity of Prince Edward Island. He will find, if he goes

there, that the people will entertain him as a gentleman, he will have potatoes, beef, pork, mackerel, codfish, salmon, cheese, butter, cream, tea—not green tea, but black tea—to drink, and he will come home satisfied that Prince Edward Island is the prettiest place, the most wholesome place and the most fruitful place in the Dominion of Canada and that the people are the most hospitable. I have always heard a good name of the people of Ontario, and I have travelled in that province, but I think the hon. gentleman must be an exception, he must have come there very lately; I do not think he is one of the original race of the people of Ontario, but I know that from this time out he will have a different opinion of the character of Prince Edward Island and the productions of that Island, and, when we ask for what is fair, he, expecting a seat in the Cabinet, will not again attempt to turn the Island into ridicule. He insulted every man in Prince Edward Island. He insulted every Tory in Prince Edward Island. There are not many of them, but he insulted those that are there. He insulted the intelligence of the people. I was almost going to say he insulted the Almighty who created the Island, and He was not penurious when He created it for He gave it a very good soil. When the hon. gentleman gets that seat in the Cabinet which we know is *in prospectu*, he may be more liberal. We have some hopes that the Government will redeem their pledges and carry out their promises to the people of Prince Edward Island, and that, before we meet here again the work on that tunnel will have been commenced, so that we may see that the Government of Canada is in earnest, and if that is so, every man, woman and child in the country will bless them, and they want a little blessing.

Mr. KENNY. I was not in my place when the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) made the speech that has fallen so unpleasantly on the ears of the hon. gentlemen who represent Prince Edward Island in this Legislature. I understand from their remarks that the hon. member for Centre Toronto undertook to criticize the trade of Prince Edward Island and to strike a balance between its contributions to the Dominion treasury and the amount of imports at Charlottetown and the other outports of the Island, and the amount of the Dominion expenditure in Prince Edward Island. I think the hon. gentlemen from Prince Edward Island are quite warranted in finding fault with that mode of treating the question. I think it is not fair to Prince Edward Island and to the other "shreds and patches" of our Dominion that their contributions to the federal treasury should be so criticized. The hon. gentleman from Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) takes the blue-books and strikes a balance and comes to a conclusion on which he builds an argument that the *per capita* contribution of Prince Edward Island to the Dominion Treasury is only what is shown by these blue-books. That is a most erroneous manner of dealing with the public accounts of the country. We know, those of us who live in the smaller provinces of the Dominion—I speak more particularly of the eastern provinces, and I am as fairly familiar with the trade of Prince Edward Island as nearly anyone who has not the pleasure of living on that Island, that a very large amount of the goods consumed in Prince Edward Island contribute to the federal treasury at ports like Halifax, St. John, New Brunswick, Quebec, Montreal and even Toronto. I hope my hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) will accept the invitation which has been extended so cordially to him by the two gentlemen who have addressed the House this evening, and will visit Prince Edward Island. If he does so, he will find a country which can be compared in agricultural wealth, to say nothing of the invaluable fisheries which surround its shores, but dealing with agricultural wealth alone—because that seems to be the only basis of wealth that gentlemen from Ontario are willing to consider—he will find that Prince Edward Island will compare favourably with the most productive districts in his own Province of Ontario. He will also find there a population as industrious, as law-abiding, as well gifted in all the good things of this world as can be found in any portion of the Dominion. I contend that the people of Prince Edward Island contribute per head to the federal treasury as much as the people of Ontario or any other portion of this Dominion. I must dissent entirely from the form of calculation which I am told my hon. friend had adopted. I should have expected to have heard of it from the other side of the House. That is the kind of argument we are familiar with. Hon. gentlemen opposite are forever telling us, for instance, that this terrible Intercolonial Railway is a great incubus upon Canada. I repeat what I have often said before in this House, and following the line of argument of the gentlemen from Prince Edward Island who have spoken this evening, that the Intercolonial Railway is of more value to the millers and manufacturers of Ontario and Quebec than it is to the people of the Maritime Provinces. My hon. friend need not go all the way to Prince Edward Island to become familiar with the trade of that Island. The next time that the hon. member for Centre Toronto, in his own constituency, will take an opportunity of calling upon any of the large importers there, he will find that they are in the habit of sending their travellers to distant Prince Edward Island, and that a very large amount of the goods consumed there come from the merchants of Toronto and Montreal. Now, Sir, I must entirely dissent from the conclusions of the hon. member for Toronto. The hon. gentleman from King's, P.E.I. (Mr. McLean), made to-night a speech so reasonable and so candid, so energetic and so eloquent, that it won for him the sympathy of hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House, and I have never heard a question more fairly and more candidly treated than it was by that hon. gentleman. He enumerated only a few articles, the products of Ontario, which are annually consumed by the people of Prince Edward Island, and his figures amounted to something like $600,000. Now, Mr. Speaker, I noticed recently in one of our Maritime Province newspapers that one county of Prince Edward Island had exported, within a comparatively short time, potatoes alone to the value of $100,000. As regards the manner in which this question has been treated, that is, drawing conclusions simply from figures in the blue-books, I noticed the other day in looking over the savings banks returns, that the people of Prince Edward Island had in the Government savings banks of this Dominion something over two million dollars. The same page told me that the people of the wealthy city of Toronto had $600,000. Why, Sir,

adopting the mode of the member for Toronto in drawing conclusions from blue-books, I might almost say that the people of Prince Edward Island are more wealthy than the people of Toronto, because they have more money in the Dominion savings bank. Reference has been made at great length to the tunnel by which it is proposed that Prince Edward Island shall be connected with the continent. This is a subject in which we can readily understand that the people of Prince Edward Island are much interested, and concerning which, I think, the members of this House generally are prepared to deal in a fair and impartial manner. Those of us who are living near Prince Edward Island, and are more familiar with the conditions of its population, hope and desire that some such communication may be established between the Island and the mainland; and one hon. gentleman who addressed the House on this matter, asked that when the returns are laid before Parliament, when all the engineers' reports are submitted to this House, if it is then found that this important work can be built and put in working order for what these gentlemen term as a reasonable sum, then this Parliament shall be prepared to deal with the question, and I must say that it is not an unreasonable position for these hon. gentlemen to take. The hon. gentleman who spoke last referred, although not in a complimentary manner, to the action of the Hon. Senator Howlan with reference to this important work. Well, as Senator Howlan is not here, I think it is only fair to him to say, in his absence, that if at any time within the life of any of us a tunnel shall be built, and I hope it will be built, it will be due to the exertions of Senator Howlan more than to the exertions of any other man in Prince Edward Island. The hon. member for King's, Prince Edward Island, pointed out the great disadvantages which the people of that province labour under, owing to their geographical position and the fact that they are compelled to force their agricultural products on the markets of the Maritime Provinces and of the United States, at a season of the year when those markets are, to some extent at least, overstocked with supplies from their own farmers. If the tunnel were built it would, I believe, add to the wealth of the farmers by enabling them to obtain a higher price for their agricultural productions, because they would have a market then open to them at all seasons of the year; it would add to the material well-being of Prince Edward Island, and we cannot improve the condition of the people of Prince Edward Island without their improvement reacting upon the whole Dominion. Therefore, anything we can do to benefit Prince Edward Island will be a benefit to the whole country. Now, Sir, the hon. member for King's, during the course of his very interesting speech, expressed the hope that when this question came to be dealt with by Parliament, it would be dealt with in the broadest possible and comprehensive way. I trust and believe that it will be so. I have no sympathy with gentlemen who are prone to deal with this question from a local or sectional standpoint. I have no sympathy with the *Globe* newspaper when it announces that the people of Ontario are tired of carrying a habitant and a fisherman on their backs. I think that such expressions are to be deplored, coming from the organ of a great party, even if the *quasi* leader of the party is disposed to refer to the Maritime Provinces as mere shreds and patches of the Dominion, for such language is not very funny and cannot be very pleasant to us; it is hardly dealing with the question in a way which will contribute either to the popularity of that paper, or to the influence of the gentlemen who make use of such statements, or in a manner which will redound to the general well-being of the country. I have very much sympathy with the gentlemen from Prince Edward Island in their efforts to secure better communication with the mainland, and I am quite sure that when the question is submitted to this Parliament, it will receive that careful consideration to which its importance entitles it.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I feel it my duty to say just a word or two on this question. I must congratulate hon. members from Prince Edward Island for the gallant fight they have made on this question. Having had the pleasure last fall of visiting that beautiful province, which is called by the inhabitants the garden of Canada, I am in a position to know the importance of this question for those people, and the necessity that exists for the Government of the day, be it Grit or Tory, to build this tunnel, if it is feasible. I think the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn), did not give a good reason when he argued that we should not give the Province of Prince Edward Island this tunnel, because the province is so small, and the people pay so little revenue to the Dominion. I think that when the Government took these people into Confederation they knew that the population was small, they knew that the income would be small, and having induced them to enter Confederation upon a pledge to build a tunnel, or to give them in some way permanent communication with the mainland, I think they must take up that pledge and carry it out. I have only to say that, having visited those people, having seen the importance of the Island, having observed the opinion of the people in favour of the tunnel, and seeing that they were induced to join Confederation because they expected the tunnel would be built, I think the Government ought to undertake that work if, as the hon. members from the Island have said to-night, it is at all feasible. The older provinces have had their share, and in acting on this matter we must not look only to our respective provinces, but to the Dominion at large. Ontario, the North-West, and British Columbia have had their shares by the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The people of Prince Edward Island have paid their share into the public treasury according to their population, and they have paid their share to the public works carried out in the older provinces. We in the Province of Quebec are asking for a bridge, and we hope to get it, and we will ask the people of the other provinces to pay their share. If the people of Prince Edward Island have a right to have the proposed tunnel, if the work is feasible, the Government should endeavour to see its way to give it to them. The Island is a very nice place to visit, and sometimes it is very easy to go there, but very hard to return; it may be a great pleasure to go there, but it is a serious matter to be detained five or six hours in the Straits of Northumberland on a cold day, and especially on Christmas day. I repeat that the Government are bound to build this tunnel if the work is feasible, and if the cost is not too great. The older provinces have had their share of public works, and if the people of Prince Edward Island are entitled to have tunnel

communication I hope the Government will see its way to carry out the work, and fulfil the pledges given during many years and especially during the last election.

Mr. McMULLEN. My remarks will be made mainly for the purpose of referring to the unfortunate position which the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) occupies on this question. When he made his statement in the House he sat alongside of the Minister of Marine. I felt satisfied, and a number of members came to the same conclusion, that all the figures and facts had been supplied by the hon. Minister.

Mr. COCKBURN. They were not.

Mr. McMULLEN. They were very voluminous, and I shall be glad if the hon. gentleman will state where they came from, for they were not complied by him. I am glad, however, to hear the hon. gentleman say they were not given to him by the Minister of Marine. I was under the impression that the hon. gentleman had been led into a trap. My reason for thinking so was the fact that one of the hon. members for Prince Edward Island criticized his utterances in a manner that was certainly not complimentary, coming as the criticism did from an hon. gentleman on the same side of the House as himself. In the next place, the senior member for Halifax made a speech somewhat in the same direction. I had come to the conclusion that the hon. member for Centre Toronto was an aspirant, and justly so, for a position in the Cabinet. I do not know any hon. member in the Conservative ranks, west of Belleville, who is better entitled to a position in the Cabinet than he is. The hon. gentleman comes from one of the most important constituencies in Ontario. I did think from the utterances of the hon. gentleman, and of hon. gentlemen who have followed him that a job had been put up on the hon. member for Centre Toronto. I hope I may be mistaken in that opinion, although I must say that it looks very much like a job. There are a great many members in Western Ontario, and it has been pointed that there is not a member in the Cabinet representing a constituency west of Belleville, and I think no other member is better entitled to become this representative in the Cabinet than the hon. member for Centre Toronto. The hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Coatsworth) does not aspire to a position of that kind in the face of the hon. member for Centre Toronto. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison) could hardly expect that he would be honoured with that seat when the member for Centre Toronto is in the House. So I considered there was a probability of the hon. member for Centre Toronto of becoming a Cabinet Minister, and when I heard the speech he delivered and saw what I considered to be a job put up on him, I thought it was done for the purpose of killing the prospects of the hon. gentleman. I hope I may be disappointed in my conclusion, but we will quietly and patiently watch and wait the results. I have no doubt it will prove a difficulty in the way of the hon. gentleman's elevation, because it is well known that an hon. gentleman seeking a position in the Cabinet endeavours to remain on favourable terms with all the provinces, and the hon. gentleman by his speech has certainly not improved his prospects of getting on friendly terms with Prince Edward Island. I am glad to know, from the hon. gentleman's record, that he is under the impression that a job has not been put up on him, and I certainly hope it is true; but I must be allowed to retain my opinion that this has been attempted, if it has not been accomplished. It looks very much like it, but I earnestly hope it may prove not to be true. I will watch the movements of things political some time, before that opinion will be completely obliterated from my mind.

Mr. YEO. With the permission of the House I I desire to offer some remarks on this subject, which the people of the province from which I come and the people I represent consider one of very great importance. The subject was so well and ably dealt with some days ago by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) in making this motion, and by the two hon. members from the Island who have spoken to-night, and by the senior member for Halifax, and by the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette), who has just resumed his seat, that I am sure that every hon. member who has given the matter his consideration must be convinced of the justice of the claim put forward on behalf of the people of Prince Edward Island. So much has been said on this subject, and the ground has been so fully traversed that I will have very little to say. But I will recall to the recollection of the House the fact that previous to Prince Edward Island entering Confederation the people were contented and prosperous. It was with much reluctance they cast in their lot with the larger provinces of the Dominion, but once the terms of Confederation were arranged, the people loyally accepted the situation, and so far as they are concerned they have fulfilled their part of the arrangement faithfully and loyally. But I regret to say we cannot say so much for the Dominion Government. One of the terms of the union on which this province joined the Confederation was that the Island should obtain continuous communication with the mainland, and we know that this important part of the terms the Dominion Government has failed to fulfil. Now, Sir, as has already been stated, attempts were made to maintain communication, first by placing the *Northern Light* on the route between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, and although this steamer did remarkably good service we know that she signally failed to keep up continuous communication, and the same may be said as regards the *Stanley* which has taken her place. Both of these steamers have done excellent work in certain seasons of the year, but it is well known to everyone who has given the matter much consideration that during the greater part of the month of January, all of the month of February, and the greater part of March in almost every year, these steamers are not able to keep up anything like continuous steam communication with the mainland. Hon. members of this House who are in the habit of receiving their mails with regularity every day can appreciate the difficulty which business men residing in Prince Edward Island have to contend with when during the winter season they are days, and sometimes even weeks, without receiving their mails. The same is true with regard to the difficulties of the passenger traffic. It is not an unfrequent thing for persons wishing to get to Prince Edward Island in winter to travel to Pictou and when they get there to ascertain that the steamer is somewhere in the ice between Prince Edward

Island and the mainland, and they have to retrace their steps to New Brunswick and cross from Cape Tormentine on the ice-boats. That is a state of things which should not exist. When winter properly sets in the trips of the steamer are protracted and irregular, and usually in mid-winter the mails have to be conveyed on ice-boats between the mainland and the Island. The ice-boat service which we have now is practically the same as we had before Confederation. Some slight improvements have been made in the shape of building boat-houses on the Island and on the mainland, but these improvements are very slight indeed, and during the greater part of the winter our means of communication are little better than they were before we entered Confederation. I think that we in Prince Edward Island have very good reason to complain of this, and to ask that justice should be done us. It is acknowledged on all sides that the terms of Confederation on which Prince Edward Island entered the Dominion have not been carried out. I am free to admit Senator Howlan has taken a great deal of pains and trouble in endeavouring to improve the means of communication between the Island and the neighbouring Provinces of the Dominion. We know that for some time the question of the construction of a subway was spoken of, but that has been dropped, and what appears to be the much more feasible project of a tunnel has been taken up. Some few years ago the construction of a tunnel appeared to be likely to involve a larger expenditure of money than perhaps the Dominion Government could feel justified in undertaking, but as it is clear now that the cost of tunnelling has been very much reduced I consider that the Province of Prince Edward Island may very fairly come forward and ask that this question should be seriously taken up by the Government. The tunnel question was brought prominently before the people of Prince Edward Island previous to the last election; I may say that it was not made an issue in that election, because the people of the Island, from one end to the other were unanimously in favour of it, and as all the candidates were pledged to the construction of a tunnel, it was not an issue in the contest. As I have said before, I believe there is very little doubt in the minds of those who have given the matter consideration, that the terms of Confederation have not been carried out. In that respect we have the opinion of one who perhaps was as well, or better able, to give an opinion on the matter than anyone else. I refer to the late Prime Minister. In his letter which has already been referred to, he clearly states that up to that time the Dominion Government had failed to carry out the terms arranged with Prince Edward Island when that Province entered into the union with Canada. During last winter while the elections were pending we were promised a visit from the Hon. Sir Charles Tupper, but unfortunately perhaps for Prince Edward Island he was unable to reach it, and I may say that if his coming there would have been the means of furthering the tunnel I regret very much he did not come. However, he did the next best thing to coming to Prince Edward Island by sending a telegram which has been read here to-night, and the purport of which is that the tunnel is feasible and that he will give it his support. We have therefore the opinion of these two hon. gentlemen that the terms of Confederation have not been carried out, and we have the further promise that this measure would receive their support. I think, therefore, that we can very fairly come before this House and ask that the matter be taken up and dealt with in the way which the Province of Prince Edward Island demands. It is unnecessary that I should refer to the letter sent by the late Prime Minister to the Hon. Senator Howlan who was a candidate for a county in Prince Edward Island last election, but I feel sure that his promise, as well as the promise of the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition, ought to ensure that this question will be taken up and dealt with fairly and properly. We have not very many particulars as yet about this tunnel, but the estimate of its probable cost has been laid before the House. I am not an engineer and I am not capable of giving a professional opinion, but it occurs to me that it is perhaps possible that the surveys which have been made across the Straits of Northumberland have not been as full and accurate as the importance of the undertaking would demand. Perhaps I am not justified in saying this, but I make the statement because I see that Sir Charles Tupper in his telegram says that he is assured that the cost of the tunnel will not exceed $6,000,000. I suppose in speaking of the tunnel he spoke of a tunnel of sufficient size to give the necessary accommodation, but the estimate which has been placed upon the Table of the House is somewhat in excess of the amount he stated. It would, therefore, appear to me that the engineer—a very eminent one I believe, Sir Douglas Fox—who has furnished this estimate has not had all the information which was necessary to enable him to give a very correct estimate. There is every probability that if his estimate is astray, it will be that he has erred on the larger cost, and the probability is that if his information had been more precise and correct, we would find that the cost estimated by him would be very largely reduced. On this point, of course, the Government can speak with more certainty than one who knows nothing about it beyond what the hon. Finance Minister has stated here. Mr. Speaker, I think it has been frequently represented in this House that Prince Edward Island has not been very generously, perhaps not very fairly, dealt with. Even in the matter of official salaries, from the highest officials we have down to the humblest employé in the railway service, I understand the salaries paid are very much below those paid in the other provinces. I do not know why that should be so—why we should be treated as being inferior to our fellow-citizens in other parts of the Dominion. Taking the people of Prince Edward Island man for man, I feel sure they will compare favourably with our fellow-citizens in the other provinces, and I do not consider distinctions of this kind are, to say the least, very fair. We in Prince Edward Island have been obliged to contribute our share to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, to the large subsidies which have been granted to railways, and to the large sums of money which have been expended on the construction of canals and other public works, while we have received scarcely any benefit from these expenditures, and our own public works on the Island—they are not very many—have not been attended to as they should be. In many parts of Prince Edward Island we have wharves which were taken charge of by the Domi-

nion Government, and which are not in a good state of repair. I have not had the opportunity of calling the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Work to this subject ; but if he knew the state of our wharves, he would authorize an expenditure for their repair. If they are not attended to immediately these wharves will fall into decay and be of no use. I merely speak of these things because we in Prince Edward Island consider that our wants have been overlooked. I know that the attention of the Government has been called to these facts by representatives of Prince Edward Island in previous sessions and by representations from the Local Government ; but up to the present time they have not been attended to in the way we think they ought to be. Now, I intended making some reference to the speech of the hon. member for Centre Toronto ; but I feel that he has been, I was going to say so properly dealt with by the press of Prince Edward Island and by the two hon. gentlemen from that province who have preceded me, that I do not think it is necessary to say anything on the subject. I have no doubt that he himself is now sorry that he did not take a little more trouble to investigate the facts more fully, and to lay more correct information before this House. It has been shown by the hon. junior member for King's County (Mr. McLean) that Prince Edward Island, instead of being a burden to the Dominion, is quite the reverse—that instead of receiving from the Dominion more then we pay into the federal treasury we receive less. The hon. senior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), who, to a great extent, is disinterested in this matter, has also shown very clearly that the hon. member for Centre Toronto was quite at fault in making the comparisons he did. The hon. member for Centre Toronto intimated that he would honour Prince Edward Island with a visit during this summer. I hope he will do so. If he goes there and sees that province and has an opportunity of speaking again in this House, I am sure he will speak in a very different tone from what he did the other evening. While the Island is a pleasant place to visit in summer, I would like the hon. gentleman, and many other members of this House, to visit it in winter. They would then themselves experience some of the difficulties which the people of Prince Edward Island have to contend with. They would find them to be very great indeed. We in Prince Edward Island know that we have been a long-suffering and patient people. We have had this difficulty to contend with for eighteen years. We have hoped from year to year that things would be better, but we find that with the exception of a small improvement we are in the same condition to-day with respect to winter communication that we were when we became part of Confederation. I have noticed that whenever any allusion is made in this House to Prince Edward Island it is sneered at. It is said . You are only a small province with a small population, and hardly worth considering. I think that is an improper way to treat a province of this Dominion. If it is a small province, it ought on that account to appeal more strongly to the sympathies of the hon. members of this House. However, I am not here on the part of the people of Prince Edward Island to plead for sympathy or to ask for favours, but only to ask that justice shall be done to us. If we get justice, that is all we want. We are satisfied, if we get fair-play, to work out our own business in every way. I have no doubt, from the speeches which have been made on this question at this time, that we are coming near to a solution of this question. I think hon. gentlemen see that there is a necessity of something being done—that they cannot allow us as part of the Dominion to go on in this unsatisfactory manner much longer. We do not wish the Government to rush hastily and recklessly into an expenditure ; but we would like them to take the matter up immediately. It is not unreasonable to ask the Government, if they are satisfied that they have sufficient information before them to go on with the construction of the work, that they will do so. If, however, they consider it is necessary that more accurate surveys should be made and other estimates obtained, they should at once take steps to have this done. We do not wish to have this matter laid over, by either this or another Government, until on the eve of a general election it is brought up again. We want it dealt with when an election is not in view, and dealt with in the way the terms of Confederation require that it should be. Now, the hon. gentleman who leads the Government in this House has stated that it is the intention of the present Government to adhere to the policy of the late Government. I am not very particular about that ; but there is one thing I hope they will do—that they will adhere to the policy of their late leader in regard to a tunnel for Prince Edward Island ; and I hope —and it is the hope of all the representatives of that province on either side of politics—that they will fulfil the promise made by their late leader and bring this matter to a close as soon as they possibly can. If they will do that, they will be doing an act of justice to, not a large province, but to as loyal and faithful a people as there are in this Dominion ; and they will be fulfilling the sacred terms of Confederation which were entered into between Prince Edward Island and the Dominion, and concerning which there can be no doubt as to their binding character. We have waited and waited patiently, and have not taken extreme steps in any way, but the time has now arrived when something should be done. The disadvantages under which we labour have been pointed out very clearly. The junior member for King's (Mr. McLean) has gone into this matter very fully ; he has shown the disadvantages which we labour under with regard to mails and passengers, and from a commercial point of view, and I believe these are difficulties and disadvantages which every hon. member of this House must appreciate. I trust, therefore, that the Government will see their way clear to take immediate steps to bring this matter to a conclusion.

Mr. WELSH. At this late hour I do not intend to detain the House very long. I have listened with great pleasure to the very able speeches of the hon. member for King's (Mr. McLean) and of the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Yeo), and also to that of my hon. colleague, who introduced this matter the other day in what I considered was a very moderate, temperate, non-partizan speech. He put the matter very calmly and deliberately, and I think his remarks should have been received by hon. gentlemen on both sides with the courtesy they demanded. I am somewhat astonished that we have had no reply from any member of the

Government on this matter. The only Minister who spoke was the Postmaster General, who brought to the notice of this House the fact that the postal service in Prince Edward Island is not self-sustaining in proportion to that service in other provinces. Naturally so, since we are isolated, and the conveyance of our mails is a very complicated business. In the fall of the year there are three routes over which our mails have to be conveyed—at one time from Cape Tormentine to Cape Traverse, at another time from Charlottetown to Pictou, and again from Georgetown to Pictou; and those routes have to be changed very often, thus entailing very heavy expenses. I might also ask how you could expect our postal revenue to equal that of other portions of the Dominion where there is continuous communication, whereas in the Island we are at times a week or ten days without any mail. How can you, Sir, expect a revenue from a service conducted in that way. But I must compliment the hon. Postmaster General on the able way he has conducted the postal service of Prince Edward Island since he took charge of that Department, for it was never shown previously the consideration it has since then received. In former years our newspapers were full of letters complaining of the inadequacy and mismanagement of that service. Talk about the letter in the *Examiner*, that Government organ of which the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) complains; the strictures in that letter are mild compared with those that appeared concerning the management of the postal service in those days. You do not see anything of that kind now, but on the contrary you see every consideration given to Prince Edward Island which it is possible for the Postmaster General to give it; and if His Excellency the Governor General had called on me to form a Cabinet I should have been very happy to have asked the Postmaster General to remain in his present position. The hon. member for Centre Toronto applauds, but he will not applaud so quickly now. He scribbled off a lot of figures and statements. His scribbling some recompense may meet, and raise this Daniel to the judgment seat; but I doubt whether his scribbling will bring him to that position to which we are told he aspires. That hon. gentleman's statements were totally uncalled for. Since I have had the honour of a seat in this House I have refrained from ever interfering with any hon. gentleman when discussing the wants of the district he represents, as I consider every representative on the floor of this House is the proper party to understand the wants of his own constituents, and I hesitate about passing an opinion on subjects in the district of another hon. gentleman. Those subjects I leave to be dealt with by the member representing the district interested; but here is an hon. gentleman who never took the trouble of coming to look at Prince Edward Island, and who gets up in this House and insults, not only every person from the Island, but the memory of his late leader, the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald. He insults also the intelligence of Senator Howlan, who resigned his seat in the Senate to give this matter of the tunnel his serious consideration for a number of years, and who spent his time and money in trying to get a scheme adopted by which continuous communication might be kept up between the Island and the mainland. He insulted equally the intelligence of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, who visited the Island and crossed in the winter time, and therefore knows the difficulties under which we are labouring. And what do we ask? Do we ask an impossibility? Is our request an unreasonable one? We only go as far as Sir John A. Macdonald went, and the leader of the Opposition went, when we ask, if this matter is feasible and not too expensive, that it should be carried out. We know that since we have been in session we have been flooded with petitions for prohibition from all sections of the country. No one here attempted to sneer at those petitions, and how have they been dealt with? They have been dealt with by means of a Royal Commission to investigate as to whether prohibition is required or not.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Would you favour a plebiscite on the tunnel question?

Mr. WELSH. If there is no better mode of settling this matter, we will have to do what the Finance Minister did with the prohibition question, and appoint a Royal Commission to investigate it. There are a good many other matters that might be brought up. My hon. friend, the member for King's, made a magnificent showing of the benefits this scheme would produce to Prince Edward Island. He has shown that in the fall of the year our shipping time is limited to the month of November, as the harvest is gathered in and the potatoes taken out of the ground in October, so that November is the only month we can ship our produce. Our produce is then forced out by every means we can get and run into our limited markets, which are then glutted; whereas if we had a tunnel our farmers could ship their supplies according as the markets required them. If the tunnel were built, do you mean to say, Sir, that the postal revenue would not be increased and be equal in proportion to that of any other part of the Dominion? Of course it would. And the Prince Edward Island Railway, instead of running at a loss of $100,000 a year, would run at a very much decreased loss, if indeed it were not made profitable. The Intercolonial Railway and other railway connections on the mainland would be benefited, so that this tunnel would be a means of profit to the whole Dominion. I think that we ought to have some statement from a member of the Government as to what course the Government intend to pursue, for in Prince Edward Island we are neither Liberal nor Conservative, so far as this question is concerned. On this question we are all united, and are going to stand no nonsense about it. It is not necessary for me to go through all the figures which my hon. friend has quoted, and I have to thank the senior member for Halifax for his kindness in making the statement he did. This scheme would not be a wild-cat scheme if it is feasible, and can be carried out for a reasonable amount of money. There was no trouble about giving $150,000 to dump a pier at Cape Tormentine. Allow me to ask any member of the Government, who asked them for it? Is there a man from Prince Edward Island who asked for the $150,000 to be dumped into the sea at Cape Tormentine? Then they went into the Chignecto Railway scheme, which I call a wild-cat scheme, and which will cost at least three millions of money. Look at the reckless way in which the millions have been scattered round that place, and they say Prince Edward Island will get the benefit

of it. When Sir Charles Tupper was here as Minister of Railways he said, pointing to me: Here is a man who objects to this railway, and it will do more benefit to him than to any man in this Dominion. I think, when a man does not ask for a thing it is hardly worth while giving it to him. I maintain my opinion on the subject. Time will tell whether I am right or not, but I believe the money is thrown away. We are told it is for Prince Edward Island. Prince Edward Island never asked for these things. Now we ask for something which all the members from the Island are united in asking for, and that is consideration for this tunnel scheme. The Government in the last Parliament, when it was presided over by the late lamented leader, sent surveyors and had the Gulf surveyed, and then they had the matter left to Sir Douglas Fox for his estimate. The opinion of Sir John Macdonald was, that if it could be built for five or six millions it would be well to go on with it, and he would lay the matter before his Government? Is that the opinion of the Government to-day? I hope it is, and I think the sooner this matter is decided and the Government lay it before the House the more satisfactory it will be to the people. At all events, the people of Prince Edward Island are determined, as far as they can, to have something done to see that the Government fulfil the terms of Confederation. Now we come to a real simple matter. We entered into Confederation in good faith with the Government of this Dominion. The Government pledged themselves to establish continuous steam communition between Prince Edward Island and the railways of this Dominion. Have they done so? They have not. They have failed in doing it, and what excuse can any hon. gentleman give for their not fulfilling those terms? If one gentleman has an agreement with another and fails in carrying it out he is liable for damages. The amount of $5,000,000, which the Conservative Government of Prince Edward Island demanded in their Address to the Queen, for the non-fulfilment of the terms of Confederation up to date, would nearly build this work. I will not detain the House further, but I fully endorse all that has been said by my hon. friend from King's (Mr. McLean), my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies), my hon. friend from Prince (Mr. Perry), and my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Kenny), and I hope the Government will give the members and the House a clear understanding as to what they intend to do in regard to this matter.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I did not intend to occupy the attention of the House by any remarks on this question, but I think it is perhaps hardly fair that the discussion should be confined to the members from Prince Edward Island, and my hon. friends from Toronto Centre (Mr. Cockburn), and Halifax (Mr. Kenny). Some of the remarks which have been made by the last two gentlemen who adressed the House have, I think, hardly been made in the fair spirit which has generally characterized this discussion. All through the discussion, I think, there has been an endeavour by every person who has addressed the House on this subject to deal with the question fairly, and upon its merits. The speakers to whom I refer, however, seemed rather disposed to complain that the terms of Confederation had not been carried out as far as Prince Edward Island was concerned, and that the Government had not made an earnest effort to carry out those terms. I think that those charges against the Government are hardly justified by the facts. The speech which my hon. friend from Toronto Centre (Mr. Cockburn) made was intended to show that Prince Edward Island had received an amount from the Dominion treasury which was very large in proportion to her contributions to the general fund. While I do not endorse what I regard as the extreme view which the member for Toronto Centre took of that subject, I cannot on the other hand endorse the sentiments of the last two speakers, that the interests of the Island have been entirely neglected by the Government. The hon. member for Prince said that the people of Prince Edward Island were in no better condition to-day than they were before Confederation. I think any hon. gentleman who will compare the condition of things to-day with the condition of things before Confederation will agree with me that the hon. gentleman was not justified in making that remark. We well know that during the winter season, during which the greatest hardships are suffered, before Confederation the only means of communication with the mainland was by the ice-boat service between Cape Traverse and Cape Tormentine, that the service was very inefficient at that time, and that after people from the Island had crossed the Straits they were obliged to take a long journey by road. They had to go from Cape Tormentine to Sackville or Amherst, on the mainland, and I think as far as the county line on the Island. The drive on the mainland was about 40 miles, and I think, though I am not quite certain as to the figures, the drive on the Island was about 20 miles. If they compare that with the service they have to-day, even at the Capes, and remember the fact that instead of being obliged to drive this long distance in the cold with horses and sleighs, they can travel by train comfortably and quickly, the hon. gentleman will be hardly in a position to say that their condition is no better than it was before Confederation. The same gentleman referred to the efforts of the Government to establish steam communication in the winter by the construction of the *Northern Light*. That boat was constructed by the party of which the hon. gentleman is a member and the Government which that party supported. It proved in time that that boat did not efficiently perform the service for which she was intended; but in 1883 the Government, in response to the request of the representatives of Prince Edward Island, appointed a committee to enquire into the whole subject of this communication with Prince Edward Island. That committee spent some weeks in investigating this subject; they had a number of gentlemen brought to Ottawa from Prince Edward Island and from the mainland, who were familiar with the question of communication there. They took the evidence of these gentlemen and presented a report to Parliament; and as a result of that report, which emanated, as I say, from the representatives of Prince Edward Island, we have at the present time the *Northern Light* replaced by a new and, I believe, as good a steamer as can be built for the service—the steamer *Stanley*. We have in addition to that an ice-boat service between the Capes, very much improved, and placed under the control of the Government. We have also the two railway systems, the Prince Edward Island system and the

Intercolonial Railway on the mainland, connected by branch lines. This is the result of the action of the Government, founded upon the reports of the committee which was appointed in 1883 to investigate this subject. I believe there is a disposition on both sides of this House to deal fairly with the question, for it must be admitted that whether the terms of Confederation are literally carried out or not, there has been every possible effort made on the part of this Government, and I think on the part of the Government which preceded it, so far as possible, to carry out the terms of Confederation and give the Island the very best communication with the mainland which it is possible to do under existing circumstances. Now, with regard to the construction of the tunnel, I do not wish to occupy the time of the House any further in discussing that question. The speech of the hon. member for King's P.E.I., (Mr. McLean) has really exhausted that subject. He went into a number of calculations to show the saving that would be effected in the present expenditure for communication with the mainland, if this tunnel were constructed. There can be no doubt in the mind of any one of the enormous advantages which would result to the farmers of Prince Edward Island if they could have continuous communication through the winter season. The advantage of having access to the markets of the Dominion for their farm produce, during the winter season especially, would be of great importance to the farmers, and would very greatly improve their condition. I believe that the Island embraces an area of something like a million and a-half acres of land, and that about half this quantity is under cultivation, say 700,000 acres. Now, in my judgment, if constant and regular communication during the winter could be established, it would very greatly enhance the value of the whole of the farm lands of Prince Edward Island. If the present cultivated lands were increased in value by $10 an acre, we would have an increase in the value of the agricultural lands of the Island, by the construction of the tunnel, amounting to $7,000,000, which is, at all events, half the cost of that work, perhaps more, perhaps it would be the entire cost. If we take the whole land of Prince Edward Island and put the same increase upon it we would have $15,000,000 added to the value of the property of the Island by the construction of this work. This may or may not be a correct estimate, but I believe that it is an estimate which is within the mark. I am convinced that in a country which has such great agricultural advantages as Prince Edward Island, which has such a fertile soil, which is capable of producing such excellent crops, if they had regular access to the markets of the rest of the Dominion, the value of their farm lands would be very greatly enhanced, and I think the estimate which I have made is not beyond the mark. If I am correct in this view, this subject certainly demands from the Government the most serious consideration. I am glad that it is receiving so much attention at the present time, and I am glad that the leaders of both political parties in this House have, during the last year, committed themselves to the construction of this important work, if it is found to be practicable, and can be done at a reasonable cost. I trust that some steps will be taken during the present season to have further surveys made, and such other information regarding this work obtained, as will enable the Government and the House to come to an intelligent decision in regard to its practicability.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I will not detain the House at this late hour with many remarks on this subject. As it is not a political subject, I had hoped that the remarks made by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) and my hon. colleague from King's, P.E.I. (Mr. McLean), and the hon. gentlemen from Prince (Mr. Perry and Mr. Yeo) would have exhausted the subject so that it would not be necessary for the other gentlemen from Prince Edward Island to take up the time of the House. However, as all the other representatives from Prince Edward Island have spoken on this subject, I will offer a very few remarks. I must thank the House for the manner in which they have received the remarks of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this, to us, all important subject. I think that my hon. friend the junior member for Prince perhaps made a little slip when he said, or insinuated, that we were being sneered at in this House; I do not think that he intended his remarks to apply to the present House, at least. I must congratulate my hon. friend and colleague from King's (Mr. McLean) for the manner in which he presented the facts to the House. He has taken up all the points, I think, as fully and as thoroughly as they can be taken up, and he has shown that we are fair contributors to the treasury of this country in proportion to our population; and if we had the advantages that other portions of the Dominion have, of regular and steady communication with the mainland, our railroad, instead of being a loss to the treasury of the Dominion as it is now, would be self-sustaining. He has also shown that if the tunnel scheme was carried out the province would become a contributor towards making the Intercolonial Railway self-sustaining. There is no doubt that at the present time we are under great disadvantages because of our isolated position, and I trust and believe that the Government will take the earliest opportunity to investigate this question of the tunnel with a view of seeing whether it can be carried out at a reasonable cost. The question of the size of the tunnel is one which we are not prepared and do not wish to go into now. The Government have a report before them from eminent engineers, showing the cost of different sizes of a tunnel, and in any case, as I understand the matter, it is advised that a shaft be sunk on the Prince Edward Island side of the Straits to a certain depth in order to reach the strata that forms the bottom of the Strait and runs across to the mainland; and if this strata is found to be such as geologists suppose it to be, that fact will be of the very first importance in the construction of the tunnel, and the formation is everything that could be desired. I trust the Government will see their way clear to put a sum in the Estimates, even this present session, in order to sink such a shaft and demonstrate whether the tunnel can be carried out successfully. I do not intend at this late hour to encroach on the time and patience of the House by offering further remarks on this question, but I would just say that I do not know but that after all we have to thank the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr.

Cockburn) for the remarks he made on this subject, because I think if he has not done anything else he has aroused the sympathy of the House and given my hon. friend near me a chance to demonstrate that the figures which the hon. member for Centre Toronto presented to the House were not based on a proper foundation.

Mr. COCKBURN. May I be allowed to say one word before this motion is put?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman can only make a personal explanation in regard to any portion of his speech which may have been misrepresented.

Mr. SPROULE. I move the adjournment of the House, with a view to give the hon. gentleman an opportunity to say a few words.

Mr. COCKBURN. I regret that any remarks which I may have considered it my duty to make with respect to this question of a tunnel between Prince Edward Island and the mainland should have given umbrage to hon. gentlemen who have been sent here to represent that Island, and certainly I had no such intention when I brought forward those figures and data that I laid before the House. It was far at least from my mind to offer anything like an insult, as my words have been characterized, to members representing the Island of Prince Edward. I have been asked if my figures were given to me by any member of the Government. The reply I had to make was that the figures were entirely my own, that I had culled them from the Auditor General's Report, and that I marked opposite each item the page from which I had extracted it; so that I take full responsibility for those figures on myself. I have been accused of narrow-mindedness, of having a provincial cast of mind, of being unable to develop any political worth. All I can say is, that I never brought forward my data with a view to establish any principle like this, that in dealing with any province we should consider how much we receive from it and how much we give to it. I stated distinctly, at the beginning of my remarks, that I regarded it as a Dominion and not simply as an alliance of provinces, that I was proud to stand here as a Canadian, and though I have the honour to represent a part of the city of Toronto, yet the interests of the Island of Prince Edward or of Vancouver are no less dear to me, and I claim I have the right as a citizen of this Dominion to take up and lay before this House any data I may have with reference to any one part of it. I cannot for a moment allow the ground to be taken by anyone here that because he happens to represent a particular district, we are all to be precluded from offering any advice with respect to any request made by that district. My figures have been called in question. It is unnecessary for me, and it would be foolish for me at this early hour of the morning, to take up the question of these figures in detail; but I cannot help directing the attention of the House to the fact that the amount of Excise mentioned by the two hon. gentlemen who wish to controvert my figures was $185,000. That is the amount claimed to be paid for Excise by Prince Edward Island. The Island I understand is under the Scott Act, and the only town where spirits are sold or that is free from the operation of the Act is Charlottetown, which I believe is a prosperous city of 12,000 or 12,500 inhabitants. Accordingly, taking $185,000 for Excise it becomes necessary for me to divide that amount among the 12,500 inhabitants of Charlottetown, which gives on an average an amount of $15 per head for every man, woman and child. Or, if I were to look at it in the other light of supposing that young children were not addicted to drinking, and look at it simply in the light of ascertaining how much each head of a family would consume, I would multiply 15 by 5 and get $75 for every head of a family as the amount of Excise paid by him, and this would involve his consuming no less than 55 gallons of whiskey per annum. We are told that Toronto was a drunken city by my return, but in common sense what must Charlottetown be, with every head of a family consuming every week no less than one gallon of whiskey? I simply mention this point as an illustration—I might take other instances of the manner in which my figures have been attempted to be dealt with. My figures are there; my figures are correct.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) No.

Mr. COCKBURN. Apart from these matters, there is the broad question, is it advisable to build this tunnel under the circumstances?

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) The hon. gentleman was widely astray in regard to the amount paid for Customs.

Mr. COCKBURN. Is it advisable under the circumstances to build the tunnel? That is really the question before us. I take the ground that, considering all the circumstances in which we are placed, the heavy indebtedness under which the country lies, the fact that we have just been relieved of two millions or three millions of revenue, the fact that there has been an earnest desire expressed on both sides of the House to curtail our expenditure and to delay all unnecessary expenditure and to put aside all expenditure we could put aside for the moment, I took the ground, and I take it still, that it is not advisable at present under the circumstances to deal with this question at all. We must await developments, and perhaps in the future, as we have seen within the past two years how very great has been the reduction effected in the cost of submarine tunnels, that a tunnel which would cost a few years ago $24,000,000 could now be obtained for $12,000,000, perhaps in a few years this tunnel may be obtained for a very few millions. It will then be time, I think, for us to take up this question; but until the expense can be brought within a reasonable compass I contend it is within our duty not to be holding out false hopes, but to improve as far as we can the machinery we now have for effecting continuous communication with the mainland and the Island. I have to thank hon. members who are kind enough to invite me to visit their pretty Island. I have no doubt if I went there I should meet with that courteous reception which one gentleman would extend to another, and I can assure them that, while we think a great deal of Ontario, we have never ceased to think well and to speak well of the pretty Island of Prince Edward, and we have always been glad to receive the representatives from the Island who have come up to Toronto with the greatest courtesy and the greatest kindness, and I trust that if there has been any feeling excited by any words of mine the other evening with

reference to Prince Edward Island, it shall be considered that the facts were stated because I believed them to be true, as I still believe them to be true, and because I believe the facts and the statements which I made were in the best interests of our common country.

Motion to adjourn the House withdrawn.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not my intention to waste, or to take up any of the time of the House at this late hour, and I should not have spoken were it not for some remarks which have been made by gentlemen from Prince Edward Island especially, and because of the fitness of things that it would be well that a motion of this kind should receive some remarks from a member of the Government. There is no doubt of one thing: I think those hon. gentlemen who come from Prince Edward Island, and who have debated this subject in so judicious a manner in the main, must have been pleased with the kindly and generous interest which has been manifested in it by the members on both sides of the House. I do not think, at any time in the previous history of Parliament since I have had connection with it, that any question which has come from Prince Edward Island has received a more careful consideration at the hands of the House than the question which we have been discussing to-night. That arises I suppose from the fact of the earnestness of the desire of the Province of Prince Edward Island for this improved means of communication, and from the fact also, that it has come to be a question in which the whole Island is interested, and it so rises to a certain extent above mere party politics. That interest is due to a great many causes ; it is due to the natural situation of Prince Edward Island and the difficulties which, on account of nature, are in the way of her having communication continuously with the mainland. It is due also to the very strong efforts which have been made by certain citizens of Prince Edward Island, notably, amongst others, Senator Howlan ; and while speaking on this point, I wish to say that, to my mind, the criticism upon Senator Howlan for his having been anxious to resign his seat in the Senate and to contest an election for this Parliament and so gain a victory for the Government, is not, I think, a just criticism under the circumstances. That a man who has a seat in the Senate, in the receipt of the same indemnity, and possessing much the same honours as are held by a member of this House ; that he should resign that seat and take part in an arduous and heavy contest in the winter season in Prince Edward Island, argues, I think, a state of mind and an earnestness of purpose which should shield him from criticism of that kind. I know from personal knowledge that Senator Howlan was not asked by the Government, and was not pressed by the Government to resign his position as Senator and to contest this seat for the House of Commons ; but he did it because he believed in the tunnel, he wanted to advocate the interests of the tunnel, and he wished, and I believe he still wishes most earnestly, to see it an accomplished fact. I wish also to correct another impression—an impression which seems to have been shared in by my hon. friend from Prince County, who I am sure would not wish the House to have a wrong impression of the facts. The hon. gentleman from Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) seemed to go on the same assumption, and that is, that there was a pledge at the time of Confederation that the tunnel should be built, or that a means of communication which could only be brought about by something like a tunnel should be provided, and further, that Sir John Macdonald pledged himself that if it were possible, and the expense reasonable, the tunnel should be built, for the reason that Canada had not carried out its pledge given at the time of the union of Prince Edward Island with the Dominion. Now, Sir John Macdonald's letter does not, I submit, carry with it that meaning at all. and I wish to read the letter so that it may be fresh on the *Hansard* and in the minds of hon. gentlemen at the time this assertion is made. Sir John Macdonald's letter is as follows :—

"In response to your pressing request with respect to the tunnel across the Straits, I desire to repeat that, under the present circumstances, the Cabinet are not in a position to deal with the question. If, as I believe, the country will continue to give us its confidence, the Ministry will, under my guidance, take the matter up without delay. I understand that Sir Douglas Fox is of opinion the scheme is a feasible one. The chief thing still unknown is the cost of construction. I fully appreciate the nature and extent of the obligation incurred by the Dominion to maintain continuous communication between the Island and the mainland. We have tried to carry this out by the *Stanley*, but of course she cannot fight against the elements. So if the cost comes within a reasonable amount, such as Parliament feels itself justified in incurring, I shall be prepared to submit the question for their favourable consideration."

Now, I do not consider that that letter admits that this Government, or any other Government preceding this, has not tried to carry out, and has not carried out the practicable engagements made at the time of the union of the Province of Prince Edward Island with the Dominion. You must read that of course in the light of circumstances and in the light of the time, and taking it in that sense, and considering what has been done by the different Governments, I do not think the cause of the tunnel will be advanced, and I do not think plain, practical, honest men looking at this matter from an unprejudiced standpoint will admit, that the cause of the tunnel will be furthered, by advancing the statement and by making the contention that the Dominion has broken its pledge of good faith with the Province of Prince Edward Island ; and that in order to redeem itself and to prevent it from standing under that disgrace it must build a tunnel. My own impression is that everything that has been promised, everything that was promised in the terms of Confederation has been honestly and loyally carried out by the Dominion, and to say, as some gentlemen have said, that the state of communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland is not better to-day than it was before the Island entered Confederation is to state a thing which is I think on the face of it plainly absurd, and which will not go down with practical and sensible men. I do not wish to go into the discussion of that matter to-night, for there is not time. With reference to the tunnel and with reference to the position of the Government upon it, I may simply say this : The Government has always felt a kindly desire towards Prince Edward Island. That is a feeling which I suppose every Government would entertain for Prince Edward Island. It is a smaller province, it has difficulties to contend with as to its communications. Every word that my hon. friend from King's (Mr. McLean) said in his most excellent and sensible

speech is true in that regard, and the advantages which would accrue to Prince Edward Island from a continuous and open communication of this kind would be incalculable to that province. There is no doubt about that, and any Government would have sympathy with an Island situated as it is, and as being a part of Confederation and labouring under these disadvantages. I think that whatever claim the Province of Prince Edward Island has to urge before this Parliament and this country must be placed upon that basis, and not upon the basis that a pledge given has been violated, and that consequently in order to keep faith the tunnel must be built if it is at all a possibility. My hon. friend from King's (Mr. McLean) touched another very practical point, and it is one which I talked over with Mr. Ferguson and Mr. Sullivan on two or three occasions when they visited Ottawa for the purpose of pressing this scheme on the Government. The Province of Prince Edward Island must in the first place admit that this tunnel, if it is feasible at all, is only so at a large cost which must be chiefly borne by the Dominion at large. What is the Province of Prince Edward Island prepared to do in return for that? It struck me, and I so canvassed it with those gentlemen—and I noticed that my hon. friend took up that point to-night—that in the working out of the feasibility of this scheme, we are to come somewhere near to this point. If it is feasible, it would be an excellent thing for the Dominion, and the Province of Prince Edward Island to have the tunnel built. In the first place, we ought to see what it can be built for. That is, is it feasible at all, and if so, at what cost? The Government has I think done all it can be asked to do in this regard. It has carried on its investigations, and at the request of delegates from Prince Edward Island, it has borne the cost of an investigation by Sir Douglas Fox and others, with a view of getting estimates, on such data as were available, of the cost of the tunnel. These are now in the hands of the Government and will be placed in the hands of the House. It may be possible, and I believe it is true, that there are not yet sufficient data for getting at what may be termed the fairly certain cost of the tunnel; and I think it will be the duty of the Government, and I am sure it will also be its pleasure, if there is something else needed in order to carry on investigations which will give the data as nearly as possible for a pretty definite and certain estimate of the cost and feasibility of constructing a tunnel, to do this if it can be done without too great cost, as I am quite certain it can. So far, the Government has evinced its desire to do all that is possible under the circumstances. Then the question comes, what kind of a tunnel is necessary—one of 18 feet, one of 16 feet, or one of 11 feet? That is to be determined by the cost of one or other of these tunnels. But the cost of the larger one may preclude the possibility of its being built. If so, would a smaller tunnel be of such clear benefit to the Province of Prince Edward Island that it would be worth the cost of building? These things are treated in the report in part, and will have to be considered carefully by the Government and by the House as well. Then, if we get at the cost of the tunnel, it seems to me the next question comes for Parliament to decide, what would be the cost of carrying the interest charge on that tunnel and working it? When you have that, it is fair to set opposite to it all that it costs the Dominion now to keep up the communication which we have been keeping up year in and year out, by way of vessels, mail service and whatever other cost there may be. That it is perfectly fair to set over against the interest charge of carrying the cost of the tunnel. Then there is something which may be said in favour of the contention that a bit of railway on the Island, disjoined from the system on the mainland, even though in a productive island like Prince Edward Island, cannot be under such favourable conditions for paying its way as if it were joined to the mainland by continuous communication; and I think it is a fair ground of argument that if the tunnel were built and this continuous communication were kept up, the deficit at present existing on the Island railway would be largely diminished, if it did not entirely disappear. That would depend in part on the size of the tunnel and as to whether the cost could be met of building a tunnel which would allow of communication by railway through and through. That would create the necessity of widening the rails on the Prince Edward Island side, which would be attended with additional expense. But there is a fairly practical consideration in that point, which was particularly mentioned by my hon. friend. If this tunnel would be beneficial, and we all acknowledge that it would be, and if the loss to-day is what we know, the loss is on account of the shipment of produce having to be made at once without the possibility of keeping it until prices are high, and on account of shipment not being continuous; if the loss to Prince Edward Island is great in that respect, why should not Prince Edward Island bear its fair proportion of the tolls on every bushel of potatoes, every bushel of grain, and every bit of produce that is now lacking its best and continuous marketing for the want of the tunnel? That is a fair thing for the people of Prince Edward Island to think of. After you have all these other charges offset against the interest charge, and find that the deficit is still too large for the people of this country fairly to assume, consistently with maintaining the interests of the other parts of the Dominion, it is a fair thing, when making an arrangement so costly and yet so advantageous to the Island, to think of putting upon its products a certain moderate toll which will act as a continuous revenue to offset the charges over and above the present outlay for services. I am prepared to say as a member of the Government that, when you put these two together and find that there is yet a certain deficit, the Dominion out of pure good heartedness, out of generosity to a smaller province, out of consideration to the peculiar natural difficulties which that province has to contend with, would be justified in giving a certain amount in addition in order to carry out the construction of a work of so great advantage to that province and of some further advantage to the other parts of the Dominion. That is about the way this matter strikes me; and so far as the Government is concerned, it has done what I have stated, and I think it is prepared to say that if further estimates are necessary to get at the cost of the structure, they will be got; and after that the Government will seriously and earnestly consider the question as presented in the light of those facts,

and ask Parliament to consider it as well. It will then be for this Parliament to say whether or not under all the circumstances it considers that the case is reasonable upon which the construction may be undertaken.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. BOWELL moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.30 a. m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 2nd July, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. BOWELL moved:

That the names of Messrs. Desjardins (L'Islet) and Masson be substituted for those of Sir Hector Langevin and the late Sir John A. Macdonald on the Committee of Privileges and Elections.

That the name of Mr. Hodgins be placed upon the Committee of Railways and Canals in lieu of that of the late Sir John A. Macdonald, and that the name of Mr. Henry Corby be substituted for that of the late Sir John A. Macdonald on the Committee of Public Accounts.

He said: The House will understand why these changes are proposed. I may say, on behalf of Sir Hector Langevin, that, under the circumstances, he desires to be relieved from the responsibility attaching to his position as a member of the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. FOSTER. Before taking up the items, I may state what I propose to ask the House to do, under present circumstances, which course I have talked over, in part, with the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I propose, if the Committee will help me in it, to pass as soon as possible the Supplementary Estimates for the past year; to pass, in addition to what we have passed, in the main Estimates, the items for pensions, which involve no discussion, as a rule, and those for the Post Office service, which it is very important we should pass in order to provide money for current expenses, and to ask the House to concur in these items, after they are passed; to put them in one Bill, send it to the Senate, and have it passed as soon as possible. I believe arrangements have been made to give assent to some Bills during the early part of next week. I ask the co-operation of hon. members in endeavouring to have this programme carried out as rapidly as we can, consistently with fair discussion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I did not understand, when the hon. gentleman spoke to me on this subject, that he proposed to include the Post Office service.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not at that time, but it has been represented to me that, if possible, these items should be included, as the operations extend over the whole country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It would be a very fair course to adopt to take a proportionate vote for the Post Office. We do not, of course, want to interfere with its operations; but as to passing all the items in bulk——

Mr. FOSTER. I would not ask that to be done. We will have time to have the usual discussion on the Post Office items.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should have supposed that it would have been better to have adopted the course followed on similar occasions in England, and that is, to take a proportionate vote of one-tenth or one-twelfth of the total amount required. There are certainly some items in the Post Office estimates which will be likely to involve some discussion, and these might protract matters.

Mr. FOSTER. We will see when we come to them; some might be omitted, if there is not sufficient time. But during to-day and to-morrow we shall be able to consider them and give them a fair discussion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a vote of want of confidence pending, but that stands over, I suppose.

Canadian Pacific Railway—Construction.....	$13,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I desire an explanation of this item.

Mr. BOWELL. This amount is to pay part of the expenses and salaries in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway arbitration now going on.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then this is really for legal expenses?

Mr. BOWELL. It is in connection with the salaries of those connected with that staff, and also other expenses attending the arbitration. I will give the hon. gentleman some particulars if he desires them. This sum is to pay salaries and expenses in this connection to the extent of $10,000, and to pay claims and salaries and expenses connected with some old claims under the original contract.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In that connection it will, no doubt, be of interest to the Committee to be advised, first, as to when the present arbitration is likely to close; and second, whether the award is likely to be final, and whether further and ulterior legal proceedings will then be in order. Seeing what that arbitration has cost us and how long it has continued, I have no doubt it would interest the Committee and professional men to know what probabilities there are of further proceedings in that direction.

Mr. BOWELL. I am informed that the arbitration is likely to close very early, and it is anticipated that that will be the end of it—that is, at least, our hope, and I am informed there is no probability of an appeal from the award.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to know from the Minister of Justice whether the

award is likely to be final, or whether, if either of the parties is dissatisfied, the matter is likely to go further and the case be reopened?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The arbitration is practically concluded; the investigation and arguments are concluded, and the arbitrators are deliberating on their award. An award may be expected in a few weeks, and by the terms of the reference the award is to be final, saving only, of course, any errors or misconduct: but in other respects it is final. It is not final in this respect, however: that there is one claim which will not be adjudicated upon, I understand, at the time when the award is made. That is a minor claim arising out of the Pembina Branch, and I believe it has not been investigated at all. The award, which is expected to take place in a few days, is upon the investigation as to the British Columbia section of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and it will finally determine that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And the amount stated?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Both on questions of fact and law?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It seems to me that the term "construction" is hardly the expression to use for this appropriation of $13,000. Part of it is for legal expenses, and it seems to me there ought to be two items instead of one.

Mr. BOWELL. My connection with the Railway Department has been of very short duration, as the hon. gentleman knows, but I am informed that any arbitration or any expense incurred in connection with contracts is always considered as in connection with the construction of the road. I can see no objection to putting in the words "construction, and for expenses of arbitration," if the hon. gentleman wishes.

Mr. FOSTER. It has gone under the appellation of construction for a number of years.

Mr. BOWELL. I believe that other arbitrations of this character in connection with contracts have been charged to construction.

Intercolonial Railway — Increased accommodation at Moncton..... $12,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was the cause for that demand; you have increased accommodation there every year, I think.

Mr. BOWELL. Up to the 31st December, 1871, there has been expended on the erection of a house and round-house, $7,405.19, and up to the 31st December, 1890, there has been expended on the extension of the freight sheds, $1,831.04; machinery for hoisting cranes, $1,250; nut tapping machine, $500; drilling machine, $150; machine for grinding plane knives, $60; amount due upon ground rent, $1,305.17, making a total of $12,500.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the machine for grinding plane knives?

Mr. BOWELL. I suppose it means knives in connection with the planers in machine shops for planing iron.

Mr. LAURIER. For grinding axes.

Mr. McMULLEN. I cannot understand how items of this kind should be charged to capital account.

Mr. BOWELL. It has been the principle in the past that all new material added to the road is charged to the capital, but that which is purchased to supply material which has been worn-out, or repairs to machinery, would be charged to revenue account. That is the principle on which these estimates have always been prepared.

Mr. McMULLEN. Has there been anything of this kind used before in the workshops?

Mr. BOWELL. I have no doubt there has, but this machine is charged on the principle of a new engine or an additional engine to the present ones on hand. If an engine were destroyed and another purchased to take its place that would be charged to revenue. I have sent for the engineer for information with regard to these minor details.

Rolling Stock..... $43,000

Mr. BOWELL. This $43,000 is required to pay for three parlour cars purchased under a contract from Mr. Crossen, $29,400; steam-heating apparatus, $600; electric lighting, $1,800; buffet outfit, $1,200; total, $33,000. The appropriation last year was only $27,000, and there is now available for this purpose, $10,000. The balance is for air-brakes on freight cars, fitting up of twenty locomotives with steam-heating apparatus at $60 each; forty-four cars with fixtures for heating with steam from engine, $200 each; being $8,800 for this purpose; making a total of $43,000. I may add, that the expenditure up to the present time has been, on the air-brakes and the locomotives, $24,000, and the balance is to pay.

Mr. McMULLEN. What number of cars of this kind are now on the line?

Mr. BOWELL. I cannot give that information to the hon. gentleman just now, but if he will call attention to it on the main Estimates, I will let him know.

Mr. McMULLEN. What quantity of rolling stock of this kind has been worn-out and replaced by new rolling stock within the year?

Mr. FOSTER. I will make a note of that and give the information later on.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not wish to detain the Committee, but I must point out that last year when we had a discussion on the increase of rolling stock and other matters connected with the Intercolonial Railway, we tried to get some information with regard to the principle on which that road is operated. We know perfectly well there is a heavy loss on the running of the Intercolonial Railway, and while anxious to facilitate the Finance Minister, yet the responsibility rests upon the Opposition to get all the information on this matter. I remember very well that Sir Charles Tupper said that, in every instance when a car was worn-out and a new car put in its place, that the charge was added to the capital account. While we add to the capital account by adding new rolling stock, we would like to know what has been put on in the place of the worn-out stock. We should know the quantity of rolling stock on that road in the past, we should know if it is kept up to its proper standard and efficiency in point of repair, and if a

car goes over a bank and gets smashed we should know if the new car put in its place is charged to working expenses or capital account. We want to know if this principle is carried out.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman must have misunderstood the remark of the Minister of Finance. We have no objection whatever to give the information he has asked, and I will take a note of it and answer him later on.

St. Charles Branch..... ..... $14,146.37

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is this for?

Mr. BOWELL. Up to the 30th of April there has been expended for land damages, $12,010.29, and in legal expenses in connection with land claims, $2,136.08.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total cost of the St. Charles branch up to date?

Mr. BOWELL. $1,686,743.91.

Mr. MULOCK. To a question I put yesterday, in regard to the carrying of freight over the Intercolonial Railway, I received only a partial answer. Is it customary for the Government to carry freight below cost?

Mr. BOWELL. Not that I am aware of. I have not yet investigated fully the working of the road.

Mr. MULOCK. Could the hon. gentleman say what is the lowest cost of carrying freight per ton per mile over the railway?

Mr. BOWELL. I shall have to ask my hon. friend to defer these questions until the chief engineer comes. I will accept the questions at any time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was the estimated cost of the St. Charles extension?

Mr. BOWELL. I have not got that. I will endeavour to obtain it.

Increased accommodation at St.John. $5,092.50

Mr. McMULLEN. What is this?

Mr. BOWELL. This is for land damages, $4,355.17, and legal expenses $737.33. I am informed that the total expenditure from the commencement of the works at this point has been $998,412.95.

Mr. McMULLEN. Can the hon. gentleman give us any idea of the freight tonnage at this point?

Mr. BOWELL. I cannot. On page 41 of the annual report, however, there is a statement showing the total number of locomotives and the various classes of cars on the 1st July, 1889, and on the 30th June, 1890.

Mr. FOSTER. And on page 23 the hon. gentleman will find the answer to his first question.

"Y" at Truro..... $1,500

Mr. McMULLEN. Why is this?

Mr. BOWELL. This is for the construction of a "Y." I can give the hon. gentleman the items. The land cost $4,318; surveying, $143.40; track labour, $644.56; progress estimates, $300.58; legal expenses, $49.60; masonry, $301; total, $5,757.64, and $1,500 will be required to complete.

Mr. McMULLEN. What was the necessity for that "Y?"

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman will see on page 20 of the Railway Report that the "Y" was required on account of the increased traffic, and that when completed it will facilitate the amount of traffic.

Mr. McMULLEN. Was there a turn-table at this point before the "Y" was put in?

Mr. BOWELL. There was. This "Y" was put in for the accommodation of the Mulgrave train.

Cape Breton Railway—Construction and equipment... ..... $399,700

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does this close the expenditure?

Mr. BOWELL. No; there is an item in the main Estimates amounting to about $30,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the entire length of this line?

Mr. BOWELL. Ninety-eight miles.

Mr. McMULLEN. What proportion of rolling stock will this give to the mile?

Mr. BOWELL. About eight engines and tenders, six first-class cars, four second-class cars, and three or four baggage cars.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total cost?

Mr. BOWELL. $2,973,042.41, exclusive of the Grand Narrows bridge, which amounts to $525,365.02.

Mr. CHARLTON. Will that leave the road fully equipped with rolling stock?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the cost of construction per mile? It appears to have cost an enormous amount of money. What is the cost without rolling stock?

Mr. BOWELL. The engineer informs me that he has not the figures without the rolling stock, but that it costs between $29,000 and $30,000 per mile, including the rolling stock. He will endeavour to have a separate statement for the Committee when we reach the main Estimates.

Mr. McMULLEN. Are there any claims along the line remaining unsettled?

Mr. BOWELL. There are a few small claims; nearly all the claims were settled as the work went on.

Mr. McMULLEN. At the inception of this scheme what was the estimated cost?

Mr. BOWELL. The original estimate was about $20,000 per mile, but the calculation was based on wooden structures, which were afterwards changed to iron or steel.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Did that include the bridge over the Narrows?

Mr. BOWELL. No; as it was at first intended to use a ferry. That was found impracticable, and it was thought better to have a permanent structure.

Mr. McMULLEN. This is a very large increase. I remember that when the Bill was introduced, it was stated that the cost would be something in the neighbourhood of what the hon. gentleman mentioned. It appears, however, to have cost $10,000

a mile more than that. I cannot understand what changes could be made in the construction which would entail this increase of 50 per cent. over the estimated cost. Unfortunately, it appears that all the lines we build cost twice, and, in some cases, three times the first estimate. This was the case in connection with the St. Charles branch and the Oxford and Glasgow and the Pictou branch. All those lines appear to have been launched with the understanding that they would cost within the limits of a respectable sum, but when we come to settle up we find them overrunning the estimate 50 per cent. on an average. The St. Charles branch cost treble the amount anticipated when the scheme was first presented. Surely that cannot rest with the engineer. If it does, it reflects seriously on the engineering skill of any man who would prepare statements authorizing any Minister to say that a road can be constructed at $20,000 a mile, when it turns out to cost $30,000 a mile.

Mr. BOWELL. I am aware of the enormous expenditure which was incurred in connection with the St. Charles branch, though I do not think it can be attributed to the engineers who made the first calculation, as a large portion of the expenditure was unforeseen, as far as the Government and the engineers were concerned. The cost of the right of way was enormous and far beyond what was expected. Referring to the Cape Breton Railway, I find that the original design was for wooden structures, culverts, bridges, abutments and piers. The culverts have been built of solid stone, and the road has been made a first-class road. It was found that the cost of introducing steel bridges and stone culverts would not at the outside exceed the cost of renewing wooden structures, when worn out, and that the changes would practically make the work permanent, and a first-class road in the first place.

Mr. McMULLEN. Was the contract let in the first place on the understanding that the bridges and culverts were to be wooden?

Mr. BOWELL. The engineer informs me that the decision to change the character of the road was made before the contracts were let.

Mr. McMULLEN. In that case, there cannot be any serious claim for payments in consequence of a change in the plans and specifications. There is nothing of that kind now pending, is there?

Mr. BOWELL. I understand that there are no claims consequent upon the change of the specifications.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then we are to understand from that, that there are no claims at all pending upon any contracts in connection with that road?

Mr. BOWELL. I did not say that.

Mr. McMULLEN. That is what I want to know.

Mr. BOWELL. What I said was, that I understood there were no claims arising out of a change in the specification or the contract. There are claims in reference to the classification of some of the work, that is, as to whether some material should be classed under one head or under another, which is now under consideration.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the claim presented under that head?

Mr. BOWELL. I am not able to give the hon. gentleman the information on that point just now, but before the House rises it will be fully informed of all the facts, that is, if any claim is recognized; as in such case we will have to ask Parliament to sanction it.

Mr. McMULLEN. Was the work all let to one firm?

Mr. BOWELL. No, it was let to two different contractors.

Mr. McMULLEN. Will this cover the cost of the railway?

Mr. BOWELL. Everything but the rails and the rolling stock.

Cape Breton Railway — Bridge over Grand Narrows..... $95,000

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the total cost of this bridge?

Mr. BOWELL. The total cost of the construction of the Grand Narrows Bridge was $525,365.02 up to the 1st June, 1891.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the length of this bridge?

Mr. BOWELL. 1,800 feet.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the height of the bridge?

Mr. BOWELL. It is about 75 feet from the mud bottom to the level of the water, and 11 feet above that, with a draw.

Oxford and New Glasgow Railway— Construction and equipment.... $233,000

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the total cost of that road up to date?

Mr. BOWELL. The total amount up to 30th June, is $1,768,027.96, including the amount for which a vote is now asked.

Mr. McMULLEN. What class of road is it?

Mr. BOWELL. This also was intended in the first place to be built with wooden structures, but the Government, on the advice of their engineers, decided to build the bridges of steel and the culverts of masonry. In fact, they made the same change in connection with this as they did in regard to the road under discussion a few minutes ago.

Mr. McMULLEN. Was this change made before the contract was let?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, before the contracts were let.

Mr. McMULLEN. There have been no serious changes made in the plans and specifications since the contracts were let?

Mr. BOWELL. The engineer informs me that there have not been any.

Short Line Railway—To pay judgment of Court..... $24,563 02

Mr. BOWELL. This line was originally subsidized for $3,200 per mile, and the Montreal and European Short Line Railway Company entered into a contract under the Subsidy Act to build the road. They commenced the work, and after doing some grading and masonry, and providing a large quantity of timber and ties, they failed to carry on the work and left large bills unpaid. These

were adjudicated on by Judge Clarke, and under his ruling, $149,233.09 was paid by the Government to the creditors of the company. The Government passed an Act expropriating their property, and the company brought action against the Government and received in addition to the sum mentioned, the sum of $100,777.68 principal with interest at 6 per cent., from July, 1887, and costs, $2,363.04. So that the payments were made of the following amounts: Under Judge Clarke's adjudication, $149,233.09; paid to company, $80,000; to the lawyers and creditors, $24,563.82, making a total of $253,796.91.

Annapolis and Digby Railway—Construction..... $108,000

Mr. FLINT. I do not see any appropriation placed in the regular Estimates for this railway, and I would ask if this is the final appropriation to pay for the so-called missing link? Are there likely to be further appropriations for that purpose?

Mr. BOWELL. The engineer informs me that he is not aware of any claim that will necessitate asking for a further appropriation.

Mr. FLINT. I understand the road is almost completed, and there is, of course, a general desire and anxiety in the western portion of the province to enjoy the facilities which it will afford. I would like to ask the Government what progress has been made in concluding an arrangement between the Government, the Windsor and Annapolis Railway, the Western Counties Railway and the contractors for running trains over the new line? Is it likely that conclusions can be reached at an early date so that trains can be run over the road?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is nothing pending with regard to that. The Western Counties Railway will be permitted to run their trains as soon as possible. The Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company have nothing to do with it. There is every desire on the part of the Government that that road should be afforded facilities as soon as possible.

Mr. BOWERS. I would like to call the attention of the Government to an act of injustice which this railway has done to the inhabitants of Bear River and Smith's Cove, and to the inhabitants of Hillsburg, in Annapolis County. The country around Bear River is a very hilly section of country. The inhabitants had a nice level road for teaming, and the Government, or the contractors, I suppose, of the company who built this line, have taken this road from the people and have forced them to go up over two steep hills to get to the depot at Smith's Cove. They have spent something like $5,000, I am informed, to enable them to get to the depot, and now they find that when they get near Smith's Cove, they have to go over high hills, where they cannot haul over half a load. They have to discharge half the load and come back half a mile or more to get the balance of the load. This makes it very inconvenient for the people. I would like to know whether it is the Government's fault, or whether it is the fault of the contractors, and whether any arrangement is going to be made whereby the people can be accommodated in this matter. I think they sent a petition about this matter a year ago, and they feel deeply hurt. They think the Government or the company have treated them with great injustice, and caused them large expense. It must be remembered that the part of the county I am speaking of is not such as most of us live in, but it is very hilly, and the company have taken the level road away from them and forced them to go further inland, and they want the Government or the company to make this road as good to them as the old road was. In this connection I wish to mention the bridge that crosses Bear River. It is always usual to build piers on the outside and on the inside of the bridge, so that vessels coming through the draw may be able to lie alongside of this pier until the bridge is open. Now, there are no piers built where the draw is to enable vessels to warp through the bridge, and when there is any wind blowing vessels are apt to be driven ashore on the rocks and damaged. I would like to know when the Government is going to build these piers?

Mr. FLINT. I have had correspondence on this subject, and the difficulty seems to be this: Bear River is a deep and at times rapidly-rushing stream between very high hills, and vessels going down the stream or coming up the stream, cannot count on finding the draw open at the precise moment when they arrive in the vicinity of the draw. As there is a large amount of trade here and a great number of vessels, comparatively speaking, there is a strong demand that in order that the public be accommodated in this respect the Government should provide piers or other conveniences so that vessels may attach themselves while waiting, and save themselves from heavy currents, squalls or gales, or during a period of detention, so that they may pass through the draw-bridge at their leisure and with complete safety. The danger is much more imminent than to a stranger would at first appear. I am informed by parties familiar with the trade that this is a matter of great importance. Have the Government had any information on the subject, and what are their views?

Mr. TUPPER. I am aware that applications have been made from different localities with respect to "walking piers" or buoys, but on enquiry I ascertained that while there are a great many of these in Canada, in no instance has the Marine Department ever paid the cost. In some cases they have been supplied by the railway corporation owning the bridges, and in others by the municipalities interested.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I desire to call the attention of the Government to the damage done by the construction of a railway bridge across the Rivière du Sud, in the County of Montmagny. I think the works that are necessary in this connection should be carried out while the water is low. I hold in my hand a report from Mr. Coste. After visiting the spot he reports:

"In conclusion, I must say, that, in my opinion, the railway bridge, if not the absolute cause of the damage, has without doubt accelerated the wearing away of the bank above the railway bridge."

Mr. Perley says in his report:

"I agree with Mr. Coste in his conclusion that the wearing away of the bank has been caused by the railway bridge."

This subject has been before the department for four or five years, and we have never obtained satisfaction. It has been stated that the amount required for a wharf was about $3,000. I think the

department knows all about the matter, but I am compelled to say that it is the ill-will of the chief engineer that prevents the work being done. In his own report, he estimates the cost of protecting the road immediately above the Intercolonial Railway bridge at $3,000, and although the Government expend large amounts on other works, yet when we ask for the expenditure of the amount estimated, no steps are taken to carry out the work. I do not understand why we do not have the work carried out, and at all events if it is not to be carried out, let us know it, for I do not like to be waiting month after month. This work should be done while the water is low, for a few months hence it will be too late and great damage will be done next spring.

Mr. BOWELL. The only information I am able to give the hon. gentleman is— and I must say it is very inconvenient to discuss every railway question on a special item—that a report was made on the subject, and the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) has quoted from it, to the effect that the Government are not responsible for the damages to which he refers. The hon. gentleman is aware that I informed him that as soon as I had time I would look more closely into the claim he made; but the information I have received is that all the engineers who have considered the question have declared that the Government are not in any way responsible for the damage done. It is true Mr. Coste made the report to which the hon. gentleman refers; but as to the wording of it there is nothing positively stated. It is very objectionable for members to animadvert on an official who can have no personal interest either for or against the parties making the claim. His duty is to make an investigation, to report fully to the department the facts as presented to him, irrespective as to how they will affect the Government or any individual. I cannot believe for a moment the insinuation of the hon. gentleman that the officer who made the report was actuated by any personal feeling against that locality. If a statement of that kind was made it was unworthy of any hon. gentleman.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I admit that the hon. Minister has done his best to give me justice. I fully expected the answer he has given, and here is my answer to his reply. The first report was made by Mr. Mackenzie, who was sent to the locality in winter when there were two or three feet of snow on the ground, and when it was impossible for any one to know how much damage would be done at another season of the year. More than that: this officer went to Montmagny and took the evidence of witnesses, and he made a report on the information of some parties interested as to what had been done. I subsequently went there with Mr. Coste to ascertain what those people had stated, and he said to them: Last winter you said so and so; and they replied: We never said that. The former engineer, who could not speak French, went there with several gentlemen, among them the leader of the Tory party, who acted as interpreter, and the witnesses then said quite the contrary to what they stated to Mr. Coste. When I went there with Mr. Coste I asked those people if the statements they were reported to have previously made were true, and they said quite the contrary. I am compelled to say, and I am sorry to have to say it, that I believe it is bad will on the part of the chief engineer. Last summer he passed through my place with his employés in a special car, very comfortable indeed, but I am not jealous of that. He stopped for a while, about an acre from the station; he was not in a hurry, as he had a special car, and I asked him very politely to stop for a minute and come and see the place. I said to him: You are an engineer, and if you say upon your authority as an engineer that there is no damage done and that the bridge is not the cause of this damage, I will take your word for it. I believe that no man of common sense could view that place and say that that bridge was not the cause of the injury. The chief engineer refused positively to stop for a minute, and he said he must at once go to Quebec. I said to him: You are paid to look after the road, and surely you can stop for a minute to see if this damage is being done; but he positively refused to look at the place, and that is the reason I say there is bad will on the part of the chief engineer. I suggested to the chief engineer that as he said Mr. Mackenzie had reported against me, and as Mr. Coste had reported in favour of my contention, that I would agree to take the opinion of an independent engineer, not under his control nor under the control of the Government, and I would accept his report as correct. That proposition was refused also, and if that does not show bad will on the part of the chief engineer, I am very much mistaken. I must say that the acting Minister has always accepted my suggestions with the greatest kindness, and I am obliged to him for that. When the chief engineer was in my constituency, I, as a member of Parliament and as one interested in the county, asked him, as a favour, to wait there for a moment and look at the place, but he refused to do so and continued on to Quebec in his special car. I told him that he was paid to look after the road, and that, as he was on the spot, he should do so, and I told him that I would bring the matter before the House, as I do now. I ask the Government, as a favour, to name a third engineer, who is not under the control of the chief engineer, to make an impartial report, and I am ready to accept the report. I maintain that this bridge is causing great damage to the people in the neighbourhood, and it is just the time now to have the work done, if it is to be done at all.

Mr. BOWELL. My information is that Mr. Mackenzie, Mr. Archibald and some other engineers have made reports on this matter.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. What are they?

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know what they are.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I would like to know, because I was told in the department that Mr. Mackenzie was the only one who reported against it.

Mr. BOWELL. Mr. Mackenzie reported against it, Mr. Archibald verified that report, as did another engineer also whose name the chief engineer does not now remember. As I understand, in the winter the hon. gentleman referred to, there was nothing done except the taking of evidence. Of course if the hon. gentleman impugns the honesty of the examiner, who he says happens to be a Tory, and apparently in his estimation must be a perjurer——

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Not all.

Mr. BOWELL. I am much obliged to the hon. gentleman for making some exceptions, but he im-

pugned the honesty of this gentleman because he said he happened to be a Tory. I would be very sorry to attribute that character to all the party to which my hon. friend belongs. I am quite sure the Government could have no possible object in depriving these people of any just rights or of any just claims for damages which may arise. The chief engineer tells me that at the time the hon. gentleman asked him to wait at that station he had already examined that locality and examined the effect which the water was supposed to have on the land, and he did not deem it necessary to go again. I am strongly reminded in this connection of the constant applications I have in my own department when a decision is given against a man, and I fear my hon. friend partakes of that particular character. Some people are never satisfied unless the decision is according to their own wishes, and if the decision is against them they bring it up next year and the year after, and if not decided in their favour before an election then the claim will be sent to the representative of the constituency who is elected, and that unfortunate member has to go through the same ordeal as his predecessor in trying to get the penalty, or whatever it may be, reversed. I do not find fault with the action of my hon. friend. I rather admire the interest he takes in his constituents, but I do not think it is fair to attribute motives to the engineers. If the hon. gentleman will promise me to say no more about it, and if I remain acting Minister for any length of time so as to enable me to select some man in whom the hon. gentleman will, I hope, have confidence, I will see that even another investigation is made, and if the report of Mr. Coste is verified I will try to do justice to the hon. gentleman and to his constituents.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I will try and explain myself.

Mr. BOWELL. Remember it is on condition that you say no more.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I wish to say that I have nothing to say against Tories, but when this engineer came down there——

Mr. BOWELL. Remember you are going to break my offer.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. One of the Tory leaders who is revising officer in my county, and who has been disqualified by three judges of the Superior Court, when asked by the engineer, said there is no damage done there. When Mr. Coste came to my place we went specially to these gentlemen, and Mr. Coste asked them if last winter they said such a thing before Mr. Mackenzie and Mr. Hebert, and they said, "No; we never said that, we said quite the contrary." Am I to judge of them that they made a mistake or that Mr. Hebert made a mistake? I did not say anything against the Tories.

Mr. BOWELL. Those people who denied that were interested, and, of course, it was to their interest to do so.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I beg your pardon; some of the people whom Mr. Mackenzie asked were adversaries of mine, and they did their best to get the Government not to do the work, so as to be able to say: You have a member of the Opposition representing you, put a good Tory in his place and you will get the work done. That was the position they took. I am glad that I brought up this matter, because I have now the word of the acting Minister that a third engineer will be sent to report, and that has been refused me by a letter from the department. I will stand by the report of any impartial engineer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is another interesting matter in connection with this. We would like to know how long the hon. member will be acting Minister of Railways, as he has intimated it will be for some time. Now, the House, in passing supplies, would like to know who will administer the votes they are giving. I think the hon. gentleman, having excited our curiosity, ought to satisfy it by giving us some notice as to how long he will be acting Minister of Railways.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). Referring again to the item under consideration, I would like to enquire whether in this appropriation is included the cost of station houses between Bear River and Annapolis? In the construction of this missing link between Digby and Annapolis, I understand that station houses have been erected at Bear River, Clementsport and Smith's Cove. When the right of way was paid for some twelve or fifteen years ago, the County of Annapolis paid for ground for station houses, not only at Bear River, Clementsport and Annapolis, but also at Deep Brook and Upper Clementsport. As I understand, no station houses have been erected at Deep Brook and Upper Clementsport. I would like to know whether, in connection with this item, the necessity of these station houses has been considered?

Mr. FORBES. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he can give me the total length of the line from Annapolis to Digby, and the total cost? I would like him also to say whether the cost includes rolling stock, whether any is to be provided by the Government, and whether, when the line is completed, it is intended to hand it over to the Western Counties Railway Company?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. $620,000 is the actual cost. Rolling stock is not included, there is none to be provided by the Government, and the road belongs to the Western Counties Railway Company.

Mr. BOWERS. I would like to know whether the Government intends to do anything in regard to the injustice I complained of, that an important road has been diverted from the side of the river and carried over two hills, to the detriment of the interests of the people who have to use it. The Minister said he did not think it was necessary to build the piers which I spoke of in the Bear River. When the Western Counties Railway built the bridge across the Sissiboo River, they also built piers, so that vessels could pass through without trouble, and if the Government have obstructed the navigation of the river by the construction of this bridge, they ought to remove all impediments and leave room for vessels to pass through the bridge. It is utterly impossible without these piers for vessels to get through the bridge.

Mr. BOWELL. In addition to what my hon. colleague the Minister of Marine has stated, I am informed that everything has been done at that bridge that was recommended as necessary to the safety of shipping, by the harbour master, who the department supposed would know what was

actually required. I am not acquainted with the locality, nor do I know who the harbour master is; but that is the information I have from the chief engineer. In regard to the road to which the hon. gentleman has referred, I am also informed that the grades upon it are easier and much safer than they would have been had the old alignment been continued—that, in fact, a change was made to avoid what are termed two-rail crossings, in order to avoid accidents which very often occur at these crossings. If anything further is found necessary to facilitate the passage of boats, it will be the duty of the Railway Department to see that it is provided. If an additional pier is necessary the department will see that it is built.

Mr. BOWERS. I am satisfied with the hon. Minister's explanation, for I know that the piers will be built if he makes enquiries. As to the road the hon. Minister is mistaken. Every person knows that if you carry a road along the edge of a river bank it will be level. This road has been diverted from the edge of the river and forced to pass up over two hills. I have a diagram here showing its position.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like now to ask what is the cost per ton per mile for carrying stone from Newcastle to Quebec?

Mr. BOWELL. I am informed by the chief engineer that the actual cost is half a cent per ton per mile.

Mr. MULOCK. Then I would ask whether the stone referred to in my question of yesterday was hauled over that particular portion of the road?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, 411 miles, the engineer tells me.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. May we take half a cent per ton per mile as roughly representing the minimum cost of the haulage of all goods?

Mr. BOWELL. The engineer says yes, approximately.

To rebuild pivot pier for swing bridge at Hastings	$1,000
For iron swing at Hastings	430
To complete dry dock at Bobcaygeon	1,250

Mr. BARRON. I understood the hon. the Finance Minister the other night to say that these estimates were only for work that had been done.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a liability which was incurred during the past year.

Mr. BARRON. I hold in my hand the report of Mr. R. B. Rogers, superintending engineer, and in that report he refers again, as he has done frequently before, to the fact that the bridge north of the lock at Fenelon Falls is still an impediment to navigation. He says this part of the route cannot be used till the swing bridge is placed in the railroad bridge above the upper entrance to the lock. It has been in that condition ever since that lock has been built, and the Government are paying a lockmaster $250 a year, although nothing can go through the lock by reason of this bridge being there an impediment to navigation.

Mr. FOSTER. The Trent Valley Canal will come up in the main Estimates, and then we will have an opportunity to discuss the whole matter.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What means this item to complete the dry dock at Bobcaygeon?

Mr. BOWELL. That is to be dropped out, the lock being, no doubt, completed.

Towards filling a pond at St. Catharines	$1,849 75

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total cost of filling that pond? It looks like a sink hole. Will this fill it?

Mr. BOWELL. I suppose so. This pond was created by back water from Lock No. 2 of the canal. It was a public nuisance, the main sewer from the town of St. Catharines emptying into it. The work executed has abated this nuisance.

Rideau Canal, lands and damages	$1,000

Mr. McMULLEN. How long has this been standing? I have noticed that every year there is some little item of damages in connection with this canal. What is the cause of this even sum?

Mr. BOWELL. I remember asking the same question when considering the estimates with the deputy, and it appears that in all our public works, though they may have been built for years, there are damages arising every year in some form or other. This was paid on the report of the engineer sent to examine into the claims made.

Mr. MULOCK. It appears there has been some expropriation or acquisition of land.

Survey above Kingston Mills	$1,200

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was the necessity for this?

Mr. BOWELL. The work has been performed and paid for. A number of claims were made for compensation for wash of shore, extending a considerable distance—the contour being about 50 miles. It was thought advisable to have a survey made in the winter, so that the contour of the land might be ascertained and fixed by a plan.

Mr. MULOCK. Who was the surveyor?

Mr. BOWELL. Mr. Wise, the Government surveyor.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I only called attention to this because I have observed that, by some curious phenomenon, regularly, before a general election, a survey is made above Kingston Mills. I think this is the third or fourth time that such a survey has been made just before a general election, and I have noticed that sundry parties have come to me and said that a survey was about to be made above Kingston Mills, and, therefore, we were sure to have a general election.

Mr. FOSTER. That was valuable to keep as an indicator.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, and I did not forget the pointer.

Towards deepening the Basin at Ottawa	$800

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is this for? Is this to clear out some more sawdust?

Mr. BOWELL. This sum is to pay the balance due on the final estimate for the deepening of the basin above the bridge in Ottawa. The hon. gentleman will remember that the work was done last year.

Mrs. J. B. Courville, gratuity equal to two months' pay of her late husband, in his lifetime Lockmaster on the Lachine Canal	$ 76
Widow of late Narcisse Bosquet, in his lifetime Foreman Carpenter, St. Ours Lock, gratuity equal to two months' pay	100
Joseph Daoust, formerly Lockman, Beauharnois Canal, gratuity equal to two months' pay, he having been incapacitated by sickness resulting from exposure while on duty	76
Gratuity equal to two months' pay to the representative of P. Ryan, formerly assistant Bridge-keeper, Lachine Canal	76
J. V. Callaerts, compensation in full for injuries received whilst employed on the works of the Chambly Canal.	400
D. Stark, Engineer, employed on works in Canada for the period of 48 years, of which 25 were in the Government service, gratuity equal to one year's salary, on leaving the service	3,000
	$3,728

Mr. BOWELL. This first gratuity was paid to the widow of Mr. Courville, who died from blood poisoning, the effect of an injury which he received when he was assisting in the repairs of the break in the Cornwall Canal. The husband of Mrs. Narcisse Bosquet was canal foreman for twenty-three years, and he contracted a disease in the service, from which he died. John Daoust, formerly lockman on the Chambly Canal, was injured by the fall of some frozen earth while working there, and died from the exposure which resulted from his injury.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Interrupting the hon. gentleman, I may say that I have no objection to the payment of two months' salary to any officer who died in the service, but I think this was one of those items for which the vote of Unforeseen Expenses was expected to serve, and, unless you are going to introduce the practice of introducing all these details in the Estimates in future, I would suggest that it would be better that they should be paid out of Unforeseen Expenses.

Mr. FOSTER. This requires a vote of the House, because these are not permanent officers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My impression is that a lockmaster is a permanent officer.

Mr. CURRAN. No; the lockmasters are only employed by the season.

Mr. FOSTER. They do not come under the clause of the law which allows us to pay the gratuity, as they are not appointed by Order in Council.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will not dispute the position of the hon. gentleman, and, of course, no one will dispute the items.

Mr. FOSTER. If it were possible to charge these to Unforeseen Expenses, they would have been charged to that item.

Mr. McMULLEN. I should like to ask if D. Stark, engineer, who is said to have been employed for forty-eight years on works in Canada, of which twenty-five years were in the Government service, contributed to the superannuation fund?

Mr. BOWELL. He did not. He worked on the Trent Valley Canal and on the Ottawa River, and, as I am informed, he was first employed forty years ago on the Lachine Canal, and has been constantly in the employment of the Government since.

Mr. MULOCK. When did he leave the service?

Mr. BOWELL. A very short time ago, and this gratuity is given to him on account of his failing health, as he could not avail himself of the superannuation fund, to which he never contributed. I am informed that scarcely any of the engineers are on the permanent staff. There are a few, but not many.

Mr. McMULLEN. Does he reside in Ottawa now?

Mr. BOWELL. He has been a resident of Ottawa during his illness for some time past, but he has left the city since he has been relieved from duty. Where he has gone, I do not know.

Mr. CURRAN. I would ask the Minister to amend the item granting two months' pay to P. Ryan, so as to allow the Auditor General to pay the amount and to make it payable to Helen Ryan, wife of P. Cassidy, daughter of the late P. Ryan.

Mr. MULOCK. Is she the person to receive it?

Mr. CURRAN. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. Is she the only child?

Mr. CURRAN. She is the person with whom her father resided, and all the others are satisfied she should get the money. She maintained her father in her own house, and there is no trouble about it.

Mr. BARRON. Perhaps the Minister of Public Works will be kind enough to say, if it is possible to grant compensation to the widow of the late Mr. Streng, who was an engineer at Kingston. He was required to prepare some plan for a dry dock at a time when he was ill, and he had to leave his sick bed, and subsequently he died, and the doctor attributed his death to having left his bed in that condition. I understand the widow has been left almost destitute. An application has been made for simply a year's salary, if I am not mistaken. The matter has already been brought to the attention of the Minister, and I would like him to say whether there is any likelihood of her getting a pension.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This matter was brought to the attention of the Government, and the hon. gentleman will do well not to persist in his question now, because I think he will see that this case has not been forgotten when further Estimates are brought down.

Improvement of ship canal between Quebec and Montreal—Governor General's warrant	$20,000

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In the beginning of April of this year, the department found itself with only $4,000 left. Dredges had to be put in order, and as the money to be voted by Parliament would not be available, we asked for a Governor General's warrant, in order not to stop the work until the 1st of July. This $20,000 is a portion of the $100,000 that I stated last year would be required to complete the work which the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal had determined to do when these works were taken over by the Government. In the ordinary Estimates we shall ask Parliament to divide into two parts the balance of

the $80,000 which will be required to complete the work undertaken by the Harbour Commissioners. Hon. gentlemen will see that $50,000 are asked for that purpose, and the balance of $30,000 will be voted next year.

Kingston Graving Dock — Governor General's warrant..... $60,000

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This sum was required in order to go on with the works on that dock. According to the reports submitted by the chief engineer on the 16th March last, the balance then available of the appropriation of $160,000 made by Parliament during the session of 1890 for the construction of the Kingston dock, was only $4,000, a sum quite insufficient to carry on the work up to the 30th June. Besides the contract for the construction of the dock proper, contracts had also been entered into for furnishing caissons for closing the dock. It is further contemplated to erect an engine house by contract. Moreover, it was expected that the caisson and pumping plant would be completed by or before the 30th June; therefore, though this sum of money has been asked, it will be applied towards the same work, and so much less will be required for the year that began yesterday.

Mr. MULOCK. What progress has been made in the construction of this dry dock?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We believe the contract work will be completed in September or October of this year.

Mr. MULOCK. Have there been any changes made, either in alterations or specifications, with regard to its size?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No change has been made since last year, when the whole matter was before the House. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will be glad to know the dimensions. Length, 280 feet; width, 49 feet; width at coping level, 72 feet; depth from coping to floor, 26 feet; depth of water on sill at low water, 15½ feet; width of entrance, 48 feet.

Mr. GIBSON. Did not the chief engineer report that the entrance should be made 55 feet?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There were two large vessels, one of them the *Cibola*, which could not enter the dock, and it was enlarged a little to accommodate them.

Mr. MULOCK. Are we to understand that the contract has been in no way interfered with, so that no question can arise of increased charges or damages on the part of the contractor? Has the contract been carried out strictly in accordance with the plans and specifications, without any alteration?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No. It was stated at the time that these representations had been made by the owners of these vessels, I do not know how many months after the works had been going on. Then we stopped them in order to have a decision of council as to whether the enlargement should take place. It was stated at the time what the enlargement would cost, but I do not remember now what it was.

Mr. MULOCK. Was there a schedule of prices agreed to with regard to the increased size of the locks, or was the contract let before the increased size was decided upon? Now, when the increased size was decided upon, was there a schedule of prices agreed to by the contractor for carrying out this increased size?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, it was according to the same schedule, because they were asking on one item something more, and council said: No, we will stick to the item in the original contract.

Mr. GIBSON. When the contract was first let the opening was 48 feet, and it was afterwards recommendeded by the chief engineer that, owing to the large size of the vessels plying upon the lakes, the opening should be increased to 60 feet. Accordingly, an Order in Council was passed that this opening should be made 60 feet without any additional cost. In the course of twenty days, after it was discovered by the engineer in charge that there was no necessity for making the opening 60 feet, that 55 feet would do, it was ascertained that $35,000 would be required additional to make the opening 5 feet less. I should like to know how, if 60 feet would cost nothing, an opening of 55 feet involved an increased cost of $35,000? I was one of the contractors who offered to do the work. According to the calculation I made in regard to the opening of the dock, instead of an increase being made to the contract, with the exception of the folding part of the castings, there should have been a reduction of $24,000 in the estimate.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken about the report that 60 feet would cost nothing.

Mr. GIBSON. I read it from the documents sent from the department, which were in the hands of the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot).

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That was never intended by the engineer, as is quite evident. The enlargement of the work must incur additional cost, and the engineer at first reported 60 feet, and afterwards, before the work was given out, he reported that after making minute calculations he thought 55 feet would be sufficient, and that reduction would somewhat curtail the expense. The result was the engineer reported accordingly. It was worth the money to get the dock so widened.

Mr. GIBSON. I still adhere to my statement. It will be remembered that 48 feet was the original opening for the dock, and it was recommended by the engineer that it should be enlarged to 60 feet without any cost to the country. In twenty days it was changed to 55 feet, at an additional cost of $35,000. There is less masonry for a 55-foot opening than for a 48-foot opening—and I know what I am talking about.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot give further information at this moment, but I furnished all the information last year. When we come to the ordinary Estimates I will then be ready to give all the information the hon. gentleman requires.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In asking a vote the hon. gentleman should be ready with the information.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I could not expect, in view of the fact that I gave all the information last year regarding the enlargement, that I would be asked to give it again this year. When the ordinary Estimates are taken up, I will be ready to give the information required.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the Minister state the contract price for the work as originally entered into, as the result of advertising for tenders?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. About $261,000.

Mr. MULOCK. There has been no change in the specification or contract price with the exception of increasing the opening to 55 feet, at an increased cost of $35,000?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. $35,000.

Mr. MULOCK. Is that all the change made in the specification for the work and in the contract price?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. So I am informed. Of course, there are other works not included in the contract.

Mr. MULOCK. I am speaking of the contract.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; I do not see anything else.

Mr. MULOCK. What other works at Kingston were there connected with this work, which forms the subject-matter of this vote?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There were the wrought iron castings, hauling gear, pumping plant, engine and boiler house, tools, coal shed, fencing and gates, shores, wedges and blocks, storehouse, residence of the dock master and engineer, dock office, plant, expense incurred for the site, &c.

Mr. MULOCK. Without referring to the land, and confining myself to the work, I should like to know if all these works enumerated were let after the publication of advertisement for tenders?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Some of them.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. gentleman say which?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Pumping plant; contractors, Inglis & Son, Toronto. Wrought iron castings; contractors, Dominion Bridge Company. I think there is another contract with respect to the engine and boiler plant.

Mr. MULOCK. I understood you to state that the contract for that work had not been let.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think that is one of the works to be let.

Mr. MULOCK. What have been let?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Those I have mentioned.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. gentleman state the names of the contractors for works not let by public tender, and the amounts of the contracts?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have not the names of the contractors here; I have only an estimate of the amount for each work.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman will see that tenders were invited for certain public works at Kingston, and, subsequently or contemporaneously, a large number of other works were let, for which public tenders were not invited. It is important to avoid such a system as that, and I should like to know, if possible, the amounts of the contracts that were let at Kingston to private contractors, and the names of the contractors. I ask that these contracts be laid on the Table of the House, and perhaps the hon. gentleman, at the same time, will bring down a copy of the report of the Minister to Council on which the Governor General's warrant was issued. The Governor General's warrants are not forthcoming in connection with all these special items, and, as I have mentioned before, I think the time has arrived when attention should be drawn on all occasions to the exercise of this extraordinary power by the Governor in Council, in passing warrants for money not having previously been sanctioned by Parliament. Here we find that on the 16th of March last, at a period when apparently it was impossible to make any reasonable use of the money, an Order in Council was passed for the expenditure of $60,000, a portion of which, at least, had never been sanctioned by Parliament. I think that the report and the argument upon which that warrant was issued should be laid on the Table. I would like to ask who is the local engineer at Kingston in connection with all these works? I may say, for the hon. gentleman's information, that the report of the previous year gives the name of George F. Perley as engineer at Kingston. I would like to know if he occupies any office other than that of assistant engineer at Kingston in connection with these various works?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; he is one of the assistant engineers in my department and he was sent up there, and is paid only for the work he is doing there.

An hon. MEMBER. Is he a relation of the chief engineer?

Mr. MULOCK. I should have said that the gentleman's name is George E. Perley. I am asked if he is a relation of the chief engineer?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. If it were not urgent to have these items passed, I think it would be only right that the whole of those items should stand over until all this information is before the House. The hon. gentleman has stated that there have been some contracts entered into in connection with this work without being put up for tender, and I think we should not dispose of this item until we have all the details. I would not wish to delay the progress of the Estimates if we are allowed to discuss the subject at some later stage.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will bring down all the details on the main Estimates.

Mr. MULOCK. That will be satisfactory. It is understood we will have the same freedom of discussion on the items as we would have now?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. GIBSON. I would like to know if the Minister would lay before the House a detailed statement of the quantities and classes of each kind of extra work embraced in the sum of $23,253 that were paid for the altering of the opening of the dry dock at Kingston. I find there is only one item of 2,500 cubic yards of extra rock excavation given in that estimate, and that was put in at a sum of $2 per yard, which the Council saw fit to reduce to the original price of $1 per cubic yard. I would like to know how many yards of concrete were put in for the $1,500; how many yards of masonry and pounds of iron in the caisson for $3,300, and in the chamber for $1,500? I find they

were allowed for the coffer dam $10,000, for unwatering $1,170, for loss of time using contractor's derrick $750, for cribbing $3,250, for cutting the cribs $750, for removing plant $600, and for caisson rollers $770. Now I find there were $16,520 allowed for this extra dam which the contractors of the original dam put in at $25,000; or, in other words, there were paid for extras to the contractors two-thirds of the original price. I would be glad if the Minister would give us the information as to the quantity of concrete, the number of pounds of iron in the caisson, the quantity of masonry in the extra walls he speaks of, and all the other items included in this charge of $23,253.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Most likely the hon. gentleman will give a list of what he wants, and he will be put in possession of the information.

Mr. GIBSON. I will give the hon. Minister a memorandum of the information which I want.

Mr. AMYOT. I moved yesterday for papers concerning this very same work. We want to understand thoroughly the work done there, as well as the extra work, and I hope this report will be brought down in time for the discussion on the Estimates. I may say that we have tried also to find out who that Mr. Bancroft is who was the successful tenderer. We cannot find any trace of his existence, and I have asked already for the name of the lessee of a certain box in the post office at Kingston, and Parliament has been refused that information. I now protest against that refusal. I have been answered by the Postmaster General that these boxes in the Kingston post office belong to the country, they are rented every year, the postmaster keeps a list of them, and I have applied to know who was the lessee of a certain box in a particular year. We are told that annual reports are made, but we cannot find who was the lessee of that box for that year. This is a very extraordinary state of things, and I draw the attention of all the members of the Executive at present in the House to it. I would like to know what is the reason this information is refused to the House; are we not entitled to know who was the lessee of the post office box for that year at Kingston, and why does the Government withhold that information from the public? It has a direct bearing upon the dock under construction at Kingston. I hope that when the Government will see the importance of the question they will try to put themselves right before the country, and not make the people believe that they participate in what we are afraid is at bottom a huge fraud. Mr. Bancroft says, in his tender, that his address is such a post office box at Kingston; he is perfectly unknown at Kingston, and I want to know who was the proprietor of the post office box he indicates at that time. The question is a very proper one, Parliament has a right to know who has furnished the money belonging to the country, and who has been the proprietor of that box for the year. I do not think that the Government is justified in withholding that information from the country. I hope that I am heard and understood. I will repeat it again, in order that I may get the attention of all the members of the Executive in this chamber. I say that Bancroft, who was one of the tenderers for the Kingston dock, is a person perfectly unknown at Kingston and in the country. I say that he gave as his address a certain post office box in Kingston. I do not now remember the number; I think it was 524. I say that I have reason to believe that Bancroft has never had any post office box in Kingston, and I want to know who was the proprietor of that box. That will give us a clue to the fraud which, I think, has been perpetrated upon the country. I want that information, and I do not intend to let the matter stand until I succeed in my efforts, in which I am animated by nothing but considerations of public morality.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. AMYOT. If the word morality does not express my feeling, I mean the safety of public money and the protection of the public against frauds. If the Government can find any good reason for withholding that information, let them at least have the spirit of justice to say so; but for the present they cannot plead impossibility. They cannot say that their postmaster at Kingston has destroyed his books; or, if he has, he should be at once dismissed from the service. They cannot say that he and all the officers of the Kingston post office have forgotten the name of the person who leased that box. We have a right to know it, and I would ask it in the name of the interests I am charged with.

Mr. HAGGART. I gave to the hon. gentleman the fullest information that was in the hands of the department. I, of course, did not know for what object the hon. gentleman asked the names of the lessees of the different boxes in the Kingston post office. I told my deputy to enquire for the list at Kingston, and I will give the hon. gentleman the whole of the return made by my deputy to me:

"The postmasters of the city offices do not report to the department the names of the lessees of boxes, and consequently it is impossible to give the information required with reference to the Kingston post office. The statements furnished by the postmaster at Kingston contain only the number of boxes let and the amount collected, copies of which statements for the year 1889 are herewith appended."

We did apply specially for the names of the lessees at Kingston, and the postmaster's answer was that he did not keep a list of names after the year expired.

Mr. AMYOT. In the first place, he should keep a list; but will he say on oath that he does not remember, and that none of his officers remember, who had the box? When a person has a box in which papers and letters are every day constantly deposited by the officers in the post office, how can it be said to an intelligent man that every one of them has forgotten whose box it was? It is preposterous. There must be some interest in hiding the name of the person who had that box for that year.

Mr. HAGGART. There is none that I am aware of in the department. The hon. gentleman must understand that the party may have rented that box for that particular object and only for that particular time, and may not have used it afterwards.

Mr. LAURIER. Are we to understand from what the hon. Postmaster General says that at the Kingston post office no record is kept of the leases for boxes entered into between any individual and the post office there? It seems to me that a record ought to be kept, and if no record is kept, the

Postmaster General ought to see that the office is not conducted as it ought to be.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. leader of the Opposition is mistaken about my answer. My answer was that the postmaster kept a record each year of parties who leased boxes for that year; but his information to the department is that after he made his return to the Government at the end of the year, he destroyed the documents, having no further use for them.

Mr. LAURIER. That is a very strange practice.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Surely the books of the department would show who paid for the box. The hon. gentleman's inspector would have had to inspect the vouchers with regard to all such matters.

Mr. HAGGART. Here are the vouchers furnished from the post office every month. They only show the total amounts received; they do not give the names of the lessees.

Mr. AMYOT. When I go to the Quebec post office to lease a box, I pay for it and get a receipt on an official form, and the postmaster keeps the stub of the receipt. Surely, if he destroys the list, he must keep the stubs of the receipts.

Mr. LAURIER. But I understand that at the end of the year these vouchers are destroyed.

Mr. AMYOT. That is not what the hon. Minister said. What he said was that the list is destroyed at the end of the year. Of course, that is the information given to him, but it is improbable, and if it is correct, the practice is blameable. You will not find any such thing done in any properly organized establishment. But there is another source of information. When the money is paid, there must be entry made of the payment; how, otherwise, could the Government verify the return to the department of the proper amount of money? A third source is the memory of the living witnesses of the party who rented that box. Under the circumstances, I do not think the Government would be justified in withholding any longer this information.

Mr. HAGGART. I will make further enquiries and find out whether any of the clerks there have any recollection of the party who had the drawer in 1887. The request made to the department in Kingston was to send down the names of parties who were lessees of the different boxes in 1887. The answer to that was that they had not kept any record of the names, as they were in the habit of destroying them at the end of the year, and the information never came to the department here. I suppose these vouchers are checked over by the inspector in the office at Kingston to see that the returns are correct.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Would not the cash book at Kingston post office show what sums were received and from whom?

Mr. HAGGART. My deputy informs me that often the same box is let three or four times during the year, and the boxes credited with the amount paid, and not the lessees. I do not know that the names are kept at all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who is Mr. Bancroft, and did he get the contract? The De-

partment of Public Works ought to know all about him.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is Bancroft & Connolly.

Mr. AMYOT. I know all about them. Mr. Bancroft, who is a perfectly unknown party, was one of the tenderers, and Larkin, Connolly & Co. were other tenderers. When Bancroft was found to be the lowest tenderer, a letter reached the department stating that he had formed a partnership with Larkin, Connolly & Co., for the purposes of his tender. Larkin & Connolly's tender was higher than Bancroft's, which was the lowest, and Mr. Bancroft got the contract because he had joined with Larkin & Connolly, who were said to have vast experience in those contracts, as I believe they had. After that large extras were granted, under circumstances into which I will not go now; but I had hoped to be able to find out who Mr. Bancroft is. I wanted to know who was the lessee of the post office box which he had given as his address in Kingston, and this information we are refused. This information should be given us, as the Kingston post office is a branch of the Postmaster General's Department, and under the control of this Parliament. Not being given that information we are inclined to believe there is some reason for not giving it. I hope the Government will not expose this House to any further enquiry or trouble in the matter, and that they will do their best to find out who was the proprietor of this box. That might be one of the elements of their defence later on.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does the hon. Minister of Public Works know about Mr. Bancroft? Is he one of the parties now carrying on the contract?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. All I can say is that the contract was given to Bancroft & Connolly, and that it is that firm which is building the dock.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The contract is given in the name of Bancroft & Connolly?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes. The tender of Mr. Bancroft, which was the lowest, was the tender accepted.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But the contract was, as I understand, subsequently assigned, in part or whole, to Mr. Connolly.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And is now in the name of Bancroft & Connolly.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, Bancroft & Connolly.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. Minister of Public Works must be able to give my hon. friend the information he wants as to who Mr. Bancroft is? He can say if the contract is now being carried out by Mr. Bancroft in connection with Mr. Connolly.

Mr. AMYOT. We might learn if he is a Chinaman, or an Indian, or an African, or what he is.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is it not the practice to require each individual party in a firm to sign the contract? And does this contract show the signatures of the parties?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have no doubt the contract is signed by the two parties.

Mr. AMYOT. Would the hon. Minister of Public Works have any objection to allowing some members of the House to see to-morrow morning the original tender of Mr. Bancroft, so that we might enjoy the pleasure of seeing his written signature. Bogus names may be sent in to a department so important as that of Public Works to give facilities to other tenderers to come in and frustrate the regular and honest tenderers, who would do the work at better prices in the end. If that be allowed, the public have a right to know it. When tenders are sent in they should be honest, *bonâ fide* tenders, and not tenders sent under bogus names. It will be readily understood how easy, under that practice, it would be to defraud the public. Here is a man who sends in a tender under a false name, and at an absurd price, and he knows the tender will be accepted, because he will form a partnership with a well-known contractor. He will have taken the contract at a very low price, but will make up by extras. He will make it up by changes, additions, by enlarging or diminishing the work, and thus will obtain undue preference.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). If Mr. Bancroft got the contract at the lowest tender and Larkin & Connolly came in and assumed it with him, the country gets the benefit.

Mr. AMYOT. The department says: I give you the contract for $200,000, but I will grant you $80,000 for extra work, which will cost you $10,000, and in that way the country is defrauded of $70,000.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). That is your view of the matter.

Mr. AMYOT. That has been done in this instance. If my hon. friend would read the incomplete report which is before the House, he would not lose his time by making the remarks he did. He does not know the facts, because his intelligence and devotion to his country are too great to allow him to make the remarks he has made had he known the facts.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). It is not given to the average member of this House to know as much as the gallant Colonel who has just spoken. Nevertheless, the House will agree with me that what I said was perfectly right. The country has got the benefit of the action taken by the Department of Public Works, notwithstanding anything the hon. gentleman has said. If the department allowed these extras afterwards, any person, I care not how little intelligence he may possess, must see that it has nothing whatever to do with granting the contract in the first instance.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Well, just be good enough now to explain where I am wrong.

Mr. AMYOT. The hon. gentleman has not properly understood the question. If a bogus tenderer, under a false name, obtains the contract at an undue price, as was the case in this instance, it is unfair to the genuine tenderer. Let us understand that point, first. If, after he had obtained that contract by means of a bogus name, he obtained extras that made up for the loss of tendering too low, and if he makes besides a large profit, it is not only unfair to the *bonâ fide* tenderer, but it becomes unfair to the public, and neither this House nor the country will put up with such a state of things.

Committee rose; and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to say something in reference to this item of $60,000. I think some very decided changes must have been made in this graving dock after the contract was let. The facts presented to the House by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) this afternoon seemed to prove that there was collusion between the contractors after the work was let. I do not blame the Minister of Public Works for this, but there seems to have been a decided change made in the work, which resulted in a very increased cost. Whether that was necessary or was by agreement we do not know. We do not know whether the work was changed from the original contract, or what necessitated the increased expenditure, or what caused the generous dealing of the Minister of Public Works with the contractors. I am not disposed at present to insinuate that there was anything of that kind, but we know that in the Esquimalt graving dock very serious changes were made, and large sums were agreed to be paid and were paid. In no single instance does it appear that any contract has been carried out under the department in accordance with the specifications prepared or the contract as it is first made. The first contract always appears to have been a fictitious contract and not intended to be carried out according to the specifications, but that the contractors should have a new price made afterwards. This has principally been done by a firm that has been doing a large amount of this work under the Minister of Public Works. I do not say that anything of this kind has taken place in regard to the Kingston graving dock, but, in view of all the insinuations that have been made, I think the Committee should have laid upon the Table, first, the contract itself, and secondly, the reasons why the Government decided to change from the original contract to an altered contract, the schedule prices which were arranged and all the facts and figures connected with the whole work, before we are required to give consent to the passage of this item. I think it would be better to allow this item to stand over.

Mr. FOSTER. I will take the hon. gentleman's suggestion, and will allow this item to stand.

Mr. AMYOT. This afternoon I spoke of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., but I see that in this case Larkin and the firm of the Connolly's did not tender together. They made separate tenders, Nick and Mick Connolly in one tender and Larkin another. I may call the attention of the Minister to some information which we will require. By the first report of the engineer, it was stated that

the opening of 48 feet for the dock was not sufficient, as some vessels would have to go into it which would be 55 feet, and it was then suggested that the opening of the dock should be widened so as to make it 60 feet instead of 48 feet as originally stipulated, and thus to allow the large vessels to go into it. The chief engineer reported that the making the opening of 60 feet instead of 48 feet would entail no expense to the country, and it was accepted of course, as it would make the country incur no expense. But a few days afterwards it was reported by the engineers in charge of the department that it was no longer necessary to make the opening 60 feet in order to receive vessels of 55 feet, but that an opening of 55 feet would suffice, and that this would entail an additional cost of $34,000. We require some explanation as to how it is that a change from 48 feet to 60 feet will cost nothing and a change from 60 to 55 feet will cost $34,000, and also how it is that a vessel of 55 feet cannot go into a dock less than 60 feet, and afterwards can go into a dock of only 55 feet. I will be told that that makes a difference in the caisson. Of course it must, but a caisson of 12 feet longer than was stipulated by the original contract must cost more than one that is only 7 feet longer than was stipulated originally. How can you build a caisson of 60 feet or a gate of 60 feet, that will not cost the country more than one of 55 feet? The hon. Minister will understand that I do not cast any blame upon him personally, but we are entitled to some information from our Executive Committee, as those hon. gentlemen are in the habit of calling themselves, and as they really are. We want explanations, because we have seen by the papers already laid before the House that the same Connolly's had employed some of their employés to tender, and they benefited by their bogus tender—in order afterwards to get them out of their way, when they found out that by doing so they would become the lowest tenderers. Their boldness increased, I presume, and so far as we can judge now, they did not think it necessary to take the trouble of using the names of their employés because it might cost them something, perhaps, to get them out of the way. So they said to themselves: If we send in bogus names and if we get the answer to the tenders addressed to our own post office box, we will manage the whole thing without a cent of expense, and it will be very easy for us—under the circumstances, I am entitled to make these suppositions—it will be very easy for us to write in the same handwriting that the tender was written with, and we will withdraw our tender. Then the Connollys, Nick and Mick, would manage to get Bancroft's contract; if there was anybody between their tender and the Bancroft tender, they would benefit by going into partnership with Bancroft; but if there was nobody between Bancroft and themselves, then they would remove Bancroft and would still hold their ground. In any circumstance, they were sure of their contract, but the *bonâ fide* tenderers were prevented from receiving the contract, and this is a most injurious state of things for the country. If you allow the public to believe that there is no fairness in granting contracts, that the tenderers have no fair-play at the hands of the department, then honest tenderers will give way, and will not take the trouble to make tenders, and the consequence will be that the country will be robbed. Another consequence is that if these bogus names get the contract, and if they are able to obtain extras, they can make up for the difference of the higher price, and they can still have a very paying contract. We must see our way through all these things, and we must learn how the contracts are given in this country. We know very well that when elections come round we are overwhelmed with money; it is very hard for us to resist the power of money, and we want to find out whether that money is public money or not, and whether it has been obtained through the Department of Public Works. Public opinion must have some weight and some power in this country. I have made these remarks in order to let the Minister of Public Works understand exactly what we want, so that the public opinion may be relieved in this matter.

Mr. McMULLEN. It might be well that the Minister, when he brings down the information for the Committee, should furnish the Committee with the amount of the cheque deposited by Bancroft when he sent in his tender, and the bank on which the cheque was payable, and where the money was deposited. They have either got to deposit the money or the cheque—probably they deposited the cheque. Now, we might know the bank on which the cheque was drawn, whether it was marked "good," and so on.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think the hon member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) might have waited until the papers I promised before six o'clock, were brought down to the House. He would then have avoided, most likely, being unjust towards my department and towards myself. I think fair-play is the proper thing. When the hon. gentleman remarked that certain documents would be required for the discussion of this item, I said I would bring down these papers. I have just spoken to my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, and he suggested, on behalf of the Government, that we postpone this item in order that I may have an opportunity of bringing down the papers. When the papers are before this House the Committee will be in a position to discuss the matter intelligently, and will then be able to make up their minds about it. But until then, I hope the Committee will suspend their judgment about this item; for I am sure, when they come to examine it with all the documents that will be brought down, they will find that the work has been properly given, and there is nothing wrong in the matter.

Mr. TROW. I would like to make one suggestion to the hon. Minister of Public Works that will aid him in his search for the papers to bring down, that is, in reference to the enlargement of this opening from 48 to 55 feet. I understand from the member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) that a vessel of 53 feet would need an opening of 55 feet. Another point that he would do well to bear in mind is the fact that in enlarging the opening from 48 to 55 feet it could not involve any additional expense, for much less stone work would be required in the opening, while the increased iron work for the gates would be sufficient to make up for the diminution in the stone work. The next question that suggests itself to me is to enquire whether, when the dock is enlarged for these two extra-sized vessels, such enlargement exceeded the original contract.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman is perfectly right in putting those questions, and I will take a note of them. No doubt hon. gentlemen understand that members cannot be exactly *au fait* with the dimensions of that dry dock; however, we know that if we enlarge the entrance of the dock in order to admit a larger vessel than was intended in the first instance, the consequence is that you must enlarge the dock itself. If you do not enlarge the dock you will not be able to work on the sides of the vessel, because some space will be required between the side of the vessel and the side of the dock. This is a matter I have obtained from the engineers, and I mention it that hon. gentlemen may see that if we enlarge the entrance for larger vessels, we must enlarge the dock itself.

Mr. AMYOT. I do not so understand the matter. It was stated on the 2nd July that it was necessary to enlarge, not the dock, but the entrance to the dock—that is a great difference. If you diminish the entrance to a dock you increase the length of the walls, and the expense will increase. The recommendation to enlarge was in these words:

"To accommodate all the steamers and propellers plying on Lake Ontario and the River St. Lawrence, and which will hereafter use this dock for repairs, some of which take a breadth of beam of nearly 55 feet."

It is recommended that the width of the entrance be made at least from 48 to 60 feet. This was on 2nd July. In the report before the House the Order in Council is not included, although it was asked by the motion. On 2nd July it was declared that this alteration will not entail any modification of the present contract so far as prices are concerned. On 22nd July another report was sent in. The *Cibola* has not diminished in size, but still exists. It was, however, found necessary, instead of having a 48-foot opening, as originally proposed, instead of having a 60-foot opening, according to the amended proposition, and which would entail no extra expense, it was found advisable to make it 55 feet for $34,000 extra. That is the position in which the matter stands. I am accused of unfairness for having stated that. On the contrary, it would have been unfair on my part, knowing these facts, not to have warned the Minister so that he would have his explanation ready when the whole matter came up. He should thank me instead of blame me. I would be very sorry to be unfair towards him. It is true the Government were not fair to me when they refused to let me know who was the lessee of a certain post office box in Kingston. They took my enquiry in a very joking way, laughing at my request, and the persistence with which I sought the information. They did not show much fair-play then. I asked the Minister this afternoon a very simple question: He should give hon. members permission to go early to-morrow, before any mysterious angel could do anything, and see the writing——

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is an insinuation the hon. gentleman should not make. It is not worthy of the hon. gentleman to make an insinuation of that kind. There is no one to interfere with the papers. The papers I promised will be brought down. I will bring down the original tender of Mr. Bancroft. I will bring down the contract as signed. I will not have copies of them, but I will bring down every paper connected with the matter, and I think the hon. member should suspend his remarks until then. The papers will speak for themselves. The hon. gentleman wishes to appear to be very fair towards me, but it is very unfair to act in this way. The papers have been promised, the papers will be brought down, and brought down here, not to be seen by one member but by all members of this House, and the House cannot ask more than that.

Mr. AMYOT. I would be very sorry to insinuate anything against the hon. gentleman, but when I see that papers in connection with the post office at Kingston have disappeared, I have a right to entertain some suspicion. I do not throw the blame on the Postmaster General, but if he thinks that they are to be allowed to make papers disappear in the departments connected with the Government, and we are not to be allowed to resist it, he is mistaken. I said the hon. Minister of Public Works had not been fair to me when he would not answer the question I put to him, whether or not he would permit us or any member to see the papers to-morrow morning early. He has not answered that question. He now says he will bring down, not copies, but the originals. I am very glad to hear it; I have not heard it before. After all, when we see we cannot reach the bottom of things we have a right to certain suspicions. I do not want to throw any doubt on the hon. gentleman personally, but there are divers parties concerned in these contracts. If you take them as extended now and as they existed in the beginning, they are of a very suspicious nature, and the quicker the Government will throw light on the whole matter the better for the hon. Minister and for the reputation of the department and for this country. We are playing with millions of dollars and with the fortunes of the people, and we who have been chosen by the people at large to watch public affairs are entitled to receive the fullest information. It never came into my mind that at this period of Confederation the Government would stand before Parliament assembled and would deny the information we have asked to-day. The information I ask may have looked simple, but when I am told that Mr. Bancroft never existed, and when I find that his address is Box 524 Post Office, Kingston, I ask, who was the lessee of that box? Was Mr. Connolly the lessee? I am refused the information. When we are told that we should not have the permission to state what we think, and when information is refused to us, we are being treated in no fair way and the Government dare not admit to the people the facts as they exist.

Mr. FOSTER. Are we really to have a long discussion on this matter? Hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House know the purpose for which we wish to put through these Estimates. If I had asked the Committee to pass this item without sufficient information, there would be very good cause to protest on that side of the House. I did not do that. All the information asked has been promised to be brought down, and I myself stated that the item would stand over until the information was brought down, and I did that for the purpose of facilitating our purpose of getting through these Estimates. I think the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) is not quite fair in this matter; he does not intend to be so, but to one who is simply an onlooker and watches the pro-

ceedings, it does seem he has been unfair. He was told this afternoon with respect to the name of Bancroft——

Mr. AMYOT. If the hon. gentleman intends to go on with the discussion we must reply to him.

Mr. FOSTER. I would not have spoken on this question at the present time except for the fact that the hon. gentleman, taking advantage of this discussion, has left a very unfair impression not on the House, but on the country, when this debate goes out without any answer being made to his assertions. He has intimated that the Government stands between him and a laudable and proper claim for information. For a purpose not known to the Government and not known to the House, he wished to get the name of a certain lessee of a box in Kingston post office. He received the information which the Postmaster General had at his command, and the facts as brought out this afternoon were these: that the post office boxes are let by boxes, that is by numbers, and that the postmaster keeps his accounts by the numbers and not by the names, and therefore he has not sent to the Postmaster General a statement of name, and it is not in his power to say who was the lessee of that box. After having obtained that return the Postmaster General stated that he had asked his deputy to communicate with the postmaster at Kingston and find out if he could from his personal knowledge tell the name of the lessee of that box. When all that is considered and taken into account it does not seem quite fair for the hon. member for Bellechasse to state that the Government is standing between him and proper information. With respect to this question under debate is it not more fair, as certain challenges have been thrown out and certain information applied for, when the Minister has declared that the originals of all papers will be brought down and laid before the House, to suspend the discussion under the circumstances until that information is here? I am not looking at this matter from a partisan standpoint or anything of that kind, but simply as to the fair, honest treatment that should be shown by man to man, and for the purpose of facilitating the work we have in hand.

Mr. LAURIER. The remarks just made by the Minister of Finance completely justify and vindicate the course followed by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot). Within the hon. gentleman's own hearing this afternoon, within my hearing, and within the hearing of every hon. gentleman, the hon. member asked for the production of a certain tender and contract. An answer never came. Not one word was said that the papers would be laid on the Table of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. It has been stated since dinner.

Mr. LAURIER. It has been stated just now, when my hon. friend has asked the Government again and again. Now the Government has said: Very well, we will bring down the papers. If that answer had been given this afternoon, probably my hon. friend would have been satisfied and would not have made his attacks. But the hon. gentleman must himself feel that the Government have no right to make the complaint they are now making, since it was simply after the persistent attacks of my hon. friend that the Government thought proper at last to give him the information which he had been seeking for during the last few hours. Why did not the Government do that at first? If they had done so I would understand the complaint now made by the Minister of Finance. I am quite sure that after the promise, which I must say has been extorted—I cannot use any other word for it—after the promise extorted by the repeated attacks of my hon. friend a promise was given that the contract would be brought down, and certainly my hon. friend is satisfied because he has gained his point. But that is not all. Are we to understand from the Government that they have no power in their hands at this moment to let us know who was the lessee of box 524 in the Kingston post office? Are we to understand that the post office at Kingston is kept in such a loose manner that it is impossible after a lapse of two years only to obtain such information as that. I do not know, nor do I care how the books are kept at Kingston post office, but if I am told by the Postmaster General that it is impossible to find out by any records in the Kingston Post Office who was the lessee of that box in 1889, then I must say that the post office at Kingston requires some reform.

Mr. FOSTER. Not necessarily at all.

Mr. MULOCK. My hon. friend who last spoke referred to the production of the contract; and in order to prevent any misunderstanding arising out of that remark, I would say that I understand that the Minister intends to produce a great deal more than the tender and contract.

Mr. LAURIER. That is certainly understood.

Mr. MULOCK. I would suggest, so as to prevent any misunderstanding, that all the papers in the department, from the very commencement to this present moment, should be produced. I mean all the specifications and conditions that were referred to in the original advertisement for tenders, the tenders themselves, all the correspondence and all other papers of any matter and kind connected with the contracts, whether let by tender under that advertisement or otherwise, and also a statement showing the changes in the contracts. That is what I understand by the papers to be produced.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes, that was understood.

Mr. MULOCK. Would it be possible to have these papers laid on the Table, at least a day before the item is to be considered, so that we may have an opportunity of looking over them?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Before six o'clock I answered the hon. gentleman, and a couple of other hon. gentlemen, that I would bring down the papers, and I meant by that all the papers.

Mr. MULOCK. Would it be convenient to have them down before this item is brought up?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will take care of that.

Mr. GIBSON. There seems to be a misapprehension as to the length of the dock——

Mr. FOSTER. If this is to continue, the Committee had better rise, and we will go on with some other business.

Mr. LAURIER. I would advise my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) to defer his remarks for another occasion.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Sproule). The question is not before the Committee, because the item has been dropped.

Mr. AMYOT. Do not put it on that ground. We consent to let the item stand for the moment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Sproule). The hon. gentleman will remember that I only used the words used by the Finance Minister, that the item stands for the present until these papers are forthcoming.

Hull Post Office..... $105

Mr. DEVLIN. What about this item?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is for an expenditure for small works, such as painting.

Mr. DEVLIN. Does that complete the expenditure in connection with the Hull post office?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. DEVLIN. Have you an idea what the Hull post office has cost up to date?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. A little over $30,000.

Mr. DEVLIN. I merely invite the attention of the hon. Minister to the item because I wish to suggest that since something over $30,000 has been expended on the building, another small amount might be provided to place a clock in the tower of the Hull post office. I called attention to this question in the early part of the session, and I received for reply that it was not the intention of the Government to complete this work. Considerable merriment at my expense was provoked at the time in the columns of the Montreal *Gazette*, which said that I got for my reply that the clock would not be placed there, and that when I wanted to know what hour it was I could either buy a watch or consult a policeman. I intend now to consult the Minister of Public Works, who is more affable, and I intend asking him to see that the building shall be properly completed. If he crosses the river, and if he looks at the building, he will find that such is not the case, for the tower is there, and a place for the clock is there, but it is boarded up, although I believe the original intention was to place a clock. This is an eyesore, and it deteriorates from the appearance of the post office, which is perhaps one of the finest buildings in the County of Ottawa. The edifice reflects credit on the Government, but as it stands at present it cannot reflect all the credit it should. The cost of a clock would be very small, and I can assure the hon. Minister of Public Works that discussion on this subject may cost more to the Government than the placing of a clock in the Hull post office would cost to the country. At all events, I ask that the building should be completed, because as it stands now it is not perfect. At the present time great improvements are being made in the neighbourhood of the post office, and handsome buildings are going up in its vicinity, the appearance of which will not be added to by this incompleteness in the post office building. If the Government do not intend placing the desired improvement in the tower, perhaps they would give permission to the citizens of Hull to put a clock there.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Devlin) would put a clock there.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It would keep Grit time.

Mr. FOSTER. That would be an objection.

Improved vault accommodation in Eastern Block for Finance Department (Revote of lapsed amount—Governor General's Warrant)..... $8,990

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does that vault cost altogether?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. $42,698.

Walkerton Post Office, Custom-house, &c.. $7,500

Mr. LANDERKIN. What will be the total cost of this building?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. With this vote it will be about $17,500.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What was the contract price?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. $14,560. That is only for the building. In addition, there are the fixtures, the furniture and the fence.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Did the building exceed the contract price?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. About $3,000.

Mr. LANDERKIN. How was this?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That comprises the inspector's salary and the architect's work. Then there was some extra work on account of the foundations.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Who was the inspector?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot give the name of the inspector.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You have not an inspector there, but a clerk of works; so you informed me some time ago. I asked at that time what his occupation was. One would suppose that a gentleman appointed to inspect a public building, to see that proper material was used and that the work was properly done, would be a mechanic. In this case, the clerk of works is not a mechanic; he has been engaged in buying grain. It would be almost implied that no mechanic could be got in Walkerton or that part of the country, and that a layman had to be employed to do the work of a qualified builder; and he gets $75 a month, I think.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. $2.50, I think, working days.

Mr. LANDERKIN. When did he begin?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot give the date, but he began as soon as the work began.

Mr. LANDERKIN. He has been on continuously since?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, until the work was completed.

Mr. LANDERKIN. He has also been engaged in other employments; he does not give his whole time to this work. I know that he spent about a month last winter in the election. That very fact had a tendency to open the eyes of the people, and it did not result in very much good to the Government. Probably, if the Government would take the hint and call off these officials in some places, it might be better for the Government and for the country, too. If he is employed to do work for the Government, the Government ought to see that he does that work, and I do not think he should be paid when he is not performing the work for which he is employed. If the Minister will say that he was employed as an election agent, then we will know.

Cobourg Post Office, Custom-house, &c.—Balance due contractors for new wing, &c.....$1,152.75

Mr. HARGRAFT. Is that building completed?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; there is a balance of $1,202 due on the final estimates.

Mr. HARGRAFT. What was the cost of that building?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. When this is paid, it will be about $53,700.

Winnipeg Immigrant Buildings..... $2,000

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the extent of accommodation there now?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The building measures 126¾ by 30¾. It is all wood. Above ground is two stories, and a kitchen to the rear, the whole standing over a basement and store.

Mr. McMULLEN. How many emigrants can be accommodated there?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I can only give the dimensions, and I must refer the hon. gentleman to another department for the information he requires.

Regina Industrial School..... $5,400

Mr. McMULLEN. Was this put up last year?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; it began in 1889, and a much larger sum was voted in 1890. The cost altogether will be about $50,000. That will nearly complete it.

Mr. MULOCK. To what use is it put?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It was finished, I think, the end of last year and opened early this spring. It is a school under the supervision of the Presbyterian denomination, and is one of the largest schools we have in the territories. It is exclusively for the Indians. I think there are now some forty or fifty pupils in it, and we expect in a short time it will be filled to its greatest capacity. We teach farming and different trades there.

Mr. McMULLEN. It appears to me rather surprising that we should have spent $50,000 on an industrial school and have only fifty pupils.

Mr. DEWDNEY. It has been open only a few months, and pupils are coming in from all parts of the country.

Three Rivers Pier—To complete..... $2,800

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is required because there was a settlement of the work, and there had to be built two or three tiers more.

Three Rivers Harbour—Balance of purchase price of deep water lot..... $775

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the cost of that lot? Is it land or water?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is a property purchased some three years ago, and this portion was left behind because we could not get a clear title. Now that the title is declared by the Department of Justice to be correct, we will have to pay the amount.

Lévis Graving Dock..... $1,000

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is to cover expenses for indispensable repairs.

Mr. LANDERKIN.

Southampton, Ont.—Urgent repairs to breakwater..... .....$1,600

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This expenditure was caused in consequence of the repairs done to the western portion of the breakwater at Southampton, which was damaged by fire to an extent of over 200 feet.

General repairs and improvements, harbours and rivers, Ontario.....$2,500

Mr. SOMERVILLE. In reference to the wharf at Big Bay, in the Township of Keppel, in North Grey, I asked for a return which has been brought down, but the repairs are not given in detail. I find that the expenditure amounted to $2,065, but there is no statement as to what the repairs consisted of.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As I did not expect that question this evening I have not the data here; but, if the hon. gentleman will be good enough to send me a note across, I will enquire into the matter and give him an answer.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Where have these repairs been made?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We have a certain amount to expend on these general repairs. Sometimes it is too large, and, therefore, the balance lapses. In other years, when there are storms and damages are caused, the amount voted is not sufficient, and we have to ask for a small amount additional to cover the difference.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I understand that, but will the hon. gentleman now say where these repairs were made? The reason why I ask is that I know of several harbours in the west, which were built by the Government, where no repairs have been made for some time, the result being that these works are practically useless. There are several in the locality from which I come, such as Goderich, Port Albert and Bayfield.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I see that we expended at Port Albert $14, at Goderich $615, at River St. John $147, at Sault Ste. Marie $169, and the balance on other works.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I am afraid the amount spent at Port Albert is almost entirely thrown away. The hon. gentleman has already expended several thousand dollars there, and, so far, the expenditure has been of very little practical use, because every season the drift of sand closes up the channel to a considerable extent, preventing vessels gaining access to the pier. I think that representations have been made over and over again to the department, especially by my predecessor in the representation of West Huron, but the Government have not seen fit to attend to them. It is true that the hon. gentleman sent dredges there last year, but perhaps not one-fifth of the time the dredge was there was it doing work at Port Albert. The hon. gentleman knows that we have expended over half a million of money in constructing the Goderich harbour, and yet, singular to say, the larger class of vessels that usually navigate Lake Huron cannot get into the harbour at all times. On account of the drift down stream, the entrance is often closed up. The town corporation have over and over again presented this fact to the Minister of Public Works, and I know that over and over again the Minister

has promised to look into the matter, but it has not been attended to. It is true that occasionally the hon. gentleman sends a Government dredge there, but I state here, on my responsibility as a member, that a large part of the dredge is there it is not working. Perhaps the hon. gentleman could find out from the captain, or whoever is in charge of the dredge, the reason of its inaction. It is stated to me that much of the time the dredge does nothing while it is there. The hon. gentleman knows that $50,000 has been expended by the Government at Bayfield, and I tell him that that money has been practically thrown away. At first over $40,000 was expended to make a pier on the south side of the stream. Then the hon. gentleman has expended four or five thousand dollars in repairing the north pier, but the repairs were so poorly made that within 48 hours afterwards they were made wholly useless by the waves. Pine and cedar piles were driven into the river on the north side so carelessly that within 48 hours they were floating in the lake and were being picked up by the farmers of the locality and used for fence posts. If the hon. gentleman sends his engineer, when he is up in that locality, to visit the harbour, he will find that what I am stating is absolutely correct. The whole of that $4,000 was not given out by contract, but was done by day's work, and it was done in such a manner that the whole of the money was absolutely thrown away. It might just as well have been thrown into Lake Huron, because the material it purchased went there within a very short time. Now, it is not right that the country's resources should be wasted in this manner. There is no use in the country spending large sums of money on public works unless some attention is paid, not only to the works when under construction, but to the works after they are completed. Now, the hon. gentleman has been in that locality, he knows the harbour of Goderich, probably as well as I do, and he knows that it is a magnificent harbour for vessels. I think he knows pretty well, also, that large vessels have not been able to gain admission to that harbour, at intervals, for several years back. For instance, the Beatty line of steamers, plying between Sarnia and Duluth, are often unable to make the harbour, heavily laden as they are with grain and iron, and all because a little necessary attention has not been given to keep the channel and entrance to the harbour clear. If the hon. gentleman sees that his dredge goes there at a fitting season of the year, and is kept occupied while it is there, he will be doing an immense benefit to the place and to those engaged in carrying grain. And so with Port Albert. The proprietor of a vessel stated to me a short time before I came down, and has written to me since, that he is hardly ever able to make an entrance to Port Albert unless upon the calmest possible day. Now, it will not take more than a month of dredging at Goderich, and perhaps two or three weeks at Port Albert, to accomplish nearly all that is desired in those two places. At Bayfield, unless the works are to go to utter ruin, the hon. gentleman will have to spend four or five thousand dollars to put the harbour in repair. As I already stated, the four or five thousand that have already been expended there within a few years have been utterly wasted, and the channel to the harbour is practically blocked up. All the money the hon. gentleman has expended on the north pier has been wasted, for the drift down the lake has filled up the channel. Now, if the hon. gentleman will put these three places in repair he would be doing a service not only to the country's trade, but to the towns and villages where these harbours are.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman has spoken of Bayfield and Port Albert, but he has especially dwelt upon Goderich. I know the difficulty about Goderich; it has lasted for years and years. There is always a bar forming there or some other obstacle at the entrance, or at a short distance from the entrance; therefore it has to be dredged nearly every year. This year I could not do that for want of money. The difficulty this year is caused by the lateness of the session, but when the money has been voted by Parliament I will see what are the calls upon the department. I have always thought that Goderich harbour has received a good deal of money from time to time. We must do some dredging there in order to allow vessels to come in, but I am not in a position just now to say how far we can go,

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The hon. gentleman said nothing about Bayfield. Does he propose to allow the whole expenditure there to be lost? I have just pointed out to him that the last four or five thousand that he expended there are altogether lost, because the work was done so inefficiently. I tell the hon. gentleman that the timber he last put in there soon floated out in the lake, and the navigation to the entrance to the harbour is now blocked up.

New dredging plant, revote of lapsed amount, Governor General's warrant $6,000

Mr. ALLISON. I would like to ask the Minister whether it is the intention of the Government to place a sum in the Supplementary Estimates for dredging Napanee River?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say that just now. The Supplementary Estimates for the present year will be considered by Council, and will be brought down. I cannot say whether there will be a vote for that purpose.

Mr. BURDETT. Is it proposed that the dredging at Belleville harbour be prosecuted vigorously? I call attention to the fact that the spring freshets that occur there have caused great damage at the mouth of the river. This year, especially, many persons have suffered to a very great extent. If the work which has been commenced is actively carried on and properly completed I have no doubt the current will keep the mouth of the river free, and I hope, therefore, the work will be thoroughly done, and done at once. I am aware that an active interest is being taken in the matter, and that it has been brought prominently before the Government, and I again draw attention to it in order that it may be actively prosecuted and facilities provided for carrying it on in future. I understand from old residents that 60 or 70 years ago many rocks were placed up the river for the purpose of forming a wharf, as boats in those days went much further up the channel. In later years the boats have been obliged to land at the lower end of the harbour, and those obstructions which remain should be removed. I call the attention of the Minister to the matter, because I am aware

that great interest is being taken in it, and it is important that the work should be carried out.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In the ordinary Estimates this work has not been forgotten. If a further sum is required, the matter will be brought before my colleagues for their consideration.

Mr. BURDETT. I am not complaining in regard to the work.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. With respect to dredges, do the Government ask for tenders, or purchase them by private contract?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. For the scows, we have asked tenders in different parts of the country where they are required. We have also purchased some timber for one built in the yard of the department. As a rule whenever we can do it we call for tenders for the scows.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. On what was the amount of $6,000 spent, and where was it spent?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It was to pay for timber and lumber that had been purchased for reconstructing the keel of a vessel and purchasing a scow on Lake Ontario, and also for new dredging plant.

Mr. FORBES. Is this amount of $6,000 to supply dredging plant for the Maritime Provinces? Dredging is much required at a number of places in the Maritime Provinces, and the usual answer given to enquiries is that there is no dredging plant available.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is for plant for Ontario. I admit that a new powerful dredge is required for the Maritime Provinces as well as for the Province of Ontario, but during the last two or three years we have not felt ourselves able to ask for a vote for this purpose. The time may come, but not this session.

Mr. FORBES. Is it the intention of the Government to place a sum in the Estimates to purchase a large dredge?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Not this year.

Mr. FORBES. When was this dredge destroyed or lost?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Three years ago.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I did not catch from the explanation of the Minister whether he intends to place a sum in the Estimates to clear the mouth of the Thames River.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. These votes are only up to 1st July. When we take up the ordinary Estimates perhaps the hon. gentleman will renew his question.

Mr. BARRON. It will be remembered that three or four years ago, at the instance, I think, of the late member for South Victoria, $3,000 was placed in the Estimates for the purpose of improving Scugog River near Lindsay. At that time an election was expected, and every one pretty well understood why the money was placed there. Since that time the money has not been expended, and the Minister of Justice will recollect that I asked a few years ago which Government exercises jurisdiction over those waters. The Ontario Government has expended a large sum for the same purpose as $3,000 was placed in our Estimates. The people of South Victoria would like to know why the money has not been expended, and, if not to be expended, why it was placed in the Estimates. The Minister of Justice will remember that he gave an evasive answer to my question and said that some dispute still existed as to jurisdiction. The people are entitled to some explanation as to this matter.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have heard about this Scugog River before to-day. I heard it from my hon. friend who represented that county; he came to my office several times and was very anxious to have the money expended. The Ontario Government decided to spend a large sum to improve the river, and they have done so, and we thought it better to allow the rich Government of Ontario to expend their money there.

Mr. BARRON. Do I understand the Minister to say that because the Ontario Government is spending money there this Government declines to spend the money which had been voted by this House for that work? I do not think that is right. The members of this House some few sessions ago voted a sum of $3,000 to spend on these waters, and I do not think the Government should now say that they are not going to spend that money because the Ontario Government is spending money there. The Minister must remember that this Government has emphasized its jurisdiction over these waters. They have Mr. Rogers, their superintendent, exercising jurisdiction over these waters, and they should spend this $3,000 which the House voted. The Minister must know that a superintendent goes over the Trent waters perhaps two or three times a month, and yet he says that because the Ontario Government is spending money he is not going to spend the money which was voted a few years ago. The Government knew of these facts at the time they asked the House to vote the money, and why did they ask us to vote that sum if they are not going to spend it? When I asked the Minister of Justice a question in reference to this matter some two or three years ago, he did not tell us that this Government did not claim to exercise this jurisdiction and he should give us some explanation now. I may point out that the Ontario Government assists railways and that this Government assists them also, and even suppose you exercise joint jurisdiction over these waters why should you not expend the sum of $3,000, which you were told to spend by the representatives of the people in this House?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. member has referred to me. I did not hear what was the name of the waters he was referring to.

Mr. BARRON. The hon. member for South Victoria (Mr. Fairbairn) knows all about it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. member referred to me and not to the hon. member for South Victoria. I do not remember the hon. gentleman ever asking me this question before, and I certainly did not intend to give an evasive answer if I did answer him. I may have been uncertain and indefinite in the answer I gave, and necessarily so if he asked me about this matter four or five years ago, because at that time it was uncertain whether the Ontario Government claimed jurisdiction in these waters or not. It is not however a question of jurisdiction, but it is a question of property; and it is not six months since we have ascertained what the claim of the Provincial Government with regard to these waters is. I do

not remember the particular stream that the hon. gentleman refers to having come into dispute, but in the case of the Southampton River, I think, the question arose about two years ago. There was correspondence on the subject which evidently it was useless to pursue because the Provincial Government were determined to claim not only jurisdiction over these waters, as the hon. gentleman says they claim over railways, but the absolute property in these rivers. A few months ago it was agreed between the Ontario Government and this Government that this question should be set at rest by an agreement for a case for the opinion of the highest courts, involving both the question of the property in the rivers themselves, and the control over them as regards fishery, &c. It would seem to be true that in the meantime, and not having that question in view, Parliament has been asked to make an appropriation for a public work there. That appropriation by no means involves the expenditure of the money, it is simply an authority to the Government to expend it. Since last session we have ascertained not only the full extent of the claim of the Provincial Government, but we have arrived at a conclusion with the Provincial Government as to the best means of ascertaining the merits of that claim. In the meantime, we certainly could not be expected to expend one dollar of Dominion money upon a property which is in dispute. The first thing is to get the title settled.

Mr. BARRON. The Minister of Justice must know that the jurisdiction over the River Scugog, running through the town of Lindsay, has been in dispute for years. The Ontario Government has for years been making improvements on those waters, and the Dominion Government has been making improvements alongside these, and to-day you have your inspector up there exercising jurisdiction over these waters. Do I understand the Minister of Justice to say that this Government is not going to spend any money in view of the doubt existing and the likelihood of the jurisdiction remaining in the Ontario Government?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do say that while we claim jurisdiction, and while we exercise control in the way that the hon. gentleman describes, and in regard to the fisheries, I think it would be most improper for us to spend a dollar in improving the property of other people. We claim and will assert our rights in the meantime.

Mr. BOWERS. I understood that $8,000 was put in the Estimates last year for the dredging of the Weymouth River. Do I understand from the Minister of Public Works that he found the channel so hard that he could not dredge the river with the appliances he had on hand? I would like to know whether the whole of this vote of $8,000 was expended last year. I understand that a dredge went down there last fall, at an expense of something like $75 per day, and that she could only work a few days on account of the weather being stormy. It is money wasted to send a dredge down there during the fall; she should have been sent there in fine weather, in summer time, when she could do work. If the $8,000 was not spent last year, I would ask that the balance should now be spent in dredging other parts of the river where the mud is soft. Weymouth is quite a growing place, and the river badly requires to be straightened and dredged.

Mr. ALLISON. It appears that this item of $6,000 under consideration was paid for new dredging plant. I would like to ask the Minister where this dredging plant was made, by whom it was made, and who has it in possession now?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As these are purely and simply the balance of accounts voted last year, I would ask hon. gentlemen to defer their questions until we come to the item in the main Estimates for new dredging plant for the current year, and I will then be in a position to give the information they require. In the Estimates for the current year there is an item of $24,200 for dredging plant, and if hon. gentlemen will be kind enough to put me their questions when this comes to be voted I will give all the information then.

Indians, Ontario and Quebec..... $5,234.55

Mr. MULOCK. I would like an explanation of the vote of $1,501.62 to cover over-expenditure in the Province of Quebec on relief and seed grain account.

Mr. DEWDNEY. In the Province of Quebec there are a great number of Indians who, although they raise a little grain, cannot be induced to save their own seed, and when the spring comes round it is imperatively necessary that we should give them some.

Mr. LANGELIER. There is a vote of $2,236.73 to cover expenses incurred in the survey of Indian reserves. Have these surveys taken place in the Province of Quebec or in the Province of Ontario?

Mr. DEWDNEY. In the Province of Quebec, on the Betsiamis Reserve, the Rougemont Reserve, and the Lorette Reserve. The survey of the Rougemont Reserve was paid for partly by the Quebec Government and partly by this Government; it was for the purpose of defining a boundary, because of trespasses which had been made on the timber there. The survey on the Betsiamis Reserve was for the running of a boundary line and laying off a portion of the reserve for the purpose of the Indians. They surrendered the other portion of the reserve with the request that the timber might be sold, and I believe it is going to be advertised in the near future. In the case of the Lorette Reserve there was a dispute between the seignior of the surrounding property, Major Duchesnay, and the Indians regarding the boundary, and the court ordered the survey.

Mr. LANGELIER. What is the amount for the survey of the Lorette Reserve?

Mr. DEWDNEY. $1,662.60, which includes legal and other expenses as well.

Mr. LANGELIER. I would like to know whether this amount includes the expenses of Mr. Pelletier, of Quebec, in connection with the case between him and the Dominion Government?

Mr. DEWDNEY. This includes expenses; but I do not know the exact proportion.

Mr. LANGELIER. I would like the exact amount of the legal expenses as distinguished from the expenses of surveying.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I will get that information for the hon. gentleman.

Compassionate allowance under the authority of an Order in Council dated the 31st January, 1890, to each of three children of the late James Payne (who, in his lifetime, was farming instructor on the Stony Reserve, Eagle Hills, N.W.T., and was killed by an Indian of the Stony Band), at the rate per annum of one-tenth of his salary or $600, from 1st March, 1885, to 30th June, 1890, six years and four months, at $180 per annum..... $1,140

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Why was there so much delay in doing justice?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The reason was that Mr. Payne was an Englishman who came out here some years ago and became one of the instructors. After he died we heard nothing of him and did not hear from his friends until some time after he was murdered. Then we had communications from his friends in England, who applied for a pension to his three children whom he had left in England under the charge of their grandmother. He was a married man and his wife had died. There was a great deal of correspondence, all of which had to be referred to the Department of Justice, which went into the whole matter, and we were only in a position last year to take it up.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the amount allowed to each child?

Mr. DEWDNEY. $60 each, until they are of age.

Mr. MULOCK. I think that is a very reasonable allowance. I well remember the circumstances of the death of this man who was assassinated. I am surprised that the amount should be so small, and hope the children have other means of maintenance.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not know that they have, but they are satisfied with this, as far as I can gather. The grandmother applied for relief as well, but we found she had means on her own.

Mr. MULOCK. Is this according to some regular scale adopted in similar cases?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes, adopted under Order in Council passed in 1885 with reference to families of officers of militia. This is exactly on the same basis.

Preliminary expenses in connection with Mackenzie River and Peace River treaty..... $3,500

Mr. DEWDNEY. I ask that this may be dropped this year, as we have had no expense as yet.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the object of entering into treaty relations with the Indians of Peace River district? Surely we will not undertake any settlement there for half a century to come, and there is no reason why the Indians should be interfered with.

Mr. DEWDNEY. For several years past hon. gentlemen opposite have been very anxious that the petroleum interests in that country should be developed. We cannot deal with any in that territory until we have a surrender from the Indians, as we consider we are under a moral obligation to obtain such surrender. And it was for the purpose of quieting their minds that we proposed to take a surrender from them next year.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman does not suppose he is going into the mining of petroleum two thousand miles north of any settlement?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Those petroleum deposits will be within eighty miles of a railway within a week or two.

To enable the department to pay a balance due to Dr. W. F. Smith for medical attendance, from 1st January to 30th June, 1888, given by him to Indians in the County of Halifax, N.S..... $71.50

Mr. McMULLEN. How is it those items are allowed to remain over so long?

Mr. DEWDNEY. This is an old claim. Dr. Smith only presented his account last August, and there were no funds to pay him. We were not aware of the indebtedness, but it was examined into and found to be correct.

Mr. LANDERKIN. We have just passed over the items with regard to Ontario, and I wish to refer to a matter which I brought to the notice of the Minister some time ago. It is charged that in the case of informations laid by the Indian agent against people in North Bruce for selling liquor to Indians, he keeps the whole fine. I would like to know here from the hon. gentleman what he has to say about this.

Mr. DEWDNEY. We cannot believe the charge. That is the Indian complaint, but the department does not believe it. We have given the inspector instructions to investigate into the matter, and I hope to have his report shortly. We cannot believe that Mr. Allen, who bears such a good character as an agent, has been keeping the fines for his own profit.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The Indians say that they were not paid the fines which they were entitled to. It is very desirable that the Minister should look into that matter and remedy it. If it goes on, it will create friction which would be disagreeable for the department and for the people up there.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I cannot tell what disposition was made of the fines belonging to the informers, but, on enquiry, I found that all the fines belonging to the department were sent in, and I hope soon to have some information as to the others.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Then, in regard to certain charges which are made against persons for selling liquor to Indians. I find that legal advice is obtained and the expense is considerable. In North Bruce, within the last few years, from answers I have obtained from the department, I find that a large amount of money has been paid by the Government in these litigated cases, and it is hard to estimate now the amount which it has cost the people in these cases. Some of these are brought against hotel men for selling liquor to Indians when these Indians are almost white, and some of these are electors under the Franchise Act. It seems an anomalous thing and one which should not exist, and it seems to me that there is a disposition to unduly crowd the revenues in this way. Some of these men, when they get out of employment, shove some one up to lay an information against a man who keeps a good hotel, and who is deceived perhaps by the complexion of the Indians, and yet he is tried and fined for giving liquor to these

Indians who appear to be white men. In the town in which I live, the agent came with an interpreter who apparently was not an Indian. He asked for liquor, and the hotel man was nearly caught, as he was scarcely able to distinguish the Indian from a white man.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh!

Mr. LANDERKIN. The gentleman laughs, but the fact is that the interpreter was so fair that it was almost impossible to tell that he was an Indian.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I am aware that there is a difficulty in regard to that, and that in the North-West, even amongst the wild Indians. There is one of the Cree chiefs, for example, when he puts on a black suit and a black hat and goes to Manitoba and passes as a white man, he can get liquor and it has been sold to him under the impression that he was a white man. We have a difficulty in that way, and we have to use every exertion we can in order to bring the whiskey seller before the courts and punish him. In certain parts of the territories, we are called upon to stop the whiskey trade with the Indians. Of course, in an old settled part of the country like North Bruce, I dare say there is a great deal of difficulty, and I am sure the hotel keepers are often placed in a false position, and that it is almost impossible to distinguish a white man from an Indian, and that, if people put up a job on a man, they can easily carry it out; but, when our attention is called to it, we have to prosecute—we cannot help it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. But you need not prosecute if you see fit not to do so, and if you are satisfied that it is a plot. I do not wish to see the law relaxed in any way in regard to the selling of liquor to Indians; but I think if a fine is to be given to informers, and the result is to cause litigation, the question should be investigated, because the result is simply that a premium is given for promoting suits, and these informers are continually laying traps because they get half the fine.

North-West Mounted Police, further amount required to meet expenditure for the year..... $30,000

Mr. McMULLEN. Is this in addition to the amounts paid last year as shown by the Auditor General's account?

Mr. DEWDNEY. This is for the balance of the year just ended. The Auditor General's Report refers to the year before.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the total cost of the North-West Mounted Police for the past year?

Mr. DEWDNEY: The expenditure for 1887-88 was $862,965; for 1888-89, $829,701; for 1889-90, $753,000; for 1890-91, $739,250. The reason for this extra expenditure was that, on account of the Messiah craze to the south of the line, it was necessary to keep the outposts on the frontier during the winter, though they are usually brought into headquarters where the expense is of course nothing like so much. The whole of the patrols were kept out on the southern boundary, and that is the cause of the extra expenditure.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The cost of this force is about equal to the maintenance of two regiments.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). How many men are there in active service?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The force is 1,000 strong, but it is generally short by from thirty to fifty men.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Does that include officers?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No.

Mr. McMULLEN. What are the hopes as to reducing that force now that the North-West is filling up and that there is some settlement scattered about there? Does the same necessity exist for keeping that force up to its present strength?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think so. We have found that, as settlement has increased, the work of the police has very much increased. The Government have not taken it into consideration whether it would be advisable at the present time to reduce the force or not; but my own opinion is that it would be very unwise to do it, because it is a force that does a great deal of good from one end of the country to the other, which gives confidence to the settlers, and is respected and at the same time feared by the Indians.

Mr. TROW. What is the annual expense per annum for hay?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have not the memorandum here, but I will give the information on the main Estimate. I know it is a large item.

Mr. TROW. Would it not be possible for a portion of the Mounted Police to have their services utilized in preparing hay?

Mr. DEWDNEY. You mean that they should cut their own hay? That was attempted at one time, but it was found not to be satisfactory. It was found that the men were scattered about at different points and it interfered with their discipline and was altogether unsatisfactory.

Mr. McMULLEN. Do they do their own freighting in the North-West from one post to another?

Mr. DEWDNEY. When they are travelling from one post to another, they take all their bedding and supplies with them. But their supplies are all delivered to the different posts by contract.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I am sorry to hear the Minister say that there is little probability of the police force being reduced. Surely in the year 1891 we hardly require a thousand policemen up there to preserve the peace. The hon. gentleman's predecessor, the late right hon. the First Minister, in 1884, declared that thereafter the police force would be greatly decreased. He gave reasons why, at that particular time, the force could not then be decreased, but those reasons have nearly all disappeared now, and having so disappeared the force ought to be decreased. Now, in 1884, the then First Minister gave as a reason for maintaining the force at its numerical strength, first, the enormous increase of the cost of transportation in the North-West. The second reason he gave was the necessity of scattering the force all over the territories in order to attempt to suppress the introduction of liquor from, I suppose, the United States. Third, the extra cost of getting Indians upon their reserve. That reason has surely disappeared. There can be no necessity for keeping the force at its present strength for that purpose. The first reason has surely disappeared, because the means of transportation there are infinitely better now than they were in 1884. Then another

reason the hon. gentleman gave for maintaining the force, was to keep the peace among the railway men. That reason has disappeared, there is no necessity for keeping a police force there to suppress apprehended riots. The fifth reason he gave was to prevent the stealing of horses. I do not know myself whether in the North-West the thieves are bigger thieves now than they were in the earlier days, but I should suppose there would not be the same necessity now for keeping there now as large a force for suppressing horse-stealing that there was then. Then, another reason he gave was, the price of food, beef especially, which he said was double the price in the North-West then that it was elsewhere. That reason cannot possibly exist now. I suppose meat is as cheap up there as anywhere else. When we consider the enormous number of ranches, well stocked, in that country, we might suppose that meat would be very nearly as cheap as it is in other portions of the Dominion; so that reason cannot prevail, at all events, to justify the enormous expenditure we are making now in comparison with what we made then. Another reason he gave was the price of fuel. Well, that reason cannot exist now. Coal is discovered there in almost every quarter, and the price of coal cannot be as high, by one-half, as it was when the First Minister gave his reasons for maintaining the force at its then strength. Now, as most of these reasons have disappeared, one would naturally expect that, not only the expenditure, but the force itself, would gradually decrease. After that speech was delivered, the force, later on, in 1885, was doubled, or nearly doubled, for special reasons known to us all. But these reasons have all disappeared since then, and if the force in 1884 was then, in the late First Minister's judgment, a force that circumstances would, in the natural course of events, decrease, and if in 1885 we doubled that force for special reasons which no longer exist, one would naturally expect that the force would be reduced even below the number at which it stood in 1884. Yet, we are told by the Minister of the Interior that there is no reasonable probability that the force will be diminished. Now, one would like to know the reason why the Minister of the Interior so says, why he dissents from the opinion that was entertained in 1884 by the late First Minister. One might well justify, in 1884, the maintaining the force at its then numerical strength, somewhere between four and five hundred men; but it has now reached a thousand men, and we are told that it is not to be decreased. I believe the North-West is as peaceable a section of country as any other portion, and why you should have a thousand policemen, with officers, up there, I cannot well understand. Why we should have to pay well on to a million of money in order to maintain this force, when the necessity has so far disappeared, I cannot well understand. I hope the hon. gentleman will be able to give reasons for the statement he has made, because there is an impression abroad that the force at present is unnecessarily large.

Mr. DEWDNEY. This is the first time I have heard any one mention that the force in the North-West is unnecessarily large. I must say that no one who knows the work that force is doing, no one who has lived amongst them, can doubt that the thousand men are all needed. They patrol the whole of the southern boundary from Manitoba to the Rocky Mountains. Every forty-eight hours the whole of the border is patrolled by them. Everyone that crosses the border is known, and they have been the means of stopping horse-stealing and smuggling along the border, which was being carried on most extensively, and was creating great trouble, not only amongst our Indians, but amongst the white people. Perhaps we might reduce the force a little if the House would agree to do away with the obnoxious prohibitory liquor law. A great number of these men are engaged in the service of preventing whiskey being brought across from Montana and from the southern counties into our North-West Territories, and they are also checking, as far as they can, whiskey being taken on the Canadian Pacific Railway into that country.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). We will help you abolish that.

Mr. DEWDNEY. You would be a very popula man in the North-West if you did that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand that the hon. gentleman desires to abolish the restrictions on the sale of liquor in the North-West?

Mr. FOSTER. No, that is not the policy of the Government.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I must say that I think it would be very unwise at the present time to attempt to cut down the strength of the force. It requires a large number of men to patrol that southern country, and there must be detachments kept at the posts in the North-West country. With regard to the expenditure, I have not at hand the cost of maintaining 500 men in 1884, but I think the remarks then made by the First Minister were correct. I think you will find by looking at the figures that the expense now is very much less than it was then, because coal is cheaper and meat is cheaper.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). No.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Have you got the cost of 500 men in 1884?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I have for 1887.

Mr. DEWDNEY. There were 1,000 men then.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). You have very little less now.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I want to compare the cost of the 1,000 men now with the cost of 500 in 1884.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The cost in 1884 was $770,000.

Mr. TROW. It is questionable whether 1,000 men are necessary, notwithstanding this statement of the hon. gentleman. A force of 1,000 men costing a $1,000 per head is a great expense to this country. The Minister states that there is a great deal of work for the force to do in connection with suppressing the smuggling of liquor in the North-West. So far as that is concerned, permits are continually given by the Lieutenant Governor, and the permit for five gallons of liquor will manufacture 500 gallons. If a party gets a permit the quantity is replaced again and again month after month, and if the liquor is intercepted the license is produced.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend is under a complete misapprehension in reference to this force, and also in reference to the permits issued by the Lieutenant Governor. Without giving the exact figures, I may say that the whole police force cost in 1884 over $1,000 a man, and at the present moment it costs less than $800 per man. The cost has, therefore, been reduced a good deal more than the ratio of reduction in regard to food and coal. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) says the price of coal has been greatly reduced in the territories. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken about that matter. In 1884 the cost was $14 per ton. In arguing as to the cost of the police one must not deal with the ought-to-be but with the fact. As a fact, soft coal is about $1 per ton cheaper than it was in 1884, hard coal is also about $1 cheaper; but coal is still high in the territories. We still pay $8 per ton for soft coal and $12.50 for hard coal. The hon. member for Huron spoke about the duties the force has to discharge as though their duties are diminishing. The late Prime Minister stated in 1884, as was quoted correctly by the hon. member for Huron, that these policemen were employed to prevent the stealing of horses. But the number of horses in the territory has increased certainly by about 400 per cent. since that year, and bands of horses are lifted in those territories at this moment, and a great loss would accrue, for those horses would be taken across the border but for the activity of the Mounted Police along the line. The chief reason why it is necessary to have a force of that size has not been brought out, although it has been alluded to by the hon. member for Huron. The hon. gentleman spoke of 1885, when we had a little war on our hands that cost us a large sum. He probably is not aware that the Indians to the south of the line in the United States, where they are very numerous, are in communication with our Indians, that they are very restless, and if we had not a sufficient force to overawe and watch the Indians south of the line, as well as those in our own territory, the chances are that we might have an Indian war on our hands at any time. To preserve the peace there and prevent an Indian war is a consummation devoutly to be wished, and I believe the Mounted Police do that effectually. If I saw any reason to reduce the force I would certainly advocate it, but at present there is no reason for a reduction. In a short time, two or three years, perhaps, as more population goes in and as our territory is more organized, then we may have to consider this question, but then what will happen? We will have vast territories to the north opened up; we will have Indians not now under treaty brought in; they will come into contact with civilization, and railways will be constructed, and navvies such as the Prime Minister spoke of in 1884 will have to be kept in order, and still it may possibly be necessary to have the police force at the full strength it is at present.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The speech of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) does not hold out a very hopeful prospect in regard to the condition of things in the North-West. We have expended a very large sum of money in that country, and we hoped in time there would be some return by having others to assist us in contributing towards the revenue and towards the maintenance of that country. But the hon. gentleman says that is wholly illusory.

Mr. DAVIN. No, I did not.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says that when the North-West Territories are occupied there will be a vast territory to the north to open up, railways to build, of course at the public expense, and the Indians must be kept in order by the maintenance of the existing police force; a paradisiacal prospect the hon. gentleman holds out as to the future to which this country must look forward. I take a more hopeful view of things at no distant period than is taken by the hon. gentleman. I am astonished to find the hon. gentleman advocating such pessimistic views. I thought he was an optimist and always took the most hopeful view of the situation; but that certainly is not the view the hon. gentleman has presented to the Committee this evening. From 1878 to 1885 we found 500 police a sufficient force, and for the five years preceding 1878, 300 police in the whole of the North-West Territories when the Indians were less civilized, and when they were more warlike than at present, were found sufficient to maintain peace throughout the North-West. When settlers went into that country, of course it was desirable that the Government should give them some assurance of protection and that protection was given by a small augmentation of the force that had previously existed in the territory. But the prospect held out to us by the Administration for many years was that when settlers went into that territory, that the more settlements became established and villages and towns sprang up a volunteer force might be organized and protection might be given in this manner at comparatively little cost to the community; and when ranches came to be established they would provide for themselves proper police protection. In fact that amount which otherwise would be paid in the shape of taxes for the maintenance of the Local Government would be paid by these men exercising their own police supervision and giving protection to their own property. The hon. gentleman suggested to us a condition of things to which we would not desire to look forward, and I hold it is desirable to maintain a large police force for the purpose of giving adequate protection to our population, to protect our property against thieves, or if I understood rightly the contention of the hon. gentleman it is this that there is a large population still to the south of the border committing most of the thefts.

Mr. DAVIN. A large population of Indians.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, but the hon. gentleman does not say that the Indians do the thieving altogether.

Mr. DAVIN. If my hon. friend will allow me I spoke of the Indians south of the line as restless and of the danger of an Indian war.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman speaks of the danger of an Indian war, and of course that is another matter. It is another reason given for the maintenance of a large police force. Well, there are a large number of Indians in Oregon Territory and in British Columbia—on both sides of the border—and these Indians are

quite as warlike as those east of the Rocky Mountains, and yet the hon. gentleman does not fear any demand on the part of the people on either side of the line for the maintenance of a large force as necessary for the purpose of preserving the peace. So far as the exclusion of intoxicants from the North-West Territories is concerned, all the complaints that have been made during the last two years have been rather against the Lieutenant Governor than against smugglers. The contention has been that the Lieutenant Governor has issued permits to anyone who asked for them, and that the sale of intoxicants is not in violation of the law and in consequence of the efforts of smugglers to introduce intoxicants across the boundary. It seems to me that the peace may be preserved, and property rendered secure, with proper vigilance on the part of those specially interested in the territories, and that a large reduction in the police force might take place. We all know under what circumstances the increase was made in that force. It was at a period of great disturbance and of a civil war in the North-West Territories; that war has long since ended, peace is restored, life and property are secure, and with moderate attention to the good government of the population, there is no likelihood that a second war will occur. I apprehend that the two lessons that have been given to the gentlemen on the Treasury benches are sufficient to prevent a third mistake of the same sort that occurred on two previous occasions.

Mr. McMULLEN. From the remarks which have been made by my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) and other members of the House, including the Minister of the Interior, I think that a considerable amount of the expense of the Mounted Police should be charged to the Customs and Inland Revenue Departments. It appears to me that the Mounted Police have considerable work as preventive officers, in preventing liquors and goods of all kinds being smuggled into the country, and in that way they may render a very desirable service. If it is necessary to keep a preventive force of that kind, some of the expense should be charged to the Department of Customs.

Mr. FOSTER. That would not alter the amount to be paid.

Mr. McMULLEN. But the expense would be charged to the proper account. Our ranching grounds in the North-West Territories are rented to people who only pay about two cents an acre, and I do not think that we should pay a large amount at the expense of the country to guard the property of those who only pay us two cents an acre. My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) says that the number of horses has increased 400 per cent., and that is no doubt because there is such an amount of ground used for ranching purposes. It is not right that we should keep a Mounted Police Force to protect the property of private individuals; they should protect themselves.

Mr. TROW. The suggestion made by the last speaker would make no difference in the total amount. If the expenses of the police were subdivided, it would all have to be paid by the country in the end, and it would cause considerable more book-keeping. The system he advocates would entirely ruin us.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

Mr. BOWELL. The duties performed by the Mounted Police for the Customs Department are additional duties, they being given the authority vested in sub-collectors and preventive officers, while patrolling the frontier from the Rocky Mountains down to Manitoba. They get no extra pay for it, and it is simply additional duty imposed upon them while they are protecting the frontier from the smugglers, and raiders, and murderers, and horse thieves, who are constantly crossing the border from Montana and Northern Dakota. When I travelled through that country from the Manitoba boundary to the Rocky Mountains, as I did two years ago, I came to the conclusion that if there was any money expended to the advantage of the country, it was in maintaining the Mounted Police force. They are an admirable force, they patrol the country about twice a week from the Rocky Mountains to Deloraine in Manitoba, and sometimes down to Turtle Mountains, and I suggested then to the late First Minister who had the management of the force, that these patrols should be given all the power and authority of Customs officers in order to relieve the country from the expenditure which would necessarily follow of placing Customs officers all along the border. Knowing the extent of the country and the difficulties of preventing smuggling of all kinds, one can easily understand how absurd it would be to place a dozen Customs officers a hundred miles apart. The smugglers would not cross where the officers were stationed, therefore the officers would be obliged to have horses and conveyances to travel from one part to the other, which would entail great expense. I am sure that a moment's reflection will show to the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen), that the course pursued by the Government in this respect was the best that could possibly be pursued in the interests of peace and good order, and in the interest of economy in the administration of the Customs Department.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. As the Minister is speaking of economy in the Customs Department, I would ask him if it would not be proper to exercise economy in the service in the Province of Ontario as well as in other sections of the Dominion. I would bring to his attention, and to the attention of the Committee, the fact that for, I think, two years, one of the principle offices in the Customs Department was left vacant at the command of a gentleman who occupied a seat in this House. I would like to ask the Minister——

Mr. BOWELL. That item will come up in a few minutes and we will discuss it then.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is it the intention of the Minister to keep the Mounted Police force up to its ordinary number? You say it is fifty or sixty below; do you intend to refill the ranks as these fellows drop off?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The force generally keeps at about that number. Unless you keep the force above the number it is impossible to keep it up to exactly 1,000 men. There is no particular pressure used to keep it up to the maximum number, but as a trooper comes along and there is a vacancy he is taken in.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Are supplies, such as coal, and coal oil, purchased by tender?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; there are tenders for all the supplies, I believe.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I do not propose to discuss the question just now, but I find in the Auditor General's Report that coal cost $15.50 per ton at Regina, and only $10 at Morden.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Is that for hard coal?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). No; the hard coal is put down at $20 a ton at Regina.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think that is a mistake. I cannot give the hon. gentleman the explanation at present, but I am quite sure that hard coal does not cost more than $12.50 or $13 at Regina; it has been at that price there for the last seven years. However, I will make enquiry on that point.

Mr. MULOCK. The Mounted Police were originally organized for the purpose of preserving the peace. If it is neeessary to keep it up to a certain extent to protect the revenue, that portion of the cost of maintenance should be charged to the Customs Department.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That would be another argument for lowering the tariff to prevent smuggling. The force, I understand, is considerably engaged in overcoming the operations of the permits which, it is charged, are indiscriminately given for the sale of beer in the North-West.

Mr. WATSON. I find an item in the Auditor General's Report for 177 tons of coal for stove purposes, at $15.50 per ton. I think the reasons for this high price was given in this House some years ago. The further you go from the coal mines, the cheaper the coal becomes. This is because the Government have practically given the Galt Company a monopoly of the coal supply in the west. The price is regulated by the competition of the eastern coal. The result is that you can buy coal cheaper in Winnipeg that you can at Calgary.

Mr. DEWDNEY. This is not Galt coal.

Mr. WATSON. If it is not Galt coal, and if we have good coal in the west, I think the Government should use western coal. It seems strange that the Government will purchase coal at $15 a ton when good coal should be got at Regina at one-half that price.

Expenses *re* survey Burrard Inlet, B.C. $2,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is this? This amount will not cover the cost of surveying Burrard Inlet.

Mr. TUPPER. The hydrographic survey is not large. In consequence of the undercurrents there having, it is supposed, created obstructions at certain points, the original chart became exceedingly misleading. Arrangements were made with the British Admiralty for the correction of the survey by the Marine Department here, and $2,500 was Commander Boulton's approximate estimate of the cost. The portion to be surveyed was comparatively small.

To pay Wm. Gliddon for special services as expert in preparation of vouchers for arbitrators in case of McLean, Roger & Co. *vs.* the Queen..... $300

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Perhaps the Minister would give us some information as to the position that matter is in now?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is still in the Exchequer Court. It was originally commenced by arbitration, but there having been a disagreement upon the terms of the referee, it was sent to the Exchequer Court, which appointed as referees the two gentlemen originally selected as arbitrators, with Mr. Cassels as the third. I presume this vote is for the purpose of preparing the papers for them.

Mr. McMULLEN. Who is this William Gliddon?

Mr. FOSTER. He is an accountant in the Department of Stationery. It was necessary in this arbitration that the Government should produce all its vouchers, showing all its transactions, and Mr. Gliddon was appointed to discover and produce them. This involved a greal deal of work. Mr Gliddon was the proper officer to do it. He did it all out of hours. He was paid at the rate of 50 cents an hour.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is his salary?

Mr. FOSTER. He is a first class clerk, I think.

Mr. McMULLEN. Was this work in connection with the duties of the office in which he is engaged?

Mr. FOSTER. It is in connection with the arbitration we have been speaking of.

Additional plant for Printing Bureau...$4,160

Mr. FOSTER. This is required to meet two payments not foreseen last year, the one being for an engine to run the dynamo for the electric light, and the other to provide tools for the repairing shop, in which minor repairs to machinery are made.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Would it not be better to give up the practice of voting contingencies, and allow all these things to be settled by Governor General's warrant. I see all along the paper contingencies without number paid in that way.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Was the engine bought by tender or contract?

Mr. FOSTER. I am not aware.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is it the case that the voters' lists are not being printed at the Bureau?

Mr. FOSTER. I think the hon. gentleman has had the information before that they are to be printed here.

Mr. BARRON. Is the hon. Minister sure about that, because my information is that the voters' lists are to be printed now in the respective towns?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman's information is altogether incorrect.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. member for North Victoria refers to preliminary lists, which is a very small matter.

Amount required to reimburse Mr. J. I. Dufresne, D. L. S., for expenses incurred by him in consequence of the loss of one of his limbs while in the service of the Government—G. G. Warrant.....$1,258.33

Mr. DEWDNEY. Mr. Dufresne has been in the service, off and on since 1883. In the fall of 1885, while in the service of the Government in the

district of Prince Albert, he cut his foot badly, and in consequence of the great distance at which he was from medical aid, the accident resulted in the loss of one of his feet. He is incapacitated from working in the field, and he is now working in the survey branch. This amount is that presented to us by that gentleman as the cost of medical treatment, both in the North-West and after he came to Montreal or Quebec.

Mr. WATSON. Does the Government make a habit of paying surveyors when they get hurt? Was this contract work or day work?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I am not quite sure, but I fancy it was contract work.

Mr. WATSON. It appears to me if a surveyor takes work by contract he takes all the risk, and I do not think it is right to vote money for any person who may get hurt while in the Government employ. No doubt this gentleman got fair pay for his work, and had to run his chance of meeting with accidents. My hon. friend beside me says he is a cousin of the hon. member for Assiniboia, but I doubt that as the name is not the same. If it were a case of day work, the case might be different.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am not going to find fault with this item, because I hope the hon. Minister of the Interior will not forget my friend who lost his thumb.

Mr. DAVIN. I may say this gentleman is no cousin of mine. I have no relatives in Canada, and if I had, I would not use any influence to have them appointed.

Expenses of Litigation..... $20,750

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It was necessary to institute proceedings in connection with questions arising in Behring Sea, and this sum was required for the purpose of carrying on that litigation. The case would have been argued but for the illness of one of the judges, and it now stands for argument early in October.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Did it require the whole of this amount to pay the charges so far in connection with the litigation then pending?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It has not been fully expended yet, but the greater part has been; it is all intended for that service.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Of course, that item is not objectionable standing by itself. The Government are engaged in the litigation and must pay for it, but it does appear to me that the cost of litigation every year is very high. I find in the Auditor General's Report about $100,000 paid in law costs to various lawyers throughout the Dominion, and among the items we have passed this evening, many embrace costs of litigation, and I venture to say that, excluding the amount we are now asked to pass, the whole will amount to $125,000. It seems to me that is a very large sum to be expended on litigation. Looking at the report I find the amounts distributed unfairly. Some lawyers get from ten to a thousand dollars while others only get one or two dollars. The hon. Minister of Justice ought to mete out something like fair-play among his fellow professionals. I find that Borden, Ritchie & Co. got $2,178, while poor Mr. Boucher only got $5. Wallace Graham—whoever he is—got $9,751. Perhaps the hon. Minister of Justice knows something about him. Mr. James Grace only got $15. Kingsmill, Seymour & Co. got $1,000 and Mr. Martel only $5. J. A. Macdonell, whose bills we have before us every year, got $2,865. I wonder if this was Mr. Macdonell who was in this House at one time?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He had not a seat in the House, but he appeared at the bar.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Then I find W. J. McGill, $7.01. There is also D. O'Connor, who is or was the president of the Conservative Association in Ottawa, $10,619.30. The amount for legal expenses appears to be very large, and I think the cost of litigation should be cut down in view of the efficient staff which the Minister of Justice has in his department, and that it should not amount to $100,000 as appears in the Auditor General's Report, though I believe it really was more.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no doubt the amount for legal expenses will be reduced as soon as the large and important cases we now have on hand, such as the Pacific Railway claim and others, are disposed of, but the hon. gentleman is not quite correct in supposing that all these amounts are paid for fees to lawyers. They include disbursements by our solicitors in all parts of the country, and often costs which are taxed against the Government. For instance, when lands are expropriated for public works, and the finding is against the Government, the costs are taxed against the Government.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Then there is something more than the ordinary disbursements of suit charged. In Mr. O'Connor's case, for instance, I should like to know if that covers more than the ordinary charges and disbursements?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That includes the disbursements.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I suppose this $20,750 does not include the counsel fees in the case still to be argued?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It includes all the fees paid and likely to be paid.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This is an estimate for the year past. If anything is intended to be paid in October next, it should not come here.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We have paid our counsel fees for the argument which took place in May, and for the occasion when counsel were ready to argue, and the books were printed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is not the greater part of this for compensation to foreign counsel and not to Canadian counsel?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Almost entirely.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Nearly the whole of it?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I see an amount of $231.92 paid to A. R. Dickey,. Who is A. R. Dickey?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. These are costs taxed against the Government in a suit which Mr. Dickey had against the Government

Mr. LANDERKIN. Who is A. R. Dickey?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I presume it is the hon. member for Cumberland. The initials are the same.

Mr. BARRON. In suits in which the Government retains counsel and employs solicitors, is there any means by which their bills are taxed by any taxing officer?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They are taxed in my department by an officer according to a scale which has been fixed.

Mr. BARRON. The officer is not a taxing officer, is he?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, he taxes every bill.

Mr. BARRON. He is not a taxing officer in any court.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No.

Support of Ontario and other lunatics, temporarily charged to District of Keewatin.....$ 3,196

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What does this mean?

Mr. DEWDNEY. This is to pay the cost of lunatics from Keewatin who are placed in the penitentiary. We found that the amount required for this purpose had been increasing for the last year or two, and when the hon. the Minister of Justice was visiting Mr. Mowat last summer in reference to some other matters, I asked him to consult Mr. Mowat in order to see if he would pay us for the lunatics who came from what was the Disputed Territory, and is now part of Ontario. Mr. Mowat replied that Ontario took charge of lunatics from other parts of the country, and he would not do it, but he would leave it to arbitration and answer it when the other matters were finally considered. The Minister of Justice thought it would be unwise to leave the matter over as the Ontario Government are in the same position as ourselves, and might come down upon us for the support of lunatics from other parts of the Dominion.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not see how any charge could be made for lunatics from the District of Keewatin, because I do not think there are any settlers in that district at all except a few Indians. I suppose what is meant is the western portion of Ontario which was called the Disputed Territory.

Contingencies, N. W. T.....$1,600

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). That requires some explanation. The expenditures in connection with that department in the North-West are startling. In reading the report of the Auditor General, one is amazed at the charges made against the Government. I will reserve any observations I have to make on that subject till we reach the general Estimates, but I think this item of $1,600, in addition to the item for contingencies in the general account, requires some explanation if it can be given off hand. I am sure that the attention of the Minister of the Interior has not been called to many of the charges made against the Government in connection with the North-West Territories, or they would not be tolerated for a moment.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have not the explanations with regard to the main Estimates with me.

Mr. McMULLEN. Perhaps when we are discussing the main item of the Estimates the hon. gentleman will give some explanation of this item for contingencies.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think this is a very objectionable way of making up the estimates for the North-West Territories. We have given to the people of the North-West Territories representative government. I understand they are asking for responsible administration, and although we may not be prepared to confer upon them at this moment the same extent of authority that is possessed by a province, it does seem to me that, whatever moneys are placed at their disposal for local purposes, ought to be granted for the Legislature of the North-West Territories to appropriate. Now, I understand that the method of appropriation is a vote by this House, as we have it before us at this instance, and that the money is put at the disposition of the Lieutenant Governor, and not under the control of the population there at all. Now, these people are contributors to the taxes, exactly the same as people in any other portion of the Dominion. They have representative institutions, they have a representative legislature, and why should we not grant them a lump sum, whatever it may be, and place it at their disposition, for their own purposes, and allow it to be distributed by them according to local necessities, and as the people may desire? They are upon the ground; they are better capable of saying how the moneys that are expended in the North-West Territories ought to be expended, than we are. I am perfectly willing that the administration shall take the opinion of the representatives of the North-West Territories on all appropriations that are being expended for Dominion purposes, those works that are under our exclusive control. But that is not the rule that is adopted. We are voting appropriations here for local works and undertakings; we are acting as much for them as if they had no Local Legislature or representative institutions at all. I think that is not a satisfactory way of administering affairs in the North-West, and I trust that at no future meeting of this Parliament will we have estimates of this sort submitted to us for local purposes.

For translating North-West Territories *Gazette*, 28 numbers at $10 each.....$280

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is there any check on this expenditure for translation? I hold in my hands a book the translation of which has been paid for, it seems to me, at an extraordinary price, when we compare it with the cost of translating the Debates in this House. I refer to the North-West *Gazette*. There is really only about 100 pages of print translated. I want to know if there is any check.

Mr. DEWDNEY. An arrangement was made by which Mr. Jules Royal was paid $10 a month for translating the *Gazettes*. They come out, I think, every week.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Twice a month. By whom was the arrangement made?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I presume by the Lieutenant Governor.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Who is the official who does the work?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Mr. J. A. Royal, son of the Lieutenant Governor.

Mr. DAVIN. I think I can explain this. As a fact, we have not many French gentlemen in Regina who could attend to this. I doubt if there is anyone who could do it, except Mr. Jules Royal

Mr. Forget, who used to attend to this sort of thing, is in the Indian Department, and is unable to do it. I do not think the price is too high. I certainly would not do it for the amount that Mr. Jules Royal gets for doing it. I want to call my hon. friend's attention to the fact that, instead of 119 pages, you have 211.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. They are only half-pages.

Mr. DAVIN. But if you take the length and size of these pages you would find that they make very nearly a whole page. It is simply the printing of an ordinary sized book, and if you got that work done here in Ottawa, you would pay something like a dollar a page for it. Another thing I want to point out to you is something that is known, I think, in the office where this is printed —I think it is printed in an office in Regina.

Mr. MULOCK. The Regina *Leader*.

Mr. DAVIN. No, it is not; it is printed in an office where there are no French printers.

Mr. MULOCK. You don't know that.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, I happen to know it.

Mr. MULOCK. You don't know what is printed at the *Leader* office.

Mr. DAVIN. This is printed at an office where there are no French printers, and Mr. Jules Royal does the revising as well as the translation, and I consider the amount that is paid there is a minimum sum for the work that is done.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. If he does the revising as well as the translation, this item ought to be amended so as to state that.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice on every single occasion when an item is objected to with regard to expenditure in the North-West, these people are prepared to say that they work for almost half nothing. My hon. friend here has always defended the cost, no matter what it was, and says that the country is always getting full value.

Schools (Governor General's warrant, $14,993.04) $46,175 04

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask the Minister upon what plan or rule the school appropriation is made. Is there a corresponding amount raised by general taxation? Is there any condition attached to that amount? Is it distributed amongst the schools according to average attendance, or is there any limitation for pupils as to the amount that is to be received?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There is a school ordinance passed by the Local Legislature to whom we hand over the school money that is voted here in a lump sum, and the Legislature expends it under that school ordinance. That ordinance provides that the Government shall pay about 75 per cent. of the salaries, and the salaries are fixed in accordance with the ordinance at so much per month, according to the grade of the teacher. I think it is regulated also by the attendance, and there are some other conditions attached. The ordinance is very long and clear, and is a very good school ordinance, so far as it goes. We have only found this difficulty. That the Legislature have had all the say in reference to the fixing of the salary, and we have come to the conclusion that the salaries are too small in proportion to the salaries paid in other parts of the Dominion. We have drawn the attention of the Lieutenant Governor to that, and next year we anticipate that a change will be made. They are authorized by Order in Council to spend this money that we hand over to them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If I rightly understand the Minister, it would seem that the Local Legislature fixes the salary of the teachers in the school districts, and not the trustees.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The trustees fix them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then it seems to me that we ought to vote a lump sum and not allow the local Legislature to say that we shall provide for 75 per cent. of the money required for the maintenance of the schools. I do not suppose in any of the provinces that 20 per cent. of what is called the Government grant is furnished towards the maintenance of the public schools of the country or anything like it. There is in the Province of Ontario, and I believe the same rule is adopted in some of the other provinces, a general taxation equal to the amount of the public grant, whatever it may be, but that county assessment and provincial appropriation taken together do not make more than 40 per cent. I do not know how much money is required to pay the teachers' salaries. Certainly if we are paying 75 per cent., it is a very large sum.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The Government has come to the same conclusion as that to which the hon. gentleman has arrived. In the early days of the North-West we had to be very liberal in regard to the school vote. We have now come to the conclusion that we have been extra liberal, and we have called the attention of the local authorities to it.

Mr. WATSON. Is it not divided among the denominational schools of the North-West?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. What is the proportion given to the Catholic and Protestant denominations respectively. It would be interesting to know the amount paid to the separate schools.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have not the information here, but I will give it when the main Estimates are under consideration.

Mr. MULOCK. I ask the Government when are we going to have a meeting of the Public Accounts Committee? This item and other items should form the subject of investigation before that Committee. I will not say how many times we have met. It is absurd to create a committee to examine into accounts and practically never convene the Committee. The Committee was called for organization and sat five minutes. It was called another time——

Mr. FOSTER. And you were not ready.

Mr. MULOCK. We were ready. We moved motions for papers and they were carried, and after struggling for six weeks we got a meeting which lasted a short time. If we are supposed to have a committee to supervise the accounts of the year it should meet, and it is not a sufficient answer to say that there are other large committees to meet also. It is necessary that several committees should meet at the same time. I ask the Minister of Finance to call a meeting at the earliest possible day, as there is business to be brought before it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It is very important that this Committee should meet, as there are several matters requiring to be investigated, or we may not have an opportunity to conduct a proper investigation into certain accounts which should be investigated in the public interest. There is a matter which I have in charge in regard to which I have not had an opportunity of bringing before the Committee. We should have frequent meetings of the Committee, as it is one of the most important, and its business must not be set aside because other important investigations are proceeding. I ask the Government to have a meeting called as soon as possible, and to have frequent meetings called during the session.

Mr. FOSTER. We will have a meeting called as soon as possible, and I hope the hon. gentlemen will be ready, because the last time we met they were not ready. We were there for business, and the business frittered out very quickly. I offered the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) to have the Committee meet every day for a week if he wanted it, and it was at his own suggestion that the meetings were left off for a time. If he wants a meeting of the Committee, let him say when, and we will have a meeting called.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Finance is entirely in error in his account of what occurred at the meeting of the Committee in question. I was present at that meeting. It was called for an early hour, in order, if possible, to accomplish some business. An officer of the Government was directed to be present. He attended, and when I came to examine him he knew so little about the books and papers, and the subject for which he was brought there, that he could not give any information whatever. I asked the Minister of Finance to have a meeting called for an early day later, and he will remember that so far as regards the business in which I was concerned, the witness, Mr. Fuller, said it was useless to call a meeting next day as it would take several days to inform himself sufficiently to be examined. I asked how far ahead a meeting would suit him, and he said Thursday, the meeting of which I am speaking having been held on Monday. He said he would not be able to give evidence for the next two days, and the second day was a holiday and he asked that the meeting should not be called sooner than Thursday. He subsequently came to me in this Chamber, and told me he would not be prepared by Thursday to be examined. I wrote a letter to the chairman of the Committee, stating that Mr. Fuller had told me he could not possibly be ready, and I said I would not raise any objection if a meeting was not held that week. Having made that remark to the chairman I would not have found fault if a meeting had not been held that week, but I did not expect there would be an interval of ten days. I hope the hon. Minister of Finance will take back what he said.

Mr. FOSTER. I think you corroborate it.

Mr. MULOCK. If so, the hon. gentleman has a very curious idea as to what I have said. The Minister of Finance is wholly in error, and is misrepresenting my position. I want the Minister of Finance to take back his statement.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not worth while.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman is misrepresenting what took place at that meeting, and I will not allow it. Have I not described correctly what occurred at that meeting?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, fairly so.

Mr. MULOCK. I have explained what took place at that meeting, and that the postponement was because the officer was not prepared to give evidence, and did not know his business.

Mr. FOSTER. That is an allegation against an officer which should not be made, and the hon. gentleman should take it back.

Mr. MULOCK. If you will call a meeting, I will for what I have said.

Mr. FOSTER. When do you want it called.

Mr. MULOCK. On Saturday.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. What is the total amount expended on the maintenance of insane patients in Manitoba Penitentiary last year?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It will be about $12,000 for the year. For the first four months it was $3,827, and the number of inmates has not increased since then. I think the number is 25.

Mr. WATSON. What rate does the Government pay?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The average rate per day, 1887-88, was $1.02; for 1888-89, $1.01⅘ cents.

D. D. O'Meara, Surveyor in H. M's. Customs, Quebec, addition to salary as Acting Collector 1st July, 1883, to 1st March, 1891.....	$2,200 00
James Churchill, Clerk in H. M. Customs, Coaticook, addition to salary, as Acting Collector, 1st April, 1890, to 20th August, 1890...	100 00
Customs share (one-half) of cost of repair and maintenance of Government steam yacht *Cruiser*, during season of 1890.....	2,254 63
Refund and law costs, &c., as per judgment of the Exchequer Court, in the suit of the Vacuum Oil Company *vs.* Regina	5,331 11
James Douglas, Surveyor in H. M.'s Customs, Toronto, addition to his salary, as Acting Collector, 1st November, 1888, to 1st March, 1891	2,666 66

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I am not prepared to say that Mr. D. D. O'Meara is not entitled to this sum, but I am prepared to say that this item, and also the concluding item, point to a very gross abuse of their duty on the part of the Government. We find here that for a period of two years and eight months that office was left unfilled. Now, Sir, I say that the Government had no right whatever to keep that office unfilled, and I say they kept it unfilled simply and solely for the purpose of acting as a bribe for some particular political friends whom they desired to serve. That was still worse in the case of the collectorship of Customs at Toronto, where for fully two years and a quarter this office was left vacant, as is perfectly well known, for the convenience of an hon. gentleman then a member of this House. I say that in the latter case in particular it was a direct violation of the spirit of the Independence of Parliament Act; but in any case, I say that keeping offices of this kind vacant for a period of nearly three years as was done in the case of the collectorship at Quebec is utterly at variance with all good government, and is a thing which ought never to have been allowed to be practised by this House. I think that the Minister of

Customs is bound to state why it was, that for a period of nearly three years, these offices were not filled. There are many objections to it, and not the least in my opinion is, that officers of the department are naturally very considerably discouraged if they find that these offices are not given to those who have served the public, but are kept entirely as a reward for political services.

Mr. BOWELL. I frankly confess that in the main I think the hon. gentleman is correct so far as the filling of these offices is concerned, but it is a practice which has prevailed in the past by previous governments and I have no doubt will continue to prevail in the future. The practice has not been confined to the Dominion Government, as my hon. friend well knows: circumstances sometimes arise with our Local Governments where registrars and sheriffs and other offices are kept open—not, I hope, for the purpose that has been intimated and suggested by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright)—although, so far as the filling of these offices is concerned, in the Province of Ontario the law provides that they shall be filled forthwith. I think that the Attorney General of that province has decided that "forthwith" means in cases where it was found convenient, but, at all events, they have acted on that principle for a long time past. I do not say that because they did wrong we should follow in their wake, but the hon. gentleman knows very well that sometimes circumstances will arise in the conducting of a government, under which it is not convenient to fill these offices. I know for no reason, other than personal reasons and not political reasons, why the Quebec office was kept open.

Mr. MULOCK. Perhaps you could not get anyone to fill it.

Mr. BOWELL. I believe that is generally a difficulty not particularly in the Province of Quebec. It is with the greatest difficulty in the world, as my hon. friend suggests, that the people can be found to sacrifice themselves in the interests of the public service when the salary is small. I may say further that there is one justification at least for all this, and that is, that something was saved to the revenue, and more particularly in the case of Toronto where the collector's salary was $4,000 per annum.

Mr. McMULLEN. That was a small matter.

Mr. FOSTER. That is borrowed; that is Mr. Blake's.

Mr. BOWELL. Never mind, the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is quite correct in repeating a good thing, a pun is always good no matter whence it comes, and it is charming, delightful, and refreshing on this side of the House, to have a pun emanate from that gentleman, because it is not very often that he says a pleasant thing; he is generally of the vinegar character, and when he smiles and perpetrates a pun, even though it is borrowed, he has not only my sympathy but my congratulation.

Mr. McMULLEN. A "bun" would be better sometimes than a pun.

Mr. BOWELL. I hope the hon. gentleman does not object to that. I may be wrong if I agree with him even once, and if I am I will try not to do it again.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You are getting facetious.

Mr. BOWELL. I think we have been all indulging in that a little, and if I have I hope it is pleasant to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That is the "customs," I suppose.

Mr. BOWELL. I think that pun is better than the other one; try it again. Now, speaking seriously, the principle upon which these allowances are made, as in the cases of Mr. Douglas and Mr. Churchill, is to give one-half the difference between their respective salaries and those of the collectors, whose duties they performed until their successors were appointed. That is the principle that was adopted by the House in 1888 in the case of Mr. Surveyor Mackenzie, of Hamilton, and I am glad that my hon. friend from South Oxford does not object to the amounts which we propose to pay. When he considers the saving of revenue, he will, I am sure, forgive the other lapse of duty, if I may so call it, in not filling the offices. We will try in the future to fill them as fast as they become vacant. In reference to the item in the case of the Vacuum Oil Company *vs.* Regina, I may say that that was a suit arising from what I should call a misapprehension as to the meaning of the law in imposing the duty upon what was believed to be the value of the oil in the principal markets of the United States whence it was exported and imported into this country. However, the judge of the Exchequer Court decided that we were wrong, and the appropriation of $5,331.11 is to refund the duty collected in excess of the amount which should have been collected, and costs.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Then we are to understand that the Minister of Customs pleads guilty to the charge that he is not justified in allowing these offices to remain vacant so long as he did, not only in the case of the collector at Quebec, but also in the case of the collector at Toronto. The collector at Toronto was not appointed for two years and four months after the decease of the former collector, and if the duties of the office can be discharged by the acting collector for two years and four months, so efficiently as to secure the commendation of the Government, what necessity is there for appointing another man at a salary of $4,000 a year to discharge duties which have been so well discharged by the acting collector at a much less salary? If this saving can be effected by the Government in the administration of the Customs Department, I think it is the duty of the Minister of Customs who is so very economical in all his expenditures to refrain from appointing these men who are so unnecessary. If the acting collector at Toronto could discharge his duties as well as a collector, and at a much less expense, why not continue him, instead of appointing a collector? I think the hon. Minister of Customs has acknowledged that he committed an error in allowing these positions to remain vacant so long, and he excuses himself by saying that the Government of Ontario has been guilty of similar conduct. I do not think that is an excuse for a man who professes to stand so high in the estimation of the people of this country as the Minister of Customs. I think he occupies a more exalted position than do the members of the Government of Ontario, and should be above following the example which he says they set; he he should set a good example to them. Every

person in this country knows that the vacancy in the Toronto Custom-house was allowed to remain open so long for the purpose of supplying a soft place for Mr. Small, after he had ceased to serve his party in this House as one of the representatives of that city, and for no other purpose. It was reported in the newspapers of both parties that Mr. Small was to get this position, and he got it when it suited the convenience of the Government and the hon. Minister of Customs. I have been accustomed hitherto of saying flattering things of the hon. Minister; I believe his department is well administered as a rule; but in this case he has transgressed in a way that he cannot justify.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think there is a position vacant in the Windsor Custom-house. I see no appropriation for re-imbursing the man who is there acting as collector of Customs. I would like to know if anything is to be put in the Estimates for that purpose?

Mr. DEVLIN. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Customs what he meant when he referred to the number of applicants in the Province of Quebec. If there is one quality the hon. gentleman possesses above another, it is that of being perfectly candid, and if in this instance he gives a candid answer, he will say that there are as many office-seekers in the Province of Ontario as in the Province of Quebec.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know that I said that there were a number of applicants for the office. The hon. gentleman I think is quite correct in the last statement he made. The population of Ontario is much larger than that of Quebec, and I fancy that the same sentiment pervades most of the population, that if they could get an office they could fill, and in some cases that they could not fill, they are quite as ready to take it as the people of Quebec.

Mr. DEVLIN. I am quite satisfied with the answer of the hon. gentleman. I understood him to say that the office was not filled because there was no applicant, and I also understood him to remark that there were a great number of applicants in the Province of Quebec.

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman reflects a moment, I think he will see that he is a little over-sensitive. I did not refer to that matter at all. It was one of the hon. gentlemen opposite, who said that he supposed the reason the office was not filled, was because nobody could be got to fill it, and I facetiously said that there were plenty of applicants, I supposed.

Mr. DEVLIN. I am perfectly satisfied with the explanation given. I may be a little over-sensitive when the Province of Quebec is attacked, and I am quite certain that that feeling will not desert me.

Mr. LANDERKIN, I understood the hon. Minister of Customs to say that they could always find plenty of applicants, especially in Quebec. I would like to know what his colleague the Minister of War says about it. I know it was stated some time ago that the hon. Minister of Customs had eradicated every officer in his department who spoke the dual language. Perhaps the hon. Minister will say whether that is correct.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend quite mistook what the Minister of Customs said. Instead of saying that in Quebec there would be a great many applicants, he said it was well known under the circumstances that there would be very few.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Carried.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You have not read the items, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The discussion has been going upon all the items.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I beg to call your attention to the fact that we are allowing these items to go through with very unusual rapidity. Until the present moment every item has been read through, and I insist that that shall continue to be done, or no further items will be taken to-night.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not think that threat comes with a very good grace from the hon. gentleman. If we are to have the rules adhered to, let it be so understood. Then in future we will discuss each item separately, and not discuss them all, and then pass but one.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We have had all these items read regularly and I insist on that being done.

Mr. BOWELL. The rule is to discuss each item on its merits or demerits, as the case may be. The Chairman is justified in supposing that the general item, in which these four amounts is included, is passed because each one of them had been discussed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. By no means. The only one discussed at all was D. D. O'Meara's.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. Minister of Customs has failed to answer the question I put him. I said it was rumoured that he had removed all the French civil servants from his department. Is that true?

Mr. BOWELL. Like a great many other Grit reports, it is a falsehood.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Tell us the number you have.

Mr. BOWELL. Precisely the same number in the department as there was when I entered.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You have not killed any of them off yet?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Not one.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am ready to read every item, but hon. members sometimes ask that the whole vote be passed without reading the items. If we read item by item, every hon. member will have to speak on the item alone for which a vote is asked We have had a discussion upon the item with reference to Mr. O'Meara, and upon that relating to Mr. Douglas, which is the last item.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You are entirely in error, Sir, about that. It is quite true that the hon. Minister of Customs alluded to Mr. Churchill, but nothing was discussed except Mr. O'Meara. Necessarily some allusion was made to the pactice of keeping these Customs positions vacant for several years, and in connection with and as an illustration of that, some reference was made to the appointment of the collector at Toronto having been held over for two years and

a half. But, as a matter of fact, the only item we discussed was that relating to Mr. O'Meara.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The practice has been to read each particular item of the vote included in the bracket, but at the same time it was open to hon. members to discuss any item included in the bracket, and I think there is a very great deal of convenience in that way. When my hon. friend from South Oxford referred to the vacancy in the Custom-house at Quebec, I think my hon. friend from Brant alluded to the vacancy in the Custom-house at Toronto, and the hon. member for Kent to the vacancy in the Custom-house at Windsor. That was all for the purpose of discussing the principle of keeping these offices open for an indefinite period of time, and I do not understand that that was disposing of the items here bracketed, because the vacancy in Toronto is not referred to here nor the vacancy in the Custom house at Windsor. They were merely referred to for the purpose of illustrating the objectionable character of the practice of keeping important public offices open for an indefinite period. I think it would be well to adhere to the rule that the Chairman should read each particular item, and the Committee be free to discuss any general principle involved in all the items bracketed. I have been watching some of these items with a view of saying something, if I thought proper, when they were reached, but when you, Sir, declare the whole lot carried, you may cut off some member who may have something to say on some particular item, without interfering with the general discussion of some principle involved.

Mr. BOWELL. If we only carry out the suggestion of the Chairman and adhere strictly to the rule, by confining our discussion to the item itself, and not discuss the whole of them, we will save time, because if we discuss all the whole vote, when each item is called, then when we come to the next item we shall have the whole discussion over again. I do not think it is at all dignified that we should contradict each other in the manner we are doing point blank. When the notes of the reporter are read in reference to this question, it will be found that the first member who departed from the rule now enforced is the hon. member for South Oxford. So far as my memory serves me, he commenced a most violent attack—or perhaps the word "objectionable" would be more suitable—on the course taken by the Government with reference to the Toronto collectorship.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What I did was perfectly correct. I objected entirely, as I always have, to this vicious practice of keeping an office open for political purposes. It has been done constantly by the Administration of which the hon. gentleman is and was a member, and nothing can be more derogatory to the independence of Parliament than to hold offices vacant for the purpose of bribing political supporters.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. On which item are you speaking ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. D. D. O'Meara, surveyor to Her Majesty's Customs. These offices are kept vacant for a long time for the purpose of bribing political supporters, and that practice became doubly vicious when, as in the case of another item which I used for the purpose of illustration, it was notorious that a member of Parliament sat in this House for years who had the promise of one of these Government appointments in his pocket. That was doubly disgraceful, doubly injurious to the public service, and detrimental to the independence of Parliament. That illustration was properly made in the discussion of the allowance to Mr. O'Meara.

Mr. CASEY. Speaking to the point of procedure, it is quite impossible to confine discussion in Committee of Supply within hard and fast lines. The discussion to-night has taken no more latitude than has always been allowed. These items, which are bracketed together, are one item for the purpose of discussion, but it has been the invariable practice to read each sub-item separately before the whole vote is passed. That latitude of discussion must be allowed now, as in the past.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am willing to do anything I can to please everybody and expedite business, but I find it pretty hard to do so. The hon. gentleman who spoke last has said that I was wrong in desiring to read this item by item, but my impression was that, as I find in a book before me here, this was one vote of $12,552.40. I wanted to read the whole thing, and let hon. gentlemen see the whole. But if we proceed, item by item, I think the law is clear, and I will read it, so that hon. members may understand it. Hon. gentlemen do know it, but, unfortunately, those who know it the best are those who transgress it the most.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am in order, and I am here to maintain order.—

"As in other committees, each resolution must be proposed and discussed as a distinct question, and when it has been formally carried no reference can again be made thereto."

Some hon. gentlemen referred to it again and again.—

"Neither is it regular to discuss any resolution before it has been formally proposed from the Chair."

Here is a question about Mr. Douglas from Toronto, which has not been proposed from the Chair, and yet it has been discussed.—

"Each vote or resolution is necessarily a question in itself to be proposed, amended and put as any motion or Bill in the House. Sometimes there are a number of items in a vote or resolution."

Like this one.—

"And then these may be generally discussed as forming part of a single question. Each item may then, if the Committee think proper, be taken up as a distinct question, and so discussed and amended. The debate in such a case must be confined to the item, and when it has been disposed of no reference can again be made to it when the subsequent items are under consideration.'

If we follow that rule, we will not go astray.

Mr. CASEY. Who made that rule ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. These are the rules laid down by a man who has carefully considered the rules of Parliament and who is looked upon as an authority on this subject, that is Dr. Bourinot.

Mr. CASEY. The rule of this House is the invariable custon of this House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have many times suggested to the Minister of Finance, as I do now, that I think it would be for his convenience in future not to adopt in the Supplementary Estimates the practice of massing as we find it here,

but to divide these items. I think it would be for his convenience in the future to have these placed as separate items in the Supplementary Estimates so that each might be discussed in detail and this kind of bickering would be avoided.

Mr. FOSTER. I have largely done that this year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is true, but I think it would be better to do a little more in regard to the Supplementary Estimates. It is impossible to discuss these, particularly when a principle is involved, without making some reference to other items, but our practice, I think, has always been since this concern commenced to read each separate item.

Customs share (one-half) of repairs and maintenance of Government steam yacht *Cruiser* during the season 1890..... $2,254.63

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who pays the other half?

Mr. FOSTER. The Fisheries Department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think this is the yacht that used to belong to Mr. Gilmour. It is a very good little craft for Mr. Gilmour, but I do not think it is fitted for the purpose intended. I think it is a vessel of light draught, about 4 or 5 feet, and that it is very much more adapted for the purposes of a pleasure yacht than for any practical work in the upper lakes.

Mr. FOSTER. It is discarded now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then what on earth was the use of purchasing a vessel that you have to dispose of within two or three years?

Mr. FOSTER. We got her very cheap.

Mr. TUPPER. The amount we paid for her was either $5,000 or $6,000. As the hon. gentleman says, the experience was that she was not adapted to the rough waters of the Georgian Bay, where the fishing tugs can scarcely keep out. It has therefore been decided to dispose of her, and she is to be taken at her cost of $5,000 for the purchase and over $4,000 for repairs, on account in the purchase of the vessel which is to take her place.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the other's price?

Mr. TUPPER. I think about $30,000.

Mr. MULOCK. Who is building her?

Mr. TUPPER. Coulson, of Owen Sound.

Mr. LANDERKIN. When was the contract let?

Mr. TUPPER. I think it was on the 18th March, in this year, and the vessel is almost completed.

Refund, law costs, &c., in the suit of the Vacuum Oil Company *vs.* Regina..... $5,331.11

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are the circumstances connected with this?

Mr. BOWELL. I explained that the other day, but I will repeat it. As we interpret the law, we hold that the *ad valorem* duty is to be levied on the price at which the article is sold in the place where it is purchased, provided that be the principal market in which it is sold whence it is exported to this country. This company took exception to that interpretation of the law, contending that we should not have adopted as a value for duty the price for which similar oils were sold in the markets of the United States. The Court of Exchequer decided that both these objections were well taken. I do not desire to discuss the grounds of that decision, nor to criticize that decision, but the interpretation of the department was that we should exact a duty upon a higher price than that placed upon it when exported from the United States to Canada. I propose, however, at the next session of Parliament, if we are here, to ask the House to change the law in that as well as in other respects, so as to avoid misunderstandings and difficulties in the future.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think it would be regular at this moment to discuss the Toronto appointment. The hon. Minister has already, in the discussion of the first item, referred to the offices in Ontario that have been left vacant by the Government of that province, and he has stated that he is doing nothing more than following their example.

Mr. BOWELL. I said nothing of the kind. I did not say I was following their example.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. gentleman say they were following his example?

Mr. BOWELL. I merely called attention to the practice in the different provinces.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, and the hon. gentleman called attention to the practice for a purpose, and that purpose was in extenuation of his leaving this office vacant. I do not know what the hon. gentleman calls that, but I would call it following an example, and since he refers to that as a precedent, I think the hon. gentleman cannot call my statement a misrepresentation. But there is a marked difference between the cases to which he has referred, and the case of the Toronto vacancy. The Toronto office was kept open for the purpose of affording a place for a gentleman who was during the whole period that it was kept open, a member of this House. Now, there could not well be a more palpable and more flagrant violation of the Independence of Parliament Act than that particular case exhibits. What was the object of keeping the place open? Mr. Small sat in this House; there are many in this House who know Mr. Small, and who, perhaps, think the office was too big for the officer. However, that may be, he was a member of this House and a supporter of the Administration. Mr. Small accepted the office, and the Government intended that he should receive it. It was a matter of common rumour, it was known on this side of the House. I want to know whether Mr. Small did not sit here in violation of the spirit of the Independence of Parliament Act. Was he not exactly in the position of one who had been appointed to an office? Was he any less disqualified from sitting in the House, from the fact that the office was a prospective one so far as he was concerned? Why, Sir, after the passage of the Independence of Parliament Act in England, Mr. Fox's Bill, a gentleman, a member of the House of Commons, was asked to accept the office of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He gave his consent, but in the meantime the King became insane before he could accept the appointment, and it was held that his seat in Parliament had become vacant because, from the very moment that he gave his

assent to the acceptance of that office, he could no longer sit in Parliament without violating the principle of the Independence of Parliament Act; and the fact that the King did not recover made it impossible that he could be appointed, and the party who held office continued in office, and the party who had agreed to accept it was compelled to go back and seek election at the hands of his constituents. Now, Mr. Small was here expecting an appointment from the Administration, and the Administration expected the support of Mr. Small. I say that Mr. Small was at the time being a paid employé of the Administration, and therefore was disqualified from continuing to sit in this House. He was as much dependent upon the Administration as if he had already been sworn into office, and it was a most flagrant violation of the Act relating to the independence of Parliament to keep that office open for the purpose of filling it at the close of Parliament by a gentleman who was then a member of the House. It was as much so as if the hon. gentleman had already taken office at the hands of the Administration. Now, I say that there must have been an understanding, and Mr. Small must have agreed to accept that office. The Government must have communicated to Mr. Small that it was their intention to offer him that office; and so both on the part of the Administration and on the part of Mr. Small, the Act relating to the independence of Parliament was violated in that particular matter. Now, we have this item in the estimates asking for $2,666 to compensate some other party for the discharge of the duties of the office that Mr. Small received and that Mr. Small, it was known, was to receive, at the hands of the Administration. Now, it may be an improper thing that an office should not be promptly filled. It seems to me that it is a great responsibility for any Administration to assume, whether it is Dominion or Provincial, to continue to keep an office vacant for a long period of time. But there is something more than that in the case of the Toronto vacancy, because it is a case in which a member of this House was morally disqualified for the discharge of his duties as an independent representative of the people, by the promise that must have been made to him, and by the course that the Government pursued towards him under the circumstances.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I notice that Mr. Small was duly grateful for the pledges that were given to him in reference to this. A couple of days after the general election he wrote a poem, which I will read.

Mr. BOWELL. Who wrote the poem?

Mr. LANDERKIN. It is signed "John Small, ex-M.P." He seemed to be duly grateful, he seemed to understand that it was a union of hearts and of hands that had brought him into the office that gave him the salary which he is now receiving. This is the way he expressed his gratitude:

"A union of hearts,
A union of hands,
A union that none can sever;
A union of lakes,
A union of lands,
A Canadian union for ever."

That was the idea of a patriot who had secured the office, having been retained in the House as a placeman during the last Parliament.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

Mr. FRASER. I understood the Minister of Customs to say that the methods that he did not attempt to defend prevailed in all the provinces. I want to say distinctly, as an ex-member of that Government in one of the smaller provinces, the no such practice prevails in the Province of Nova Scotia. I say this in order that the Minister of Customs may not shield himself at least behind that province. When an office becomes vacant we make the appointment at once; that was the practice of our predecessors as well as of ourselves.

Mr. BOWELL. Are you sure I said in all the provinces?

Mr. FRASER I understood so.

Mr. BOWELL. If I did, I will withdraw it with reference to Nova Scotia.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think that the Government of Ontario supply a precedent for the action of this Government in reference to the appointment in Toronto. The Ontario Legislature does not, I think, supply a precedent such as has occurred, that of promising an office to a member of the House and the member sitting in the House for a long period afterwards.

Mr. WALLACE (York). Mr. Badgerow, of East York, is an example.

Mr. MULOCK. Is the hon. gentlemen aware that he had a pledge?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Just as much as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) knows that Mr. Small had a pledge.

Mr. MULOCK. If so, it was a bad precedent.

Mr. MASSON. What about the sheriff of Ontario?

Mr. MULOCK. Mr. Paxton was not appointed sheriff while he was in the House.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do not wish to detract from the loyal utterances of the Commissioner of Customs of Toronto on the day after the election. I have been informed that he read a Yankee poem. I do not know that the fact that he read a Yankee poem entitled him to a place in Her Majesty's Customs. It is said there is an annexation feeling spreading in the Government ranks, and whether this appointment was made in obedience to this growing sentiment I do not know.

Excise $4,171

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman explain the item of $3,500 further required for contingencies?

Mr. FOSTER. The vote for contingencies taken last year was $70,000, of which about $20,000 was estimated to be required for stamping tobacco and cigars, leaving $50,000 for Excise contingencies proper. The Excise and Customs stamps for 1889-90 cost $22,640, and as the tobacco and cigar revenue has slightly increased during the first half of 1890-91, it is estimated that at least $22,500 will be required on this behalf. This will account for a considerable portion of the increased vote. In addition to this, the growing demands of the service rendered it necessary to engage in the leading centres temporary employés, who have since been replaced by permanent officers or by the return to duty of 3 or 4 officers who were on lengthened leave of absence on account of illness. It is hoped that

this source of expenditure having been removed, or rather having been placed in the Estimates for next year under the proper sub-head,—that is "salaries of officers," which item has been correspondingly increased, the expenditure under the head of Excise contingencies for 1891-92 may be kept within the reduced estimate, namely, $65,000, including the stamping of tobacco and cigars.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Are the stamps printed by the Bank Note Company, and if so, when does the contract expire?

Mr. FOSTER. In October next.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is it the intention of the Government then to invite tenders for the work?

Mr. FOSTER. The question is under consideration of the Government. I think tenders will be called for.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hon. gentlemen opposite should make up their minds, and tell us what they intend to do. There was a long unpleasant discussion with respect to this matter three or four years ago, and at that time an understanding was arrived at that in future tenders would be invited for this work and due notice given. If there is any intention to depart from the resolution, I will not say the pledge given, intimation should be given to the House before it rises.

Mr. FOSTER. I will give an intimation to the House before it rises. With respect to $576 commission to Customs officers, Customs officers have to be employed on a commission of 5 per cent. to collect the Excise duties where Excise bonding warehouses have been granted in places in which not sufficient business is done to warrant the stationing of a permanent officer of the Inland Revenue staff. The requirements in this way have exceeded an estimate made last year, which was $3,500.

Cullers' salaries..... $1,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I had hoped they were to be reduced and not increased.

Mr. FOSTER. There was a mistake in the Estimates, the amount being $1,000 short.

Weights and Measures, contingencies.. $1,000

Mr. FOSTER. Two officers have had to have their places supplied by temporary employés, during their temporary illness, for a somewhat lengthened period. This will probably require about $600. The additional amount, namely, $400, is to provide for the payment of six months' allowance to Mr. Miall as Commissioner of Standards, withheld during the last half of 1889-90, during which year, owing to the non-payment of this and other items, this vote was under-expended to the extent of some $500 to $600.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What is the total cost of carrying out the Weights and Measures Act now?

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman will look at the Public Accounts he will see the total cost. I propose to reduce this amount to $600.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Then you ask the Governor General to sign a warrant, and you throw it back in his face.

Mr. FOSTER. He will not object.

Mr. MULOCK. I understand the Governor General's warrant was issued for $1,000. It included a small sum that was not urgent, and therefore was not warranted by the Audit Act. On what principle did the Minister make the report on which the warrant was issued? Is that the principle on which warrants are issued now?

Mr. FOSTER. I think there is no inconsistency in that. It may have appeared to the Minister at the time that this was necessary, and he so made his report. The Minister of Finance has nothing to do with that except to certify that there was no appropriation for it voted by Parliament. It was found out afterwards that the necessity did not exist, and we did not spend the money. Surely my hon. friend need not grumble at that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That hardly covers the objection of my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock). There is a very strict definition of the purposes for which alone a Governor General's warrant can issue, and it does appear there was an abuse of it in proposing to pay a sum of money to Mr. Miall, an officer in the receipt of a very tolerable salary in the department. It is one of these things which ought never have been done. I cannot see, for the life of me, how it can be defended under the Audit Act, to make a proposition to use a Governor General's warrant to pay $400 to Mr. Miall.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is struck out.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know, and it is quite right it should be struck out, but it was very wrong that a Governor General's warrant should be asked for such a purpose. The sum is small, but the principle is one of very great moment. We, on this side of the House, have found occasion, time and again, to object to the use made of Governor General's warrants, and this undoubtedly is a case in which I cannot conceive how any Minister could, by any possibility, defend, under the terms of the Audit Act, the action which has been taken. As the Minister of Inland Revenue is not here, I should like to know from the Minister of Justice or from the Minister of Finance how such a thing can be presumed to be within the four corners of the Act. It appears to me that this is the very last thing that should be paid by a Governor General's warrant.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In this case two persons are receiving $300 each out of this contingency appropriation, because the two other persons were unable to discharge their duties. I would like to know from the Minister of Finance whether those two gentlemen who could not discharge their duties were not out in an election expedition, and whether this money is not really to pay persons for canvassing during the election.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend must admit in his cooler moments that that insinuation does not tally with his ordinary fairness. He should not suppose a thing of that kind. The two officers were seriously ill, and these two gentlemen were appointed to do their work while they were ill. This $600 is for the payment of those two officers.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And they were not away during the elections?

Mr. FOSTER. I should not judge so. I would have to be very suspicious indeed to enable me to think so.

Mr. DEVLIN. Perhaps we would be able to get the names of these two officials.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I know of one of those cases personally, because I had to do with him professionally. I refer to the case of Mr. Macdonald, of the Hamilton division, who was ill from cancer, and who died before the election.

Mr. WALLACE. I know that one of these sick inspectors was Mr. Kinnee who has since died.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. As regards the question of Governor General's warrants I do not think there is any difference of opinion between us as to the restrictions imposed upon them. As the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) read to us the other evening, they are to be used only in cases of urgency, unforeseen cases, and cases in which the money is immediately required. The list of warrants this year is unusually large because Parliament met very late, and at that time of the year when most of those warrants were drawn the moneys were for what in an ordinary year would have been voted in these Supplementary Estimates for the current year. The service was required to be provided for in that way to an unusual extent in consequence of our not having Supplementary Estimates for the current year. As regards this particular $1,000; the case fully comes within the statute as regards $600 of it, and the other $400 must have been passed through an oversight. I was not aware of it myself until it came to be explained here. The $400 has not been paid.

Mr. MULOCK. I am quite satisfied with the explanation which the Minister has given. I think it is satisfactory to have the Government really live up to the Act. It is not the $400 that we are discussing but the abuse of the Act. Of course it is possible to make a mistake, and this appears to have been done by mistake.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The point I had in my mind with regard to the $400 being included in the Governor General's warrant, is that I do not see how it could escape being paid out.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It has not been paid out.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). From what the Minister says, that the recommendation did not pass Council the question would then arise, how came it to be included in the warrant?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There was an application before the Council to pay this $400, and in view of the fact that it could not be voted in time, it would seem to have been included improperly under one of these warrants.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But the warrant would be subsequent to the recommendation by Council.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It ought to have been.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It was done in a moment of weakness.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think it was a moment of too great strength on the part of some one.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A very curious thing about these Governor General's warrants is the fact, which my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) has alluded to before, that you take warrants for urgent expenditure required to be immediately carried out, apparently to the amount of $1,310,000, and of that sum it would seem you have expended only $750,000. There must have been some grave oversight when the Governor General was made to sign warrants for the purposes of urgency for nearly double the amount actually expended.

Mr. FOSTER. The amount expended at that time was the amount expended when the report was brought down to the House. We have not been able to get money from that time up to this, and the amount given there is not the amount expended up to this present time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But the Governor General's warrant is only intended to meet cases when Parliament is not sitting. That is the special object of it. The Government can, when Parliament meets, on a requisition of urgency, obtain a reasonable vote if they make out a sufficiently strong case. This $750,000 expended went down to the date when Parliament had assembled.

Mr. FOSTER. We have no authority given us for any expenditure yet under these Estimates.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know that, but you might have got authority from Parliament.

Murray Canal staff..... $3,000

Mr. MULOCK. Is this not included in the main Estimates?

Mr. BOWELL. I am informed not. Of course the hon. gentleman is aware, I suppose, that the Murray Canal has only been opened for traffic a short time. Experience showed that it was necessary to have a larger staff than was contemplated at the time of the main appropriation, because a great many more vessels passed through the canal than was anticipated. It was necessary to have men at night to take charge of the lights, as well as during the day.

Williamsburg Canal staff.....$1,000

Mr. MULOCK. Does the same explanation apply to this?

Mr. BOWELL. This is required to meet the payment of extra men employed on the locks on account of the work of construction being carried on.

To pay expenses for negotiating a settlement of outstanding balances of hydraulic rents at the Chaudière,.....$3,009.38

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Whom does this go to?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is in settlement of law expenses, and so forth, arising out of claims in connection with the Chaudière rents. Suits were commenced against all the proprietors of the Chaudière lands for arrears of rent, in compliance with instructions from the Committee of Public Accounts. Negotiations were entered into for a settlement, which resulted in the adjustment of new leases and the payment of upwards of $63,000 of arrears. The solicitors, Messrs. O'Connor & Hogg, who conducted the matter, had an engagement in writing with the department for the collection of rents, which entitled them to 10 per cent. The agreement had been entered into some years ago, with the view of collecting small sums. This amount was to cover the costs of suits as well.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Are the rents paid at the Chaudière fixed according to the horse power?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the rent is not now paid according to the power of the respective mills. The leases contain a great many conditions, which I do not now remember; but I think the rent is so much for each lot, with a restriction as to the power to be used.

Mr. MULOCK. What was the face amount of the claims originally?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We did not throw off any substantial amount. The claims were paid in full. The principal difficulty was in getting a settlement of new conditions.

Mr. MULOCK. Has that agreement been rescinded?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No, it has not. It applies still, I presume, to the small amounts collected. I am referring now to the Inland Revenue Department.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it would be prudent to put an end to the agreement, so that in future if such services are required, the agreement will be made applicable to the particular transaction.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There never can be again for many years, at any rate, so large an amount as this put in their hands for collection.

Militia expenses in connection with the rebellion in the N.W. Territories..	$8,017
Pension—J. Franckum, late Gunner "A" Battery, pension from 19th July, 1890, to 30th June, 1891, at 30 cents per diem.....	104.10

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. This is for militia pensions on active service. Franckum was discharged from "A" Battery on pension the 19th of July, 1890, at 30 cents per diem. The Order in Council was passed the 27th June, 1890. Franckum entered in July, 1881. By a rifle bullet striking him above the ear, while marking at the rifle butts for his battery, he became injured. He had to pass the medical board and was so severely wounded that he became insane and is in a lunatic asylum. All the papers were submitted to the Department of Justice, and the whole matter submitted to Council before the Order in Council was passed. There is an amount for legal expenses, $350; for transport, $1,450; for clerical work *re* North-West claims, $500; North-West Navigation Company, judgment of the Exchequer Court, $5,400.

Mr. WATSON. Is it the intention of the Government to pay the claim made by Mr. Bremner in connection with North-West rebellion matters?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is only a week since that came in, and it has not yet been examined.

Seed grain and expenses collecting and receiving grain.....	$2,338.71

Mr. DEWDNEY. Last year $3,150 were voted in the Supplementary Estimates for seed grain. Out of that, at the end of the financial year, there was $666 of the appropriation lapsed, as the accounts were not all in within the three months which we were allowed to pay the accounts which had been incurred at the end of the financial year. Therefore, all the addition we ask on account of those accounts is $600. We expect to have $1,000 more to pay for the expense of receiving the seed grain which is now being paid back. We have to pay a small percentage to some parties for collecting, and as the grain is sold and paid for the money is paid in to the Receiver General.

Mr. MULOCK. When did the distribution of grain take place?

Mr. DEWDNEY. A year ago last spring. None has been distributed since and none is asked for this year.

Mr. WATSON. How much has been paid back?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have a rough memo. of the account for seed grain advanced in 1888-89 and 1889-90, showing $81,882, and the amount refunded has been $45,435.

To pay ex-constable G. H. Harpur balance of pension to 30th June, 1891, on account of Rebellion of 1885	$814.60

Mr. DEWDNEY. Harpur's first application for pension was made by letter from him dated Battleford, 21st April, 1890, and inquiries were continuous into the case until the matter was taken up by the late Premier on the 15th November, 1890, when application was made in Parliament. Harpur stated that his expenses for medicines and medical advice had far exceeded those for the necessaries of life; that he had been unable to perform any ordinary bodily labour since 1885, and that to support himself and pay his doctors' bills, he had been compelled to sell all his personal property; that he had been frequently urged to apply for a pension but put it off in the hope of ultimate recovery, and, having expended all he possessed in supporting himself, he was compelled to ask for assistance.

Mr. MULOCK. I am quite satisfied with that. I was only anxious to find out if the department had had this case before it for years without taking action.

Committee rose and reported resolutions.

Mr. BOWELL moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1.10 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 3rd July, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved:

That Government Orders have precedence on Wednesdays for the remainder of the Session, and that the order of business for Wednesday under Rule 19 be made the Order for Mondays.

Mr. LAURIER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would consent that this rule should not apply to next Wednesday, but that next Wednesday should remain members' day. I have no objection to the motion taking effect next Wednesday week.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We thought that it would be sufficient to take the Orders for next Wednesday on Monday next, because the number of measures in the hands of private members is very small, and the hon. gentleman will see himself that it will be necessary to expedite the business of the

House. Perhaps if members have the afternoon of next Wednesday, the Government could take the evening.

Mr. LAURIER. I agree with the hon. gentleman that the paper is not much loaded with business in the hands of private members, but still there is a good deal to be yet disposed of. There is, for instance, Mr. Cameron's Bill to amend the Criminal Law, which is an important measure, and it may take some hours' discussion. I think it would be better if next Wednesday should be allowed to remain as members' day.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I agree to the suggestion of the hon. gentleman. I am sure that he and his friends will make up for that on other days and help us to get through the business.

Mr. LAURIER. We have no desire to remain here in this hot weather longer than we can help it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I may mention in connection with the Bill referred to by the hon. gentleman, that I propose to ask, after any discussion that may be thought necessary upon it, that it shall stand over for circulation with the Criminal Code which has been drafted.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Code has not been brought down yet.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It has been brought down, but it has not been distributed.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

ADMIRALTY JURISDICTION.

House again resolved into Committee on Bill (No. 13) to provide for the exercise of admiralty jurisdiction within Canada, in accordance with the Colonial Courts of Admiralty Act, 1890.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will state, at the outset, what I intend to suggest with regard to all the clauses that were allowed to stand. I propose that the appeal to the Exchequer Court from a Vice-Admiralty judge shall be optional with that to the Supreme Court. I propose that the tenure of office shall be during good behaviour, like that of other judges. I propose to abolish all fees payable to the Vice-Admiralty judges, and to make provision for the appointment of deputy judges, to take the place of judges who are interested or unable to sit, and surrogate judges with subordinate jurisdiction, and with such authority as may be conferred upon them by the general rules which may be made in pursuance of this Act. The object of having surrogate judges is to facilitate procedure in cases instituted at a distance from the place of registry. These are the principal amendments.

On section 4,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This was allowed to stand, as the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) had some doubt as to whether it did not curtail the jurisdiction given by the other clauses. I think it merely provides the places where the court may exercise its jurisdiction, and does not restrict the powers of the court.

Mr. LANGELIER. I would suggest whether it would not be better to do for admiralty jurisdiction what has been done with regard to contro-

verted election cases, and allow the admiralty cases to be dealt with by the ordinary courts of each province.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman was not here the other day when that question was raised by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) and I endeavoured to reply by stating that that view had been very fully considered, and that while I had to admit it had many advantages, such as the consolidation of all the litigation in one tribunal, there were other decided advantages in favour of pursuing the course of keeping this court under federal authority. One was that the power to legislate on this subject was lately given to us, and it may be very useful to have the organization we are making by this Bill available for other purposes than mere admiralty jurisdiction; and, besides, we avoid, by retaining the present officers, providing pensions for some twenty officers, whom the Imperial Parliament have legislated in favour of, in the way of pensions, if we dispensed with their services.

Sections 20, 21 and 25 struck out.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In moving that the Committee rise and report the Bill, I may say that the resolutions to provide for the salaries which will be necessary in consequence of the abolition of the fees, will be moved separately, and that a separate Bill will be introduced to provide for them so as not to interfere with the progress of this Bill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would suggest that the Committee should simply report progress, and that the Minister should have the Bill reprinted, so that we may see how it stands and whether any error exists before it is passed. No time will be lost by that.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If the Bill is reported I will agree to have it reprinted before the third reading.

Committee rose and reported progress.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

High Commissioner's office. $1,000

Mr. FOSTER. The estimate for contingencies last year amounted to $6,789.22. There have been over-expenditures, and additional will be required in order to complete the year, of about $1,000. There have been expended up to the 10th of June, on rent of offices and fuel, out of an estimate of $2,800, $2,100; cleaning and gas repairs, there was an estimate of $250, and there were expended $343; the expenditure, therefore, has overrun on that amount. Printing and stationery, the estimate was $650; the expenditure was $852, that item having overrun by about $200. Postal expenses were $33 over the estimate. In travelling expenses there was a decrease, the expenses being $68 out of an estimate of $200.

Mr. MULOCK. You are not charging for the trip out to Canada the other day?

Mr. FOSTER. No, that would not bring him out. There is an increase in the income tax. The messenger's estimate was $700; the amount expended up to the 10th of June was $516. Extra clerk in place of one who has retired, $73. So that altogether, taking into account these over-expenditures up to the 10th of June, $1,000 will be required to meet the expenditure up to the last of the year.

Mr. MULOCK. Why not take it out of that $2,000?

Mr. FOSTER. We cannot do that this year.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have no desire to detain the Committee at any length on this item, but I want to say this. The items for contingencies in connection with the High Commissioner's office in London are very minutely detailed in the Auditor General's Report, but I cannot see unless from the remarks the Finance Minister just made, that there is any necessity for granting an additional sum of $1,000. Now, there were some remarks made with regard to the contents of the High Commissioner's report, which was pretty well criticized at a previous stage of this session. As I said then, I cannot see that there is a necessity for all the expenditure in connection with that office that we are called upon to bear each year; and, in my humble opinion, there ought to be a very carefully and minutely prepared statement of all these expenditures, so that we might fully understand how every item of this money has been spent. I notice that it is increasing every year. It is to be regretted that year after year the cost of that office is rising. You go back five years and you will find it was very much less than it is now. It was less under Sir A. T. Galt than it is under Sir Charles Tupper. I do not for a moment doubt that, perhaps, he performs duties and does a considerable amount of travelling and so on. The duties of the office may be increasing, but I say in justice to the people of this country who are tax-payers, and in justice to this House, we should have a pretty detailed statement of all the moneys expended within and under the office of High Commissioner in London. In the first place I would like to know whether there has been an increase in the number of officers employed.

Mr. FOSTER. I think there has been a decrease of one.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am very glad, that is a step in the right direction; because, from the report we have received, I do not think there can be a necessity for the extensive staff that is kept there.

Mr. FOSTER. They are all kept at work.

Mr. McMULLEN. Judging from the report that has been sent in, it seems to be more in the line of an emigration office. While we have emigration agents in Liverpool and in other towns of the United Kingdom, whose duty it is to attend to that particular matter, I cannot see that a large amount of emigration business can devolve upon the High Commissioner and his staff in London, because those emigration agents must perform a very large part of that service. I want to get some idea as to when we may be able to reach the ultimate limit of the increased expenditure under the head of the High Commissioner. In order that we may ascertain that limit, we should have a very minutely detailed account laid before Parliament so that we can form some idea as to whether this money is being well expended or not. There are increases in a great many lines, and it is our duty, as an Opposition, to oppose unnecessary increases, and closely to criticize them in the public interest. If we find, upon careful investigation, that they are justifiable, then we should consent to them; but if they are not justifiable, it is our duty to resist any further increase. In my opinion, the High Commissioner has been rather disposed to spend more money than was necessary in the general interests of this Dominion, and I would suggest that every detail of his expenditure should be closely criticized.

Printing voters' lists and election expenses —Governor General's warrant..... $21,500

Mr. FOSTER. These are the Governor General's warrants about which we were talking the other day, and none of us knew much. The details of the printing of the voters' lists, as given to me, are these: There was a Governor General's warrant taken, and the expenditure to 10th July was for the items which I will read: Pay of printers—that, of course, is the cost of the printers engaged upon the printing of the voters' lists, $1,922; pay of clerks, $2,000; Dominion Type Founding Company for type, and another company for type, $1,500; express company, $1.10; telegraph company, $10; another telegraph company, $24; Queen's Printer for printing stationery, $331. Then there was an item advanced to the two revising officers by the Auditor General, to enable them to get to work upon the duties of their office, which is simply, of course, an advance of so much upon their salaries, which is sometimes done. The whole amount of the expenditure was $6,702. Then there was a question raised as to the returns for the sale of the lists. The amount received for sale of voters' lists is $3,907, making an expenditure over and above income of $2,795. Now as to the details of elections—that is, the other returns. Out of $11,500 there have been expended $9,381. These expenditures have been for expressage. I may say that up to the past election there was an arrangement between the Dominion and the two Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, by which they had a joint ownership of the ballot boxes, and in the provinces there is a rather close connection between the municipalities and the Government, and for municipal elections, which are conducted by ballot, the same ballot boxes were used. So whenever an election came round the officers had to send men all over the country to scour up these ballot boxes, and this was attended with much difficulty and expense. An arrangement has been carried out with the Province of Quebec, by which that province bought the old boxes jointly owned by the province and the Dominion, and paid for them, and we got new ballot boxes in Quebec for ourselves, which are to be our very own and not to be trotted around and loaned, so that we will know where they are when we want them. A similar arrangement has not yet been completed in Ontario, but negotiations are being carried on. At all events, with regard to Ontario we adopted the same plan and got our own ballot boxes. The item for ballot boxes amounts to $6,000, the cost of each box ranging from $2 to $2.50. They are considered to be very good boxes. The item, Queen's Printer, $1,314, is explained in this way:

Heretofore in elections the instructions to voters and instructions to returning officers and that class of work were printed locally. This work has been done by the Queen's Printer, and consequently it appears here in a lump sum, instead of coming into the returning officers' expenses to be paid afterwards as part of the expenses of the elections. There are items here also for the expressage of the ballot boxes to their various destinations, and there is an item for clerical work, the largest portion of which is paid for the preparation of the return to be presented to the House of the results of the election in the different constituencies. These items make up a total of $9,381, as follows:—Express charges $199, clerical work $966, ballot boxes $6,600, printing and stationery $1,380, travelling expenses $100, telegraphing $50.

Mr. McMULLEN. In connection with the ballot boxes, it is a pity that the Government did not adopt more care in the construction of those boxes. In my constituency each ballot box is made with a lock, and the key is tied to the handle. When the deputy returning officer has performed his duty, he locks the box and leaves the key attached to the handle. Thus the locking of the box is a fallacy. The Government should have taken some means of obtaining boxes that were self-locking, and the boxes should have been given by the returning officer to the deputy officer, closed, but unlocked. When the deputy returning officer had performed the necessary inspection in the morning before the poll was opened he could close the lock with a spring, and there should not be a key attached to the handle. The hon. member for Grey had a very narrow escape owing to these keys being attached to the boxes, because the premises were opened and the keys being there the ballot boxes were unlocked and ballots were changed and others substituted.

Mr. FOSTER. Who would count the ballots at the close of the poll?

Mr. McMULLEN. There would be trouble on that point; but the ingenuity of the Government engineers would be able to devise some means of overcoming the difficulty. With respect to the printing of the lists, can the Minister of Finance say what rate is now paid to printers at the Printing Bureau. A few years ago the pay was $10 a week, and it was raised to $11, I think.

Mr. FOSTER. The same pay now prevails. Is it not a fact that a seal is attached to each ballot box?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I doubt very much that a seal is attached, although the law may provide for it.

Mr. FOSTER. Something of the kind was done to the ballot boxes in the division in which I voted. I remained there till the close of the poll.

Mr. FRASER. It is not sufficient security unless the returning officer is thoroughly honest. There is security if there is only one key to the box, and it is given to the presiding officer, and that key at the close of the poll is placed in an envelope secured and initialled by the agent of both parties, and afterwards given to the returning officer and opened in the presence of the parties.

Mr. McMULLEN. The reason I asked with respect to the rate of wages paid to the printers is, that it was understood the pay should be $11 per week, but on speaking to a printer whom I know he told me the rate is $14 per week.

Mr. FOSTER. I gave the hon. gentleman my own impression. I have not charge of that department, but I do not think any change has been made. However, I will enquire and give the hon. gentleman the information.

Intercolonial Railway.....$300,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We desire to have very full explanations from the Minister as to the causes of this enormous sum demanded on behalf of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. BOWELL. This sum of $300,000 required for the Intercolonial Railway: $4,000 for the Windsor Branch, and $30,000 for the Prince Edward Island Railway, is to make up a deficiency in the running expenses of the road during the present year over the appropriation which was made during the last session of Parliament. The estimates as originally presented by the department included these sums of $300,000, $4,000 and $30,000, but by some means they were omitted from the Estimates when they came before Parliament. These sums are to provide for the amount that was really asked for by those who were managing the department last year. The same sum is asked this year, namely $3,700,000. It is made up of items for locomotive power, car expenses, maintenance of way and work, station and train expenses and general charges, making as near as they can approximate it $3,700,000. It is only a repetition for me to say, that had not the Estimates been changed last year by some error, this deficiency would not now have to be asked for.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course the hon. Minister of Customs was not Minister of Railways at the time, but I am afraid that the reason for leaving out that sum, after it had been applied for, was because there was a great reluctance to disclose to the House or to the country the enormous extent of the expected deficit on the Intercolonial Railway; more especially as a good deal of attention had been called to the fact that by reason of certain changes, and by reason of the construction of a line across the State of Maine, we were likely to add enormously to the deficit on the Intercolonial Railway. The statement now made by the hon. Minister would appear therefore, without, I think, any unfair straining of the facts, simply to imply this: That last year the Government, or the party in charge, thought it expedient not to take the House into their confidence as to the amount which was likely to be charged, and the amount of the deficit which was likely to be incurred. Now, I would like to know from the Minister if he can inform us, what at the present time is the charge for conveying coal on the Intercolonial Railway per ton per mile; say from Spring Hill mines, for example?

Mr. BOWELL. Three-tenths of a cent per ton per mile.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Three-tenths of a cent is about half a farthing or a little more. On the English lines, if I am correctly informed, the charge for conveying coal is five-tenths of a cent per ton per mile, and if my memory does not altogether mislead me, it was stated last night by the Minister of Customs in reply to a question from

me, that five-tenths of a cent is the lowest rate at which heavy goods can be conveyed on the Intercolonial Railway. The consequence is, and the House, which is now asked to vote $300,000 additional for the Intercolonial Railway, may make a note of it, that according to the statement given us last night, and according to the statement given us to-day, whereas it costs five-tenths of a cent per ton per mile to convey such goods, the country is conveying this coal for three-tenths of a cent or about one-half; or, in other words, on every single ton of coal which is hauled we sustain a loss of about one-fifth of a cent per ton per mile. I do not think, Sir, if that is a specimen of the way in which a good many of these charges are regulated, it is at all a matter to be wondered at, that there is now a deficit of over half a million dollars per year on the working of the Intercolonial Railway. So long as this system goes on, so long the whole of the country is going to be taxed for the purposes of conveying coal to oblige the proprietors of a particular railroad.

Mr. FRASER. I think there are other reasons why there is a deficit on the Intercolonial Railway, and I can very well understand why it is necessary that this $300,000 was not included in the Estimates, and has to be voted now. I was very much pleased with the speech made by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) a few days ago when he referred to the Intercolonial Railway. It is becoming a very serious matter, and while I can conceive that the country is very much benefited by a Government railway carrying goods at a cheaper rate, still if we can find other reasons than that why a deficit occurs I think we should enquire into them. Now, Sir, I think that all thoughtful men ought to move in the direction indicated by the member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), and for this reason: I take it that the Intercolonial Railway is badly managed perforce. I think perhaps that even a stronger Government, a Government of stronger moral back-bone than the present Government, would make a mistake in running that road because there are so many people who look upon that Government road as something made for themselves and their friends, that the Government put anybody and everybody into office upon that road. During the last election we had a very fine example of the system under which the Intercolonial Railway is run. In every town there was a book of passes ready to be filled up with the names of voters, and these names were filled in and given to every man who wanted to go anywhere over the province to vote. I will give you one example of this, as I happen to have the evidence of it right in my hand. For example, the secretary of the Conservative Association for the County of Pictou is an official of the Dominion Government, he is keeper of the Savings Bank in the town of New Glasgow, and a very worthy man, and he was secretary of the Association in New Glasgow. A letter is addressed to a gentleman in New Glasgow, and is sent with the inscription "please have this delivered at once," and the name of Mr. Cameron, secretary of the Conservatives for the County, is put upon it to deliver it to the voter, and he does deliver it. The voter who lived in New Glasgow, but who had a vote in the County of Halifax, opens the letter and he finds that it contains two passes. The man has no idea of voting, but his name is found on the list in Halifax, and it is discovered that he lives in the town of New Glasgow, and so adroitly is the work done that he gets a pass as an employé of the railway department. The pass reads as follows:—

"Intercolonial Railway—For employés only."

Of course, every man that votes is an employé of the Government, and this pass is for employés only—

"Pass—A B—From New Glasgow to Dartmouth."

I do not give his name, but I substitute the letters A B for it. He did not live in Dartmouth, nor did he need to go to Dartmouth at all, but so adroitly is the business managed, that in order to put the people off the scent, he is given a pass to Dartmouth. The pass says:

"Why granted"——

And there is a stroke after the words "why granted," because it could not be granted to him as an employé. The pass is good up to 5th March, and it is signed by D. Pottinger and was countersigned by P. S. Archibald. The pass was just handed to the man and he could go on that to Halifax to vote, but he did not go and did not vote. There was a return pass for this man, and the return pass is of a like character. It says:

"Pass—A B—From Halifax to Barney's River."

Barney's River is 20 miles beyond New Glasgow, where the man lives; they make it appear that he did not live in New Glasgow, and so they give him a pass to Barney's River, 20 miles beyond that, in order to bring him back from Halifax. I make the statement here, and I take the responsibility of the statement, that, if the books of the Intercolonial Railway are searched, during the time of the last election, it will be found that hundreds of voters were granted passes in the same way. Now, that is not fair to the other voters. If the Intercolonial Railway is to be used for election purposes, they should give passes all round. Why should unsanctified Grits be compelled to pay, when they go to vote, while these loyal Conservatives can get passes anywhere they like along the Intercolonial Railway? You will notice, of course, that the passes do not come from Ottawa at all: it is all done down below. The acting Minister of Railways knew nothing about it, or else he would frown upon it, and the chief engineer—whom I am glad to see on the floor of the House, instructing the Minister, and who conducts so well the business of the Intercolonial Railway—would not do it, of course; everyone knows that. You see, it is done at Moncton, and these books of passes were in the hands of the agents of the Conservative party; the book was handed to the Conservative agent, and he could fill it up with any name he liked. The Government found it was necessary to use so many more engines, and so much more coal, and to keep so many more men at work, that they, of course, found the money voted last year was not sufficient, and that is one of the reasons why this $300,000 had to be drawn on a Governor General's warrant.

Mr. FOSTER. To carry your hundred voters.

Mr. FRASER. I submit that it is high time the Government should take this matter into their serious consideration. I tell you, that the fact that the people know that a Government road—and the Government are the trustees for the people—is

used for political purposes to carry men to vote from one end of the province to the other, is doing much to sap the public morality. It is bad enough when a railway company does this, for to a certain extent they are paying it out of their own pockets, but when the people's money is expended in this way at the rate of half a million dollars a year, to meet that deficit caused by carrying voters belonging to one particular party, I submit that it is high time that this matter should be enquired into. Now, I have got the papers here, and I can give the Government the names to show how these agents go behind their backs in this matter. I am not holding the Government altogether responsible. No man would ever think that the present Minister of Railways, or the late Minister of Railways, would be guilty of authorizing the granting of these passes. I only mention the fact to show that there must be looseness somewhere when the employés on the road could use their powers to pass voters from one part of Nova Scotia to another. There is a clamant need that the road should be run by men who cannot be influenced by pressure from persons who come to them and say: "This man or that man has a vote and should get a pass," or "Put my son on the railway," or "Give me a pass over the road because I am going to vote." Those who issued those passes are far worse than the men who took the passes; but so anxious were the Government to make the deficit larger that they sought the voters out and granted them passes. This occurred in Halifax, and I know that the hon. gentlemen who represent that county will repudiate it. I only mention this to show how, behind the backs of the Government, those men in some way or other hoodwink the authorities and abuse their powers. I call the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways and all hon. members from Nova Scotia and elsewhere whose fame has been tarnished by these villainous officials, to unite together and see that these things do not happen again. The deficit on the Intercolonial Railway is becoming a very serious matter indeed, and I do trust that before the next session of Parliament something in the direction indicated by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) will be done. After the way the railway has been run, I admit that it would be very hard for the opponents of the Government, if they came into power, to stop these practices. It is very difficult for a Government in running a railway to resist this pressure; but they should draw the line somewhere; and in winter especially, when everybody knows that the expenses are greater than in summer, they should not allow the road to be used for carrying voters free. I have heard a good deal since I have been a member of this House about the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway carrying voters. It is a bad thing to find any railway company doing that; but I maintain that it is far worse when the Government enters the lists and uses a public railway for election purposes. I care not whether it is one party or the other that does it, it is demoralizing. That is one of the reasons why it is necessary to vote this $300,000. If the Minister means that this amount was voted last year——

Mr. BOWELL. No. What I stated was that the officials in the department had asked for a sum sufficient to cover this, but that in the House the amount was reduced for some reason or other.

Mr. FRASER. No reduction could be made except by the Government. That strengthens my argument and shows conclusively that it was the operation of the road during the election that made this vote necessary. I trust, however, that the serious attention of the Government will be given to this matter, and that no passes will be granted in future.

Mr. FOSTER. There will be, either on this item or on the main Estimates, an extended discussion on the management of the Intercolonial Railway. I know that personally, because a number of gentlemen on this side of the House have spoken to me about it, and some of them have asked me just now whether they should take this discussion at the present time or defer it until the main Estimates are under consideration. I should much prefer that the discussion should go over to the main Estimates, and that the present discussion should be confined to the item before us; but if the House thinks otherwise, we can have the discussion now. I should like to ask the opinion of the hon. member for South Oxford on that point.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am afraid that there is no alternative unless this item stands. To postpone the discussion until the main Estimates are before us may mean no discussion at all. It is quite possible, looking at the state of the House, that the vote might not be reached until a late period, and the statement made by my hon. friend, and some of the other statements, do undoubtedly require to be discussed and explained. If it is convenient for the hon. gentleman to withdraw the item, I am quite agreeable to that.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know that that would be convenient.

Mr. MULOCK. If the item stands, perhaps the Minister would make enquiry as to the number of passes which were issued during the election, so that we may discuss the question with a full knowledge of the facts.

Mr. FOSTER. It will not be possible for this vote to go over for any great length of time, as it is for the service of the year now up, and the amounts are pressing for payment. However, if it will facilitate matters, I will promise that very early in the consideration of the main Estimates the item of the Intercolonial Railway will be brought up, and the utmost freedom of discussion will be given upon it, and all information that can be brought will be brought. There is no wish on the part of the Government to avoid a thorough discussion of the Intercolonial Railway. In fact, I should welcome it myself as an individual member of the House; and I should like to have, so far as I am concerned, not the partisan, but the cool and well-thought-out opinions of members on both sides, in relation to the management of that railway. It is for no purpose of burking discussion that I make this suggestion; but the hon. gentlemen know how we are situated. Our desire is to have sufficient voted to provide for the working expenses of the railway. Under these circumstances, I am willing to promise that there will be full opportunity for discussion.

Mr. BOWELL. The amount that has been credited to the management of the Intercolonial

Railway has been exhausted, and it was only through the courtesy of the bank that the last pay rolls were met. Pay rolls for the past month are now unpaid, and unless the bank extends its favour still further, the employés of the road will have to wait. For that reason it is absolutely necessary, in order that the men on the road should be paid at the end of the month, that we should have this money placed at our disposal. I quite concur in the remarks made by the Finance Minister. There will be no attempt whatever to shirk any debate. We shall have the fullest and most extended investigation into the charges that may be made against the management of the road. I may say to the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) that I have no knowledge, personal or otherwise, of the charges he has made. I will say, however, that in the short time during which I have had connection with the road I have come to about the same conclusion as himself, that the people of the country think that the road is theirs, and that they have a right to use it. But in justice to the chief engineer, who directs the management of the road, I will say that if there has been any abuse of the pass privilege, it has not been on his part.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. Minister of Finance desires that when this item comes up again it shall receive full business-like discussion. That will involve information regarding the working of the road, which will enable us to discover how it is money has been lost, and, if possible, provide a remedy. The information, therefore, I have asked for will be very necessary. Are passengers being carried for less than a fair rate or for nothing? And if so, to what extent? Then, if the schedules of rates are not always adhered to, we should have information as to the exceptions made. Further, we should know to what extent the pass system has been adopted, not merely in connection with elections, but generally. I have been told that it is an ordinary occurrence to see a passenger train of dead-heads pass through as railway employés. People consider it is their own railway, and that they have the right to travel on it free. If there are any books to show that, we should have the information. I would like the acting Minister of Railways to say also whether passengers are allowed to travel over that road without any pass at all, and whether a custom does not prevail of carrying people free by car loads at election times without even having passes. We also should have a statement as to whether the road is used for political purposes or a party character such as have been referred to by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser).

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As the hon. Minister of Finance has made the suggestion, and as I think it extremely likely that this discussion, once entered into, may go to very considerable lengths, I would suggest to my hon. friends that they should, provided the Minister of Customs sees his way to accept the suggestion, supply him with statements of such information as will be required, and we will agree to forego at present the general discussion, on the understanding that this will be the first item brought up after the Budget debate is disposed of.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no objection to that.

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. member for Guysborough will put in writing what he has stated, and if the hon. member for York (Mr. Mulock) will put in writing what he wants, I will endeavour to obtain all the information I can get on these points. But I can assure these hon. gentlemen that passengers are not permitted to pass up and down the road free, unless the conductors violate their instructions and defraud the revenue.

Mr. FRASER. I am bound to say in corroboration of what the hon. Minister has stated, that at any other time there is the greatest possible strictness with regard to the general public, who must show their tickets or passes every time, or pay their money.

Mr. LANGELIER. From my own personal knowledge I know that on the day when a certain public meeting at Rimouski, during the last election, was to be held, there were two special excursion trains bringing the people to the meeting, the one from the east and the other from the west, and I saw the system which was resorted to in order to allow the Tory voters to get to that meeting without paying.

Mr. FOSTER. Are we to abide by the understanding suggested or go into a discussion now? If these charges are made, they must be met.

Mr. McMULLEN. In order that the Government should have the necessary information when the matter comes up, it is highly desirable that we should provide them with it now.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not highly desirable that all sorts of charges should be made by hon. gentlemen opposite, involving the good name of the railway, and that those charges should go to the public in the *Hansard* without any reply being made to them. The Minister of Railways made a fair proposition. Whatever information any hon. gentleman on the other side wishes to have let him send the Minister a note of it, and he will furnish the information as far as possible. I do not think it is fair that charges should go upon the record without any rebuttal appearing, as there are many people who will simply read the charges and not follow the sequence in a fortnight or three weeks later.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. Minister of Customs said that the practice mentioned did not take place, or that if it did, it was in violation of the rules of the department. My hon. friend from Quebec wishes to give the hon. Minister the information in advance of violations of that rule to his knowledge.

Mr. McMULLEN. All we desire is to place the Government in possession of the information which they must have before them when this question comes up for discussion. We do not want them to be in a position to say that we did not intimate our intention of putting these questions. We want to know, when this road is not paying working expenses, whether we are running any cars at the entire cost of the Dominion, as we have reason to believe is the case.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not understand that the observations addressed to the Committee by the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) were, in any way, a departure from the understanding which was had. If that hon. gentleman is able to inform the acting Minister of Railways of certain facts that came within his own observation, the Minister of Railways might very well explain them now, if he can, or if he cannot now, he may explain them when we come to dis-

cuss the general Estimates. In fact, it gives the Government the opportunity of knowing what the complaint is and what the defence is.

Mr. BOWELL. The complaint which has been made by the member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) will be enquired into. Did I understand him to say that these people were carried free on these trains?

Mr. LANGELIER. I had not finished my remarks, but I stated that one train was started from the east and one from the west to come to Rimouski, and I saw dozens of people, who were supposed to be in favour of the Minister of Militia, who showed me the kind of pass they had to go over that railway. They had not paid one cent, and they told me that hundreds of other people, in fact all the other people who were there attending the meeting, had been passed in the same way. I venture to say that no record has been made of the passes to travel on those trains. I was shown the pass they had, and it was a little piece of white paper with a hieroglyphic written on it by a Conservative wirepuller, and that is what dozens and dozens of people showed me as having passed them on board that train. I would like to have the information, because I desire to find out how much these two excursion trains paid to the Government. There were hundreds of people on these trains. There were many other special trains during the election, and I do not know what they paid to the Government, but I am speaking especially of those that came to the large meeting which was held at Rimouski a few days before the election. I do not know if any of these people paid, but all those that I saw told me they had these passes. I think it would be very important to find out how these trains were managed.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I can see that the hon. gentleman could not read these mysterious signs on that little bit of paper which he refers to as a pass for the friends of the Conservative party to travel free on the Intercolonial Railway. I did not see any of these pieces of paper, these pieces of ordinary paper with an extraordinary sign, and it appears to be extraordinary that the friends of the Conservative party should have selected the hon. gentleman (Mr. Langelier) to display these passes to when I saw nothing of them. I had complaints —and the hon. gentleman will understand that in the midst of an election fight many of your friends expect you to do more that you can—from many of those who came, as the hon. gentleman truly says, from the east and from the west on those two special trains, that they could not be admitted on either of those trains without having to pay their fare. It was stated to me that orders had been issued by Mr. Schreiber or Mr. Pottinger—I will not be sure which —that every man should pay special rates, which meant excursion rates. I am positive of that, and that complaints were made in regard to their having to pay anything, and that was especially the case on that day to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Langelier) refers, when he and his friends were at that meeting at Rimouski. I did not see the mysterious white papers allowing the friends of the Conservative party to travel free. All I know is that my friends complained to me that strict orders had been issued that they must pay, and they said: You being in the Government, it seems to us very natural that you should be able to pass your friends free. I said it was impossible, that I had nothing to say to the chief engineer who had the management of that road, and, as far as those I saw were concerned, I can say that they had tickets, but I do not know what colour the tickets were or what was on them.

Mr. MULOCK. Did they pay for the tickets?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I cannot say. Certainly they did not pay me.

Mr. LANGELIER. It would be well, before we come to this question in the main Estimates, to have a statement of how many special trains went in there during that election, from what places the trains ran, how much each train cost and how much it earned?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I intimated to the Minister before that I desired to know the total amount of coal transported from the Spring Hill collieries over the Intercolonial Railway, and the rate per ton per mile which was charged.

Mr. BOWELL. I will get the information, as well as that for the hon. member for Quebec, and will state the result when we come to these items in the main Estimates.

Deficiencies in the Estimates for 1890-91 caused by the increase in the rate for mail service over the Canadian Pacific Railway, between Montreal and Vancouver.....	$75,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If, as is quite likely, there will be a long discussion on that subject, it might be well for the Minister to state now in such reasonable detail as will partly explain it, the cause of this additional sum of money being required. In that case, I dare say the general discussion can be allowed to stand, on the understanding that it will be brought up at an early date as the discussion will be brought up on the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. HAGGART. The detailed explanation might occupy a considerable time. This is simply an increased allowance for the carrying of the mails on the Canadian Pacific Railway, making the amount $105 a mile on the full length of the road per annum. The payment before was at the rate of 12 cents per mile.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The present arrangement is to pay $105 a mile on the whole of the main line?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. For what length of time does that last?

Mr. HAGGART. Until it is changed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What notice must you give to change it?

Mr. HAGGART. We can change it at any time—three months, I think.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can you change it at a month's notice?

Mr. HAGGART. I think so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then I would ask that, before this comes up again, and at the earliest convenience of the Postmaster General, he might lay on the Table of the House a copy of the Order in Council fixing this rate, and that he might append to that the regulations showing the cost last year under the 12 cents per train mile rate.

Mr. HAGGART. It amounts to the difference between $75 and $105. Twelve cents a mile would be about $75 per year. There would then be an increase of about $30.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was the practice before? Was the Canadian Pacific Railway receiving $105 on part of its track, and 12 cents on the remainder, or was it receiving 12 cents on all?

Mr. HAGGART. This increase applies solely to the main line, the $75,000. You will see in the other estimates, there is an increased expenditure from Montreal to St. John.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then do I understand from the Postmaster General that virtually under this vote the post office allowance to the Canadian Pacific Railway is changed from $75 per mile to $105 along the whole line?

Mr. HAGGART. On the main line between Montreal and Vancouver, which is 2,915 miles; it is a change from $75 per mile per annum to $105 per mile per annum.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then if you will just lay the Order in Council making that change on the Table at your earliest convenience——

Mr. HAGGART. I will lay it on the Table on Monday.

Amount required to cover unprovided items for 1889-90, as per Auditor General's Report, page A—79.....$709,748.64

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The details I find on page 78. Take, for instance, the item for railways, under the head of collection of revenue. There I see an unprovided expenditure of $302,958. Surely that would have been foreseen before the end of the year 1890, and ought to have been provided for in the Supplementary Estimates of last year. Prorogation took place on the 23rd of May, that was within five weeks of the end of the year, and I should like to know of the Minister of Finance how it comes that so very large a sum as $302,958 should have been left unprovided for. With common care on the part of the officials of the department that sum ought to have been foreseen, and the Government ought to have been communicated with. Were the Government communicated with, or did the officials not know before the 25th of May that so large a deficit would have to be met?

Mr. FOSTER. With reference to this matter I cannot say from recollection that the Government was communicated with. I think if the Government had been communicated with, it would have brought down the sum in the Estimates to cover the deficiency.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The chief official is there,

Mr. FOSTER. No, he is gone.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, he ought to be sent for, because that is a matter which, to my mind, rather reflects, and reflects seriously, on the management of the Intercolonial Railway, and is a thing about which we ought to have some explanation—unless there was some extraordinary cause which it is not easy to understand. It was that officer's duty to have communicated to the Government, long before the 23rd of May, that there would be a very serious deficiency, giving the Government the option of obtaining a vote from the House. It is quite clear that, *primâ facie*, this reflects gravely on the management of the department.

Mr. FOSTER. It may not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I say, *primâ facie* it does. The idea that this House should rise on the 23rd of May, and a department like that of railways should not know within $302,000 what its expenditure was going to be, sheds a very ugly light on the way in which that department is managed—unless there is some explanation.

Mr. FOSTER. The estimate would have been brought down six weeks before that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But the department ought, in all conscience, to have advised the Government before the House rose, that there was going to be this deficiency, if they knew it, and it was very difficult to see how they could have avoided knowing it. I do not myself complain about a moderate sum of unprovided items, knowing that these expenses will occur. For instance, in the Post Office, which is our nearly next largest expending department, there were items unprovided for to the amounts of $56,230, and lapsed balances to the amount of $56,319; so that I would not be at all disposed to complain of that. There are always certain amounts in each department which lapse over, but here you will see there was only an insignificant lapsed balance of $15,900, and this huge gap.

Mr. FOSTER. If you look at A—74 you will see that the whole of that amount is covered by Governor General's warrant.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That may be, but that is exactly what the Governor General's warrant should not be taken for, unless there was a reasonable ground for alleging that it was entirely unforeseen. That is an abuse of the Governor General's warrants, and we have been complaining against the system for several years back in this House. The departments, knowing that the Governor General's warrant is issued nowadays without sufficient investigation—I do not reflect on the hon. gentlemen, but I speak of the facts—knowing that they neglect to apprize the Government before the House rises of the fact that the expenditure is to be largely exceeded; and then we come to have such items as this one before us.

Mr. FOSTER. Whether the Governor General's warrant was taken before the House or not, it should have been covered in the Estimates.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A thing of that kind could by no possibility escape the attention of the Ministers. Long before 24th of May they must have known there was going to be a big gap.

Mr. FOSTER. I think probably that Governor's warrant was got before the House met in 1891, not after it had risen. That fact is no justification, for the amount should have been embodied in the Estimates if it was issued before the House met.

Mr. MULOCK. Why should not the reports of Ministers on which Governor General's warrants are issued be laid on the Table. We have simply a statement, but not a report.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think the hon. gentleman would obtain much more information if that were done.

Mr. MULOCK. Then what is the use of the reports to the Governor General?

Mr. FOSTER. The report, if the hon. gentleman got it, would inform him that so much money was required, and there was no appropriation out of which it could be taken, and it was so declared on the report of the Minister of Finance, and, therefore, a Governor General's warrant do issue. In some cases there might be a more detailed statement. The hon. gentleman fears there is not a truly strict revision of Governor General's warrants. He is more or less right as regards the past, and it may be there is too much laxity at present; but, so far as I am concerned, I have tried during the past year to revise all such statements, and before I sign the report to satisfy myself, as far as possible, that there was really a ground for issuing a warrant. Then we have adopted a new principle within the last few months, that all Governor General's warrants before being passed by Council shall be referred to the Treasury Board and undergo the revision of that board. That, I think, will be a very good extra check on the issue of Governor General's warrants. So the hon. gentleman will see that every disposition exists to keep as nearly as possible to the line.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Finance says the reports of Ministers would not throw light on the matter. The report of the Minister should not be a mere echo of the statute, but it should contain on the face of it the facts that warrant the exercise of this special power. The facts form the basis on which the Council comes to a conclusion on the application.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is quite right in that, and it was that consideration which led to the determination to refer the reports to the Treasury Board. Since that reference has been made several instances have occurred in which we have had officials from the departments to give information as to the necessity of issuing Governor General's warrants.

Mr. MULOCK. Then in future these reports will be of service, and will be laid on the Table of the House?

Mr. FOSTER. I have no objection to laying them on the Table, if the House wants them—that is, any that may be called for.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not see that the change suggested by the Minister will quite meet the case. If a Minister is without the necessary funds he applies to his colleagues for a Governor General's warrant, and that if it is referred to the Treasury Board I suppose the only question that can come before it is whether the money is required in the public service, and there is no appropriation for the purpose. I do not suppose the Treasury Board would prevent the money being obtained, if it were made perfectly clear that no appropriation existed and that money for the purpose was required. But it will be seen from an examination of the Act that while it may be necessary that the money should be obtained, it is not such a necessity as is contemplated by the provisions of the Auditor's Act authorizing the issuing of Governor General's warants. It is the duty of officials of the department to inform the Minister as to the money required for the public service of that department, and there is great neglect of duty if that information has not been given in order that the appropriation should be had at the hands of the House. The statement of the Minister of Finance shows great neglect of duties in these particulars. If the money has not been appropriated, why was not application made to Parliament for an adequate sum for the public service? What is contemplated by the Auditor's Act is an appropriation upon a Governor General's warrant for some unforeseen emergency. There may be some public work which the Government require to maintain, destroyed by fire, or in some other way. There may be something arising which requires an appropriation of which neither any Minister nor the House could know anything at the time the appropriation was sought. But these sums which are provided in the Supplementary Estimates by Governor General's warrants are sums wanted in the ordinary course of the administration of each department, and it certainly indicates very great laxity in the administration of the affairs of the department when the authority is employed for the purpose of supplementing the sum asked that ought to have been provided when the House was in session.

Mr. FOSTER. I will give the House the fullest information before concurrence.

Country Savings Banks, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island—	
Salaries	$11,650
Contingencies	1,750

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice there is a small decrease in this item.

Mr. FOSTER. That is because, according to our policy, these savings banks are being absorbed into the post office savings banks whenever by death or other cause the incumbent for the time being vacates the office. By this means we save a considerable portion of that vote and add very little expense to the management of the post office savings banks.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am glad to learn that the Government is going to carry out that policy. Has this reduction been caused by the death of any of the office-holders?

Mr. FOSTER. We transferred three savings banks last year; the keepers of two having died and one keeper having resigned.

One-half of 1 per cent commission on $7,222,271.57 for payment of interest on public debt	$36,101.35

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before we quite leave this subject of the savings banks I would like to ask the hon. Minister, although I shall not press him to answer the question unless he chooses—I would be glad to know whether any sort of understanding has been come to, or whether he expects to come to any sort of understanding with the various banking institutions of the country as to the rate of interest? The alterations which were made last year in the Banking Act would, in my judgment, under certain conditions, render that possible. It is an important question of policy, and if the hon. gentleman for any reason does not see proper to make any statement upon it, I shall not press the question further.

Mr. FOSTER. You mean the interest on deposits?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, as to whether any arrangement has been made, or is likely to be made with the banks on this subject, so as to create something like a uniformity, and prevent heavy loss.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a subject which has been engaging my attention for the last four or five months, and although I am not able to make any definite statement now, I may say that the Government has been in communication with the banks with that end in view, and that so far the prospects seem—I think I may say—fair towards that conclusion which will, I think, be beneficial all round. I would not like to make a more explicit statement at the present time upon that subject, but simply to say to my hon. friend that it is engaging my attention and that communications are at present being had upon it. It would be desirable for the banks, and desirable for us as large holders of deposits, that a uniform and fair rate of interest should be agreed upon, if it can be agreed upon.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is one other point which I would like a little information about. I do not know exactly what relations the hon. gentleman has with our chief bank; that is to say, the Bank of Montreal; but it still continues practically to all intents and purposes the Government bank. I observe that the bank has been in a number of instances rather outbidding the Government whose banker it is. It seemed to me a rather strange proceeding that the Bank of Montreal, which is the Government banker, should be offering a higher rate of interest for deposits than the Government are paying, in the shape of savings banks opened, as one might say, almost in direct competition with the Government in many places. Has the hon. gentleman any information to give on that point, which is a distinct and specific point in the administration?

Mr. FOSTER. No changes have been made in the relations between the Government, so far as its deposits and business is concerned, and the Bank of Montreal—which, as my hon. friend says, is the chief bank with which we do our business—except this: that, possibly, the Bank of Montreal may have had, during the past year, reason for complaining that the usual amount of money kept on deposit was not kept on deposit by us, we having been obliged to let it run very low at times. The Bank of Montreal has established a savings bank branch. It has had to do that, possibly, to some extent on account of the competition of other banks, but I do not think it was the first, by any means, to introduce the system. The arrangement which is possible and about which we had a conversation a few moments ago, may obviate that to a certain extent; that is, it may eventuate in a uniform rate.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The only reason that I make that remark is this: that, unless the circumstances had been very exceptional, the spectacle of the Government banker outbidding the Government for deposits, as was done in a great many cases, is peculiar, to say the least of it, and there is no doubt that the Government lost heavily under the operation, and that a very considerable number of deposits were transferred straight to the Bank of Montreal. Now, had the Bank of Montreal no communication with the Government, there is not a word to say; but, in the very close relation which the Bank of Montreal is to the Government, it strikes me as slightly peculiar they should have done a thing of that kind, unless by previous conference with the Government.

Mr. MULOCK. How many different holders are there of Canadian stock? The reason I ask the question is that each year we have an item of $36,000 odd, being one-half of 1 per cent., for paying out the interest on the Government debt. The work of distributing dividends is merely clerical work, and $36,000 a year for distributing a little over $7,000,000 does strike one as a pretty high figure.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will recollect that this matter has been up for years; and ever since Confederation we are under an agreement with agents by which certain commissions are paid to them, commissions on the negotiations of loans and on the payment of interest. If we take the net percentage of the ten years preceding this ten year period, we will find that the amounts which we paid were much larger than those which we are paying now. The last arrangement, which was made in 1882, I think, contemplated an existence of ten years, and the rates were largely reduced from what had been previously paid for all these services. That arrangement is subject to denunciation in 1892. I have already been in communication with our agents, and when we can revise that, we shall go over the whole matter with a view of making, if possible, better arrangements. However, it has been a fundamental principle hitherto that we must have the aid of strong and reputable houses in London in making our loans, and we have always found it the wisest course in doing our work there. I do not know whether any revision can be made which will result more favourably. That remains to be seen.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observed, as I think everybody did, with great regret, that one of our financial agents, the house of Baring Bros., had been compelled to suspend and go into liquidation. I am aware that no loss was sustained by the Government; but at the same time, when this item is up, it is necessary for us to know first of all whether the Barings, or rather the limited liability firm which takes their name, are retained as the agents of the Government for the time being, and also what their intentions may be. Without in the slightest degree desiring to reflect on Baring Bros., who are always, I believe, so far as we were concerned, very useful and valuable friends, it is a matter of grave question whether their successors are able to render services at all commensurate with those rendered by the great house of Baring Bros.

Mr. FOSTER. I may say that the present firm of Baring Bros. are retained as our agents. Of course, one cannot say very much about that; but it is a matter that is engaging the consideration of the Government. My deputy is over in London just now in connection with some financial transactions which we are carrying on. He was over last year in connection with a temporary loan, at the time the troubles were at the acute stage; and, on consideration of the matter then, it was considered advisable, under all the circumstances, not to

change our agency in that respect. I have here a statement of the agents' commission. In 1881 one per cent. was paid on payment of dividends and principal on maturity on Canada 6 per cents., and on the first issue of Intercolonial Railway 4 per cents., and one-half per cent. on all other guaranteed bonds and ordinary Dominion loans. On 1st January, 1882, the other arrangement was made, and it is terminable on one year's notice from and after January, 1892, so that it is only terminable on the 1st January, 1893. By that arrangement, instead of one per cent., we pay one-half per cent. on interest and sinking funds; one per cent. on all new loans, to cover all charges, except stamp duty and actual brokerage payments; no commission on loans negotiated by the agent; one-half per cent. on conversion of Canada fives and other securities.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does that apply to the old loans, of which there are some outstanding?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. The only provision is that on any loans where the charge is less than one-half per cent., it is not to be raised.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. Minister seems to justify this high expenditure for commissions on the ground that it is necessary to have strong financial agents in London. I thought he had taken the ground that his Administration had so improved the credit of Canada that it could take care of itself, and that it was not necessary to bolster it up by such arrangements as that which he is compelled to resort to. I called attention last year to the manner in which the sinking fund that was redeemed was taken care of, and I call attention to the same matter now. I understand that some of the bonds are payable to bearer. I suppose our agents in London redeemed some of our public debts. What becomes of the redeemed debt? It is not cancelled, I understand, but is still kept alive when it falls due, and is redeemed by sinking fund.

Mr. FOSTER. That is retained, of course. It is still an investment.

Mr. MULOCK. In whose hands is that investment?

Mr. FOSTER. In the hands of trustees.

Mr. MULOCK. Who are they?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not remember their names.

Mr. MULOCK. Could the hon. Minister state the amount of Government securities in the hands of trustees?

Mr. FOSTER. About $22,000,000, I think.

Mr. MULOCK. The trustees have control over these securities.

Mr. FOSTER. They hold them in trust.

Mr. MULOCK. They are negotiable.

Mr. FOSTER. No, they are held in trust investments.

Mr. MULOCK. They are in the hands of the trustees, and would be negotiable if the trustees chose to commit a breach of trust.

Mr. FOSTER. As I understand, they are simply bought upon the market by trustees, just as any person else would buy them. Then they are held by the trustees, and instead of the interest being paid it is kept and added to the investment, and in that way it accumulates.

Mr. MULOCK. That is just the position in which I understood it to be, and that is why I call the attention of the Committee to the fact that to day $22,000,000 of these securities of Canada are in the hands of trustees. I will assume that they are good strong men; but apparently their standing is not of sufficient importance to impress their names on the Minister's memory. This system of redeeming securities is going on, and year by year there will be larger amounts of trust securities in the hands of trustees, and we are running an unnecessary risk, it seems to me, in leaving our securities beyond our control, even in the hands of trustees. I felt a degree of anxiety when the crisis occurred last year, knowing that a large quantity of the securities of Canada were held by the bank in question in trust for the people of Canada. I am glad to know that nothing has occurred to occasion any loss to the country; but it is not a satisfactory position, in my opinion, and I trust that the Minister, now that he is going to revise our whole financial arrangements, will make provision for doing away with any unnecessary risk. I am unable to understand why we cannot cancel the redeemed debt at maturity and be done with it, instead of keeping the securities alive, a source of danger. In all future issues, it seems to me it would be a wiser plan to provide for redemption and payment of interest at the same time.

Mr. FOSTER. There is the condition of the law.

Mr. MULOCK. I know you cannot alter existing contracts.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. Minister know whether these various securities, amounting to $20,000,000 or thereabouts, are in the position of inscribed stock, or whether any portion are held as bonds?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot say what proportion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have several times mentioned the extreme desirability of having all those put in as inscribed stock. When they are put in as inscribed stock, instead of as bonds, I think that, so far as the security goes, it would probably be sufficient; for, if my memory serves me, one of the trustees is our own Receiver General. We have altered the status of that functionary so often that I really forget whether the Minister of Finance does not combine in his own person the position of Receiver General. I think he does, and in that case these securities should be in his name as well as in the name of one or perhaps both our financial agents. I rather think there are three trustees.

Mr. FOSTER. There are three at least.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So that if our Finance Minister and one of our agents and some third party be the holders of the inscribed stock, specifically described as in trust, there would not be any very material danger.

Mr. MULOCK. Quite so; but it seems to me all the securities should be in Canada. I understand that the redeemed bonds are in London, England. Why not have them in our own custody here?

Mr. FOSTER. Do you mean the sinking fund or the redeemed debt?

Mr. MULOCK. The redeemed debt.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman mean those which have been used for the sinking fund or those where the debt is matured?

Mr. MULOCK. I mean where they have been redeemed out of the sinking fund.

Mr. FOSTER. These are held by trustees.

Mr. MULOCK. They should be here.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Whenever any purchases are made and invested in inscribed stock, the bonds must be delivered up and destroyed. Two classes of securities cannot remain outstanding.

Mr. FOSTER. Quite so. I know that the last year or two the drift has been entirely towards the change to inscribed stock.

Mr. MULOCK. Perhaps the hon. Minister could, at a later date, give the information to the Committee as to whether any of the debentures which have been redeemed are now in London and where they are.

Mr. McMULLEN. Did I understand the hon. Minister to say that it required a year's notice before any change could take place in our financial agents?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, from the 1st of January, 1882. It is a ten years' arrangement.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the contract is for ten years, it would expire itself without notice.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a condition of the contract that, at the end of a certain time, it can be terminated on giving one year's notice.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then I notice that one-half of 1 per cent has been paid. Of course it is a very large amount, $36,000.

Mr. FOSTER. It is one-half what we formerly paid.

Mr. McMULLEN. Still it should be less. Does the hon. Minister look forward to being able to utilize our High Commissioner in any financial arrangements in London with regard to our debt? I remember when the late First Minister made the statement in the House, at the time of the appointment of the High Commissioner, that he would be of decided advantage to us in financial matters in London. Does the hon. gentleman expect to be able to use him so as to save us a considerable portion of this money?

Mr. FOSTER. The High Commissioner in London is in a position to be of great service to Canada in connection with our financial arrangements, and the negotiations of loans, in the way of advice and co-operation. In those respects he has been of great service and will continue to be of great service, but I do not think he could ever take the place of a banking house or firm in these operations. If my hon. friend were acquainted with the *modus operandi* of the London market, he would see that, under present conditions, it is quite impossible for the High Commissioner to take the place of our banking agents in the negotiations of loans. He could not do so any more than I could myself.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In connection with that matter I must reiterate the remark which I made before, and which has been made several times from this side. If our High Commissioner in London is to meddle in any London transactions whatever, I must say that it is extremely inexpedient that he should be mixed up in any form or shape with companies of any sort or description. Mischief will arise, as mischief has arisen, and I think it should be distinctly intimated by the Finance Department, whose servant, for that matter, he is, that the High Commissioner should, if he is to be trusted in any financial matter at all, abstain from any dealings with other companies of any kind or description.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it would be extremely unwise to mix up the present High Commissioner with our finances. He has had connection of a more or less intimate character with several financial enterprises, and I have not heard that they have succeeded. I do not know that it is because of his connection with those financial associations, but it is necessary for us to have our business in the hands of a strong financial man, and we can hardly regard our present High Commissioner in that light.

Mr. McMULLEN. If in the opinion I have expressed I am astray, I was led astray by the remarks of the late First Minister, made by him some years ago, when impressing on the House the desirability of appointing a High Commissioner, who, he said, would save us in commissions much more than would be expended by the creation of that office. I quite agree with the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) that it is highly desirable our present High Commissioner, mixed up as he has been with some of those concerns with which his name has been associated during the past year, should not have anything to do with our financial arrangements. For instance, a company which has been formed recently and with which, I understand, he is connected, has completely collapsed; and certainly the man whom we send over to the other side for the purpose of representing us should not allow himself to be mixed up with such questionable concerns, to the serious impairment of our credit and dignity in the financial world. We should rather have a representative who will keep up the credit and dignity of this country as a borrowing country. I hope the Finance Minister will see that if in future we are to become borrowers, we should be represented by an official in London whose career, financially and otherwise, will reflect credit on us, and who will keep free of these questionable associations with which our present High Commissioner has become connected within the last two or three months.

Expenses in connection with the issue and redemption of Dominion notes.. $5,000

Mr. CHARLTON. What are these expenses?

Mr. FOSTER. You will find them detailed in the Auditor General's Report, page B—23. It has reference to the counting of the notes in the department, taking them in, numbering them and destroying them.

Mr. CHARLTON. When these notes are brought in are they cancelled and new ones issued?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, whenever they are damaged in the least, they are cancelled and destroyed, and all precautions are taken in regard to the destruc-

tion. That also takes in the signing of the notes. Of late we have had one name lithographed, but the other has to be signed.

Mr. CHARLTON. What precautions are taken to prevent the cancelled notes from being put in circulation again?

Mr. FOSTER. They are immediately destroyed?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who superintends their destruction?

Mr. FOSTER. The comptroller.

Mr. CHARLTON. How many have been cancelled since the issue commenced?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot state now.

Mr. MULOCK. Who witnesses the destruction?

Mr. FOSTER. There are certain officers who do that. There is the comptroller, and, I think, the accountant.

Mr. MULOCK. It is not usual to have only one officer to supervise the destruction?

Mr. FOSTER. No, there are two or three.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There should not be less than three.

Mr. FOSTER. I think there are three.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the highest denomination of notes which are issued?

Mr. FOSTER. We have $1,000 notes, and, I think, we have $5,000 notes for the securities in the banks. In fact, I think, we have as high as $10,000 notes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What form of securities are you issuing in London just now?

Mr. FOSTER. Treasury bills.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are they exactly similar in form to the English Treasury bills?

Mr. FOSTER. Precisely.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does that involve the deposit of any security?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are these only for a period of one year?

Mr. FOSTER. The present issue is only for one year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And at what rate?

Mr. FOSTER. Four per cent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are they payable half-yearly?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Printing Dominion notes.....$50,000

Mr. CHARLTON. How is this work done? Is it by contract?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, by contract.

Mr. CHARLTON. By whom is the work done?

Mr. FOSTER. It is done by Mr. Burland in the new building which he put up here in Ottawa about two years ago.

Mr. CHARLTON. To what extent were tenders invited for this work?

MR. FOSTER. This is an old question which has been discussed here before. The contract has been running for four years and, I think, terminates in October.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the rate allowed for printing these notes?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not the contract here, but you can find out the rate by the statement on page B--23 of the Auditor General's Report, where the number of notes and the price of the sheets are stated.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It amounts to about 6 cents per note.

Mr. MULOCK. I think the amount of Dominion notes in circulation is about $16,000,000?

Mr. FOSTER. About that.

Mr. MULOCK. I have been told by banks that the cost of printing their bills amounts to about 1 cent each. I do not know what the average life of a bill may be, or how many million dollars worth of bills are printed a year.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the average life of our bills is rather less than that of the bank bills because we are careful to keep them as clean as possible.

Mr. MULOCK. I understand that 1 cent a bill is what the banks calculate as the cost of printing.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot state just now what is the cost of printing our bills or the bills of the banks, but I know that we have the right of revision each year under the contract, and each year an investigation is made. The last investigation which was made—I think January—showed me that this firm were doing the work at as cheap rates as it was being done in the best houses in New York.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many notes would be contained in one issue?

Mr. FOSTER, I cannot tell you now, but I will find out and give you the whole cost.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What we want to know is roughly what is the cost per note. Of course there would be a difference in regard to the large notes of which only a small number are printed, but say in reference to the one's and two's.

Printing, advertising, inspection, expressage, miscellaneous charges, including commutation of stamp duty..$10,000

Mr. CHARLTON. This requires a little explanation.

Mr. FOSTER. You will see the account of expenses under that in the Auditor General's Report, page B—23. It takes in the advertising by our agents in London and the express charges on silver and notes and the like of that, as well as legal services, the travelling expenses of the financial inspector and the assistant inspector, and the stamp duties on the inscribed bonds at home.

Committee rose, and it being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 88) to incorporate the St. Catharines and Merritton Bridge Company.—(Mr. Gibson.)

Bill (No. 16) to amend the Acts relating to the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Curran.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 120) respecting the Salisbury and Harvey Railway Company.—(Mr. Hazen.)

Bill (No. 121) to amend an Act to incorporate the Montreal Bridge Company.—(Mr. Desjardins, Hochelaga.)

Bill (No. 123) to revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Oshawa Railway and Navigation Company, and to change the name thereof to "The Oshawa Railway Company."—(Mr. Madill.)

Bill (No. 124) further to amend an Act to incorporate the Great Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Desjardins, Hochelaga.)

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 125) to incorporate the Rocky Mountain Railroad and Coal Company (from the Senate).—(Mr. Ross, Lisgar.)

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. FOSTER. Having passed the items with regard to financial management we have taken up all the individual items I propose to ask the Committee to pass during this sitting. I have had a conference with the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and owing to the peculiar circumstances under which we are placed, having entered upon the new year with expenditure constantly accruing and the different services of the country going on, we are at present without any funds for current expenses. Any appropriations made for last year, the balances of which are left, cannot be used, of course, for any expenditure for the present year. In order to facilitate matters and have the business of the country and its service to go on smoothly we have agreed to take up the different items untouched, and to pass one-tenth of each appropriation asked for without discussion, leaving nine-tenths of each appropriation afterwards, when the fullest discussion will be allowed on each item. After we have passed these, I will ask the House to go into concurrence on the Estimates already passed and these resolutions, so that they may receive their several readings and be put in the form of a Bill and assented to as quickly as possible. That being so, then the first item is for census and statistics, the full amount asked being $175,000, and the resolutions will be taken in their order, each calling for one-tenth of the amount asked for in the vote.

Mr. McMULLEN. If we should strike any item that is looked upon on this side of the House as being very objectionable it might be allowed to stand and another item allowed to take its place.

Mr. FOSTER. That cannot be. The hon. gentleman might object, for example, to the item for dredging, and ask that it be allowed to stand. The result of that would be that the Minister of Public Works would have to discharge his men and do nothing towards dredging. It is plainly impossible to allow the items to stand if we wish to help the services of the country, but I do not think any items will be found so objectionable that one-tenth cannot be passed without discussion.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman as I understood him at the private conference to which he has alluded, intends to take such items as are absolutely required to carry on the business of the country.

Mr. FOSTER. I will not ask for any vote of one-tenth for new services, for public works not commenced.

Mr. LAURIER. Only for services going on now. There can be no objection to that principle, and the only objection can be to the amount of the item and these we can discuss later; but to-day in order to carry on the business of the country, I consent with great pleasure to the proposal of the hon. gentleman.

Prince Edward Island—Extension of Cape Traverse Wharf..... $40,000

Mr. FOSTER. That item is to be withdrawn.

Mr. LAURIER. Why is it withdrawn?

Mr. FOSTER. In the revision of the Estimates, it was put in by mistake.

Mr. LAURIER. Is there no necessity for that extension there?

Mr. FOSTER. There is no extension to be undertaken this year.

Mr. LAURIER. That does not answer my question. I asked if it is required or not?

Mr. FOSTER. It is not considered to be required this year.

Committee rose and reported resolutions.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply, May 19, 22, 26; June 5, 16, 30; July 2 and 3.

Intercolonial Railway..... $300,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the Minister can give the explanation of this now?

Mr. FOSTER. I have seen the chief engineer since that vote was passed, and the information I have gathered from him is that the deficiency arose from an error in estimating. The Supplementary Estimate was made on the 1st January, 1890, and there were two things which he did not take into consideration. Basing his estimate on the receipts and expenditures of the preceding year, he thought the estimate was sufficient, but he left these two things out of consideration. One was purely an error, a want of thought, and that was that an amount would be required for the new railing which takes place at the end of the year, and which, in that case, amounted to nearly $200,000. That was a pure omission, something which escaped his mind. The other part was the added expenditure due to the opening up of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the consequent passage of extra trains from St. John to Halifax over the Intercolonial Railway. These two sums made up nearly the sum of $300,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then are we to understand that, in addition to the cost of sub-

sidizing a road across the State of Maine, an extra expenditure of $300,000 is to be saddled upon the country for the special convenience of the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know, and I did not say whether the expense from that alone was $100,000. The new railing cost about $200,000, and there would be required about $100,000 to make up the deficiency, but whether the whole of that was caused by the new trains being put on I do not know. There may have been some other deficiency included in that. Of course, that takes no account of what would be the extra receipts from the extra trains between St. John and Halifax.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As I understand the matter, all the explanation the engineer gives is that, in January, 1890, he made certain omissions. Now, before the 23rd May, 1890, it must have been clear to him that his supplementary estimate would be enormously exceeded, and what I desire to know is whether any representations to that effect were made by the department prior to the 23rd May.

Mr. FOSTER. The engineer did not tell me that he had made any, and, if that error or omission had escaped his attention, he probably did not call the attention of the Government to it before the House adjourned.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The omission must have occurred in January and not in May?

Mr. FOSTER. We adjourned in May.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know that we adjourned on the 23rd May, about five weeks before the termination of the fiscal year, and it appears to me that it was impossible that the engineer in charge of the Intercolonial Railway should not have known by that time that his estimates would be $300,000 short. If he did not know it by that time, it is difficult to understand how he can be fit for his position.

Mr. FOSTER. There might be an omission of that kind.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of $300,000?

Mr. FOSTER. Of what might be necessary for the new railing.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I can understand that in January it might be possible that such an omission, though a very extraordinary one, should have taken place, but that, by the 23rd of May, by which time I take it a very large portion of these new rails had been put on, he should not have discovered how seriously astray he had been seems impossible on the supposition that the engineer knew what was going on upon the Intercolonial Railway. If we had closed say at the end of March, such a thing might be barely possible, but, closing on the 23rd May, it is almost entirely out of the question that the engineer should not have known it.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the explanation I have received.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, that I must say is a very unsatisfactory explanation. Now, is there any necessity that these unprovided items should be passed? The money has actually been paid, every penny of it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. FOSTER. All paid.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then, I think we had better let the item stand, because we would have to bring it up in some form afterwards.

Mr. FOSTER. If you think that is necessary, I do not think I can give you any further explanation on that. I might get something fuller.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course, I know the hon. gentleman is giving me exactly what has been stated to him; I am not imputing any blame to him. But the whole circumstances connected with this show such an extraordinary negligence, such extraordinary looseness in keeping the accounts, that it is necessary we should have some more explanation. Therefore, I shall ask the hon. gentleman to let this stand, as no possible detriment can accrue to the public service thereby.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman will allow it to pass, the explanations can be asked and received just the same as on the item for the Intercolonial Railway in the main Estimates. Keeping these little tid-bits floating around is not desirable.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then it must be distinctly understood that we will have the power of returning to these unprovided items——

Mr. FOSTER. To this one.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And also that the engineer will be here, and that some more satisfactory explanation will be given than we have had.

Mr. FOSTER. I will get as full explanation as I can.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If there is any explanation to be had.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10.15 p. m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 6th July, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILLS WITHDRAWN.

Bill (No. 83) respecting the Septennial Benevolent Society.—(Mr. Coatsworth.)

Bill (No. 81) respecting the Order of Canadian Home Circles.—(Mr. Coatsworth.)

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES ACT.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 126) to amend the North-West Territories Act. He said: This Act is very similar to the one introduced last year. It provides for the election of members of the Legislative Assembly for three years, making clear a doubt that existed about the provision of the Bill of last session on this point. It proposes to abolish the advisory council and the

legal experts. It gives the Assembly all the powers it had previously by Order in Council, in addition to the disposition of the liquor question. There is a clause providing that a lump sum of money shall be placed at the disposal of the Legislative Assembly. The Bill also does away with the system of justices of the peace sitting in conjunction with the Supreme Court to hear criminal cases. It provides for the establishment of gaols in the North-West Territories and for applying to these the same regulations as are applicable to penitentiaries. It makes it illegal for any man to have liquor in his possession unless he has a permit in his own name. Section 110, which deals with the dual language, is altered in accordance with the resolution of the House of last session. The Bill also gives power to the Legislative Assembly to repeal all the provisions of the Act relating to the liquor traffic—this provision was in the former Bill—and grants to the Legislative Assembly the same powers as the provinces possess in regard to licenses, that is, after a general election.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Will the hon. gentleman state whether he provides that the advisers of the Lieutenant Governor shall enjoy the confidence of the majority of the Legislature?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There is no provision for an executive at all.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 29) to incorporate the Montreal and Atlantic Railway Company, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Ives.)

Bill (No. 80) respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. Ryckman.)

Bill (No. 96) respecting the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway Company.—(Mr. Jamieson.)

Bill (No. 87) to revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Quebec Bridge Company.—(Mr. Desjardins, L'Islet.)

Bill (No. 91) to revive and amend the Act to enable the City of Winnipeg to utilize the Assiniboine River Water Power.—(Mr. Macdonald, Winnipeg.)

Bill (No. 70) to incorporate the Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Company.—(Mr. German.)

Bill (No. 107) to incorporate the Burrard Inlet and Westminster Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Corbould.)

BAIE DES CHALEURS RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. CURRAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 82) respecting the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company.

Mr. AMYOT. Have the amendments made in the Railway Committee been printed?

Mr. CURRAN. I do not think they are printed, but they are on the Table.

Mr. AMYOT. We do not know what those amendments are yet?

Mr. CURRAN. I thought you knew in the Committee.

Mr. AMYOT. I want to know what the amendments are, and if they have been printed. This is a company incorporated by a local Act, and now it is proposed to have it declared to be for the general advantage of Canada and to have it incorporated here. I want to know if the consent of the Local Government has been obtained to this Bill, and also why the railway was first declared to be of local interest and now of general interest. I want to know what circumstances have changed that since. If there are no circumstances to change that, it would be invading the domain of the Local Parliament to pass this Act. It is not a matter of course that it should be passed here because it has been passed through the Committee. We are entitled to some information in regard to it.

Mr. CURRAN. In answer to my hon. friend I would say, in the first place, that I am instructed, and have reason to believe, that there is no objection on the part of the Local Government at Quebec to this legislation being carried out in its present form, and to this company being granted powers from this Parliament constituting it a work for the interest of the Dominion of Canada. As regards all the other questions connected with the Bill, which are the subject of discussion, I may say that my hon. friend will find that clause 6 of the printed Bill provides that "the time for the completion of the railway to Paspebiac is hereby extended to three years." To meet the views of those who objected to the extension of the time, that was reduced to two years, and it is so written in the Bill now. The time for the completion of the road is reduced from five years to four years, and the section is made more comprehensive in the way of clearness of expression. Now section 6 is also amended to this effect:

"And the company shall also be subject to all the liabilities and obligations of the company existing at the time of the passing of this Act; and any suit, action or proceeding pending, or judgment existing at the time of the passing of this Act, may be continued, completed and enforced against the company in the same manner as if this Act had not been passed."

So that there is not only a general provision in this section of the Bill that no rights shall be interfered with in any shape or form, but there is the further provision made which I have just read, and which leaves no room for doubt, all interested parties being present and agreeing that this covered their views. Then, we have added to section 5 the following:—

"The rights, powers, privileges and obligations of the company respecting the construction of its line, shall apply to the extent in mileage from the junction with the Intercolonial Railway at Metapedia to Gaspé Basin, a total distance of about 180 miles."

This is incurring very much larger responsibilities than the Legislature of Quebec had forced the company to undertake, because, whilst in the Bill obtained in the Local Legislature the company had the right to go as far as Gaspé Basin, by this Bill the company is forced to go to Gaspé Basin, and all the line is hypothecated for any claims that may exist. Then again, there is a change made in regard to the directorate; but, in everything connected with the principle to which my hon. friend referred in opening his remarks, the greatest safeguards have been thrown around the rights of all parties concerned, either public or private, and larger liabilities are incurred by the new company even than had been incurred in the original corporation under the provincial Act.

Mr. AMYOT. I am glad to hear that the local authorities have been consulted. I take the hon. member's words, of course, and I assume that it is correct, and that the Parliament of the Province of Quebec accepts the Bill. I want this to be clearly stated. I must say that, as a general rule, I find that the law which allows this Government to declare local works of general interest is very dangerous of application. In the second place, I suppose the Government have taken notice of this disposition of the Bill, because when this Parliament goes on to declare a certain work to be of public interest it assumes at the same time corresponding obligations. With this explanation, I will not object to the Bill going into committee.

Mr. JONCAS. I can corroborate the statement just made by the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran). I have always understood that the Provincial Government made no objection to this Parliament granting a charter to this company.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I suppose it is useless to enter into a discussion of the question as to whether this House has jurisdiction over legislation of this particular class, but as there have been a number of measures, most of which are open to the same objection, to my mind, which lies against this Bill, I propose saying a word or two before we go into committee upon the Bill. It seems to me that we greatly abuse the provisions of the 92nd section of the British North America Act, subsection 10 of which authorizes us to declare that certain works are for the benefit of Canada, and that by such a declaration we may bring them within our jurisdiction. I confess that although this Parliament has for some years, at all events since 1883, committed itself to the principle of making every local work or undertaking which it chooses to declare to be for the benefit of Canada a work coming under the jurisdiction of Canada, I must say that I think that is a misinterpretation of sub-section 10 of the Act. Where is this subsection placed? Why, Sir, it is placed in section 92, which deals with the subjects enumerated that are under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Provincial Legislature. That is the object of section 92. There are certain matters excepted out of that section in a portion of sub-section 10. Now, subsection 10 begins in this way:

"Local works and undertakings, other than such as are of the following classes:—"

Then follows an enumeration in clauses *a*, *b* and *c*. As clause *c* of sub-section 10 is being interpreted, it would be in the power of this Parliament to declare any work or thing undertaken to be for the general advantage of Canada, and in that way take to itself jurisdiction. For instance, there would be nothing to prevent this House declaring that the street railway which runs along Wellington street, from Bank street to the Canadian Pacific Railway station, is a work undertaken for the general benefit of Canada, and that street railway would be placed under the absolute jurisdiction of this Parliament. Now, I do not understand the section in that way. It seems to me that you are obliged to give such a construction to sub-section 10 of section 92 as that there will be something left under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Local Legislatures; for it is obvious to any one who will reflect for a moment that the assumption upon which we have been proceeding for the past eight years is an assumption which places no limitation upon our powers in reference to local works and undertakings. Now, is that a true construction of this Act? Was it intended to be so construed? I do not think so. There are certain classes of work here mentioned in sub-sections *a*, *b* and *c*, and it appears to me that the rule, *ejusdem generis*, applies to the whole—not to those mentioned in section *a* alone, or in section *b* alone, or in section *c* alone, but to the whole of these sub-sections taken together. If that is so, then I think that all these tributary railways that are situated within the limit of any province are under the exclusive jurisdiction of that province, and cannot be brought under the exclusive jurisdiction of this Parliament by a simple declaration on our part. There must be certain characteristics that belong to local works or undertakings that will preclude this Parliament from making the declaration upon the subject. For instance, a canal connecting the Georgian Bay with Lake Ontario, although a work wholly within the limits of the Province of Ontario, yet if it should make a continuous waterway extending over several provinces it might be regarded as a work for the general advantage of Canada. So if there is a railway in one province and a waterway in another, and a canal was required to connect the two, although it might be situated in one province, yet, when it was made, it might be considered to be for the general advantage of Canada. Then that declaration would be right enough, and it would leave a great portion of the work of a local and provincial character still within the exclusive jurisdiction of the provinces. But it is clear that we are in these measures putting an interpretation on the Act which would enable this Parliament by a simple declaration to declare any work, any street railway, any macadamized road, any work, however local or insignificant in its character, to be for the general advantage of Canada, and thus be brought within our jurisdiction. I do not think it is a reasonable and a sensible construction of the Act. It is an abuse of the powers conferred upon us, and it is intended to enlarge our jurisdiction in a manner never contemplated by the framers of the Act and never acted upon for many years after it came into operation.

Mr. FAUVEL. As representing the constituency through which this road is to pass, I beg to state that I am quite satisfied with the Bill and its amendments, and at the same time I hope that on a future occasion, when the House shall be called upon to grant some subsidy to this road, we shall have our share of the public moneys.

Motion agreed to; Bill considered in committee and reported.

PAPERS RESPECTING KINGSTON DOCK.

Mr. AMYOT. I beg permission to ask the Minister of Public Works if the papers concerning Kingston dock have been laid before the House? They were to be brought down, if I understand rightly, on Friday last, in answer to a request I made to be allowed to see them in the department. After recess we were promised they would be laid at once on the Table; and if they have not been laid on the Table, I should like to know when that

will be done, and when they will be brought down.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I was promised by my deputy that he would send them down before the sitting of the House. I may have them before six o'clock, or afterwards.

QUEBEC POST OFFICE—SUNDAY CLOSING.

Mr. RINFRET (for Mr. LANGELIER) asked, Whether the Postmaster General, or any other member of the Government, received during the course of the past year a petition signed by His Eminence Cardinal Taschereau, Dean Norman and many citizens of Quebec, asking that the post office of the said city may remain closed on Sunday?

Mr. HAGGART. Such petition was received in March last year, and an answer was given on 20th of the same month.

MAILS BETWEEN CANADA AND GREAT BRITAIN.

Mr. MULOCK asked, 1. By what line or lines of steamships are the mails carried between Canada and Great Britain? 2. What does the Government pay for such service?

Mr. HAGGART. The mails are forwarded from Canada to Great Britain by the following lines, and at the prices mentioned: Allan line, *via* Quebec, 50 cents per pound for letters, and 5 cents per pound for other matter; Inman line, Cunard line and White Star line, *via* New York, 5 francs per kilogram for letters and 50 centimes per kilogram for other matter.

CIVIL SERVANTS AND ELECTIONS.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, How many civil servants resigned to take part in the elections? Did the Government ask them to resign? How many of them have been reappointed to office since?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No civil servant resigned to take part in the elections, and no civil servant was asked to resign by the Government.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What about the statement made the other day that the postmaster at Galt had resigned?

HARBOUR AT CASCUMPEQUE.

Mr. PERRY asked, Is the work of improving the harbour of Cascumpeque, P.E.I., going on? If not, why not?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The work at Cascumpeque was suspended on 30th June. No appropriation has been made for continuing it during 1891-92.

DREDGE *PRINCE EDWARD*.

Mr. PERRY asked, Why is the dredge *Prince Edward* not working? Will said dredge do any work this season? When will the work begin, and where?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. My answer to the first question is: because the repairs were not completed until the end of June. To the second question my answer is, yes. To the third question my answer is: the dredge has been ordered to Summerside, and will commence work immediately on arrival.

POSTMASTER AT HOLSTEIN.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Did the postmaster at Holstein tender his resignation? If so, when? Was it accepted? If not, why not? Was it withdrawn? If so, when? Did any persons apply for the office? If so, who were they? Were petitions sent into the department on behalf of any candidates for the office? If so, in whose behalf?

Mr. HAGGART. The postmaster at Holstein tenderd his resignation by letter dated October 30, 1890, and it was accepted under date November 30, 1890. There is nothing to show that the resignation was withdrawn. The only application for the office was from Mr. George L. Gilroy. No petitions were received in Mr. Gilroy's favour.

INSPECTOR DINGMAN.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Have the Government taken any, and what action about the following letter:—

"SIR,—Inspector Dingman of Indian Agencies arrived in Port Elgin on Saturday, the 20th inst.; on Monday he was in Southampton and at the Indian reserve. Agent Allen was from home. Inspector Dingman had a conversation with R. Johnston and T. Solomon; he told them they must be easy with Allen, and said he would hold an investigation in Allen's house at ten o'clock on Tuesday; Johnston and Solomon wanted it held at the Council chamber; the Inspector held it at Agent Allen's house with closed doors; chiefs, councillors and others were excluded from ten o'clock (except adjournment for dinner). The whole day was taken up trying to persuade Johnston and Solomon that they were only entitled to witness fees, and trying to worm out of them who had written the letter for them, and asked them if Creighton had not written it for them.

"Now, if Johnston and Solomon were only entitled to witness fees, why did Agent Allen give Johnston an order for $10 to Mulvaney's store, Port Elgin? Agent Allen was sent to the reserve with full power of two magistrates to adjudicate on all matters occurring on the reserve, and outside matters where Indians are concerned; it is his duty to protect them, and have violators of the law punished. When Solomon and Johnston lodged their information against McVittie and Briggs with Agent Allen, they expected half of the fine, but instead of them getting it they are told 'it was not you made the information, it was I who did it,' and he pockets half of the fine the Indians ought to have. Inspector Dingman occupied the whole of Tuesday with closed doors to get Allen out of his difficulty; he does not even call a witness. If that is what the department pays Mr. Dingman for, the sooner the public know it the better.

"I am, Sir, yours truly,
(Sd.) "JOHN CREIGHTON.

"SOUTHAMPTON, 27th June, 1891."

Mr. DEWDNEY. The letter from John Creighton, a discharged Indian agent, of which the above is supposed to be a copy, was only received by this department on the first of this month. No action has as yet been taken thereon.

MANITOBA SCHOOL LAND.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron) asked, Is it the intention of the Government to put into the market the Manitoba school land this year? If so, when?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; it is proposed to sell some of the school lands in Manitoba. The date is not actually fixed. It will depend largely upon the time when the crop is harvested, and will take

place as soon after that event as convenient. Due public notice of the date or dates will be given.

LIEUT. COLONEL ARTHUR BEAUDRY.

Mr. DELISLE asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to cancel the commission of Lieutenant Colonel Arthur Beaudry, Commandant of the 81st Battalion, Portneuf, in view of the fact that the said officer has, in violation of No. 74 of Regulations of the Militia of Canada, for several years past resided outside of the County of Portneuf, wherein his battalion is formed? Whether any complaints or reports have ever been made against him, and if so, when, and by what persons?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is not compulsory for commanding officers to reside within the limits of their command. No. 74 of Regulations and Orders reads as follows:—

"Officers of the Active Militia must be resident within the limits of the city, county, or countries from which men composing the corps are drawn. On their ceasing to reside within such limits, their commission may be cancelled."

The only complaint against Lieut. Col. Beaudry is one filed in February, 1886, by one Levis Dussault, for not accounting for band allowance to his regiment. This matter was settled to the satisfaction of all parties, according to a report of the Deputy Adjutant General of the District.

NEW ENGLAND PAPER COMPANY.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Has the Government or any of the public departments purchased any paper within the past six years from the New England Paper Company, or Mr. J. Brookes Young, or any agent of theirs? If so, how much and to what value?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The only transaction with the New England Paper Company found in the books of the Department of Public Printing and Stationery, during the last six years, is as follows:—

"November 26th, 1890, 252 reams printing paper, 25½x36—55-500s. at 7¾ cents. Value, $1,074.15."

No purchases in the name of J. Brookes Young, nor any through any known agent. There are certainly none during the last three and a-half years.

POSTMASTERS' SALARIES.

Mr. GERMAN asked, Did the postmasters at Niagara Falls, Niagara Falls South, Thorold and Chippawa, or either of them, receive as salaries for the years 1889 and 1890, or either of said years, a larger sum than 40 per cent. on the first $800 of actual postal revenue, and 25 per cent. on the revenue in excess of $800? And if so, for what reason?

Mr. HAGGART. Niagara Falls—year ended 30th June, 1889: This being an office at which night duty was performed the postmaster received the percentage usual in such cases of 50 per cent. on the first $800 of revenue. Year ended 30th June, 1890: Same rate of allowance maintained, the circumstances being unaltered. As revenue of office was falling, however, salary was reduced in former year by $80, and in the latter year $60. Niagara Falls South—year ended 30th June, 1889: This being an office at which night duty was performed the postmaster received the percentage usual in such cases of 50 per cent. on the first $800 of revenue. Year ended 30th June, 1890: Night duty having ceased the salary was reduced from $560 to $500. The latter amount was still in excess of 40 per cent., but certain returns in possession of the department indicated that the revenue from sale of stamps did not fully represent the business of the office. Thorold — Year ended the 30th June, 1889: Postmaster was allowed slightly less than 40 per cent. on the revenue, certain returns received by the department indicating that the actual postal business of the office was less than stamp sales. Year ended 30th June, 1890: The salary allowed was in excess of 40 per cent. on the first $800 of revenue. The revenue had fallen off and the department was unwilling to reduce it suddenly to the exact figures warranted by the established sale. It was reduced, however, by $80. Chippawa—Year ended 30th June, 1889: This being an office at which night duty was performed the postmaster received the percentage usual in such cases of 50 per cent. on the first $800 of revenue. Year ended 30th June, 1890: The amount of night duty not being so great the rate was allowed of 45 per cent.

FORT ERIE AND BUFFALO FERRY.

Mr. GERMAN asked, Has the Government instituted an enquiry into the management of the ferry running between Fort Erie and Buffalo? What is the result of such enquiry, if any? What action, if any, does the Government intend taking in the matter?

Mr. COSTIGAN. A report was made but no action has yet been taken, further information being necessary.

OXFORD AND PICTOU MAILS.

Mr. FRASER asked, Does the Government intend to have the mails carried on the Short Line from Oxford to Pictou and delivered at all stations along the line?

Mr. HAGGART. The Government do intend to have the mails carried on the Short Line from Oxford to Pictou, and, I think, delivered along all the stations on the line.

LIVERPOOL, N.S., POST OFFICE.

Mr. FORBES asked, Whether the Government is aware of the insufficient postal accommodation in the town of Liverpool to meet the requirements of the people of said town, and whether it is the intention of the Government to supply a building of sufficient accommodation by construction, purchase or lease, to satisfy the requirements of the town?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government has taken no action about the erection of a building there yet.

STONE FOR LANGEVIN BLOCK.

Mr. MULOCK asked, What number of miles was the stone used in the construction of the Langevin Block carried over the Intercolonial Railway?

Mr. BOWELL. 411 miles.

EXPORT OF WILD FOWL.

Mr. McKAY asked, Whether, in view of the fact that a large number of petitions has been sent to this House praying for certain amendments to the Customs Act prohibiting the export of wild fowl, &c., it is the intention of the Government to amend the Act in that direction?

Mr. BOWELL. It is not the intention of the Government to introduce a measure this session to prohibit the export of wild fowl.

MR. LAFORCE LANGEVIN.

Mr. DELISLE asked, Whether one Laforce Langevin, who has for several years been employed as assistant engineer of the Quebec Harbour Works, with a salary of $1,800 a year, has ever obtained a diploma as civil engineer, and if so, when, and from what institution?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Laforce Langevin holds a certificate of membership of the Canadian Society of Civil Engineers, a society incorporated under Act 50-51 Vic., chapter 124. The following is a copy of the certificate:—

"THE CANADIAN SOCIETY OF CIVIL ENGINEERS.
"Established, 1887.
"*Incorporated by Dominion Act, June*, 1887.

"These are to certify that Hector Laforce Langevin is an Associate Member of the Canadian Society of Civil Engineers, a society established for promoting the acquisition of that species of knowledge which constitutes the profession of a Civil Engineer, whereby the great sources of power in nature are converted, adapted and applied for the use and convenience of man.

"Witness our hands and seal at Montreal this 27th day of June, 1888.

"C. S. GZOWSKI, President.
"HENRY T. BOVEY, Secretary."

CAPTAIN OF THE *ALERT*.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, Who is the captain of the steamboat *Alert?* Did this captain undergo an examination before being appointed to this position? Did other persons undergo an examination of fitness for this position at the same time that he did? If there were such other persons, who were they? Was the appointment made in accordance with the results of the examinations? If such was the case, what was the number of points obtained by each candidate?

Mr. TUPPER. No captain has been permanently appointed. One has been temporarily employed on probation, Charles Koenig. He underwent an examination before being appointed to this position. He was examined by the Board of Examiners of Masters and Mates in 1873, and granted a master's certificate of competency, seagoing, on the 21st March, 1873, by the Department of Marine. Capt. Koenig was again examined by Capts. Smith and McElhinney on the 15th April, 1891, with other applicants. Capt. Koenig was taken on board the *Alert* on the 29th May, and his abilities and qualifications practically tested under the supervision of Capt. McElhinney, who reported to the department that he was satisfied that Capt. Koenig is competent for the position of master of the steamer *Alert*. Other persons underwent examination of fitness for the position at the same time as Captain Koenig. They were Jean Baptiste Bélanger, Arthur Morin, Onésime Bernier and Sigismond Bélanger, and they were examined by Captains Smith and McElhinney on 15th April, 1891. There were also examined by Captain McElhinney alone, Sigismond Bélanger, Jean B. Bélanger, Charles Koenig, Arthur Morin, Onésime Bernier, H. O. Bernier, A. Sansterre and D. F. Pelletier. Captain Koenig was employed as the best available man in accordance with the result of the examination. No points were given for answer to questions, as the examination was not conducted upon the system of giving merit marks for each question, but was conducted with a view to ascertain what were the abilities, general knowledge, experience and practical qualifications of the candidates for the position of master of the steamer *Alert*, to be engaged in the supply service. The applicants all hold certificates of competency, having passed previous examinations.

CITY MARKET PROPERTY, HALIFAX.

Mr. FRASER asked, What correspondence or interviews have taken place between the Government and any members or ex-members of the syndicate who purchased the City Market property, Halifax, for $20,300? What is the price asked by the syndicate, and do the Government contemplate purchasing said property at the price asked, or at any other price?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not aware of any correspondence or interviews having taken place between the Government and any members or ex-members of a syndicate who purchased the City Market property at Halifax.

WHARF AT KNOWLTON'S LANDING.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. RIDER) asked, 1. Has any survey or other enquiry been made respecting the building of a wharf at Knowlton's Landing, or at any other place on the shore of Lake Memphremagog? If so, has any report been made? If a report has been made, what is the nature of such report? 2. When and by whom was such survey or enquiry made? 3. If the report is favourable to the construction of such wharf, when will the work be undertaken? 4. Is it the intention of the Government to proceed with this work this year?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. A survey has been made. Two reports have been made. The first reported on the construction of a wharf at an estimated cost of $2,800, the second on making an existing wharf available at a cost of $950. The examination was made in February and March last by Mr. Assistant Engineer Lafleur. The matter is now under the consideration of the Government.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES.

Mr. AMYOT asked, Whether in cases of claims for damages against the Crown resulting from accidents on the Intercolonial Railway, and petitions of right filed in relation thereto, it is the intention of the Government to plead prescription as a defence, or to resist such claims solely on the merits and facts in each case?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It would not be the policy of the Government to plead prescription in any case where the delay did not occur through the fault of the plaintiff, or in any case in which

the plaintiff delayed on account of waiting for the adjudication of his rights in any other case.

THE DUTY ON BINDING TWINE.

Mr. MULOCK moved:

That the House do go into Committee of the Whole to consider a resolution: That binding twine be placed upon the free list.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the motion which I am about to place in your hands I gave notice of on the 1st of May, but at the request of the Government I have allowed it to stand until the present time. In view of the long time that has elapsed in unsuccessful endeavour in this way to ascertain the intentions of the Government, and also in view of the fact that in the Budget speech delivered by the hon. Minister of Finance a few days ago no reference is made to this important subject, I deem it my duty now to bring the matter to the attention of the House. In proposing that binding twine be placed on the free list, in order to establish a case it will only be necessary, I think, to show a reasonable prospect that a reduction in price to the consumer would result from the adoption of the course this motion suggests. I would, therefore, trouble the House with a few figures, which I think are reliable, showing the prices which obtain to-day in Canada and in the adjoining country. I am informed by what I consider a reliable authority that the prevailing price of binding twine in the United States to-day, in car loads of ten tons, is as follows: pure manila, 11 cents; pure sisal, 7½ cents; pure New Zealand, 7 cents; whereas the prices in Canada in similar quantities are as follows: pure manila, 14 cents, and pure sisal from 11 cents to 12¼ cents. Thus you will see that there is a difference between the prices in the States and in Canada of upwards of 3 cents per pound.

Mr. McMILLAN. Would the hon. gentleman be kind enough to give us the source of his information for these quotations?

Mr. MULOCK. The figures I have read are from a letter which I received from a dealer. I will read the letter without giving the signature, unless it is really important.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. MULOCK. I am willing to give the name if desired. The letter, upon which I partly base my information, is written to a firm of manufacturers of implements, and is an application to them to do business through the writer. It is as follows:—

"DEAR SIRS,—The National Cordage Co. of New York quote me prices as follows:—Ten-ton lots pure manila, 11 cents; pure sisal, 7½ cents; New Zealand, 7 cents. At these prices you should do some business. Do not say much about it, as I do not want the Canadian cord men to get after me. I expect to place over twenty cars here, as I can undersell them nearly a cent and make $250 a car on it. The duty is 25 per cent. I got samples of this twine and find it is superior to any of the Canadian makes. They also make mixed twine of different prices."

I have had the advantage of information from persons in the trade and others, and I think that the figures I give represent substantially the difference in prices prevailing in the United States and Canada to-day.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). Would the figures you give apply to car loads in Canada as well?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes; the figures I give apply to car loads of ten tons each in the United States and Canada.

Mr. BOWELL. Has the hon. gentleman any information as to whether that is the American charge at which they propose to send to Canada, or is it the export price for Canadian consumption?

Mr. MULOCK. The prices I have read are the prices at which the company in question are prepared to sell to the Canadian dealer for the Canadian market.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). Do they sell their own dealers at that price?

Mr. MULOCK. I believe the Americans have a system that obtains in Canada as well. I understand the Canadian manufacturers of binder twine, taking advantage of the tariff, exact a higher price from the Canadian consumers than they do from those abroad.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). That is a Yankee trick.

Mr. MULOCK. It is being copied here. Our National Policy is only a Yankee imitation. At all events, on reading that valuable work on combines, which was the outcome of the enquiry directed by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), a couple of years ago, you will find it there sworn to that the Canadian manufacturer of binder twine sells the article at a lower price, of about a cent, I think, a pound to those outside of Canada than to the Canadian consumer. The result is that the Canadian consumer is obliged to pay, to-day, on an average, about 3 cents per pound more for the twine than he otherwise would have. I presume that if an American manufacturer wishes to trade abroad and chooses to sell to-day to Canada at less than he would sell in the United States he would adopt that same policy, whether there be a tariff wall or not.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. MULOCK. Perhaps the hon. gentleman is familiar with the policy of the American manufacturers. I am not, any further than what they have made public. But following out my reasoning, I find that the result is that the farmers of Canada are compelled to pay, on an average, 3 cents a pound more than the article is worth; for it is reasonable to presume that the American manufacturer does not sell the stuff either to the people of Canada or the United States at less than its value. It is not our business if he is selling to the United States consumers at a higher price than he can get from the Canadian consumer plus the duty. It is sufficient for us to look after the interests of Canadian farmers, and I think on that point there can be no doubt the tariff to-day has placed the Canadian farmer, in respect of binder twine, entirely at the mercy of that industry, which is using the tariff to exact unreasonable advantage and profit from the Canadian people. Just to bring this matter home to myself, I made a calculation as to what the excessive price costs the people of the County of York; and taking the last returns, the returns for last year, from the county council of the County of York, I find it is there stated that there are now in the County of York 529,044 acres of land assessed, and assuming that one-third of that is under grain crop there would be 176,348 acres of crop to take off. Thus, if it

takes two pounds of twine per acre—which may be taken as a fair average, perhaps rather under the amount than over it——

Mr. CASEY. Rather under it.

Mr. MULOCK. At all events, assuming that is not an outside estimate, it amounts to this, that the farmers of the County of York pay $10,580.88 more than this twine is worth. They are compelled to do that by reason of the tariff, and I think it is fair to assume that if the present duty were abolished the price of twine would fall in proportion. I have only to point to what has happened within the last few days, since the Budget speech of the hon. Minister of Finance—a speech to a certain extent on the lines of a second resolution of which I had the honour to give notice, and which is on the Paper, to place sugar upon the free list—I need only point to what happened in the sugar market of Canada as soon as his Budget speech was made as a sure indication of what would follow were he to announce a similar policy in regard to binder twine. Why did the price of Canadian sugar fall when the hon. Minister took off the duty on certain grades of sugar? It fell simply as effect follows cause. The cost of the article was reduced, and the consumer got the benefit. Such would inevitably be the result, I have no possible doubt, were he to adopt the same policy with regard to binder twine. If the present condition of the farmer in regard to his binder twine is what I have stated, what is it likely to be should what is indicated in the papers really be the case? It is asserted, with what truth I do not know, by prominent journals, that one great corporation in the States, the National Cordage Company, has acquired control of the binding twine factories of Canada. For example, in the Ottawa *Citizen*, 20th of June, 1891, there appeared the following telegraphic despatch from Halifax :—

"A BIG DEAL.

"A SYNDICATE SECURES CONTROL OF LEADING CANADIAN CORDAGE MILLS.

"HALIFAX, N.S., 19th.—It is learned here to-day that the National Cordage Company, of New York, has purchased the business of the Dartmouth Rope Works Company. The importance of this transfer can only be properly realized when the magnitude of the turn-over is known. The concern employs over six hundred hands, and the sales exceed one and a-half millions per annum. It is claimed that the National have now secured all of the Canadian mills, eleven in number, and intend to materially increase the capacity of the larger concerns in the Maritime Provinces to compete for export business, owing to cheap labour and other advantages possessed by these mills."

The advantages of manufacturing in Canada are so great that this factory proposes to be able to export to the free markets of the world, and there enter into open competition with twine manufactured all over the world; and yet the Government proposes to make the Canadian farmer pay 25 per cent. more than the free market price for this product. On Saturday the following article, taken from the Boston *Daily Advertizer*, appeared in the *Globe* :—

"The Boston *Daily Advertizer*, in the course of a favourable notice of the National Cordage Company's affairs, says:

"'The company actually has purchased all the cordage mills in Canada, and the cordage business of the Dominion of Canada is protected by a tariff wall which enables the business to work at a profit.'"

Now, if it is true that the National Cordage Company, of New York, has obtained control of the Canadian manufacture, we will simply have in an intensified form the evils from which we were suffering a short time ago. I find, again, in the Journals of this House of 1888, page 403, the evidence of Alexander W. Morris, of Montreal, manufacturer. I understand that this evidence has never been contradicted, and, therefore, we may assume that it was correct. A committee was enquiring into the working of combines, and into the question of the binder twine combines. It appears that Mr. Connors was a member of the combine, and the evidence contained in this book shows that the manufacturers of binder twines had arranged to limit their productions and pool their profits. Mr. Morris was examined as to how the combine affected the trade. He gave the following evidence :—

By Mr. Gillmor:

"Q. Mr. Connors is in your combination? A.—He was in, but there is no combination now.

"Q. How many were there in the combination?—A. Five.

"Q. You were proportioned out what each one should make?—A. Yes; we each had a stated percentage.

"Q. What proportion of all the quantity that was to be made for Canada did he make?—A. On binder twine last year he had a percentage, I think, of 10 per cent. of the whole; and I think he manufactured about two tons of twine.

"Q. How much did he get last year out of the pool, as you call it, as near as you can tell?—A. I think about $6,000 or $7,000. Perhaps as much as that. It might be $5,000.

"Q. For not making rope?—A. No; not making binder twine."

So, for not having manufactured binder twine, he receives a bonus of about $5,000, or about a dollar a pound for what he did not manufacture. How did the people who were in the pool come to be able to give $5,000 for the work which this man did not do? He toiled not, neither did he spin. If the opportunity is again afforded, we will find that there will again be one corporation which will absorb the whole of this industry. I think the farming population are entitled to the relief which I ask for in this resolution, which I, therefore, move.

Mr. GRIEVE. It is not my intention to take up the time of the House very long this afternoon, but I feel it my duty to my constituents to say a few words in reference to the resolution which is before the House. As a young member of this House, representing a farming constituency, and one of the most progressive agricultural constituencies in the Province of Ontario or the Dominion of Canada, I think I would not be doing my duty if I did not raise my voice against the unjust tax which is now being levied on the farmers of this country. I do not intend to enter into a general discussion of the tariff, but I shall confine myself to the resolutions which are before the House. For my part, I am not aware whether there is any combination in regard to the manufacture and sale of binder twine or not; but, if I were to judge by the reports which are presented, I could come to no other conclusion excepting that there is a combine for that purpose. Combines of this nature are about the worst that the farmers have to contend with. I remember when a great combination existed between the binder manufacturers of Canada, though the twine manufacturers were not in the combine at the same time. I remember when the farmers were forced to pay $210 cash for a binder, while the same article was sold for $65 less money after the combination was terminated. Some of the farmers who paid $210 when they

should have obtained the same binder for $145 have come to the conclusion, as we must, that they paid the extra amount simply because of the protection which was afforded to the manufacturer of the machines. I understand that now our responsible rulers are not satisfied with the invoice of the article. A Canadian dealer imports an article of twine and receives an invoice for it, and he pays 10 cents per pound, or 2½ cents per pound duty, but our Customs officials insist upon charging him on the value of the article in the Canadian market, and they charge him from three-fourths of a cent to 1 cent per pound over and above the actual cost. That is a very serious item. I have in my possession several samples of twine which I would be willing to show to hon. gentlemen. They are samples of sisal and manila twine. The American quotations of mixed twine are 8¼ cents a pound, while the Canadian quotations are from 12 to 13 cents a pound. The American quotations for sisal twine are 7¾ cents and the Canadian quotations 11 cents, or 3¼ cents in favour of the American twine. Now, I consider this a very serious item to the farmers of Canada, more especially to those of Ontario, Manitoba and the North-West Territories, where twine is used to a much greater extent than in the other provinces. Let us take into consideration the enormous amount of twine that is annually used to bind the harvests of this country. I find, in looking over the returns made to this House in 1888, when a committee of the House was appointed to investigate and to report upon alleged combinations, Mr. Massey, of Toronto, one of the largest and most successful manufacturers of Canada, who was examined before this commitee, gave it as his opinion that it would require over 3,000 tons of twine to bind the harvest of 1888. If his figures were correct, and I think hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House will admit that probably no better authority could be found in that respect in the whole Dominion of Canada, I think I am within the mark when I say it would require 4,000 tons of twine, or 8,000,000 pounds, to bind the harvest of 1891, provided that the harvest of 1891 is as bountiful as it was in 1888; and I am sure we all wish that it may be so. Now, taking the price of American and Canadian twine at the present time, we find at the least calculation, at 3 cents per pound, the farmers of Canada have got to pay between $250,000 and $300,000 over the legitimate price of that article. Now, I contend this is a very serious matter indeed. And what excuse have the Government for extorting that amount out of the pockets of the farmers? Is it to enrich the treasury? If that amount of money went into the Dominion treasury the Government might hesitate in taking action on the matter; but, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns for 1890, we imported into this country, for home consumption, only 27,990 pounds of twine, valued at $4,915, and on that we received of duty $1,279.18; so that the farmers of Canada are annually forced to pay nearly $300,000 over and above the legitimate price of their goods in order that the treasury may be enriched to the extent of $1,279.18. Some people talk about encouraging home industry, about encouraging home manufacturers. I believe that the great majority of the farmers of Canada to-day would rather buy their machines and twine of Canadian manufacture if they could get them at the same price, but I do not believe there is a single farmer in Canada who would rather buy twine of a Canadian manufacturer at 12 and 13 cents per pound, when he can get an equally good or better article of American manufacture at 10 cents a pound. Now, I will show the House how this affects the farmers in my own County of Perth, that I have the honour to be one of the representatives of. There is probably only one way by which we can get at the amount of twine used in that county, and that is by taking the number of acres that are put under crop. I find, according to the report of the Ontario Bureau of Industries for 1889—the last report issued by the department—that in the County of Perth there were 39,474 acres under fall wheat; 1,853 acres under spring wheat; 17,728 acres under barley; 68,184 acres under oats; 44 acres under rye—making a total of 127,283 acres of grain. It may not be correct to say that all that grain was harvested with binders, but I believe I am within the limit when I say that at least seventeen-twentieths of the farmers throughout the county have binders, and the majority of those who have not generally hire their neighbours who have binders to cut their grain. Now, as the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) stated truly, it requires, at the least calculation, two pounds of twine to bind an acre of grain, and I am satisfied he was within the figure when he said that. If the Canadian farmer has got to pay 3 cents a pound for twine over and above the legitimate price, he has got to pay 6 cents an acre over and above what he would be obliged otherwise to pay if there were no duty upon twine. That means to the farmers of the County of Perth no less a sum than $7,636.98 that is wrung out of their pockets in order that two or three manufacturers may become millionaires. Now, I do not think that is a proper position for this Government to place farmers in, when we take into consideration that the farmers of Canada form 75 per cent. of the total population. It seems to me absurd that they should be taxed to that enormous extent in order to make fortunes for a few manufacturers. In the House the other afternoon the Minister of Finance said, in reference to abolishing the duty of raw sugar:

> "But the Government has looked over the whole question, and on two conditions it has come to the conclusion to sweep away, from the burden of the great mass of the people, with one stroke of the pen, $3,500,000 of taxation; and I venture to say, Sir, that never in the history of Canada, either before Confederation or since Confederation, has any Government come down to the House with such a large reduction of taxes as is involved in this proposition."

Now, it seems to me that the Government deserves a considerable amount of credit so far as that article is concerned. We are willing to give them credit where credit is due; the only thing we can complain of is, that they did not do away with the duty upon sugar years ago. I would ask the Minister of Finance that, with another stroke of his pen, he would relieve the farmers of Canada of their burdens to the extent of $300,000 that the Government now take out of their pockets annually by means of the duty on an article so necessary to them.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the price of mixed binding twine was 12 cents. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. GRIEVE. I said 12 or 13 cents, and sometimes as high as 14 cents.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I do not propose, upon this question of binding twine, to go into the whole argument between protection and free trade, but I would point out that there is a great difference between the duties upon sugar and the duties upon binding twine. The duty that has been taken off sugar has been taken off the raw material, and as I understand it, the raw material of binding twine is admitted free, so that there is all the difference in the world. Therein lies the whole principle of the National Policy—that the raw material is admitted free while duty is placed upon the manufactured article. Now, something was said about the price of binders. The hon. gentleman has given up the whole case with regard to binders, because he has admitted that the price of binders was brought down $65 on each article. Well, Sir, under the National Policy I say, and there can be no contradiction to it, that the price of agricultural implements has gone down very nearly, on the whole, 50 per cent. since that policy came into operation. What absurdity it is to say that the National Policy, as regards these articles, has imposed a tax upon the farmers. We know there is no foundation for it. Now, with regard to binding twine, having pointed out the distinction that must be made between the duty upon the raw material and the duty upon the manufactured article, I beg to tell the hon. gentleman, and those who have spoken on this question, that I have got that same mixed binding twine that he speaks of as worth 12 to 13 cents—I have bought it in quantity of 100 pounds at 10 cents. I bought it myself the other day, and that is the regular price in the town of Barrie, where I get my supply. It can be bought at retail by the 100 pounds at that price, and I was assured that the article was sufficiently good for all practical purposes. I could have got a cheaper article—I am speaking from memory now, because I am not positive about the other articles—I believe I could have got an inferior article at 8 cents, and I could have got a better article at 13 cents and 14 cents. The very highest price quoted to me for the best twine was 14 cents; for the medium quality, which I purchased, and which seemed to be sufficiently good for the purpose, 10 cents, and, if I had desired, I could have obtained an inferior article for 8 cents. Those prices were at retail for 100 pounds, and there are very few farmers who would want less than that quantity. If that is the case, it does not matter whether the duty is 25, 50 or 100 per cent. If we get the articles as cheap as we would do otherwise we have nothing of which to complain. The assumption is made in all these cases that the consumer pays, in addition to the cost of the article or what the cost of the article ought to be, the duty. That is to say, if a man ought to be able to buy binding twine at 10 cents, with a duty of 25 per cent., he really is called upon to pay the difference between the true cost and 25 per cent. If that were so, it would be very good ground for an attack on the National Policy. But hon. gentlemen must establish that as a matter of fact, otherwise there is no foundation for their argument. What is the case? I, for one, would never stand in this House or elsewhere to defend a policy which would place anything like an unfair advantage in the hands of the manufacturers. I do not think the consumers should pay an additional price in order that any man or any body of men should make fortunes. It is our duty as regards the consumers to watch the operations of the National Policy, and if we find any articles on which any manufacturers or combination of manufacturers enforces a higher price in consequence of the duty, it is our duty to interfere, to step in and tell the Government that as regards that article or any article of the same class the duty should be reduced and the protection, of which the manufacturers are taking an unfair advantage, should not any longer be continued. But so long as the duty operates simply to prevent the introduction of foreign-made articles and does not increase their price to the consumer, the National Policy is answering its legitimate purpose and the purpose for which it was proposed in 1878 when it was adopted. If my figures are correct, my case is proved, and the hon. gentleman has nothing further to say. He may argue from now to doomsday the theoretical advantage of free trade as against protection, so long as we are satisfied that the prices of the articles entering into general consumption are not enhanced to the consumer by the consumer paying the duty on the manufactured article. That seems to me to be the whole case. The hon. gentleman endeavoured to make out his case, and the figures he gave were, no doubt, quoted fairly and honestly; but the whole question depends on whether his figures are correct or not. My case also depends on the accuracy of my figures. The hon. gentleman says he paid 12 cents; I paid 10 cents, and I say I paid no more than I should have done. The Government in the matter of sugar simply did what they ought to have done in accordance with the principles of the National Policy, and that was to admit raw sugar free of duty.

Mr. MULOCK. It took them a long time to do it.

Mr. O'BRIEN. It may be a fair ground of attack to say that they should have taken this action long ago. The answer to that would be that the duty on sugar provided a certain revenue, and until the Government saw their way to replace it they could not remove the duty. It is evident that this was the case, for we are obliged to make up a portion of the deficiency by increasing the tariff on other articles of a similar nature. One of the articles of a similar kind in which the farmers are personally interested is that of salt; and so soon as the Government found the operation of the National Policy was doing a great injustice to the general consumer they stepped in, as they ought to have done, and as they ought to do in all such cases, and reduced the duty, so as to prevent combinations taking advantage of the circumstances and placing an undue tax on the consumer. I say the whole question rests on this: whether, as a matter of fact, the consumer is made to pay the duty upon the manufactured article. Of course, if there was a duty on the raw material, necessarily the consumer would have to pay the duty; but if our manufacturers, having the raw material free, can produce the manufactured article and sell it to the consumer at as low a rate as it can be bought outside, then the consumer pays nothing. This duty might as well be 50 per cent. or not enforced. It is a mere matter of form as to what the duty is, so long as the consumer does not pay it. The whole article comes down to a question of figures and the

prices we really pay. I have given my experience and the hon. member has given his, and the House can ascertain which figures are correct.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman made a valuable admission at the close of his speech. He said, if the Canadian manufacturer can get his raw material free he can produce quite as cheaply as any one else, and it is a mere matter of form as to what the duty is on the manufactured article. According to the hon. gentleman, it makes no difference in the price of the finished article whether the duty is 10, 50 or 100 per cent., so long as the raw material comes in free. I should like to ask him if he would follow out that statement logically by asking the Minister of Finance to raise the duty on refined sugar to double the present duty, the raw material of which comes in free, and then see if the price of the finished article would not be increased. The hon. gentleman has stated clearly the only ground on which a protective policy can possibly be defended.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I stated two conditions; please state both.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman says that a protective policy can only be defended on the ground that the amount of the duty on the finished article has no relation to the price afterwards, so long as the raw material comes in free. The only difficulty as regards that basis on which to build an argument in favour of the protective policy is that it is not true. My hon. friend made several statements that were as distinctly logical as that to which I have referred, and more correct. The hon. gentleman says we may argue as long as we like on the theoretical advantages of free trade so long as we cannot show that the prices are enhanced by the National Policy, and it is merely a question of figures and prices. That is quite correct. It all depends on the accuracy of the figures. In this particular instance the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Grieve) has obtained correct figures, and the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. O'Brien) has been misled by the name of the twine he says he bought for 10 cents. I do not doubt he bought twine for 10 cents, but he was doubtless misled into supposing that it was the same kind of twine as that to which the hon. member for Perth referred. I think the kind of twine he bought, as he will find if he will look at the packages when he goes home, was the one called Silver composite twine. That is the kind of twine which is sold at 10 cents, and which is quoted by Masseys and others at 10 cents. I cannot tell what the Silver composite twine is made of, because it is a patent, and the composition of it is kept secret; but the kind of twine to which my hon. friend from Perth (Mr. Grieve) referred as being quoted at 13 cents is composed of manila and sisal, and is known as "Red-cap binder twine," and that cannot be purchased under 13 cents. That is the kind of twine to which my hon. friend from Perth (Mr. Grieve) referred, and if my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) tries to buy twine composed of manila and sisal he will not get it, either wholesale or retail, at less than 13 cents; at all events, he will not get it from the large manufacturers of binders. I come now to another argument of my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien). He said there was a great difference between taking the duty off dark sugar and off binder twine, because one is the raw material and the other is the finished product; and he adds, that the principle of the National Policy is to admit raw materials free while taxing only the finished product. My hon. friend from Muskoka has not carefully read the tariff or he would not make that statement. Is pig iron a finished product? Pig iron is the raw material out of which agricultural implements are made; pig iron is the raw material used by all our manufacturers of farming implements, and it is taxed heavily; it is taxed to the amount of 30 or 35 per cent. on the average price. Coal is not a finished product; it is the raw material of the manufacturer, and yet coal is taxed. I might at great length continue to point out other raw materials which are taxed, but these two examples will suffice to show that whatever the principles of the National Policy may have been when it was first invented or constructed, those principles have certainly not been carried out in practice to the extent of avoiding taxation on raw material. But even if it were so, Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out to you, and to the House, and to my friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) that binder twine is raw material to the farmer. It is the raw material with which he prepares his product for the market; and I contend that the farmer is just as much entitled, if not more so, to have his raw material put on the free list as anybody else in the community. I have tried to secure a copy of the annual report of the Ontario Department of Agriculture, in order to see the number of acres of land under grain in Ontario last year, but I have been unable to obtain the report, because it appears there is only one copy kept, and that is out of the Library. I think we should have more copies of such an important document as that. I will take the figures given by my hon. friend from Perth (Mr. Grieve), whose calculation is, I presume, correct. Last year there were 8,000,000 pounds of twine used, involving a tax upon the farmers of between $250,000 and $300,000. The hon. gentleman referred to the removal of the tax from sugar and stated that that caused a very serious loss to the revenue; but in asking for the removal of the tax on binding twine we stand in a very different position; we ask the Government to relieve the farmers of a tax of from $250,000 to $300,000 at a loss to the Treasury of only about $1,000 or $1,200. We think that is very little to ask from the Minister of Finance for the benefit of the farmers of the country. Besides that, looking at it from the manufacturers' point of view, we believe that if the American manufacturers, as stated by my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) can sell twine at a low price, our manufacturers can do the same thing, and they will not be ruined in any sense by what we ask. I will go further than that, Sir, I will say that if every one of the twine manufactories in Canada were ruined, we have still a right to ask for the removal of this duty. If the manufacture of binding twine in Canada was entirely stopped by the passage of this resolution the farmers have a right to ask for the removal of this duty, not as a favour, but as a right. What were the principles of the National Policy when it was first presented to this House? It was declared to be such a rearrangement of the tariff as would foster all the industries of the country, and the agricultural, the mining, the manufacturing and other industries were to be put upon the same level. It was declared to be the

intention of the National Policy to foster the agricultural industry just as much as the manufacturing industry, and considering that according to the last returns there are only five manufacturers of binding twine in Canada, as against millions of farmers, I contend that the interest of the millions should be considered as against the interest of the five manufacturers, even if the interest of the five should be injured by what we ask. I beg leave to tell this House that the time is coming—I believe, in fact, that the time has already come—when the farmers will be forced to organize in their thousands and their millions for their own defence against the highly-protected manufacturers of this country. If combines of manufacturers are entered into against the farmers, if the Government sets itself in a declared position of hostility against them, they will be compelled to organize themselves in their thousands and their millions to protect themselves against those manufacturers who are organizing against them and fleecing them. The Government which identifies itself with the combines, and identifies itself with the taxation of the farmer for the benefit of certain individuals, will suffer such a crushing defeat in the near future that their return to power will be a very indefinite possibility. It is bad enough to be taxed and fleeced—I can use no other word than "fleeced"—for the benefit of home manufacturers; but if it be true, as stated by my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock), that a Yankee syndicate has bought up all the cordage mills in Canada for the purpose of working them, and of enriching themselves at the expense of the farmers of Canada, then this taxation becomes intolerable. We might submit to a low tax for the benefit of home manufacturers, but to be taxed for the benefit of foreigners is something intolerable. I hope that the House will show by its vote to-day that its members are in sympathy with the people of this country in resenting foreign aggression in Canada.

Mr. McMILLAN. I wish to say a word or two on this subject, because, so far as the argument has gone, it does not show the full extent of the injustice inflicted on the farmers of Canada by this binder-twine combine, and for this reason: the tax upon raw material in the United States is $25 a ton on manila, and sisal pays $15 a ton duty in the United States, and the tax on the raw material there amounts to something like 1 cent per pound on the finished article, whereas the Canadian twine manufacturer has all his raw material free. If the American manufacturers had their raw material free they could allow us to have the binding twine at 4 cents per pound cheaper than the Canadian manufacturer sells it, instead of 3 cents cheaper, as at present. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) has told us that he paid 10 cents per pound for his twine. I have no doubt he got his twine for that, but, if he did, it was of a very inferior quality. Manila twine, for which the farmers of Canada now have to pay 14 cents a pound, could be sold for 11 cents if the duty were removed. Let us go back to the time when Mr. Massey, a gentleman in favour of the National Policy, appeared before the Combines Committee. He stated there most emphatically that he could purchase binding twine in the United States, pay the duty, bring it into Canada, and have a small margin left; and he objected to the manufacturers in this country making a profit which, in consequence of getting their raw material free, equals the whole amount of the duty on the manufactured article. The hon. member for Muskoka said something about implements being cheaper. We admit it; they are coming down in price every day; but does that hon. gentleman or any other on that side of the House mean to tell us that we can purchase implements to-day as cheaply as we could if the duty were removed?

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). Cheaper.

Mr. McMILLAN. I have taken from the Trade and Navigation Returns a list of implements, and I have added the price and duty together to find out what the Canadian farmer has to pay. I find that on each seed drill he has to pay a cost of $29.30, and a duty of $8.30. Who pays this duty, if not the Canadian farmer? Upon each harrow that comes in he has to pay a cost of $16.15, and a duty of $5.66. Upon mowing machines, of which 309,000 are brought to this country from the United States, he has to pay a cost of $128.41 each, and a duty of $9.94. Upon harvesters, of which sixty-nine come from the United States, he has to pay a cost of $109 each, and a duty of $38.40. So that when hon. gentlemen tell us that the Canadian farmer has not to pay a higher price for his agricultural implements on account of the National Policy they tell us what is not borne out by the Trade and Navigation Returns issued by this Government. Now, I wish to say a word or two with respect to the number of acres under crop in the Province of Ontario. We have 4,140,109 acres of wheat, oats, barley and rye, all of which can be tied. I do not mean to say that this is all tied; but according to the statement of Mr. Massey, made in 1888 before the Combines Committee, it would require at least 6,000,000 pounds of twine to do that work at that time; and as there must have been a considerable increased demand since that time, the 8,000,000 pounds estimated by the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Grieve) is not over, but under the quantity that would probably be necessary to supply the needs of Canada to-day. As only a little over $1,200 of revenue is derived from the duty on binding twine, the result is that for every dollar that goes into the treasury $190 goes to the manufacturers' combine. I was very much astonished to hear the other day that the combine had bought out the St. John Cordage Company—or, rather, that they had paid that company $15,000 to allow their works to stand still, the result of which was that 90 workmen were turned out and had to leave this country and go to the other side to seek employment; and now we are told that a company from the United States have bought up all the cordage companies of Canada; so that the duty on binding twine now exists, not in the interest of the manufacturers of Canada, but in the interest of manufacturers from a foreign country. Allow me to say that it has become a very grave question indeed with many farmers whether or not, at the present price of binding twine, it pays to use the binder, which is perhaps the greatest labour-saving machine on the farmer. Last year on my own farm the principal crop was oats, and it cost us nearly 50 cents an acre to tie the grain. Now, I hold that it is the duty of the Government to give the farmers this relief. Hon. gentlemen cannot say that it is going to embarrass the treasury, because

it will have the effect of doing away with only some $1,200 of revenue. The farmers are alive on this question, which affects them very seriously all over the country, though perhaps most in the Province of Ontario and the Province of Manitoba. I have always held that one of the reasons why Manitoba and the North-West have not been settled more rapidly is the very large amounts of duty which the settlers there have to pay on agricultural implements and binding twine, The first purchase of the settler in the North-West after he reaps a crop is some kind of agricultural implement, and upon that he has to pay a very heavy tax. I heard it stated the other day that a man and a boy could to-day perform as much labour in the harvest field as four men could do some years ago; but when we take the price of binding twine into consideration it is a question whether it does not cost about as much to do the harvesting with a binder as it would with hired hands. I warned the Government last year, and I think that since that time they have got a lesson in the western part of Ontario. I need not tell you, Mr. Speaker, that many of the agricultural constituencies have changed their political complexion. Give them another opportunity and I can assure you the tables will be turned, and hon. gentlemen opposite will have to take their place on this side of the House. I do not know that I need say any more. Our manufacturers at the present time are benefited by this duty, not simply to the amount of 3 cents a pound; but, when we take into consideration the duty on the raw material, they have an advantage of 4 cents a pound. This is a burden that has been borne too long by the farmers of Canada; they have been a long-suffering race, but if the present Government do not grant them the relief they desire before it comes to an end hon. gentlemen opposite will never have another opportunity.

Mr. WALLACE. I was not going to trouble the House with any remarks on this occasion, but owing to some statements which have been made by the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) I wish to say a few words. He, like all hon. gentlemen opposite, has stated that the price of binding twine in Canada is far in excess of what it is in the United States, and he added that the manufacturers in the United States pay a duty on their raw material of $15 a ton for sisal and $25 a ton for manila, while these raw materials are admitted into Canada free. It is quite true that these materials are brought into Canada duty free, and it is equally true that they are brought duty free into the United States. I hold in my hand a copy of the Tariff law of the United States of 1890. In the list of free articles, on page 44, I find jute, manila, sisal grass, fibrous vegetable substances, unmanufactured and undressed, and not specially provided for in this Act. I presume the hon. gentleman was rehearsing to us his campaign speech, or some speech of his of a previous year, which he had forgotten to revise up to date. With reference to the statement of the hon. member for North Perth, that the consumption of binder twine in Canada was, according to his estimate, about 4,000 tons, I have here the statement made by the largest manufacturer of binding twine in Canada, Mr. A. W. Morris, of Montreal. In his evidence before the Combines Committee he stated that the amount sold by the manufacturers in the combine was a trifle under 1,800 tons. Now, although we have improved in agriculture generally, and have increased our cultivated area, I do not think that increase has been so great as to require a jump in consumption from 1,800 to 4,000 tons of binder twine in a couple of years. Mr. Massey, the implement manufacturer of Toronto, also stated before that committee, in answer to Mr. Bain, of Wentworth, who asked him what was the actual cost, including the duty, of the American article:

"We had to import a large quantity for the North-West last year. We could not get it in Canada. We laid it down in Manitoba at about the price we had to pay in New York, and duty added. It cost us about the duty extra."

To bring it in from the United States it cost more than he could buy it for in Canada, by about the duty. In another statement Mr. Massey goes into particulars, and shows that $11.50 was the price for the American and $11.87 the price for the Canadian, and the duty had to be added to the American, so that the price in Canada and the United States was about the same.

Mr. WATSON. I am much pleased that the hon. member for North York has brought this matter up in the shape of a resolution. I was sorry to see that the hon. Minister of Finance had not thought fit to make a change in binding twine the same as on sugar. I assure him that the people fully appreciated the change on the latter. To-day we find, however, hon. gentlemen on the opposite side using the same arguments with regard to binding twine as they were in the habit of using formerly with regard to sugar. We used to be told that because sugar was cheaper in 1890 than it had been in 1878 the consumer had not to pay any more for it on account of the high duty; and we are now told, because binding twine and machinery are cheaper to-day than in 1878 the consumer is not paying more for his machinery and binding twine than he would if the duty were off. The fact that the Government have taken the duty off sugar and that the price has consequently been reduced clearly proves that we on this side of the House were right in our contention. In discussing the question of binding twine we must not confine it altogether to the price per pound at which it can be secured, for the quality has a great deal to do with the matter. I have made enquiries, from what I considered to be fair sources of the most reliable information, and have obtained figures from Toronto and Chicago. I have not taken the figures from Manitoba, because the greater portion of the twine is used in Ontario, although in Manitoba we use more binding twine *per capita* than any other portion of the Dominion.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Have you the figures from Manitoba?

Mr. WATSON. The freight has to be added to get at the price in Manitoba?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I mean the quantity used.

Mr. WATSON. Yes; I will give the quantity used. It is easy to get at the quantity if you know the number of acres under cultivation. The figures I received from Toronto are as follows:—

	Cts.	
Red Cap	12	½ Manila ½ Sisal.
Crown	11	½ do ½ do
Blue Ribbon	14	Pure Manila.
Composite	9	Jute.

I asked for information from Chicago, and received the following—the prices are jobbers' prices and not manufacturers' prices :—

	Cts. per lb.
Diamond G Standard	8¼
Diamond H	8
Standard Manila	10¾
Diamond K Standard, mixed	8¼
Diamond I Pure Manilla	12¼

Now, you have to make the comparison between the different samples of twine, and I have those samples of twine in my desk, so that any gentleman, competent to judge, may examine them for himself, to see whether the inferences I have drawn are correct or not. To ascertain the relative values, I have taken the trouble to weigh and measure the twines, because the value depends a great deal on the number of feet you get per pound. The following is the result as regards Canadian twine, at Toronto prices :—

	Cts.	
Red Cap	12	525 ft. per pound.
Crown Brand	11	490 "
Composite (Jute)	9	589 "
Pure Manila	14	could not get sample.

The following shows the American twine at Chicago prices :

	Cts. per lb.	Cts. per ft.
Pure Manila	12¼	693
Standard Manila	10¾	522
Standard K, mixed	8¾	498
Standard G	8¼	522
Standard H	84	522

In making a comparison as to the relative value of those twines, it would not be argued by any hon. gentleman in this House that pure manila is not a better twine than the mixed twine which is known as red cap brand. Canadian Red Cap gives 525 feet to the pound and American pure manila gives 693 feet to the pound. Therefore, taking the difference in feet, you will find that this Red Cap mixture will cost 15·84 cents in Canada as compared with the pure manila, which costs 12¼ cents per pound in Chicago. So that a mixed twine costs more in Canada than the pure manila does in Chicago. Take the Crown brand, a great portion of which is sold in job lots at 11 cents per pound ; and I was informed to-day by a retailer that it was sold here at 12½ cents per pound, the difference covering the freight from the factory and the profit. Comparing that brand of twine manufactured in Canada, which gives 490 feet to the pound, with Diamond H American twine, with which I think it would be fair to compare it, that gives 581 feet to the pound and costs 8 cents per pound, and you find the price of our Canadian twine is brought up to 13 cents per pound. In figuring on the twines, as has been stated, the hon. Minister of Customs saw fit to fix the prices at which they shall be entered into this country, so that in reality, instead of paying 25 per cent., we often pay 30 and 35 per cent. duty.

Mr. McNEILL. What is the difference in cost between the best manila made in Canada and the best made in the United States ?

Mr. WATSON. It is the difference between 14 cents and 12¼ cents, or 1¾ cents, but the hon. gentleman must bear in mind the difference in the quantity. Unfortunately, I have not got a sample of Canadian pure manila ; but in comparing the others, it will be seen there is a greater number of feet in the American than in the Canadian, and consequently it is worth more per pound to the farmer. We have agents in Manitoba who sell certain binding twines. They sell American and Canadian implements, and they tell me that they could furnish American binding twine at the same price to the consumer as Canadian binding twine—that it was a matter of choice for the consumer. They prefer to handle Canadian twine, because they have not to pay cash for duty on receiving the goods, so the Canadian farmer has to pay the amount of the duty in every case, whether the article comes through the Customs or not. If the amount which we have to pay more than we should have to pay went into the revenue, we as loyal Canadians might not object to contribute our taxes on that as well as on any other article, but we find that last year the amount collected in revenue, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns, was only $1,279.18. The protection on binding twine is, therefore, practically prohibitory. If this was an industry which employed a large number of men and required skilled labour, we might benefit by making a market for our products in manufacturing this twine, but we know that the labour employed in this manufacture is very cheap and very small. In fact there are not more than 400 employés, as I understand, engaged in these rope-walks, and thus for the sake of five or six rope-walks we are taxed this large amount. In Manitoba alone, which is a province more affected by the tariff than any other, as it has to pay more *per capita* than any other province in the Dominion, particularly on binding twine and machinery, there is about 1,300,000 acres in crop this year. This is a very low estimate of the land under crop, and it requires at least two pounds of binding twine to the acre, especially of the Canadian product. The American twine would go further, and two pounds to the acre would be about the amount required, but this year it may take two and a-half pounds, as we have the prospect of a magnificent harvest. Taking only two pounds to the acre, at 3 cents a pound, the people of Manitoba will have to contribute, not to the revenue, but to these manufacturers, $78,000 this year. The tax on machinery is bad enough, God knows, but this tax on binding twine amounts to 6 or 7 cents an acre this year, and the Government, acting under the name of protection or the National Policy on this article of binding twine, which every farmer needs in order to bind his crop, is taxing the farmer not for the benefit of the revenue, but for the benefit of the manufacturer. In this debate I do not know that it is well to refer to anything except the articles under discussion. I have expressed my views in regard to the matter, and I think I am expressing the views of every one who has undertaken to consider this question from Manitoba and the North West. Hon. gentlemen may say that binding twine can be bought as cheaply in Manitoba as in Minnesota and Dakota, but such is not the case. I am willing to leave that question to those who have to buy the article, and to the quotations which have been given by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), and I am willing to leave it to the better judgment of the men who are selling this article to the consumer. We are compelled to pay at least 6 cents an acre for all the crop bound in Manitoba this year. Thus we are compelled to pay $78,000 in that.

province, although only $1,200 altogether goes into the revenue, and that is a small province in regard to population, though it is a large province in regard to the output of grain. I hope the Minister of Finance will see that, notwithstanding this paltry sum of $1,200, he could not do anything more popular than to adopt this proposition as he adopted his policy in regard to sugar. There is no excuse for this in point of revenue, and the only excuse is that a few people are employed in the manufacture of this article. We were told by the First Minister a few years ago when we were discussing this question, and a member who had a rope-walk argued in favour of the duty on binding twine, "Certainly the member for Halifax supports me, and I support the member for Halifax who manufactures binding twine." I say it is very unfair to tax the masses for the sake of the few. If the hon. gentleman would ask the representatives of the farmers they would tell him that they would be prepared to board these twine makers in an hotel if the hon. gentleman would take off the 25 per cent. duty from binding twine. I think it has been shown that this duty should be taken off, and from our present prospects the condition of affairs is likely to be worse than it has been in the past, and we know that our farmers have paid nearly every cent of this protection to the manufacturers.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) and the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) should have arranged their arguments before they rose, because they do not agree. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) estimates the cost of binding twine at about 6 cents an acre to the farmers of Manitoba, while the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) said it would cost about 50 cents an acre to bind his crops.

Mr. WATSON. That was two years ago.

Mr. SPROULE. He said he could bind his crops by hand for about the same price. Now, I will tell my hon. friend from South Huron that in our part of the country last year you could get grain, whether wheat, oats or barley, cut by the binder and bound, including the price of the twine, for 90 cents an acre.

Mr. MULOCK. Does not the cost of cutting and binding by machinery depend somewhat upon the yield, upon the amount of straw that is produced?

Mr. SPROULE. The highest price charged in our part of the country to any farmer for cutting a crop, taking the crop all round, was $1 an acre, and many of them got it cut for 90 cents an acre, including the binding twine. The hon. gentleman says that it cost 50 cents an acre for the binding twine alone. Now, you can get grain cradled for 50 cents an acre; then how much will the farmer have left to pay for binding it by hand? Any one can see that the argument of the hon. member for South Huron will not bear examination. I think these hon. gentlemen ought to meet together and compare their arguments before they present them to the House, because they are certainly not in accord. Now, the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), in introducing this question, gave as a reason for taking the duty off this article that it was controlled by a combine; then he goes on to tell us that the National Cordage Company has bought out eleven factories in this country. What is the

National Company. It is a combine that controls the output in the United States; and if the combine then controlling the output in the United States has got the control of the output here in Canada, what benefit would it be to our farmers to take off the duty? I would like to remind this hon. gentleman that when a Bill was before this House designed to control these combinations and to stop their injurious operations in this country, many hon. gentlemen opposite were lukewarm on that question, and many of them opposed it because it came from this side of the House. Now, that Bill is on the statutes, and it is the duty of the Provincial Government to enforce that law. Have we found any of these hon. gentlemen, or their friends, or the Attorney General of Ontario, trying to enforce that law controlling these combines? Not a single effort has been made. In some of the farmers' institutes where this question has been brought up it was held that this Bill would be no use to control these combines—in fact, the Bill was rather ridiculed by Reformers present. Now, I say that if the output of this article is under a combine we ought to do away with the injurious influence of that combine, and give the article to the farmers of Canada as cheaply as possible. If it is a fact, as hon. members have assumed, that the Cordage Company have control of the production in Canada, taking the duty off twine would practically amount to nothing. Now, Sir, allusion has been made to the price of the implements that farmers use. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) says that by virtue of the duty the farmers of Manitoba and the North-West have to pay so much more for their implements. The hon. member for Huron also quoted the price of harrows, and the price of mowers and binders and reapers in this country. Now, it is a very strange fact that notwithstanding the duty, whatever it is, on these farm implements, the manufacturers of Canada are making them here and are putting them on the Australian market alongside the American manufactures, although the Americans are said to manufacture them so much more cheaply than we can. I have here a letter from the Mercer Bros. & Co., who are manufacturers in Allison, and although they have been in the business only two years they say they are able to put their implements into the port of New York for $160, F.O.B., and they tell how large a number of implements they sent to Australia last year, 300. They say: "We are amongst the highest exporters of these articles, either from the United States or Canada." Now, why are these gentlemen able to manufacture their implements so cheaply to-day as that they can compete with the Americans? It is by virtue of that very National Policy which was introduced a few years ago, giving the Canadian manufacturer the Canadian markets. And now they are competing in the outside world with the Americans, although the Americans can make implements so much cheaper; yet in the markets of the world, open to both Canadians and Americans, our manufacturers are able to hold their own, although they had a much larger distance to send their goods, for they shipped *via* New York, as the steamers had not then been put on from Victoria to Hong Kong, and they have sent their goods by the port of New York to Australia, and still they are able to compete with the American manufacturers. I think the Canadian farmer is not paying more for his implements than he would pay if the duty was

taken off. The hon. member for Marquette did not make a comparison between the price of the implements in Canada to-day, and the price in the United States, as he should have done; I think I am correct in saying that in almost every instance, taking into consideration the quality of the implements, whether it be a plough, or a binder, or a mower, they are sold just as cheaply in Manitoba and the North-West as they are across the line. In my section of the country there were two farmers, brothers, who went, one to Dakota and one to Manitoba, and no longer ago than last year I saw letters written by both of them, making comparisons as to the price of implements in the two countries, and there was practically no difference between the two, except that in the United States, when the implements were sold on credit, they had to pay at least 10 to 12 per cent. on the money, whereas in Canada only 8 to 10, and that was the only difference. It was in favour of Canada. That was the information these two brothers gave, and there is no reason to doubt the correctness of their information. I believe the more this subject is investigated the more we will be driven to the conclusion that the Canadian farmer is paying no more for his implements than the American farmer, notwithstanding the duty that is put on them. This holds with reference to binding twine. In our part of the country, last year, it was retailed at 10 and 12 cents a pound; that was the common price. The hon. member for Marquette gave quotations for different grades. He may be correct; I do not know; I have not had an opportunity to verify his quotations; but I know that it has been sold in Ontario for 10 and 12 cents. I do not know whether he gave quotations by the car load or by the hundred pounds.

Mr. WATSON. I gave it in thousand-pound lots, or over.

Mr. SPROULE. It is certain that American twine is sold at just about the price that it is retailed here. I do not see that our farmers are suffering much in that. I say this: that, if the output of that article in Canada is under a combine to-day we should rather direct our attention towards bursting up that combine, because, if the article is controlled by the same men who are controlling the output in the United States, taking off the duty would not accomplish the object.

Mr. WATSON. We could get twine from Great Britain; part of it came from there last year.

Mr. SPROULE. It is possible we might; but there is the same duty, I suppose, on twine coming into the United States that there is on that article coming into Canada; and taking the duty off between the United States and Canada I do not think would alter the price of the article very much. Certainly if the production here is controlled by the same men who controlled it in the United States they would still be shrewd enough to figure out a price that would cover the duty and give them a reasonable profit. Now, the member for Marquette has made some reference to the number of acres under crop in Manitoba—something like one million. The member for North York gave us some information about the County of Simcoe. I notice that the member for North York gave us the gross acreage under crop in the County of Simcoe, and he assumed that it would all be bound by binding twine. I would like to ask, if the farmers of Simcoe bind their grass, their clover and their pease—because part of the crops in Simcoe must be of grass, unless the farmers in that county follow a different style of farming from the farmers in our part of the country. I think his argument was just about as faulty as the argument of the hon. member for Huron. It is evident that they have not gone over this question carefully, and they have not presented such arguments as will stand criticism and stand examination by the practical farmers of this country, who have got to pay the price of the twine.

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

After Recess.

Mr. BAIN. When you, Mr. Speaker, left the Chair at six o'clock, the matter of binding twine was still under consideration of the House. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) made a reference, in passing, to the effect that it was desirable, before hon. gentlemen on this side attacked the policy of the Government, that they should first reconcile the position which they themselves occupied on this question, and he quoted a statement made by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) with respect to the cost to the citizens of Manitoba of the increased burden placed upon binding twine, and he drew a parallel from a statement of the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) respecting the total cost of binding twine in handling his own crop. I do not know how it appeared to the hon. gentleman, but no reconciliation was necessary in the matter. If I understood the hon. member for South Huron, he simply made the statement that it cost him, with his heavy crop, 50 cents per acre for binding twine. The hon. member for Marquette was not speaking of the total cost of binding twine per acre, but he said that the net additional cost in consequence of the 25 per cent. duty took out of the pockets of the Manitoba farmers 6 cents per acre over the necessary cost of that article. Under these circumstances, there is nothing to reconcile. The two statements are perfectly fair and compatible with each other. Again, my hon. friend took the ground that if, as the statements made seemed to indicate, the National Cordage Association on the American side has the control of the Canadian cordage companies, it was a matter of no consequence whether we had increased duties or not on the goods in Canada because they would be charged one price anyhow. That is a mistaken view of the question. We may assume, in the first place, that if American cordage manufacturers are under the control of one large monopoly they will at least see that the prices at which their goods are sold to American consumers are not lower than prices which will leave them a sufficient margin to carry on their business successfully. Then why should we in addition enable them to take 25 per cent. out of the pockets of the Canadian consumers for similar goods? Why should we not put ourselves upon an even basis, and then we would at least be on a level with the American consumer of these goods. There is another feature of this question to which I wish to direct the attention of this House, and it seems to point to this as being a settled fact, that the Canadian cordage companies have passed under the

control of this great American combination. The *Journal of Commerce*, published in Montreal only a few days ago, pointed to this fact, that for the first time the stock of the National Cordage Company of New York was listed on the Montreal Stock Exchange. If these facts do, as I think they do, point unitedly to one direction, I hold that it is time for the Government to consider whether the altered circumstances do not require some action on their part. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) argued from a protective standpoint that it was desirable that Canadian manufacturers should not be placed in a position of disadvantage as compared with American or other companies, and that the National Policy was inaugurated for that purpose. Under these circumstances, I ask if it would not be wise for the Government to revise their position, and either sweep away entirely the duty on binding twine or else place us in the same position as the Americans occupy under the McKinley tariff. The hon. member for York (Mr. Wallace) quoted approvingly the action of the American Government in the operation of the McKinley tariff, when they swept away the duty on the raw material of sisal and manila that hitherto American manufacturers had to pay. What has been the result of that action on their part? Parallel with that, they reduced the duty on the finished goods from 35 per cent. down to seven-tenths of 1 cent per pound; thus sweeping away, practically, the whole protection that American manufacturers had against the outside world. Yet our Government to-day, in the face of these altered circumstances, propose to maintain our tariff at its old rate of 25 per cent., with the raw material, as it always has been, free to Canadian manufacturers. I want to draw the attention of the House to another fact. If this binding twine manufacture was the whole of the production of our cordage companies in Canada then there might be some reasonable justification for discussing the propriety of maintaining the protection imposed for the purpose of enabling those industries to live and prosper. But if we look at it from a reasonable standpoint we will find that last year all the binding twine imported into Canada was of less value than $5,000, on which the total duty collected was less than $1,300. That is a mere bagatelle in the revenue of this country, and while the consumption of binding twine is a large and growing item to farmers, and to western farmers especially, it is after all only a small proportion of the cordage trade carried on by this great combination. I find, on looking at the returns of last year, that we imported cordage to the value of $73,000, on which nearly $15,000 in duty was paid into the public treasury. In addition we imported twines, hammocks and manufactures of twines to the value of nearly $50,000, and upon that sum we collected between $12,000 and $13,000 of revenue. These so far have been a substantial source of income to the Dominion Government, but the impost on binding twine was only a burden on the farming population of the country, without giving any corresponding benefit to the revenue. Under these circumstances, I submit that it would be only just and equitable for the Dominion Government to revise this whole question of the duties imposed on binding twine, so as to take this burden off the farming community. The last official census of 1881 shows that the rural population, as compared with the city population of this country, was 78 out of every 100. Why, in the name of common justice and reason, should 78 people be taxed at this rate when it yields practically no revenue to the country, simply for the purpose of enabling a small proportion of the other 22 to put additional money in their pockets in a branch of business that ought to be able by this time to stand alone. But there is another side to this question to which I wish to draw the attention of the hon. members, and especially the Minister of Customs. The importations of binding twine last year were very small. There was a circumstance that came under my attention that goes a long way to show the reason why the importations were very small. We have heard to-day the present prices of binding twine on the American side and on the Canadian side quoted against each other, and I think every one will agree with me that if the prices quoted prove anything, they establish that there has been a reduction to the American consumer in the cost of binding twine compared with a year ago, and that in this respect the reduction of the duty imposed on those goods has been followed by a corresponding reduction in the cost of those goods to the consumer. We have a striking illustration of that when the Government, notwithstanding their protest that they stood up independent in the face of all creation and that they were not influenced by anybody outside of this country, reduced the duty upon sugar, and followed suit the moment our American cousins reduced the sugar duties, and with the result that the Canadian consumer is getting sugar at a correspondingly lower price. I maintain that if you take this 25 per cent. duty off binder-twine, or at least reduce it to the corresponding position of the Americans, namely, seven-tenths of 1 cent per pound, the Canadian farmer will get his binder-twine correspondingly cheaper; and if the combination is on the part of manufacturers in the United States as well as in Canada, I will engage beforehand that that combination will see to it that the Canadian farmer does not get his binder-twine at such a price that they are losing money in manufacturing it. But, Sir, there was another difficulty in connection with this matter which came to my observation last year, and I will quote a *bona fide* transaction which took place through the Customs of this country. A merchant of my acquaintance in my vicinity, early last summer, bought a consignment of pure sisal binder twine on the American market, He bought it at 8¾ cents net per pound, and that was after allowing a deduction of half a cent, the rebate allowed on the exported article. Assuming that this binder twine had been passed through the Customs at that price, or even at 9 cents per pound, the result would have been that the twine would have been placed on the Canadian market for the Canadian farmer to buy at 11½ cents per pound, which would enable the merchant to have a good margin of profit upon his goods. When this merchant came to enter these goods at the Custom-house, what position did he find himself in? Instead of these goods being valued at 8¾ cents per pound, or 9 cents per pound, which would be an equitable charge, we find that they were valued at 14¼ for dutiable purposes. If they had been rated at 9 cents per pound it would have been a liberal allowance of increase when put upon our market, but we find that the duty, instead of

being $45 per ton, was $71.25, and the practical effect of this was that the duty, instead of being 25 per cent., was increased to 40 per cent. by this extra valuation of the Customs officials at the port of entry. At the very time that these Customs officials were valuing these goods for duty purposes at 14¼ cents per pound, that very same twine was being sold at Cleveland in the United States, by retail, in small quantities, for 13½ cents per pound, after all the various dealers had had their profits on it, and when it was going by retail into the hands of the farmers. Under these circumstances, need the House be surprised that the importations of binder twine are very low, or that the Canadian combine have been able to put their prices up so high. I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, one result of that operation. It is this: On the first of July when the farmer was launched into the busy season, we find the Canadian cordage combination again constructed solidly, and the first thing they did was to put up the wholesale price of their binder twine by one-half cent per pound. How did these prices compare last season? My friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) has quoted to us to-day the price of the composite twine he purchased at ten cents per pound. My experience, and the experience of our farming population is, that on grain which is green and heavy it is impossible to use the composite twine to any advantage, for the simple reason that it is thick and soft and is perpetually blocking the needle and getting the machine out of working order. The experience of our practical farmers is, that taking the cost of the various twines, from pure manila and pure sisal, down through all the various mixtures and grades, the highest-priced twine is the cheapest in the end, and for two reasons: one reason is that it is finer, and smoother, and harder, and it runs through the machine and through the needle with less trouble and less difficulty in catching and breaking. The second reason is that in the Province of Manitoba and the North-West Territories, where everyone knows the farmer is alert to handle his grain at the earliest possible moment it can be handled with sufficient ripeness to cut, these cheap-priced twines are utterly worthless for all practical purposes. One of our dealers last season compared the various prices of twines, with the result that the American sisal which was, as I said, purchased at 8¾ cents per pound would measure from 560 to 660 feet. The pure manila which our Canadian manufacturer turned out then and which was known as "blue ribbon" was sold at the same time for 15 cents per pound and ran out to 660 feet, and the composite and mixed twines ran all the way downwards at various ratios below this. I wish to draw the attention of the House to the position which the Canadian manufacturer occupies to-day with regard to this very same class of twine. One of our dealers has furnished me with the relative position of the Canadian highest grade manila twine this year as compared with last. The "blue ribbon" twine which last year was sold at 15 cents per pound and which measured up to 650 and 660 feet, is, at this season, sold at 13 cents per pound, but it only measures about 550 feet, or 100 feet shorter than last year. The secret of that is this: This combination are using the New Zealand article mixed more or less with this manila; it is a heavier fibre, and the result is that the farmer, while he is getting nominally the same grade of twine at 13 cents per pound is really paying as much as he did a year ago at 15 cents per pound. The American standard sisal has been imported this season and the duty paid on it, and it is being sold to-day at 10 and 11 cents per pound, according to the different grades offered on our market. I say that, under these circumstances, the Canadian combination have just had enough protection at the expense of the consumers in this country, and I submit that even on the lines of the National Policy—because I assume that while the National Policy is to protect the manufacturer it also assumes, to a certain extent, to give the consumer fair-play in the transaction—I submit that it is necessary for the Government to take some action now in this matter, and not leave this burden any longer on the farmers of this country. This tax yields no revenue to the Government, and I say that it is a standing discredit to the country, where 78 per cent. of its population are a rural population, that this tax should be allowed to exist without any gain to the revenue and simply for the purpose of enabling this large American National Cordage corporation to control our cordage manufacturers and put money in their pockets. I submit that if that is one of the fruits of the National Policy, it will discredit it in the eyes of the farmers of this country; and there is no longer any justification for maintaining that condition of things. Now, I say that the farmers are entitled to some consideration at the hands of this Government. It has been pointed out, in the course of this debate already, that in many of the rural districts of this country representatives have changed sides from the last Parliament, and that on that account the Government are here with a decreased majority. Under these circumstances, it would be only a graceful act on the part of the Government to place the farmers of the country in such a position with respect to binding twine that they would at least be on an equality with the American farmers. I heard it argued to-night, on the implement question—and I think we should not mix the two questions—that the Canadian manufacturers have successfully competed with the American manufacturers in foreign markets. I grant that; and why should not the Canadian manufacturer make as good an implement as any other man on this continent? Are we to be told that Canadian energy and enterprise are not equal to American energy and enterprise, and therefore that our manufacturers should fall behind their competitors in any part of the world? I want to call attention to one fact in this connection, which will not be denied by any hon. gentleman: that is, that both American and Canadian manufacturers of agricultural implements put their goods on the foreign market at a lower price than they sell to us at home. Under these circumstances our farmers require a little equity and justice. We do not ask for anything more, and we shall not be satisfied with anything less, in the matter of this duty on binding twine, which bears heavily on the farmer and brings nothing into the treasury. The importation of binding twine is practically impossible, because the 25 per cent. of duty applies to all grades. If the Government propose to retain any duty at all, they ought at least to put us on a basis of reciprocity with the Americans, and reduce the duty to seven-tenths of a cent per pound, or, better still, sweep it altogether out of existence, seeing

that it has now become a nuisance to the farmers if ever it was a benefit to the manufacturers.

Mr. STAIRS. Before the motion is put, I would ask the privilege of saying a few words on this question. I am afraid that some hon. gentlemen on the other side who have spoken on the subject do not know very much about it. It is a rather complicated question; but it is one of which I have had some knowledge since binding twine has been manufactured. Everybody knows that the manufacture of binding twine is the creation of possibly not more than ten years ago. Its manufacture in Canada was commenced about the same time as its manufacture in the United States. The company with which I am associated took steps to go into the manufacture of binding twine for our Canadian farmers. I may say that I quite appreciate the importance to the farmers of new countries like Canada and the United States, that they should be able to obtain their supplies of binding twine at a reasonable price; and I claim that its average price in Canada since it has been made has been as low as the price in the United States. Canadian manufacturers can, on the whole, I think, make twine as cheaply as American manufacturers. If there is any difference at all, it is so slight that it does not form an element in the calculation. Although matters during the last eighteen months, or perhaps two years, have become so complicated, owing to the consolidation of the United States manufacturers in a very peculiar way, as to make it rather more difficult at the present time to make a comparison than it would have been some years ago, yet I believe that even now, in the exceptional circumstances which exist, the prices of binding twine in Canada are no higher to the farmer than in the United States. I will show this more clearly a little later on. In the meantime I want to say a word or two in reply to the remarks of some hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for North Wentworth (Mr. Bain) has fallen into an error, unintentionally I know, in regard to what he calls "blue ribbon" twine, which he says was sold last year for 15 cents a pound and measured 660 feet, whereas the same brand sold this year at 13 cents a pound and only measured 550 feet. So far as I know, there has been no "blue ribbon" twine manufactured in Canada this year, all that has been sold having been the product of last year; so that I do not see how twine which was 660 feet long last year could be reduced 100 feet in length this year.

Mr. BAIN. I am quoting a Conservative dealer.

Mr. STAIRS. I cannot help whom the hon. gentleman is quoting. I am only quoting the facts. I have something to say in reply to some of the other hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) stated that he supposed that if American manufacturers could make twine and sell it at a certain price, Canadian manufacturers could do the same. As I said before, I believe this is the case in the main, although there may be exceptional circumstances which may occasionally produce a little difference in the price on one side of the line from the price on the other side. I am not going to make comparisons between the different prices of twine which that hon. gentleman mentioned, because I am going to show later on that when hon. gentlemen opposite compare the prices in Canada with those in the United States at the present time, they are not comparing prices in the same circumstances, but in totally different circumstances. The error into which the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) fell when he claimed that there was a duty on manila hemp in the United States of $25 a ton and on sisal hemp of $15 a ton, was pointed out by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), but I refer to it because a little later in his remarks he stated that on account of the duty the difference in price to Canadians was 4 cents a pound instead of 3 cents. I want to state most emphatically that no such difference exists to-day between the prices on the two sides of the border as 3 cents a pound. There is one remark which has been repeated by different hon. gentlemen opposite, and which is to the effect that the high duties on binding twine in Canada, are imposed for the benefit of a few millionaires. If by millionaires these hon. gentlemen mean those engaged in the manufacture of twine, I am sorry, Sir, to say that they are entirely mistaken; and I have only to mention the case of a gentleman, whose name has been referred to already this afternoon, and which, therefore, I do not mind mentioning again, to show hon. gentlemen opposite that in this respect they are entirely mistaken. I refer to my friend Mr. Morris, whose name has been mentioned with reference to the evidence he gave before the Committee of the House a few years ago. Any gentleman from Montreal, and any gentleman acquainted with commercial affairs in Canada, must know very well that, unfortunately, my friend Mr. Morris' investment in the manufacture of twine has not made him better off than when he commenced. I very much regret it, but it shows that the manufacture of twine has not been the great bonanza some hon. gentlemen opposite seem to think it is. It has been stated that the twine made in Canada is not as good as that made in the United States. I deny that altogether. The whole gist of the evidence from a large number of manufacturers of implements in the United States, who are conversant with the qualities of twine used in Canada as well as in their own country, is to the effect that the average make of twine in Canada for some years has been better than that made in the United States. There can be no question but that it is. I have heard that opinion expressed by impartial men, men, at the same time, well qualified to know what they were talking about. Now, I just want to say a word or two upon the general question. In the first place, I want to explain to the House that the manufacture of binding twine and cordage, in the United States has, during the last year or two, been in very exceptional circumstances. The company, which has been referred to here, the National Company, almost entirely controls the manufacture of this article, most unfortunately, I think, for the general interests of business, not only as regards the power of manufacturing twine and the prices at which it can be sold, but also as regards the facilities which have heretofore existed for procuring a supply of the raw material. This company has practically got complete control of the particular fibres which enter more largely into the composition of binding twine, so that it is difficult, indeed, for a small manufacturer to secure the raw material unless at prices that preclude his doing a profitable business. In the matter of sisal fibre, this is particularly proved to be the case. Every hon. gentleman will under-

stand in what a difficult position this state of affairs puts the manufacturers of binder twine. This company is so large, its interests are so widespread throughout the United States, its capital so extensive, that it is almost impossible for these small men to compete with it in getting their supplies. As a matter of fact, it runs the market up and down at will, and thereby makes it most unsafe for any other company to engage in the manufacture of these articles. I have had myself practical experience during the last few years of the great danger which has arisen through the manufacturers of twine in Canada endeavouring in the autumn of the year to secure a sufficient supply of hemp to manufacture the twine required for the coming season. Having to buy at that particular time, and to buy at very high prices, through the manipulations of speculators, and the market being subsequently lowered by similar means, these manufacturers have incurred very heavy losses. Then, as I have stated, in referring briefly to the manufacture of twine in the United States, this company has secured very nearly the monopoly in that line. They own nearly all the machinery running to-day in the United States in the manufacture of this article, and are in a position to sell twine at any price they like. The company is in the position of the Standard Oil Company, so that it is impossible for any competition to be started against it with any likelihood of success, and during the last year or eighteen months, this National Cordage Company has been selling twine at very much lower prices than it was formerly sold at in the United States some years before, and simply for the purpose of crushing competition. I wish to point out that the prices of twine existing in the United States to-day are not normal prices at all; and when hon. gentlemen take these priees and compare them with the prices in Canada, they are not fair to the Canadian manufacturers. Take the manufacture of cordage, the prices charged by the company in the United States to-day are not paying prices. One of the hon. gentlemen from the other side said that Canadian manufacturers could manufacture as cheaply as Americans. I believe they can, but they may not be able to manufacture and sell as cheaply as Americans, when the Americans are selling below cost, and selling below cost for a definite purpose, I am convinced that the prices at which different kinds of cordage are being sold in the United States to-day are not more than paying the labour it takes to make the cordage, leaving nothing at all for the interest on the plant, for the wear and tear, for the interest on the capital invested and the profit, so that cordage to-day is practically being sold in the United States at less than cost, and a great deal of twine is being sold on the same basis. I want to explain a little more fully what I referred to a few moments ago, when I said it was not fair to compare Canadian prices with those ruling in the United States, as hon. gentlemen who make this comparison are comparing two different sets of circumstances. The American prices which have been referred to in this debate and with which Canadian prices have been compared, are to a very large extent—and certainly this is entirely the case with regard to the prices given by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock)—the wholesale prices in New York, whereas the Canadian prices with which these prices have been compared, are list prices. Furthermore, the New York prices are net prices, while the Canadian prices are list prices, subject to a discount, in some cases to a very large discount—different discounts, of course, in proportion to the quantities given; and the Canadian prices are the prices at which Canadian twine is sold in Canada to-day to the farmers.

Mr. BAIN. Will you give us the wholesale prices?

Mr. STAIRS. No; I will not give you the net prices. I will give you the list prices, but it would not be fair to the firms to whom it is sold to give you the net prices.

Mr. WATSON. Are the prices quoted by the jobbers in Toronto correct?

Mr. STAIRS. The prices which are given to the farmer, and which the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) has compared with the manufacturers' prices in New York, should not be compared at all. I know that, while binding twine can be sold in Ontario for 10½ cents to-day——

An hon. MEMBER. What brand?

Mr. STAIRS. Crown brand.

An hon. MEMBER. What is that made of?

Mr. STAIRS. It is a mixed twine. I was going to point out to hon. gentlemen opposite that it is impossible to compare the prices of mixed twine, because that is such an indefinite article. Pure manila twine would be sold to-day at 13⅓ cents to the farmers in Ontario.

Mr. WATSON. How many feet of that would there be to the pound?

Mr. STAIRS. Probably 625 feet—whereas pure manila is sold in New York net in large quantities to-day for 11 cents per pound. I do not put forward these prices of manila as entitled to very great weight, because there is very little pure manila twine sold either in the States or in Canada. The principal twines sold are mixed twines, and it has been found by experience that they will do the work, if not quite as well, practically as well as manila for the farmers. I want hon. members to remember that these comparisons of prices have not reference to exactly the same things, and also I wish them to recollect that the circumstances which exist in the United States to-day are exceptional, and it is hardly fair to found any arguments upon them. It is not unlikely that matters will be very different indeed in another season, and you may find that the American prices will be very much higher than they are to-day. It is very difficult to compare the prices which exist from one year to another, because the prices of hemp from which these twines are made are subject to great variations. It may be only a question of months, sometimes, and the price of hemp may go up 2 or 3 cents a pound, and the manufacturer might be getting less for his goods than he did at the lower price. All things taken into consideration, I think the farmers of Canada have been fairly treated by the manufacturers of binder twine. A very large amount of capital has been put into the business. I know that an extra amount of capital was put in by the firm with which I have been connected in order to develop that industry for the benefit of the farmer. Last year about 600 tons of the composite twine

were used, and very satisfactorily used, in Canada, and if it does not work quite as well as the other twine, it has, at all events, the effect of keeping down the price of the other articles. I repeat what I said before, that I thoroughly appreciate the importance of the farmers getting the cheapest binder twine they can, and, taking the average of a few years, and not selecting one year in particular, hon. members will find that the price of binder twine has been less in Canada than in the United States. There is, therefore, no reason why the Government should take any action in the line suggested by hon. gentlemen opposite, and I think the resolution which has been moved should not receive the support of this House.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN. I have listened with some little attention to hon. gentlemen opposite who have addressed us this afternoon on the subject of binding twine. I will say, as a farmer, and I think that I understand as much about twine as any of the gentlemen who have spoken on the subject, and have used as much of it, and I have tried all kinds of twine, that I find no twine like our Canadian Halifax twine. I say above board, that I agree very much with the hon. gentleman from Wentworth (Mr. Bain) that the cheapest is not the best or the cheapest in the end. The first great principle is to get the best twine in the interests of the farmer, because, we are engaged in using it when time is valuable, and when anything which interferes with the reaper and the binder is a loss to the farmer. I was surprised at my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) who treated us with the same course of argument he used last December in South Victoria, when he preached blue ruin to the farmer. I, as a farmer, do not agree with that style of argument. I do not agree with the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). I think that he and I having succeeded in Canada as we have succeeded, having our herds and flocks about us and enjoying prosperity, should be ashamed to decry our country, and I would be the last man to say that the small trifle of twine which was produced here in Canada should make us pick holes in the National Policy, which is the national existence of Canada. What does it amount to? Three years ago I bought 1,200 pounds of twine, and I have some of it yet, and I harvest 300 acres of land. I have raised 80 bushels of oats to the acre, and it never cost me 50 cents an acre to bind them, and I think I grow as much to the acre as any of the western farmers. I think this matter is of too small importance and ought not to be entertained, and I will vote against breaking into the National Policy and the national interests of this country in this particular.

Mr. ROWAND. In discussing this question, as in some other questions which I have heard discussed in this House, I do not see why the National Policy should be trotted out at all. It seems that, whenever an advantage is asked for the farmers or it is demanded that the farmers should be placed on an equal footing with the other classes in this country you have to trot out the National Policy. Now, we have an admission from the manufacturers themselves to-night that the Canadian is able to hold his own against any other manufacturer. We have a gentleman who, I am told, manufactures binding twine in the city of Halifax, who says he is able to compete with the Americans. Now, we have the conditions alike in the United States and in Canada; we have the raw material in both countries free, we have just as cheap labour in this country as they have in the United States. Now, why should we have to pay more for our binding twine than they do in the United States?

An hon. MEMBER. We do not.

Mr. ROWAND. We do. It has been shown to-night we do. I would refer to the statement that was made by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), who says that American twine, with duty paid, is sold in Manitoba alongside Canadian twine. If you want any stronger evidence than that I do not know where you will go for it. Now, I am not going to speak as a manufacturer; I am going to speak as a farmer, and I will speak as briefly as possible on the subject. In regard to the cost of binding twine, it was stated by the hon. gentleman who spoke last, I think from South Victoria (Mr. Fairbairn), that he never consumed 50 cents worth of binding twine per acre in his life. Well, I have consumed that, more than that, and I have consumed a great deal less than that sometimes. I think myself that 2 pounds per acre of binding twine is a very fair average in this country. But when we take 2 pounds of twine we have got to take into consideration the difference in the article. My experience has been, and I have watched my neighbours around me whose experience is the same, that it does not matter very much what kind of twine we use, it just costs about the same number of cents per acre. The better kinds of twine, as has been stated by the hon. member for North Wentworth (Mr. Bain), I believe, are the most profitable. You lose less time with your machine, and seldom get into a snarl; you seldom break your thread, whereas the coarse twines do not run so well in the needle. In my county we pay between $8,000 and $9,000 in duty on binding twine. Now, I want some advocate of the National Policy to tell me how the farmers of Bruce get that $8,000 back into their pockets through the National Policy. It does not go into the treasury, at least only about $1,200, I think, altogether went into the treasury last year from binding twine used in the country. No, Sir, it goes mostly into the pocket of our friend who spoke here a short time ago, and others who are engaged in that business. We would not grumble so much if it went into the treasury, but it goes into the pockets of those gentlemen, and how it gets back out of the pockets of those gentlemen into the pockets of the farmers again, is what I would like to find out. We may be told that the duty does us no injury. That is not our experience. Our experience is that we are paying just 50 cents an acre for binding twine when we ought to be paying 44 cents. That is the condition of the matter. Now, some people are always talking about protecting the industries of this country; it is said that we ought to protect the infant industries. But in our experience in this country they never get to be anything else but infant industries and the longer they live the larger infants they get to be, and the more nourishment they need. Now, I claim that I represent the largest industry in this country, as a farmer. The farmers compose something like 78 per cent. of the population of this country, including those who depend upon them in our towns

and villages. Now, we do not ask for any protection, but we do ask that we have fair-play in this country. We want to buy where we can buy the cheapest, and sell where we can sell the dearest, without any restrictions being put upon us at all, and we are perfectly willing to grant everybody else the same liberty that we ask for ourselves. We are the largest industry in this country; we have the largest amount of capital invested, larger than in all the other industries combined, but we have the least protection and the smallest returns for the money we have invested. Now, Sir, I hope that the Minister of Customs or the Minister of Finance, will take this matter into his consideration, and if he does not feel disposed to throw off the whole duty and give us binding twine free—which I believe would be just as popular a move in this country as was the removal of the sugar duty a few days ago—if he cannot do that, let him at least put us on a level with the Americans.

Mr. GILLMOR. I was a little struck with a remark made by the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs). He said that the farmers in Canada were very fairly treated by the manufacturers of binding twine. Now, the farmers of Canada, numbering some millions, ought to be under great obligations to the five or six manufacturers of binding twine in Canada that they used them so fairly, that they are so generous to them, that they do not impose upon them. It is a most remarkable thing that the great mass of the people, the farmers and agriculturists, those who till the soil in all ages, have been under the control of a few folks who make binding twine. The slave-holders, the slave-owners, would get up and tell you that they treat those who till the soil well; they feed them well, clothed them well; they take good care of them and use them for their own benefit. The landlords of Russia used the serfs well, I suppose, those who till the soil in that country, and the landlords doubtless use their tenants well in Ireland, England and Scotland—the great mass of the people who work and toil and feed the world. And here comes up a gentleman, one of the half dozen manufacturers of twine in Canada, and talks about treating well the millions of independent toilers, and says they ought to be thankful that the manufacturers use them so well. He did not tell us anything about the combinations. He made a very learned speech about the difficulties that they had in getting raw material, but he did not tell us anything about what arrangement he had made in his manufacture, and how it was being worked now, whether he was in the combination, and how much he was getting out of the arrangement. There is the factory down in St. John; I do not know the prices, I do not live there, but the National Policy was instituted to give labour, to make employment for the people, and to create home industries. They boasted of a rope manufactory that existed for years and years, when you had no protective system, and furnished employment for a certain number of people, I cannot say how many. And where is it now? Is there anybody employed in the rope factory, or the binding twine factory, in St. John? The representatives from that city know—there may be; but I say that under this fostering policy, this National Policy that was to give employment, to make a home industry, they have shut down the factory, and the people had to go off and find food and labour somewhere else, and Mr. Connors is getting, I am told, $15,000 a year for walking about and doing nothing, and furnishing no employment. Who pays the $15,000 that goes to pay Mr. Connors, and who pays the $30,000 to Mr. Stairs? It is the men who are using binding twine, and the rope and cordage in this country. I say the farmers deserve no better treatment if they do not unite together and take charge of this country, and not allow a few combines to fleece them and enrich themselves at the expense of the bone and sinew of this country. I think that our friends are too modest in claiming privileges. Of course, I cannot go into the prices, but I know that the farmers who use binding twine are paying these men, and those who make it make enough to satisfy themselves and pay the others to shut down their manufactories, in order to give them a chance to do it. They talk about this tariff, and I have heard some of my friends on this side of the House admit that under a tariff for revenue, when you take off the duty, it lessens the price. A tariff means a tax for revenue or protection. Hon. gentlemen opposite boast about having reduced the price of sugar; but if they want to give free sugar, let them take off their protective tariff and the people will get 25 lbs. instead of 20 lbs. for a dollar. I do not give the Government credit for what they have done with respect to sugar. I admit the people are going to get a few more pounds of sugar for a dollar; but the Government are not giving these protected industries any less profit. It is true they allow sugar used in manufacture to come in free of duty, but the raw material that comes in free cannot be used by the people, and therefore it does not come into competition with the manufactured article. The people have now a taste of free sugar, and the National Policy is doomed. I remember reading the history of the repeal of the Corn Laws and the breaking down of the protective system in England, and the first breach made in the wall of protection was that of free sugar. And the people once having got a taste of free sugar will demand the removal of protection on the whole class of articles consumed by the people. The moment you remove the duties, goods become cheaper and the people get more for their money. Hon. gentlemen opposite are endeavouring to hold on to the National Policy; but, thank God, the people have got a taste of cheap sugar, and they want cheap food and clothing and the necessaries of life, and they will obtain them.

Mr. McNEILL. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat, that the people will very much approve of cheap sugar. They will learn a lesson from cheap sugar, and it will be one that will not tend to lead them to approve of the arguments advanced on the other side of this House to-night. The lesson they will learn from cheap sugar will be this, that during the period when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, when they were carrying out the policy which they advocate to-day, sugar did not get any cheaper, rather a little dearer; but when the National Policy was introduced sugar did become cheaper, very much cheaper.

Mr. MULOCK. Why?

Mr. McNEILL. Simply because we were not under the control of the combines, which hon.

gentlemen seem to admire so much, on the other side of the line. Sugar became cheaper when we manufactured our own sugar. Now sugar has become so much cheaper under the National Policy by reason of the prosperity brought on this country through the operation of that policy, and the Government have been able to reduce the price of sugar to such an enormous extent that hon. gentlemen opposite can hardly hold their tongues about it and barely permit the matter to be referred to for a moment. Nevertheless, the people have the fact that, by pursuing a system of fair protection to our own national industries we have succeeded, in this one very important article of sugar, in reducing the price to a most extraordinary extent. In the same manner we hope and believe we have reduced, and will still further reduce, the price of the greater number of articles we are manufacturing in this country. Agricultural machinery, to which reference has been made to-night, is another example of it. The price of agricultural implements, as everyone knows, has come tumbling down year after year. Hon. gentlemen opposite no longer say, as they used to tell us, that the effect of the National Policy was to enormously enhance the price of all articles, but they tell us they should be even cheaper still. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) told us that the people of the United States, in order to obtain control of our markets, are prepared to sell their implements to buyers who will bring them into Canada cheaper than they sell them in their own markets. What does this mean?

Mr. McMILLAN. I made no such statement. I did not state that the Americans were prepared to sell cheaper here. I enumerated different articles and stated the prices and showed the amount of duty paid.

Mr. McNEILL. Some hon. gentleman opposite made the admission, and it does not matter to my argument whether it was the hon. member for Huron or not. What does this state of things mean? It simply means this, that American manufacturers are paying the duty. American manufacturers, I repeat, in order to gain access to our markets, are prepared to pay the duty. If we remove the duty we would not be better off than we are now, because the American manufacturers would not have to pay the duty in that case to enter here, and the price paid would be that prevailing in this market. I suppose this argument, as applied to machinery, does not go down with hon. gentlemen opposite, but if I applied it to the case of horses sold to Americans it would no doubt be accepted. If an American were to say that he could buy a horse which would sell for $100 in the States in Canada for $70, and it was the duty that made him pay $100 when he got it from the other side of the line, hon. gentlemen opposite would agree with that proposition. But the same argument has been used with reference to machinery. So far as binding twine is concerned a great deal of fuss is being made over very little. It seems to me, further, that it is most astonishing that hon. gentlemen opposite can, one after another, talk in the way they do talk about the farmers of this country, as if they thought the farmers were such a wonderfully stupid set of people that hon. gentlemen opposite required to rise and pretend to be so wonderfully in earnest in defence of their interests. The farmers of this country are sufficiently common-sense people to know well that any Government whatever they may be, must consider the interests of the vast majority of the electors. Do they not understand that any policy which the Government adopts cannot be such a policy as is directly opposed to the interests of the enormous mass of electors? Any Government must consider the interests of the farmers, and it is absurd to say that any Government will consider the interests of five men in the place of two or three millions of people. Yet that is the buncombe which hon. gentlemen are talking to-night when they are endeavouring to persuade the farmers that the Government are considering the interests of five men rather then the interests of two or three millions. I wonder hon. gentlemen opposite do not consider, as I do, that it is impertinent to the farmers to talk to them in any such manner. What does the matter of binding twine amount to after all? The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Waton) told the House that the price of the best class of binding twine in Chicago, manila twine, was 12¼ cents per pound; and the junior member for Halifax, who is better informed on the question than any other member of the House, has told us on his responsibility as a member that the price of that class of manila binding twine in Canada is 13¼ cents per pound, or a difference of only 1 cent per pound.

Mr. WATSON. 1¾ cents, and there is a difference of 75 feet in the length of 1 pound.

Mr. McNEILL. I have quoted the figures of the hon. gentleman for the Chicago article, and I have quoted the figures of the hon. member for Halifax for the Canadian article. I am taking the hon. gentleman from Halifax (Mr. Stairs) as the representative of Canada, and the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) as the representative of the United States in this matter, and I say that the representative of Canada states that the price of this class of binding twine is 13¼ cents per pound. and my hon. friend to my right says that the price in the United States for a similar quality of binding twine is 12¼ cents per pound. You can only compare the same classes of twine, for the other twine is all a mixture, and it is quite impossible to compare mixtures when you do not know what the mixtures are. But here is a pure class of twine, and we can compare these two cases; and, so far as I have been able to gather from the discussion which has taken place here to-night, the price in the United States, according to my hon. friend from Marquette, is 12¼ cents, and the price in Canada is 13¼ cents.

Mr. WATSON. Give us the length?

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman told us himself, when he was speaking that he could not give the length.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Stairs can tell you.

An hon. MEMBER. 525 feet.

Mr. STAIRS. Do you refer to manila?

Mr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. STAIRS. About 650 feet.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. You said 625 feet before.

Mr. McNEILL. That is the twine which my hon. friend who interrupts me continually, sees is the same length as the American twine.

Mr. WATSON. The American twine is 693 feet.

Mr. McNEILL. There is a difference of 43 feet in favour of the American twine, and how much thinner it may be as compared with the Canadian twine, and how much inferior from being too thin we do not know. So far as I can see, as between those two classes of twine there is a difference of 1 cent per pound and 43 feet in length to the advantage of the American twine. That is the result of all this tremendous discussion to-night, and the cause of this display by hon. gentlemen opposite on behalf of the ruined farmers of Canada, because of the fact, even if it is admitted, that on this very highest class of twine there is one cent difference; and for the sake of saving that one cent per pound difference, hon. gentlemen opposite are ready to send out of the country the total of this 12¼ cents per pound on all the twine manufactured in Canada, and to give the benefit to the United States. They are ready to ruin the binder twine industry in this country for the sake of promoting the industry in the United States. It is the same way with regard to the agricultural implement industry, and with regard to every other industry in this country. On the very same principle the gentlemen opposite are prepared to stifle, and to ruin, and to trample under foot the industries of Canada which have been built up under this National Policy, and the industries which will continue to grow and develop under the National Policy, in spite of all my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock), and his friends on the other side of the line, may say or do.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). I do not rise for the purpose of making a speech, but I would take the liberty of asking a question which, if answered, would do much to clear up the minds of members of the House on this subject. I have a right to assume, and I do assume, that the mover of this resolution moved it in good faith, and from his standpoint he no doubt believes that its adoption would result in good. The chief argument he used in sustaining this resolution was a letter which he read containing a proposition from an American manufacturing firm to a firm in Canada, and which letter contained a request that the offer should not be made known to the Canadian twine manufacturers. If that was a *bonâ fide* offer, why was the request for secrecy made? If we could know why that request was made, I have no doubt that the answer would clear up the atmosphere a little.

Mr. MULOCK. The letter which I read was forwarded to me by a firm of binding implement manufacturers in Ontario. There was a letter sent to them by a Canadian dealer in binding twine, quoting the terms of an arrangement which he had made with the National Cordage Company of New York, and if the hon. gentleman desires to have the name of the manufacturer I will give it to him.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). I do not ask that.

Mr. MULOCK. I shall be quite pleased to give the name of the writer to him, or to any other hon. gentleman privately, but not for the purpose of the press. When I was asked for the name before I said I would give it to the Minister of Finance, and I am ready to do so still.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). Perhaps the hon. gentleman has not understood my question, or may be I have misunderstood his proposition. I asked him why that letter contained a reservation that the offer should not be made known to the Canadian twine manufacturers?

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman ought to be quite as capable as I am of drawing his conclusions, but since he cannot, I will. At present the Canadian manufacturers are selling, or were selling at the time of that letter—you must remember that I gave notice of my motion on the 1st May, and I have allowed it to remain in abeyance until to-night; I have not kept track of the markets of Canada on this subject, and, therefore, I am depending on others for information—I should judge from that letter that the writer concluded that the Canadian manufacturers were endeavouring to place their goods on the Canadian markets at an excessively high price, and this man had succeeded in supplying himself with the wherewith to supply the Canadian market at a very much reduced price, and he was anxious to promote a trade before the Canadian manufacturers came down to competition prices.

Mr. ROSS (Lisgar). I wish to correct the statement made by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson). He stated that the prices of agricultural implements and of binding twine were higher in Manitoba and the North-West than they were in Dakota. Such is not the case. The delegates who came over, and who are coming over all the time, from Dakota to Manitoba and the North-West Territories, representing farmers in the various counties of Dakota and looking out for another home in Canada, in order to leave Dakota, are arriving in Winnipeg every day. Some of them arrived there from Dakota last winter. They called on me in my office, and I secured for them the price lists of the various Canadian agricultural implements used in Manitoba and the North-West. I went to the different agents and got the printed price lists of the Canadian implements, and also the price lists of the American implements sold in Manitoba and the North-West. They, the delegates, had with them the price list of farm implements quoted for the farmers in Dakota. They compared these two lists in my office and in my presence, and they found that binding twine last year was quoted at precisely the same rate in Dakota as it was quoted in Manitoba and the North-West. In going over the lists further, they found, as far as they could make out, and as far as I could make out, that there were only two classes of implements sold at a higher rate in Manitoba than in Dakota, and these were American implements. On the other hand, we had four or five agricultural implements which sold at a lower price in Manitoba and the North-West than they sold in Dakota. Many of these delegates were Canadian farmers settled in Dakota for years; they came over to see what advantages, if any, we had on the Canadian as against the American side, and they were anxious to discover the advantages and disadvantages, so that they could represent them to their people. These delegates came to the conclusion on the whole that prices were cheaper in Canada than in the United States. There was a Mr. Cumming, a farmer who had been a Liberal in Canada who previously resided in Halton County, but who moved to Devil's Lake, in Dakota. He told me he had read a speech in the Winnipeg *Free Press* which was delivered by the member for Mar-

quette (Mr. Watson) a year or so before, and he expressed his surprise that any Canadian member of Parliament should have made the statements that gentleman did. He said that the hon. member for Marquette had given prices for agricultural implements in Dakota which were not the prices at which those implements were sold to the farmers there, and he said that the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) must either have been misled, or else he had quoted the wholesale prices instead of the retail prices, for the prices quoted were not the prices at which the farmers had to purchase these agricultural implements in Dakota. I object entirely to this continued acting as the hon. member for Marquette is doing—trying to represent to this House and the country that we in Manitoba and the North-West are suffering more than they are in Dakota. Such is not the case. People are moving from Dakota to Manitoba and the North-West in hundreds; at least 1,000 of a farming population have moved from Dakota to settle in Manitoba and the North-West this year.

Mr. WATSON. Will you give us the prices in Dakota?

Mr. ROSS (Lisgar). My recollection is that it is 17 cents for binding twine.

Mr. WATSON. The prices of implements.

Mr. ROSS (Lisgar). I had them, but I have not got them here.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I always listen with a great deal of interest to my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill). He is generally original, and generally very clear and concise in his statements, except when the National Policy is attacked or in danger; then my hon. friend falls into the old rut, and adopts the old fallacy of his friends in power. To-night he falls back on the old story of sugar and agricultural implements, and all the other things the farmer uses being cheaper under the National Policy than they were under the previous system. It is the same old story and the same old fallacy. These hon. gentlemen always keep in the background, carefully concealed out of sight, the fact that the prices of these articles in the markets of the world, have fallen at least one-half since the National Policy has been inaugurated. Take sugar, for instance, and I venture to say that it is one-half cheaper in Great Britain, and in all the leading markets of the world to-day, than it was in 1879. Most of the sugar-producing countries in the world have bonussed the production of sugar, the investments in it have been larger; greater enterprises, keener competition, and cheaper methods of production have all tended to reduce the price most materially. The fact is just the same with regard to agricultural implements and most other articles. I need not tell this House that the price of iron, the raw material used in the manufacture of these implements, has fallen one-half; and that improved methods of production and skill in working mines and in manufacturing, have all contributed to the fall in prices; and not one iota of the reduction is due to the National Policy. My hon. friend from North Bruce and all the other sensible men of that party know in their hearts that this is the case. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) opposes free twine on the same ground, he says, that he favoured free sugar. He says that in the case of sugar we admit the raw material free, and we do the same in the case of binding twine. Let us look at that for a moment. So far as sugar is concerned, it is true we have thrown the duty off the raw material; but what practical benefit is that to the farmer and the general consumer? You have to get a revenue, and if you throw the duty off one article, you must put it on something else; you are just shifting the taxes, and the farmer and the consumer will have to pay them; but they are not relieved one whit by the introduction of raw sugar. But with regard to the money which goes into the pockets of the manufacturers, which they ought not to have, which is direct robbery of the farmers and the other consumers to give them, they have more of than they had before. Under the present protection of eight-tenths of a cent a pound at least $1,800,000 is taken out of the pockets of the consumers, of which not one cent goes into the treasury, but every cent into the pockets of the refiners. That is what we complain of in the case of binder twine, which the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs), who is concerned in its manufacture, gets up and pleads for to-night. I think it would have looked as well if he had allowed others to plead for it, because he is not a disinterested, but an interested witness, and is not in a position to give a fair decision on the matter. Now, let us look at the conditions of the case. We use in this country 8,000,000 lbs. of binding twine in a year, and so little is imported that we only derive about $1,200 of revenue from it. I need not tell you that my hon. friend the Minister of Customs is very careful to get all the duty he can from what is imported. Some three years ago a Mr. McDonald, of Mitchell, undertook to bring in a quantity of binding twine. He had bought it in the United States at 7½ cents a pound, and he produced his invoice, expecting to pay the duty upon that price; but the Customs Department charged a duty, not on the invoice price, the actual price which he had paid, but on a valuation equal to what the manufacturers of twine in this country sold it for, namely, 11 cents a pound; in other words, they made him pay duty on 3½ cents a pound more than he had paid for the article. Now, suppose that the 8,000,000 lbs. of binder twine used in the country were valued at 10 cents a pound; if that were all imported, the duty upon it at 25 per cent. *ad valorem* would amount to just $200,000. Well, here is just how the matter stands. Our manufacturers, with equal facilities for manufacturing to those in the United States, with the raw material just as cheap, with the taxes just as low, with all the conditions for manufacturing just as favourable, have exactly $200,000 of protection. And where does that money go? Not one cent of it goes into the treasury. Now, the stand I take is this: The hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) said that we should not apologize in the matter, that we should not ask it as a favour. We do not. We say the farmers of Canada have been robbed long enough, that it is not fair to take $200,000 from them every year, not one cent of which goes into the public revenue, and put it into the pockets of five individuals. That is the ground we take. We demand it as a right, and the time is not far distant when, if it is refused now, we will get it.

Mr. DALY. I do not intend to take up very much time of the House, as, on a former occasion,

I have addressed the House upon this question, Nor do I intend to follow the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, because his statements are as extravagant as those of the hon. gentlemen who preceded him on the other side. I simply desire to confine myself to the question at issue, as to whether or not the motion before us should carry. I do not think any evidence has been adduced by hon. gentlemen opposite to satisfy my mind that the farmer has been injured in the slightest degree by the duty on binding twine. I showed to the House last session, in the speech I made during the Budget debate, the exact position in which our farmers stand with reference to this question as compared with the farmers of the United States. At that time I had received a letter from the Massey Manufacturing Company—a company which hon. gentlemen must admit is one of the largest concerns in Canada, and which is concerned very largely in the manufacture of binding twine. I will quote an extract from that letter, which, I think, will satisfy any unbiassed mind, that, at all events in 1889-90, the farmers of this country were not suffering from the duty on binding twine. They say:

"We certainly consider twine made by the leading manufacturers of this article in Canada to be fully equal and in some instances better than that made in the United States. The price of a standard twine manufactured out of half manila and half sisal hemp we believe is worth in Chicago to-day in wholesale consignments of, say, 100 tons, about 13½ cents to 14½ cents a pound, while pure manila is worth from 15 to 15½ cents a pound, with a discount of 3 per cent. for cash at ten days. It might possibly be a little higher than this now, but certainly not any less, as a rule; and we can vouch for the past two or three seasons that binder twine of equal quality has been retailed in the United States at a greater price than in Canada. To further substantiate the price named above, we enclose you herewith a clipping from the *Farm Implement News* published in Chicago."

I will read the clipping from the *Implement News* later on. They go on to say:

"You will notice that the lowest quotation made to us in 100-ton lots is 9 cents per pound f.o.b. cars, New York city. We might say for this same twine, which is being manufactured by the Dartmouth Ropeworks Company of Halifax, and which we are using a goodly quantity of, we are retailing to Ontario farmers, payable on the 1st day of October next, at 10 cents per pound, and in Manitoba delivered at farmers' stations at 13 cents a pound. The standard manila twine as indicated above, we retail in Ontario at 15 cents, and in Manitoba at 17 cents, which goes to show that we retail twine to farmers in Ontario at about the equivalent price as it is being wholesaled by the manufacturers and dealers in the States, and only a bare addition of 2 cents a pound, to cover the additional freight and expenses incurred in the Manitoba trade."

The following is the clipping from the *Farm Implement News*:

"The binder twine situation has not improved. Those whose interests are merged with the association, are persuaded that established card prices are bound to prevail a little later on in the season, on a basis of about 16½ cents for pure manila sold out of St. Louis. In support of this position they cite the fact that seventeen mills of the National Cordage Company have been sold, so as to permit the cleaning out of the old stocks. But the demoralization of prices goes on merrily in spite of all warnings and admonitions; and it is to be noticed that more cheap grades of twine than ever are offering. For instance, there has been a wonderful increase of the American and New Zealand hemp article, whose usefulness is claimed to be greatly advanced since the fibre is presented in single rather than in the three-ply form in which it went to the market two or three years ago. Furthermore, dealers complain that certain jobbers are having sisal made up on half-and-half, one-half being coloured to represent manila. In such circumstances the low price people are getting the lion's share of the trade going; but buying is, nevertheless, not to say active. The prices ruling for the business are about as follows:—Manila, 15c. in car lots, and 15½c. in less than car lots; standard, 13½c. and 14c.; hemp, 11½c. and 12c.; jute, 10½c., 11c. and 11½c. These are close, too, if they are not the lowest quotations obtainable by half a cent."

Now, the quotation from the letter of the Massey Manufacturing Company and the quotation from the *Farm Implement News* will indicate to any fair-minded man, that, so far as the farmers of Ontario and Manitoba are concerned, they were getting manila, in that year, at a lower price, or, at all events, as cheaply as it could be got in the United States. I communicated with the Massey Manufacturing Company this year, in connection with the very motion before the House now, and they wrote me as follows:—

"Your favour of 4th instant received, informing us of the item that Mr. Mulock has on the motion paper in regard to putting binder twine on the free list. The question as you put it to us is rather a difficult one for us to answer, as the conditions of the trade given varied so much during the past year or two, and we would briefly state the facts as they just now present themselves to us. Last season binder twine was sold in Canada at 1 to 2 cents per pound less than it was in the United States, unless it might be in some of the States where the crops were poor. And with the anticipation of raw material being cheaper for this season, the manufacturers and dealers in twine unloaded their stocks at prices below what it actually cost them; raw materials have been greatly reduced during the past six months, and raw material being placed on the free list now in the United States, the Government, we believe, has promised the manufacturers on that side of the line a rebate equivalent to the amount of duties they have paid on the raw material on all sales that they have made of the manufactured article, up to a given date; and as they carried over a very large quantity of high-priced material, with the duty added on it, they are doing their best to unload, and believe that prices are generally quoted lower just now than they are in Canada. But everything being equal, we believe there would be a very little difference between the prices of Canadian manufacturers and those of American manufacturers. To cite an instance, we would say that last season when we were retailing a twine here to the Canadian farmers at 10 cents per pound, freight and duty paid to their nearest stations, and for which we accepted their paper payable 1st October following, we could not buy the same article in the United States in lots of 100 tons, f.o.b., New York, for less than 9 cents per pound cash; whilst we believe the same twine is being retailed in the United States to the farmers at 10 cents per pound, and which will be the price obtained for it here this season. Surely farmers do not want their twine cheaper than this. If they do, some one practically will have to be robbed, in some shape or form. We also believe that a large quantity of inferior material is being used in the composition of twine, with manila and sisal hemps, and coloured so as to prevent detection; these fibres being a very cheap class of goods of course assist to reduce prices on the other side. * * * *

"We have bought a considerable amount of twine in the States for export and would refer you to the National Cordage Company of New York, the Elizabethport Cordage Company of New York, the Boston Cordage Company of Boston, all of which are reliable houses."

Now, the data given in that letter will convince any hon. gentleman that, so far as the farmers of Ontario and Manitoba are concerned, up to the present they have not been affected by the duty on binding twine; but I am given to understand that the National Cordage Company of the United States, which is referred to in the communication of the Massey Manufacturing Company, has made some arrangement with the binding twine concerns in our country; and it may be that in the course of another year our farmers may be injured by the effect of the duty. They may be injured by this combine brought about by the National Cordage Company of New York, because the effect of that combine will be that all the binding twine manufactured on the American continent will be controlled by that company. If this motion

were to carry to-night it would not affect the price of binding twine to our farmers in the slightest degree, since all the wholesale purchasers have laid in their stocks long ago and no doubt the majority of the prudent farmers of Manitoba have also purchased their supply: but if it be true that the National Cordage Company have made this arrangement with the concerns in Canada, the Government will no doubt take this matter into serious consideration. I have myself laid the matter before the Government, and I hope sincerely that the views which we have placed before the Government will have sufficient weight to induce them to take this matter into serious consideration, and, if the existence of the combine made by the National Cordage Company is going to raise the price of binder twine to the farmers of Ontario and Manitoba, I hope the duty on that twine will be thrown off during the next year.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know that I should have troubled the House after the full discussion which has taken place, if it were not for the way in which the administration of the Customs Department has been animadverted upon by some of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken. They seem to have forgotten that there is a law on the Statute-book, and that it is the duty of the Minister of Customs and his officers to carry out that law rigidly and to the letter. They seem also to have forgotten that the provisions which are now in the Act were in force when they sat on this side of the House and sustained on every occasion the gentlemen who then controlled the destinies of the country. It is not very often that I have to complain of any remarks of my hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor). I have often said that he was one of the most consistent free traders in this Assembly, and I think he exhibited that to-night, but he forgot his own conduct when he supported the late Administration. When they came into power, the Finance Minister imposed a specific duty on tea—an article which the people had been consuming for some time free of duty—of 4 cents a pound on green and 3 cents a pound on black. I think my hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) supported the proposition of the Government of that day in that matter. Not satisfied with that, the Finance Minister, with the aid of my hon. friend, increased the duty on tea to 6 cents and 5 cents a pound respectively. If my hon. friend could thank the Almighty for free sugar, and could state that, having once had the taste of that sweet article in their mouths, the people of Canada would never again allow a duty to be placed upon it, surely he ought to have remembered that other article, occupying a somewhat similar position to that of sugar, and I do not see how, after his solemn prayer, he could have given his support to the imposition of a duty upon an article which is a prime necessity just as much as sugar is.

Mr. FOSTER. He was not converted then.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, he was just as ardent a free trader then as he is now, but the difference was that he was then on this side of the House and had his friends to support instead of being, as he is now, on that side of the House and having his opponents to oppose. A good deal of fault has been found with the manner of carrying out and imposing the duty on binding twine, which applies, I may say, with as much force to any other article imported into this country. The gentlemen who have spoken know well that the provision of the law is that the value of an article for duty when imported into this country is the price of the article at which it is sold for home consumption in the country from which it is exported. Knowing that to be the case, is it fair, or I may say is it honest, to abuse the administrators of that law for enforcing it rigidly and to the letter? Let me ask these hon. gentlemen, especially the Finance Minister and his colleagues who then occupied the positions we fill to-day, if they did not try to enforce the law as rigidly as we do now? Perhaps I am putting that a little too strong. I will ask them if they did not issue instructions to every collector and Customs official throughout the Dominion to enforce the law as rigidly as it has been enforced by this Administration? The only difference between these gentlemen and this Administration was this: They gave instructions for the enforcement of the law, but they never carried it out; we, finding the law on the Statute-book, not only gave instructions to the collectors to enforce it, but we have steadily, at all events from the time that I have occupied the position that I do now, seen that the law is enforced. If the law is wrong, it is in the power of Parliament to change it. My hon. friend from South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) is not as fair as he usually is in the case which he gave to illustrate his argument this evening. He informed the House that a Mr. McDonald in the West had purchased binding twine at a certain price, and that the Customs Department, in enforcing the law, had compelled him to pay a duty on a higher price—the difference, I think, between 7½ cents and 11 cents a pound. The hon. gentleman is right, but we had the best evidence which we could possibly obtain that 11 cents or 11½ cents was the price it was sold at in the American market for home consumption, and it was therefore our duty under the law to enforce its provisions. It was found, however, after full investigation, that, from the time of our issuing the order instructing the officials to collect the duty upon 11 cents, and the time when he purchased, it had fallen in the market, and it would have been only just and fair, and much more honourable, if the hon. gentleman had stated that, after a full investigation had been made, an investigation which was the result of sending an official from Canada to the United States for the purpose of ascertaining the facts, the amount which he had paid over the price at which it was sold at the time he purchased it in the United States, was refunded to him. That is the policy which has been pursued by the department in the administration of these provisions of the Customs Act. Now, when my hon. friends opposite were in power, they were just as ready and anxious to enforce the law, and upon almost every stump they told the manufacturers of this country that they were enforcing the law in precisely the same manner in which it has been enforced by the present Administration, of which the supporters of our predecessors are now complaining. I have here a speech delivered by the late leader of the Government, the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie, at Sarnia, on the 11th October, 1875, when he said:

"The complaint of Canadian manufacturers has been that this (United States competition) has made what is called a sacrifice market for their goods, and no doubt it has been productive of great provocation to our manufacturers and injury to the trade of Canada."

Having made that admission, he went on to say:

"That the policy of his Government was never to permit United States manufacturers to introduce their goods into this market at the valuation at which they were willing to sell them.

When he used the expression "the valuation at which they were willing to sell them," that was when they were selling their goods for export at a much lower rate than they were selling in their home market for use in that country, so that, no matter how much you may complain at the present moment of the administration of the law, you supported it when your friends were in power, and I venture the prediction that, if unfortunately that party crosses to this side of the House, you will do the same thing in the administration of the Customs Act, unless, forsooth, you adopt your unrestricted reciprocity resolutions, when you would have no Custom-houses to look after. One hon. gentleman complained that we had drifted from the question before the House into a general defence of the National Policy. Well, I am not prepared to say that that sin lies at the door of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House.

Mr. LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BOWELL. My hon. friend has drawn altogether a wrong inference from my remarks. I say that there was scarcely a member on his side of the House who has spoken to-night who did not attack the National Policy in almost every particular, apart altogether from the question of binding twine, and it scarcely lies in their mouths to find fault with us for defending, on this side, a principle which we have steadily sustained and voted for during the last twelve years, when that principle had been attacked by hon. gentlemen opposite. When I used the expression that it had not been mooted on this side, it was not with the intention of leaving on the minds of the House the impression that we were not prepared to defend it, and to defend it successfully. Now, so much has been said upon the question of binding twine, that one can scarcely go into the arguments without repeating something that has been said. As the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) has pointed out, we have heard so many conflicting statements from hon. gentlemen opposite that it reminds me of an anecdote that was told of an eminent English statesman. After the Cabinet had discussed a question in Council and had come to a decision as to what course they intended to pursue when they went to Parliament, one of the Ministers asked the question: "Is this to raise the taxes upon the people or is it to lower them?" "I am not particular which," answered the Premier, "but be sure to tell one story when you get outside the Council chamber." Now, it seems to me that when those gentlemen make a general onslaught on one particular item of the tariff, it would be just as well for them to meet together, and agree upon some story to tell in order that they might not present the spectacle they have presented to-day of telling half a dozen different stories, and coming to about a dozen different conclusions upon the one subject. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) told us that it cost him 50 cents per acre for binding twine, and his statement was verified by the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Rowand). So far as I can remember to-night, the highest price that has been paid, according to hon. gentlemen opposite, for binding twine imported into this country, has been 14 cents a pound. Now, 2 pounds of twine would be sufficient for an acre of ground, and the hon. member for Bruce admitted that it was, notwithstanding that he had just informed the House that it cost him 50 cents an acre. That would make the value of the twine 25 cents a pound. Now, I leave that little bit of difference to those hon. gentlemen to settle among themselves. It is only one of the absurd I was going to say, but I do not desire to be disrespectful—it seems to me one of the absurd statements that have been made on this occasion. The hon. gentleman from Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) also told us that the farmers had been robbed of $200,000 upon the binding twine they had used in one year. If that be the case, then it would imply that the full amount of 25 per cent. duty which is imposed upon the article, had been added to the value of it. Now, we have heard over and over again statements made here to-night, and the most indubitable evidence given that such is not the case, that, in fact, binding twine has been sold in this country in some cases at a less price than it was sold in the United States; and if you sell in Canada at the export price, and you calculate the duty upon the price at which it is sold, and then add it to the price paid by the importer, you will find that it was not higher in Canada than in the United States. Do you want an illustration of that? I have a statement before me in which, I think, that principle is very well illustrated. Senator Vest, in discussing the question of combines in the Senate of the United States, gave a table of prices for export and for home consumption, and if you take the prices given by that gentleman, you will find that if you add the 35 per cent. to the price at which the article is sold for export, you then get it cheaper than you would if you had your—I was going to say, unrestricted reciprocity, but I believe you have abandoned that altogether and now call it "continental free trade." If you had continental free trade, then, there would be no necessity, nor would there be any inducement for the manufacturer in the United States to lower his price, and the Canadian farmer then would have to pay the whole price, the price at which it is sold in the home market, plus the freight, to that portion of Canada into which it was imported. Now, I will prove this, although it has no bearing upon this particular question. As I said a moment ago, I do not desire to enter into the general question of protection or free trade, or the success or non-success of the National Policy, but I think there are arguments sufficient, and there are facts in abundance to show that the farmers have not only been provided to a very great extent with a home market for their products, but they have purchased their articles as cheap and cheaper than they did previously to the introduction of that policy, proportionately to the price.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Put on more tax.

Mr. BOWELL. We have heard that taunt so often that it is a chestnut that is baked almost to a crisp. The hon. member for Middlesex made use of the same argument in discussing the question of sugar. He said that my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill) was not fair because he did not point out the fact that the price in the country

of production of that article was much lower than it is to-day, arising partially from the fact of the Government having given bounties for the production of sugar. But if he had taken the tariff as it was left by hon. gentlemen opposite when they left the Government and applied it to the price of sugar at the present day, and applied the present tariff to it, sugar would be dearer to the consumer than it is under the present tariff.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, I make that assertion, and it is quite susceptible of being proven. I have gone fully into that calculation; I have taken the price of sugar in 1878-79, I have applied to it what is termed the Cartwright tariff, and if you take the price of sugar to-day under the tariff as it existed before the reduction was made on the 24th of last month, I repeat the statement that if you apply the tariff of the late Administration to the sugars which would be imported to-day under the tariff which was in existence before the 24th of last month, the people would have paid more for their sugar than they did under the present tariff. Now, let me come back to this statement of Mr. Vest. I find that he gave two statements, one regulating prices for Canada and the United States, and the other the price of the articles which were sold to South America. They are very strange. I find that a plough when exported to a foreign country sold for $9, but when sold for home consumption the price was $18. In another kind of plough the difference was between $4 and $8. If we take mowers, there is a difference as between $40 and $65. I admit there is great disparity in these prices. But if you take the first article, a plough at $9 and add 35 per cent., which is $3.15, you will then have the plough laid down plus the freight, at $12.15, being $5.85 less than the price at which it is sold in the whole market. But apply the law as it exists on the Statute-book and impose the duty upon the $18, then you would have the article at a less price than that at which the American farmer could buy the same article. If you carry the principle through the whole of the list, except in one or two items, you will find the result precisely the same. For instance, take a feed cutter No. 3 at $60, and add 35 per cent., or $21, the total would be $81, or $9 less than the price when sold to the home consumer. But if you impose a duty on the $90, which is the price at which it is sold in the home market, even then it will cost only $1.50 more than the home price. So you may carry the principle from the smallest article even to the highest, and it is that principle which is contained in the provisions of the Customs Act to which I have called the attention of the House. Apply the principle of continental free trade, as advocated by the leader of the Opposition, or the unrestricted reciprocity theory of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), or the still more ridiculous theory of the hon. member for North Norfolk, and every consumer in this country would have to pay, not the price at which the article was sold for export, but the price at which it is sold for home consumption in the United States, plus the freight.

Mr. CHARLTON. Will the hon. member explain what the theory of the hon. member for Norfolk is? I should like to have it defined.

Mr. BOWELL. The theory of the hon. member is rather enigmatic—chameleon-like is a better term. I have heard the hon. gentleman from this side of the House make one of the most convincing and able protective speeches ever delivered here. I have heard the hon. gentleman on that side of the House say that all he said on that previous occasion was wrong, that he had been converted since then, and he thereupon made a free trade speech. I have heard him tell the people that every cent of protection put on an article was paid by the consumer. I have read speeches delivered by him in which he told the people that every cent that the Americans placed on articles exported to Canada was paid by the consumer. Talk about his theory or his policy, it is as changeable as the weather and as variable as the hue of the chameleon. Every one knows that it is so, not only on the question of protection but on everything else. The hon. gentleman is an ardent and thorough equal righter. He carries out his principles admirably, particularly when he applies them to the question of a commercial policy. He is everything to everybody and anything to anybody. I have never known a single question discussed during the time he has had the honour to occupy a seat in this House, on which he has not made a speech on the opposing side. He is a free trader in grain, but a protectionist in wrecking. He has a reason for that. He is a protectionist in coasting, and is a free trader in logs, which he exports to the United States. What his policy is I do not know. The leader of the Opposition when he crosses the floor and becomes Premier will find that the hon. gentleman is fit for any position into which he could put him. There is no conceivable question which he is not able to discuss and defend; but unfortunately for him, and I fear it will be very unfortunate for the leader of the Opposition, when leader of the Government, he will never be able to convince the people of this country who read and think, that he is honest. He is quite prepared to defend the hon. gentleman here as his leader; here he falls down and worships him. When he gets abroad, where he thinks a different position will be more popular, he denounces that hon. gentleman because he belongs to a certain race and a certain religion. He can embrace even the "machine politicians" when he sits here, but out in the country he is so honest he condemns them all. Yet he asks me, with that coolness characteristic of the hon. gentleman in everything he does, what his policy is. Well, I do not know. I leave that to the future, when he gets into power.

Mr. LAURIER. By-and-bye.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman says "by-and-bye." The speech the hon. gentleman for North Norfolk will make after I sit down will not be the speech he would make if he sat here, or the speech he would make before another audience. He will change as rapidly as it is possible for anyone to change. I do not propose to press this discussion further. We had the question raised by the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) as to what constitutes the raw material.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the question before the House?

Mr. BOWELL. That is what I have been trying to find out. I believe the question is whether binding twine should be placed on the free list or not. We have drifted off into every subject that one could conceive or think of. I leave it to the House to say whether the attacks on the admi-

nistration of the Customs are warranted under the facts or not. I leave the House to judge whether binding twine has cost more to the people of the country than it would have cost if there had been no duty placed upon it. A point was tried to be made by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) as to the number of feet in a pound of twine. Every one who has given any attention to the subject knows that the number of feet is exactly in proportion to the strength of the fibre out of which it is made. If it is a pure manila there will be a greater length than if it is composed of sisal and manila, and if of sisal it will be still less. A composite article, a new discovery, is being manufactured, which will be a much cheaper article, and one equally strong. Such are the claims put forward; but whether that proves to be the case or not I am not prepared to say, further than that the information I have is that such will prove to be the case. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) put the question fairly before the House. The Government are always alive to that which they believe to be in the interests of the consumer as well as the manufacturer. Whenever they found that the salt industry was controlled to such an extent as to become at all burdensome to the people they took the first opportunity to reduce the duty. And if it be true that the American combination for the manufacture of twine has or is about to secure all the cordage factories in this country and keep up the price, then it will be the duty of the Government to see how far they will go in regulating it, in order to prevent the colossal fortunes to which hon. gentlemen have referred being made by the manufacturers. But supposing that to be the case, supposing the statement to be true as made by hon. gentlemen opposite, that the combination is so great and that it is shown that this combination is about to purchase all the cordage factories in this country, it will make very little difference to them whether the duty is taken off or not. If they can control the market in Canada by controlling the manufacturers, and at the same time control the market in the United States, it will make no difference to them whether the duty is twenty-five per cent. or whether it is nothing, for they will exact from the people of this country just as high a price for the binding twine as if there was no duty at all. Any one who thinks for a moment will see that this must be the effect of a combination of this kind. However, I do not fear that combination, because I am much of the opinion of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs), that the industry, the perseverance and the wealth of our own manufacturers is sufficient to enable them to carry on the work in this country as successfully as they have done in the past. My hon. friend from Huron (Mr. McMillan) has given a better illustration of the benefit of the continuance of the industry in this country than any member on this side of the House has given. He told us that this combination was of such a character that they paid one of the manufacturers in Portland, which is now a portion of St. John, a large sum of money in order to shut up his factory, and that the result of that was that some ninety people had to seek employment in foreign countries or somewhere else. Now, if the combine in the United States has shut up one factory and thrown out of employment ninety people, thirty of whom I presume were heads of families, then at the rate of five to each family it would give us a hundred and fifty persons, and the other sixty would make a total of two hundred and ten persons who were deprived of means of support in that city, simply because one small factory had been closed. Upon the same mode of calculation, if all our manufactories were closed down how many people would be thrown out of employment in Canada, who are to that extent artisans that they understand the manufacture of rope and cordage, and who would have to seek employment in the United States where the large cordage factories are. If you make the same calculation, the farmers of this country would lose at least from 1,500 to 2,000 people whom they now supply with food from their surplus products. I suppose this is what my hon. friend desires. I believe that the closing of our different factories, in this country would be to compel the artisans who had learned trades, and who had worked in factories, to go to these countries, and to the factories where the business to which they had been brought up was carried on. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan), the farmer who produces so much from his land, would then have to send his products to that country in order to feed the persons who had left Canada; provided of course that the United States farmers did not produce sufficient to supply them, and from the statistics we know that the United States in every section, from one end to the other, produce more than is necessary for the consumption of its own people. Under these circumstances it is questionable how far that market would be of any benefit to those who are now raising cereals on their farms which they cannot sell at home.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am sure we all listened with a very great deal of pleasure to my hon. friend the Minister of Customs in his laboured and involved defence of the policy of the Government. I scarcely know myself what the hon. gentleman has been aiming at, and I should hardly have spoken to-night if he had not succeeded in offering some remarks with regard to myself, which I should term insulting if offered outside the floor of this House. The hon. gentleman has treated us to a wonderful display of eloquence; he reminds me of a ballad which I read once, and which describes the struggles of a Mississippi steamboat on a sand bar:

> "She hove and sot and hove and sot
> And high her rudder flung,
> And every time she hove and sot
> A wusser leak she sprung."

The hon. gentleman got himself on a sand bar, and then he got into deep water, and I doubt very much if he himself comprehended what he was trying to explain to the House. He referred to the policy of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, he referred to the policy my hon. friend the lieutenant of the leader of the Opposition, and he referred to the still more ridiculous policy of myself, and when I asked him to define what that policy was I do not think he succeeded very well. However, he did succeed in making some remarks in reference to my course which I feel bound to allude to. The hon. gentleman's charge with regard to inconsistency is one that I think perhaps he had better have employed some other man to have made. I remember the time, Sir, when Orange deputations came down here to urge upon the leader of the Government of that time the propriety of appointing that hon. gentleman to a position in

the Cabinet, and I remember, too, that on an occasion when one of the principles of his order were at stake, he basely deserted them and proved himself to be an unworthy ex-grand master of the order he was supposed to represent here.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is not the Minister of Customs sorry he spoke now ?

Mr. BOWELL. Both these statements are not true.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. Minister of Customs, in the course of his speech, made allusion to the fact that I deemed it proper to defend the policy of the Government with regard to "wrecking," and he could not even admit that I had acted in that matter honestly. He could not admit that I had pursued a policy in advocacy of any feature of the Government policy that I could be commended for, and he attributed to me base motives in doing so. I assure the hon. gentleman that it will be a long time before I will go out of my way to advocate or defend anything that he may advocate again. Then he refers to the question of the export duty on logs. He has travelled over a wonderful lot of territory and a great many degrees of latitude and longitude in his speech to-night. He referred to the log question, and he says that I am in favour of free logs, whether I am a protectionist or not. I think perhaps the log question is one that the hon. gentleman might just as well have left alone. He has been an ardent supporter of the export duty for many years, yet he and his colleagues last fall very wisely dropped that duty, and they dropped the duty because the American Government made it an object for them to do so. The McKinley Bill made it an object to the extent of a dollar a thousand to the pine interest of this country to drop that useless, exorbitant and unjustifiable duty, and I hope now that having dropped it they will have the wisdom to leave it where it is, because if they put on the duty again they will find the American Government adding the Canadian export duty and the American former import duty and leaving the Canadian lumbermen to pay $4 a thousand instead of $1 upon lumber.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman alluded to my past course upon the protectionist question. It is true, Sir, that I came into this House, nineteen years ago, with protectionist principles. It is true that as late as 1875, I urged upon my hon. friend the Minister of Finance of that time, the propriety of increasing the duty to provide for the deficit and to satisfy the protectionist sentiment in this country. But, Sir, I advocated no such system as has been since adopted. The degree of protection I advocated was 20 per cent, an increase of 2½ on 17½ per cent.—not an exorbitant degree of protection, in fact, simply a revenue tariff. Now a man may be consistent through his life and he may not; a man may have weak moments in his past life. Even so bright and shining a light as my friend the Minister of Finance told us the other night that he had changed his views, and that in a moment of weakness he once did what he now declines to do: that he once voted for a prohibition policy, but he would not do it now. It may possibly be that I knew less in 1876 of political economy than I knew five or six years afterwards, when I devoted myself to the study of the subject. I came into this House educated a protectionist. Just as a man receives his religion from his forefathers, I received my political economy from my instructors. But in 1876 I sat on the Depression Committee of this House, and in the revelations made before that committee, before which manufacturers and sugar refiners were examined, I saw the hollowness of the pretensions put forth by protectionists. I saw that the whole scheme was one designed to rob the people for the benefit of the combines; and I changed my opinions on the question of protection. I acknowledge freely that I once entertained opinions on this subject that I do not entertain to-day. I believe in the truth of the saying of Carlyle, that the only consistent animal is the jackass, for he never changes his opinions; and if my hon. friend the Minister of Customs has that kind of consistency, I have nothing more to say. Any man who claims to be so consistent as never to have changed his opinion is a human donkey. We must live to learn. The man who sees no reason for modifying his opinions in the course of a long life is a man who does not investigate questions or arrive at conclusions. I profess to be a man who has arrived at conclusions. I have a policy to-day, and my policy is to strike the shackles from trade, to give the overtaxed people of this country better markets for what they have to sell, and to enable them to buy more cheaply. My policy is to increase the prosperity of Canada, and all the sneers and jibes which my hon. friend makes against that policy I throw back in his face.

Mr. BOWELL. I am glad you have told us. We never heard it before.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have laboured to impress on my somewhat obtuse friend what this policy is, but he does not seem to have comprehended it. I will at some other time endeavour to make it plainer to him than ever.

I have one more remark to make. I did not rise to discuss this question, which has been fully discussed already. I may say, however, that it is absurd that five or six men should have power to tax the farmers of this Dominion for their own benefit; and I say it is a disgrace that any Government should become the tools of five or six men for the purpose of enabling them to plunder millions by the creation of a binding twine combine. With regard to the allusion of my hon. friend to something which I said some two years ago with reference to the leader of the Opposition, I have a word or two to say. I did give expression to the opinion that the Liberal party of this country would be better with an English leader than with a French leader. It was merely a matter of opinion as to the availability of a gentleman who was the leader. I expressed no opinion with regard to the character of the leader. I do express an opinion now; I have expressed that opinion before on the floor of this House; and my opinion is that the character and the qualifications of that hon. gentleman fit him in the most eminent degree to be a successful leader. I have always held that opinion of him, and I see fit—for I am not a thoroughly consistent man you know—to revise somewhat the opinion I expressed two years ago with regard to the availability of that hon. gentleman; and I express the opinion to-day that he is the most available man as the leader of the Opposition, that he is the strongest man we have for a leader, and I gladly accept him as the leader of the Opposi-

tion. So much for the inconsistency, if any exists, in the opinion I once expressed that an English-speaking leader would be more available than a French leader, as contrasted with the opinion I express to-night that we have got the right man in the right place.

Mr. DAVIN. I am glad to see that hon. members are anxious to arrive at a division on this question, and I will not for any length of time stand between them and that division. But I should like to say one or two words on the twine question as well as on the general question that has been raised. Now, my hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) spoke with the most extraordinary enthusiasm in regard to the reduction of the duty on sugar. He thought that was the opening of the sluice, and that the flood of the free trade would afterwards pour in. Well, Sir, that has been dealt with very ably by the hon. Minister of Customs. He has referred to the time when the friends of the hon. member for Charlotte were in power, and when they put a duty on tea, and he has told us how the hon. gentleman remained mute in his seat at that time. These hon. gentlemen, and especially my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), speak as if this were a free trade question. They know very well that if parties were to cross this House they could not give free trade to this country. They know very well that they might have to deal with the tariff, but they could only modify it in a certain direction; and when they talk in this vague way about free trade they are simply talking to please the ears and deceive the judgment of the people; they are not talking sound sense or anything they could fulfil if they came in. Now, I will ask the House to bear with me while I read a few words from the speech of the hon. member from North Norfolk, which has been alluded to by the hon. Minister of Customs. He did not merely state in that speech the creed he had learned from his forefathers; he was not talking as a young neophyte emerging from the paternal home with all the innocence of youth on his brow; he was talking as a man of mature years, and he gave the reasons of the hope that was in him. In that speech he said:

"What is the foreign commerce of that country compared with the vast domestic trade that goes on increasing without the fluctuations or risks of foreign trade. Look at the progress of the cotton trade in that country. Previous to the import duties on foreign cottons in 1824, British manufacturers crushed out all efforts to establish factories in the Republic; but the imposition of 25 per cent. duty on foreign cottons had the effect, in a few years, not only of building up manufactories, but led to the production of an article better in quality and lower in price than the Americans received from British manufactories before their own industries were established. In 1860 the United States were exporters of cottons, exporting nearly 10 per cent. of the whole amount manufactured. The same way with the iron trade. All attempts to establish iron industries were crushed out by foreign competition, and high prices were maintained at intervals—higher, on the average, than the percentage necessary to produce them in the United States at a profit. But when a protective duty was imposed, iron manufactories were established, and in a short time the price of iron was brought down several dollars per ton, and it is now sold cheaper than the British iron ever was offered for on that market."

After some other remarks, the hon. gentleman said:

"Why is it that we are so desirous of selling to the United States articles of food? It is simply because they have by protection built up manufacturing cities with a numerous population that consumes not only the vast products of their own country, but also afford a better market for our products than we in the Dominion possess."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Raw cotton especially.

Mr. DAVIN. I understand by that that the hon. member for Bothwell, as the hon. member for Norfolk has lapsed into free trade, is coming over to protection. Is that what I am to understand? As I understand this twine question, it seems to me that the Government has been taking in regard to that a course perfectly consistent with their policy as laid down on National Policy lines. As the hon. Minister of Customs says, if it should be found that any harm is being done, any given duty can be modified or taken away but what have we heard here to-night, and what is it those who are conversant with the facts have been impressed with? Why, you have a vast company of great wealth, with great designs in the United States, the National Cordage Company, established—for what purpose? To lay hold of every cordage factory in the United States. They are reaching over their claws of monopoly into Canada, and suppose the hon. Finance Minister had taken off the duty, what would he have been doing? He would have been playing into the hands of that monopoly, and instead of doing anything for the advantage of the farmers he would have been betraying the farmers into the hands of that monopoly; whereas by helping, in accordance with the very reasoning of the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), the farmer, that is to say, by giving a chance to our own cordage manufacturers here to fight against this monopoly, he has really been acting in the interests of the farmer. Should that Cordage Company come over here and seize our cordage factories, then will be the time for the Finance Minister to act. When it is once seen that that monopoly is stretching its upas shade, not only over the United States but over Canada, then will be the time to act in accordance with the principles those of us who uphold the National Policy have always held. We do not hold to the cast-iron theory that you should put a duty on everything, but that you should put a duty on the things we can manufacture successfully, and not only manufacture successfully, but sell cheaper in consequence of that successful manufacture. The hon. member for Middlesex spoke to-night on this subject, and I could not but be reminded of the remarks he made with regard to one of his leaders, the hon. member for South Oxford, two years ago. The hon. member for South Oxford, last year, and two years ago, and four and five years ago, just as he has this session, talked in gloomy tones, "in hues of earthquake and eclipse," whenever he spoke of the farmers of Canada. Then the hon. member for Middlesex spoke as follows:—

"Neither do I advocate this measure on the ground which, I am sorry to say, has sometimes been taken, that the farmers of this country are a poor, miserable, half-starved class, that cannot live without it. Any such statement is a libel on the farmers of the Dominion. Considering the industry of our farming population, the intelligence and the skill they bring to bear in their profession, it is impossible under any circumstances they can be any such poor miserable class as——"

As was described in other years and this year by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). The hon. member for Middlesex continues:

"I repudiate the idea altogether."

We have the sons and brothers of those farmers in the North-West. Is it to be supposed, for one minute, because you may be sure they keep an eye

on prices, if they were paying more as compared with the prices in Dakota for binding twine, I should not have heard a complaint? I have never heard in my constituency one word of complaint as to the price paid for twine. We have had, within a few weeks, in Regina, a large number of farmers from Dakota, who were interviewed as to the prices of things in Dakota and Regina, and they declared that, with regard to all things the farmers use on their farms and in their business, down to the clothes they wear and the food they eat, the prices in our North-West compare advantageously with those in Dakota. A great deal has been sought to be made out of this, and it has been somewhat suddenly put before the House as though to strike a blow at the National Policy, but I think the scheme has totally failed. My hon. friend and colleague from Marquette (Mr. Watson), who takes great interest in this question, has had letters from manufacturers and dealers in binding twine, and has specimens of that twine, but he has completely failed to prove to me, and, I think, to satisfy the House, that there is any excessive price charged to the Canadian farmers. What sort of evidence did he give us? He gave us a letter from a dealer in this twine from Chicago. That man knew very well it was a Canadian member of Parliament who wrote him. In fact, my hon. friend was kind enough to show me the letter, and no doubt he would have no objection that I should repeat the postscript asking "that you should call on me when you went back." This man knew that my hon. friend was a guileless Canadian member of Parliament, who wrote to him to know what the price of binding twine was.

Mr. WATSON. Do you deny the accuracy of my statement?

Mr. DAVIN. Not at all, the figures were accurate. What I mean is this, that that man would naturally put the prices at the very lowest figures he possibly could, even lower than he would like to sell at as a rule, because his obvious object would be to try and get an entrance for his goods into Canada. I know, in my own experience and that of my constituents, that the thing has been done. They have sent for prices to Chicago, St. Paul, and prices have been quoted which, when compared with prices actually paid by the people in the States, did not at all correspond. My hon. friend takes prices given him in Toronto and compares these with prices given him by a gentleman in Chicago. I say, Sir, that you can place no reliance whatever on that comparison. The true comparison will be to take the farmers in Dakota, to take the farmers in the country districts around St. Paul and around Fargo, and to ask them what they paid for binding twine, and then to ask the farmers around Winnipeg and Regina what they paid, and I venture to say that those on the other side of the line did not get their binding twine for 10 cents as my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) said he was pleased to get it. The fact is that these Dakotans who, as my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Ross) has said, are coming over to the North-West by hundreds, and I hope by thousands—at all events, it is the first sprinkling of a shower which will pour from Dakota into those territories—declare themselves satisfied that not only is the land better, but that all the conditions of life are better in the North-West Territories than they are in Dakota, and if there were a difference in any one item they would have dwelt upon it. I did not intend to take any part in this debate, but as it took a wide range, and as the North-West Territories were especially referred to, I thought I would say a few words and, at all events, give my honest impression as to how this question affects the North-West.

Mr. WELSH. My hon. friend seems to think that, by keeping the duty on binding twine, we are benefiting the farmers of the Dominion, and that by taking it off our farmers would not get their binding twine any cheaper. I think that is a very erroneous principle. We were told that the removal of the duty on sugar would not enable our people to get their sugar any cheaper, but directly the Finance Minister removed that duty the people got their sugar 2 cents a pound cheaper; and I say that, if the duty is taken off binding twine the farmers will get it 20 or 25 per cent. cheaper, and no man of common sense in this House will dare to deny it. My hon. friend here (Mr. Davin), with his plausible manner of putting things, would make black white or white black, but, when you come down to a hard matter of fact, when you look at it from a business point of view, you will see that if you take the duty off the people of the Dominion will get the benefit of it. The amount of $3,000,000 was taken off sugar, and that amount ought to go into the pockets of the people who use that article, and, if you take the 25 per cent. off twine, it will be a great boon to the farmers, who will get the benefit of it, and if you take the duty off everything else, the cost of living will be so much less, and the people of Canada will benefit so much more. I am opposed to this protection or National Policy system from beginning to end. We were told that this National Policy was to be only a question of a few years. Sir Charles Tupper said, give us this National Policy for two years and we will obtain reciprocity. That was endorsed and sworn to by every hon. gentleman on that side. Well, what do we find? We have had that policy now for many years, and it is getting worse and worse. They say: We will nurse these industries, and then the duty will be taken off. It seems to me that they want a great deal of the bottle; they want a great deal of feeding. I think we should take the bottle from them and let them get their food some other way. I am surprised at my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Davin), representing as he does a farming community, and I think this is a great burden on the farmers who use binders and reapers.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. WELSH. My hon. friend laughs. Is he a farmer? I am told he is a lawyer. Well, he can find a way to put money into his pocket without putting a duty on twine. I think the farmers have been hoodwinked long enough, but they are getting their eyes open. I buy a good deal of binding twine, and it is a heavy tax on a farmer to have to pay $30 to $40 a year for that. I go on the principle of buying in the cheapest market. I am opposed to all the taxes which injure the farmers. The least the Government could do would be to take off this tax. According to the blue-books there is only a thousand dollars collected in the way of revenue, but how many thousand dollars have the farmers paid? That does not go into the

treasury but into the pockets of the manufacturers. I support the motion of my hon. friend that this duty be taken off.

Mr. MULOCK. I was not at all surprised at the remarks which fell from the hon. gentleman from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) or at the remarks of any of the representatives from Manitoba. If this were the first occasion on which I had listened to them, I would have been surprised, but, when I remember their attitude on the monopoly question, when they stood, as they said, by their country and opposed railway competition in that part of the country, and when I again hear them to-night defending an institution which they know in their hearts they should not defend, or at least I would give them credit for sufficient intelligence to know that, I see that it is only history repeating itself, and I am not surprised. The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) read a letter from Mr. Massey stating that he could supply the article from Canadian manufacturers as cheaply as it could be got from abroad. In 1888, this same Mr. Massey gave evidence under oath, and he is reported in Appendix No. 3 to the Journals of 1888, volume 22, page 354, to have said on this subject:

"We can buy the same material that is sold here, the same finished twine, from the Americans, paying a duty of $1.79½ per 100 lbs, cheaper than we can buy it in Canada. On that we pay the duty."

He could afford to import American twine, paying the freight and duty, cheaper than he could buy it in Canada.

Mr. DALY. That is three years ago.

Mr. MULOCK. That is true, but I am afraid that the same condition of affairs obtains to-day. My hon. friend shakes his head, but he stated to-night that he had been privately making representations to the Government that he believed this combine was going to enhance the price of twine, but he is going to wait until the blow falls, he is going to wait until his constituents suffer, and then, when he cannot help himself, he will give an unwilling consent to relieving the people of this burden. When the Minister of Finance threw off the tax on sugar, he said he was giving back a large amount of money to the people. What did he give back to the people? It is true that, in that case, the whole amount did not go into the pockets of the manufacturers; some went into the treasury; but it was pretty much in the same position as this manufacture which we are now discussing, and to this extent he made an approach to a free trade basis and thus lowered the prices to the consumers. I can undertand a gentleman like the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) defending this tax and I can partly understand the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), and I can partly understand the member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), defending this tax. And why? It is true that they represent, in a sense, rural constituencies, but I am afraid they are losing some of their sympathy for the people whom they represent. I am afraid the few votes and speeches the hon. member for East Grey has made in the line of the speech he made to-night, account largely for the reduction in his majority, that has fallen from 400 to under 20. He came here a few years ago defending this National Policy up to the hilt, and he barely acquired a seat in this House at the last election, although he represented a constituency overwhelmingly strong in sympathy with the party he belongs to.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to see you come up there and run me?

Mr. MULOCK. I am satisfied to draw conclusions from the last race you ran. The hon. member for North Bruce as well represents what he thought was a safe hive at the time, a rural constituency, but why has he turned his back upon the farming community of that district? Is it because they refuse to endorse him in his restrictive policy? Is it because he has in the past resisted all propositions for the amelioration of the farming community? I fancy if the vote was analysed it would appear that he too has been losing his hold on the people of his riding, and that his reduced majority is about the same, I believe, as that of the hon. member for East Grey. He too fails to show that sympathy which he ought to have for the great farming community of the country. But, Sir, when I listen to the hon. gentlemen, one and all, I find running through all their speeches, an apology for their action, and they seek to take shelter behind the arguments of the hon. the junior member for Halifax. As I said before, I do not wonder at his attitude; I would be surprised if it were otherwise. But I think that the farming community ought not to depend upon one whose interest it is to crush them, or to oppress them, for that is what protection to him is doing to them.

Mr. WALLACE. Oh, oh.

Mr. MULOCK. If the indescribable noise that the hon. member for West York has just given expression to, is the best argument he can advance, he must certainly have a very weak cause. The hon. member for Halifax stated that the manufacturers of twine in Canada could manufacture cheaper than could those of the United States. If that is so, on what principle is it that he demands an additional price for the wares he has to sell to the people of Canada? He further said that the price in the United States to-day was cheaper than in Canada, but other hon. gentlemen who wish to follow his lead and keep up the tax, refuse to accept him as a witness in regard to that point. It is true he offered to assign a reason for the lower price in the United States, but, nevertheless he stated the price there was lower. The Minister of Customs, however, has advanced a new doctrine. He says that the United States manufacturer sells to the foreigner, to the Canadian, cheaper than he does to the American, and that is the effect of a protective policy; so that the country that is protecting its own people is protecting them to the extent of supplying cheaper goods to these abroad than to these at home. Now, let us apply that rule to Canada. The people of Canada, we will suppose, protected as they are, seek to establish a foreign trade; according to the reasoning of the Minister of Customs, they must sell their goods abroad cheaper than they sell to the people of Canada.

Mr. BOWELL. Does that follow?

Mr. MULOCK. It must follow, and it does follow. The hon. gentleman from Halifax tells us that his company proposes to embark in the foreign trade. I read in the *Citizen* to-day a telegram from Halifax stating that this cordage company proposes to take advantage of the cheap labour of Canada to

supply the foreign market. Protection, then, according to the hon. gentleman's doctrine, comes to this: If the protected country developes a foreign trade, it must be at the expense of its own people. The protected country supplies the manufactured article to outsiders, at a less price than to the people at home; therefore cheap goods are supplied abroad at the expense of the people at home. Now, I would like to have had the hon. member for Halifax give us some further information in regard to these combines, and, before this debate is closed, I shall call upon him to tell exactly the position of the matter. He told us a great deal about the comparative prices here and there, but he failed to tell us anything about the organization of this Canadian combine. I am told that there has been a combine; I am told that the National Cordage Company, indirectly, under another name, has acquired control of a great many of the twine manufactories of Canada. I would ask the hon. gentleman, does he know if that is correct or not?

Mr. STAIRS. If the hon. gentleman asks me for information, I will tell him that that is a question which I am not going to answer. It is a question concerning my own business, and I am not bound to give him an answer. I will only tell him this, that half the reports and half the statements that he has made here to-night are incorrect.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. gentleman specify?

Mr. STAIRS. I have already replied to them.

Mr. MULOCK. I understand that the hon. gentleman is the president of the Canadian Consumers Cordage Company of Canada. Is that a correct statement?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MULOCK. I am perfectly in order in what I am saying, and in what I am about to say. I want to show that when arguments are advanced to the people of Canada in order to induce them to approve or disapprove of a certain course or policy, it is due to the people of Canada that we show what interest the person has who uses those arguments. If the hon. gentleman, for example, or any hon. gentleman, is deeply interested in this trade, it is but right that we should know that he is so interested. It is not a dishonour for him to have an interest, I am not finding fault with him for having an interest, but it is material to know what his interest is, in order that we may know what value to place upon his arguments. If, for example, to put a suppositious case, the hon. gentleman is now president of that cordage company that is extending its ramifications throughout the whole of Canada, endeavouring to capture every factory where binding twine is made—and understand that that has been accomplished, or is about to be accomplished—if he is the president of that company, I would like to know whether the farmers' representatives in this House are content to follow his lead, when he asks the House to maintain his privilege. If that is not his policy, let him rise in his place as a man and say so. It is due to us before we have this vote that he should tell us exactly the truth on this question. The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) says that we ought to wait for a year, to give this company one year longer to plunder the people of Canada—perhaps two years. I say it will not do to leave our constituents at the mercy of a voracious

institution for two seasons longer, no, nor for one season. The member for Selkirk says it is too late to grant relief this year. I deny that. The farmers have not yet bought their supplies. I gave this notice on the first day of May, and I waited patiently, week after week, hoping that the Minister of Finance would see and act upon it. I let it remain quietly, trusting that he, in his own judgment, having taken the advice of his friends, would do as he did regarding in the sugar question—come down like a man and deal with it. But we have now arrived at a late period in the season, when the farmers are just about putting their binders into the fields, and it would be postponing it too late to give them relief if I did not, on this occasion, press my motion. Up to this present moment, I believe, the farmers have not bought their supplies, and if we pass this resolution to-night, to-morrow morning, as certainly as the sun rises, so certainly will the price of twine fall by the amount of duty that is taken off. The hon. gentleman seems to think that there are no manufacturers in the world but in the United States. Where is their regard for Great Britain? How is it that they cannot remember that it is the greatest manufacturing country in the world, that binding twine is made in Great Britain, and on the continent; that binders are to be found all over the world wherever grain grows. Let us take down this tariff and we will give relief to the mother country, and we will have the satisfaction then of supplying ourselves with British-made twine instead of doing what we are doing to-day, transplanting an American institution from the United States to Canada. I protest against such a monoply being established in Canada for the aggrandizement of its proprietors, even, although it has for its mouthpiece a member in this House a supporter of the Government. I have now done my duty in calling the attention of the House to this proposition, and I hope the House will approve of the resolution.

Mr. FOSTER. Before this debate closes, I desire to say a few words, and they will be very few, on the subject which has been so long discussed. I, for my own part, would have been one of the first to welcome a fair, a candid and exhaustive debate upon the question under discussion with a view to the instruction and information which would be evolved therefrom. But I cannot say that any desire like that on my part has been very much gratified by the tone and tendency of the larger part of the discussion on this subject to-night, for it seems not to have been entered into with a view of getting at the rights of the case, at the facts in the case, so much as to use it as a party engine in a partizan way against the Government and against the supporters of the Government. There would have been a great deal of advantage to be gained if it had been carried on in a fair spirit. But I suppose it is almost too much to ask that that be done by hon. gentlemen opposite, considering their long toil, their long struggle and the fruitless outcome of that struggle against the principles which were dear to the people and have been sustained by the people on three or four different occasions.

Mr. LANDERKIN. But in a moment of weakness.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps in a moment of weakness, and perhaps in other moments. I want,

in the first place, simply to point out the unfair methods of argument which have been used, to point to a few of the statements which have been made, and made just lately, by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. I want to ask the fair and candid sense of this House what difference in the world it makes whether a man is rich or poor, whether he is a dissenter or a churchman, whether he is a Protestant or a Catholic, whether he is a manufacturer or a farmer, when he rises in his place in this House and places an argument before it. Is not the argument to be weighed, and not the man's circumstances or surroundings? I say the hon. gentleman never did a more unfair thing, and never, to my mind, did a more despicable thing in a political point of view than when he attempted to influence——

Mr. MULOCK. I rise to a question of order. The hon. gentleman has no right, in my opinion, to say I did a despicable thing.

Mr. FOSTER. I will state it again.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think the expression in the sense in which it was used was unparliamentary, but I think it should be withdrawn.

Mr. FOSTER. I will withdraw it with very great pleasure, and will substitute another. I never heard the hon. gentleman use a more unworthy argument than he has just used, when he attempted, not to prejudice the minds of hon. gentlemen here, because that cannot be done, but when he attempted to prejudice the minds of the people by using the insinuation that my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax was interested, largely interested, and stood up in his place in this House on account of the interest he had in it. Why did he not attack the facts and arguments of the junior member for Halifax? Why did he not show that what he said was untrue, badly based, that his arguments were not fair or his conclusions were not well drawn? The hon. gentleman did not attempt to do that, but he used another kind and a more unworthy kind of argument to catch the minds of the people by appealing to their prejudices, and saying: There is the monopolist; of course he wants your taxes. Do not look at the arguments, do not weigh the truth, do not take even balance and weigh fairly the arguments that are made. Oh, no, do not appeal to what is fair and reasonable, but appeal to the *ad captandum* argument, appeal to the prejudices, appeal to the most unworthy part of the audience to which you can appeal. I leave it to this House to say if the junior member for Halifax made any pressing argument in favour of the present duty. I leave it to this House to say if his statement is not as fair and unbiassed as any one could give. He made nothing but a business-like statement of facts, and he did not go to the length of pressing his arguments in favour of the continuance of the present system. I say it would have been infinitely fairer and better for the hon. gentleman opposite to have met his arguments, which he did not in one single case attempt to do, than to attempt, as he did attempt, to prejudice the people against my hon. friend and against us in this matter which we are discussing. After having shown that, I wish to present another of the arguments. The cloven hoof came out at the very first, it showed as plainly at the last. Is this an attempt to deal with the subject of binding twine alone? No; it is simply using that as a sort of means of getting at something else, and it came out in the last part of the argument of the hon. gentleman, as it came out in the first part. It is an attempt to tear down the fiscal policy, the National Policy, which this country has reaffirmed time and again. This is the attack; but hon. gentlemen opposite have learnt wisdom from circumstances and from adverse circumstances too. They have dashed themselves with their strength, but puny strength it has proved to be, against the people's wishes and against the progressive spirit of the Canada of to-day, and they have dashed themselves against it in vain. Having been thrown back in 1882, having been thrown back in 1887, and having been thrown back but a few months ago, they have learnt wisdom, and they come up to the attack now by these by-ways and alleys with a pretension of immense sympathy for the poor farmer. They attack the great subject of binding twine, and if they can only make a breach in the wall in this respect, they will do it. Why? Because they want to undermine the whole foundation, and to pull down the walls that this country has built after so many years of persevering toil.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. Hon. gentlemen opposite may interrupt me, but they are walls of protection for the best interests of the people in a material, in a social, and in a trade point of view as well. So that this is an attack on the whole system, an attack veiled under a specious expression of sympathy for a suffering class in one particular, and one particular alone. The hon. gentleman used another specious, but not a good argument, and it was not a very true one, I think, as based upon fact. He stated that the junior member for Halifax declared that they manufactured this twine cheaper in Canada than in the United States, that they were able to do it. I did not so understand my hon. friend. I understood him to say that Canadian manufacturers could manufacture this article as cheap, or nearly as cheap, as the people of the United States could manufacture it. That was the statement made, and it had its weight and its direction, but the hon. gentleman misquoted the statement. He misunderstood it, I dare say. However, he used the statement in a very different sense from that in which it was used by my hon. friend. He endeavoured to create the opinion abroad—he could not create it in this House, because this House has gone through the whole discussion, and this is a sensible business House—but he endeavoured to create the impression in the country that raw sugars and binding twine stood upon the very same level, and he endeavoured to point the argument and to catch the people with it: that because the Minister of Finance recommended that the duty on raw sugars should be taken off, the Minister was inconsistent if he did not take the duty off—not from the raw material out of which binding twine is made, but from the manufactured product itself. Sir, therein lies the very essence of the difference between gentlemen on this side of the House and gentlemen on that side of the House. Therein lies the very essence of the difference between the two policies. Hon. gentlemen opposite, if they carry out to their logical result their preachings upon this and upon other points in their programme, and their statements upon the tariff and the fiscal policy as a whole, would undermine the entire

system and policy of protection as we have used it, and been benefited by it in this country. Sir, it is consistent for us to take the duties off raw materials, and to-day more than one-third of the total imports of this country are free materials, most of them are raw materials which are used for the purposes of manufacturing, and for the benefit of this country in that way. We believe we might just as well manufacture these articles in our own country, and pay our own labour for making them, and build up our own homes and villages, and towns and country places as well, by the making of these things in our own country, as to be always hewing wood and drawing water and sending the money that we make in some way or other off to a foreign country, to pay for the making and the labour and the product of these commodities in these foreign countries. That is just the difference between our policy and the policy of the gentlemen opposite, and when we took the duty off raw sugar we put into the hands of the people just that amount of money which they paid out last year, and would have to pay this year, and we give it to them entirely. But at the same time we retained the refining industry, one of the many branches of the industry which has grown up under this National Policy. I have the admission of an over-candid friend on the other side of the House that we were successful in giving three and a half million dollars to the consumers, without at all hurting the sugar refiners of Canada. That is a very good kind of a policy. If we can keep up the industries of this country and secure employment for our people, together with all that this employment means to this country, and at the same time manumit taxes to the people, that is a very good kind of policy, and that is a policy which the people of Canada will be very glad to endorse. Well, Sir, I think in this debate so far there have been proven two things: First, that binding twine has in the years that are past, and up to the present time, been sold cheaper in the Dominion of Canada to Canadian farmers, than it has been sold in the United States to United States farmers. That has been the rule, and that has been the rule up to within this very year. It has not been proven that this very year, even with all the disturbing and abnormal conditions which exist in the United States, that the price of binding twines of equal grades and qualities, is very much dearer—if dearer at all—to the Canadian farmer than it is to the United States farmer. It has not been proven in this debate, that even taking into consideration the abnormal conditions of the year, binding twine is any dearer here than it is in the United States. The kind of argument used by gentlemen opposite in the country, before the people, is well illustrated by the arguments of my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. McMillan), who, in trying to show the immense disadvantage we had in comparison with the United States, made the astounding assertion here that the raw material for making twine was taxed $15 per ton in the United States, while our manufacturers had it free. How much duty have statements of that kind done in the political contests of this country? Was not that grand voice of my hon. friend, that grand Scotch voice that he has lifted up through the valleys and hills in the constituency which he represents, telling the people what an iniquity it was that while the manufacturers of the United States had to pay $15 per ton duty on the raw material, our bloated monopolists did not pay a single cent, and that, nevertheless, even under these conditions, the Government must keep up this duty upon binding twine? That is the kind of statements they make before the people of the country; these are the kind of *ad captandum* arguments they attempt to use before the people. Ours is not that kind of policy. We are in favour of the National Policy and of relieving the burdens of the people as we can. You, gentlemen, are against the National Policy, you would take it away, you would introduce free trade, you would bring in unrestricted reciprocity, and where would you raise your taxes then? Why, Sir, my hon. friend who sits there with his wealth of wisdom which he gives us from time to time upon these matters—he would take the duty off binding twine, and he would take the duty off everything else; but how would he run the Government? How would we keep the service of the country going? Does not my hon. friend know that when he uses an argument like that he does not go far enough, and if he is honest with himself and the people he must say: if we take the taxes off these things we must put them on you, or upon something else, because we must have money to carry on the service of the country. My hon. friend knows he must in honesty say that. My hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) said that the people had got a taste of free sugar, and that they were so hankering after that taste that they would not be satisfied until they had free everything. I ask the hon. gentleman if the people had free everything what then would happen? We have got to raise $38,000,000 to spend in this country and who is to pay that? You have got to have it from the people some way or other. Our policy is this: that whilst we raise that sum of money, and whilst we spend that sum of money in the services which are essential to the country, essential to its progress and advancement, we dispose of it in such a way that it induces the employment of labour, builds up our industries, keeps our own people at home, and helps us in the race of progress with other nations.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, and our policy would have kept very many more of our own people at home if it had not been that gentlemen opposite, misguided in their opposition to this policy, have been preaching the doctrine of blue ruin to the people; have been preaching the doctrine of blue ruin to the Canadian people I say, and have been painting the skies as always bright on the other side of the line. If gentlemen opposite had not conducted themselves upon that plane and pursued that policy, we would have had very much fewer people leaving our shores to-day, and we would not have the spectacle which we have seen within the last two or three months of Canadians lured to Dakota by the reasoning of these same speakers, sorry the very hour they got there that they ever had gone, and glad to get back to Canada now, after the sacrifice of every dollar they had perhaps made in the meantime; glad to get back to Canadian skies and to Canadian soil, and, if you like, to Canadian binding twine as well. Now, Sir, there have been three threads running through the discourses of hon. gentlemen opposite to-night, and one of them has been the execration of monopoly. Oh, how these hon. gentlemen hate monopoly, and how

they hate monopolists! And yet for the last twelve months this country has been ringing, from every hustings, with arguments of every kind from these same gentlemen, asking the people to do what? To tear down all tariff walls between us and the United States of America, and to go in for unrestricted reciprocity which cannot be obtained on any other basis than a uniform tariff and that tariff the tariff of the United States. They hate monopolies, even that of binding twine; and yet they will welcome a fiscal system which will put them under a monopoly twice or three times as great, so far as the uniform rate of taxation goes, as that which we have to-day. And, Sir, I challenge them, without evasion, in a manly, straightforward way, if they deny that they must have a uniform tariff, to show me two things: first, show me a respectable authority on the United States side of the line which supports you in your assertion that you can get unrestricted reciprocity and yet keep the full control of your own tariff, to make and amend it as you please; and in the next place I ask you to show, without any evasion, in a straightforward, honest way, how you can work such a thing as that between these two countries, with fairness to each country. These two things have got to be stated and proved, or else you will have to lie under the aspersion that while you execrate a monopoly at home, as you call it, you are willing to embrace a monopoly three times as great for the purpose of carrying out a certain pet form of fiscal policy which you have espoused, and which you expect the country to espouse as well. The other thread which has been running through this discussion is a general condolence with the farmers—you love them so well now. When you had a Government, and had five years of rule, what did you do for the Canadian farmer? Your fiscal policy was such that both our exports and our imports fell by millions. You never thought of taking a bit of taxation from the people; but your Finance Minister came down with a million, and a million, and a million of taxation to be placed on the farmers of this country. And yet, to-day, when we have built railways on which the farmers' goods are carried at a third of the cost that they were formerly; we have built a canal system and opened it up to free communication, when we have opened up the great North-West by the expenditure of a great deal of money on a great railway—while we have done all that, and have given the farmers not only the means of developing this country, but the means of carrying their products by the cheapest possible routes to the markets of the world, what have you to show for your five years of power? You did nothing but load on your millions of taxes; whereas this Government has done all that I have said, and at the end of the period comes down and takes $3,500,000 of taxation from the shoulders of the people. Mr. Speaker, when hon. gentlemen opposite can show some deeds and fewer professions, they will gain more in the hearts of the people, and they will see light in the future that have not gladdened their eyes for many past years. With reference to this particular duty which is under discussion, the Government's eyes are not closed. The very action they have taken with regard to salt shows that. We have a salt industry and salt wells in this country, which a protective policy has brought to a certain state of perfection; but when at a certain period it was shown to the Government that that protection had evolved a monopoly, and that the farmer was not being helped by it, the Government came to the rescue, and to-day the farmer gets his salt at one-third less than he did before. And what the Government did in that respect, it proposes to do, not on mere doctrinaire principles, not out of the books; but it proposes in view of the circumstances of the time, to make this policy meet the needs of the time, whether by laying on taxation or by taking off taxation; and if it be proved that a monopoly takes hold of this business as it has taken hold of the salt business, and that the farmer is injuriously affected by it, it will be for this practical Government to do for the farmer in that case what it has done in other cases. My hon. friend put his motion on the paper on the 1st of May. If he had been honest in his endeavours to help the farmer?——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. I take that word back; if he had been earnest to help the farmers from the very first, that was his time, not an hour was to be lost. The day was approaching when the farmer would be making his bargains for his twine for the season; the day was perilously near. Why did the hon. gentleman wait and wait until to-day, on the 6th or 7th of July, before moving his motion, when, even if it should succeed, he could not get it embodied in a law and get the Governor General to assent to it in time? Why does he wait until the men have drowned, according to his own theory?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Why did you ask him?

Mr. FOSTER. I leave it to this House if the first man to ask that it be allowed to stand, was not my hon. friend there?

Mr. MULOCK. Mr. Speaker, I never asked it to stand, from the day it was on the paper to this moment. I will tell the hon. gentleman if he will allow me, what I did say: When I put the motion on the paper, and the hon. gentleman asked me day after day to let it stand, I said at last: "It is very inconvenient to me to be watching this every day; if you want it to stand, you had better have it stand for a reasonable period instead of obliging me to watch it;" and the hon. gentleman said: "let it stand for two weeks;" and he added: "and when that is up, it will have to stand a great deal longer after that."

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps my impression may be wrong in that respect. Nevertheless, my hon. friend, with his sturdy frame, his independence, and his great persistence, is not of such weak temperament to give way when the farmers' interests stand in the balance even at the wish of the Government. Does my hon. friend sit here in the farmers' interests, in the interest of a bleeding country, to get measures passed, by putting a motion on the Order paper, and then meekly letting it stand because a member of the Government asks to have it stand? My hon. friend knows that he could have brought on his motion at any moment he wished; he had power to do so; and if he was not willing to let it stand——

Mr. MULOCK. Why did you ask to have it stand? I thought I could have trusted the hon. gentleman when he asked to let it stand. I thought the hon. gentleman had an honest

motive—that he intended to deal with the question. Will he now inform the House why he asked to let it stand for these two months?

Mr. FOSTER. I simply asked that it should stand because I thought the hon. gentleman wished it to stand; and the hon. gentleman never once, from the 1st of May till to-day, pressed that motion. If he had pressed it, it would have gone on, and no person knows it better than my hon. friend himself. But to-day, on the 6th of July, when it is too late to help the farmers, even if his resolution passed, he presses his resolution. I say, then, that the Government in this, as in other things, is keenly alive to the best interests of the farmers, as well as every other class in this country. The Government, however, is not of that frame of mind that is continually setting class against class. It believes that the farmers have interests; it believes that the industries of this country, other than the farming, have interests as well. It believes that the farmer should have fair-play; it believes that the man who builds a factory should have fair-play as well; and it is a tenet of this party that all the interests of this country are better not fighting one against the other, but that they should be joined in one harmonious whole, the advantage of one being in every case the advantage of the other, and the advancement of one the advancement of the other; and while this Government has done for the farmer many things which were never attempted by hon. gentlemen opposite, while it has done for the country things which have never been attempted by hon. gentlemen opposite, it will in the future, as in the past, carry out the very same policy and if, as I said before, in this or any other case, it becomes clear to the mind of the Government that any interest has not been fairly treated in this country, the remedy will, so far as it lies in the power of the Government, be applied, and the people's interest, as a whole, will be safeguarded.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I must confess that I have been not a little surprised at some portions of the speech the hon. gentleman addressed to this House. I have been here a quarter of a century, and I must say a speech as disingenuous as that which the hon. gentleman has, on this occasion, addressed the Parliament, I have not before heard. The hon. gentleman has asked my hon. friend to allow his motion to stand. He has asked him, again and again, since the session began. It could not have remained on the motion paper if this had been done. Twice at least while I was present in the House, this session, the First Minister of the recent Administration asked my hon. friend to let this motion stand, and now the hon. gentleman, after my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) has allowed this motion to stand for nearly two months at the request of the Administration——

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell),—taunts my hon. friend with a want of sincerity and earnestness because he did not press his motion at an earlier period. I venture to say that so extraordinary an argument has never been heard on the floor of this House.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I rise to a point of order. On the 13th May Mr. Mulock——

Mr. MULOCK.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) The hon. gentleman may make a speech at a latter period in the evening, but I have no intention to allow him to interject his speech into the observations I propose to address to the House.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). It is a question of fact.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman ought to know that a question of fact is not a question of order. The hon. gentleman can raise his question of fact at a later period of the evening. The hon. Minister of Finance has charged my hon. friend with want of earnestness in pressing his motion. The hon. gentleman seems to have judged of my hon. friend for North York by himself. He supposes that my hon. friend, in a moment of weakness, put this motion upon the paper, which he had no intention of pressing upon the attention of Parliament. Now the hon. gentleman has told us that we have been overwhelmingly defeated in the country, and that we are seeking to do, in an indirect way, what we have not been able to accomplish with the sanction and support of the people. I think the hon. gentleman is about the last member of this House who should have addressed an argument of that sort. I do not think he has had such overwhelming support, such an exhibition of overwhelming confidence on the part of those he has for some years represented in Parliament, that he should taunt hon. gentlemen on this side with a want of public confidence. Why, if I understand the position of matters fairly, the hon. gentleman ran away from his constituency immediately after the election was over, lest he might be counted out.

Mr. FOSTER. All wrong information.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman exhibited on that occasion something like weakness. It was one of those moments of weakness which overtook the hon. gentleman, and made it impossible he should remain in his constituency and ascertain who was actually elected at the late election.

Mr. FOSTER. I knew before I left.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Well, the hon. gentleman may have known whom the returning officer would send to this House. I have known that myself on more than one occasion, but whom the people actually returned to Parliament may have been a wholly different question. And so I think that the hon. gentleman made a mistake when he introduced into the discussion this evening the statement that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House do not enjoy in any degree the public confidence. Now, the hon. gentleman also said that we on this side had been preaching blue ruin. What did the friends of the hon. gentleman, the leaders of the hon. gentleman, do when they sat on this side and we sat on that? Did they represent the country in a most prosperous condition? Did they say that the people were remaining at home, and that the state of public affairs was entirely satisfactory? Did they denounce those who made statements complaining of the financial and commercial and material condition of the country, and the material prosperity of the population, and did they hold that everything was entirely satisfactory? Why, Sir, if I chose to detain the House, for a time, I could point to the speeches made by

the late leader of the Administration, by the Minister of Customs, by the hon. member for Frontenac, all of whom depicted a far more dark and gloomy aspect, all of whom represented the country as in a much worse condition than my hon. friend for South Oxford has ever declared it to be in. And they did so without warrant. On that occasion we were told that thousands of people were leaving the country, and they said: Give us an opportunity of getting possession of the Treasury benches, and we will put an end to this emigration. We will make the country so prosperous that every one will be anxious to remain at home and those who have gone abroad will return. That was the representation made. At that time, there were about 22,000 people a year leaving the country. During Mr. Mackenzie's Administration, as shown by the Bureau of Statistics at Washington, 122,000 people in all left Canada for the American Republic. Hon. gentlemen opposite came in and were given the opportunity they desired of trying the experiment, and what was the result? During their first year of office, 40,000 people left the country; during their second year, 68,000 left; in the third year, 80,000 left, and in the next year, 125,000. More people in 1882 left this country and went to the United States than the whole five years of Mr. Mackenzie's Administration. These gentlemen had the opportunity of trying their experiment and the people of this country left in fourfold greater numbers than they ever did before. Have they abandoned their experiment? Have they ceased to administer the medicine which, they said, would prove a panacea for the ills we complained of? Not at all; and the country is fourfold worse off than it was during the period they represented as a disastrous period. The hon. gentleman said that we did nothing to relieve the agricultural population when we were in office. Well, we gave the agricultural population protection for life and property; we left them to be the architects of their own fortune; we left them free to engage in whatever business they thought would be most profitable; we did not make one man subordinate to the prosperity of another; we did not plunder one portion of the population for the sake of promoting the prosperity of another and a smaller section. Hon. gentlemen opposite boasted that they would decrease the expenditure. Why, Sir, they added $100,000,000 to the public debt and $15,000,000 to the annual expenditure of the country. What is the condition of the North-West Territories? Have these hon. gentlemen obtained the revenue from the lands there which they promised? Have they secured the population they predicted would flow in there? The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross) has told us this evening that the people are returning in thousands from the United States. I have heard the hon. gentleman repeat in this House, every year since 1883, the same story. He has told us of the thousands and tens of thousands——

Mr. ROSS (Lisgar). I never did.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman said it to-night, and he has said it before.

Mr. ROSS (Lisgar). I never did.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I can show that he said it. He has said it in reply to myself, and he has said it again and again, and he has read statements to show again and again that all those who have gone from Manitoba to Minnesota and Dakota were coming back again.

Mr. ROSS (Lisgar). Never.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I will verify what I state and I will not take back a statement which I know to be perfectly true as to what the hon. gentleman said. The hon. Minister of the Interior put so much confidence in these statements, that he caused a census to be taken in the North-West Territories. The Minister of Agriculture produced evidence before the Immigration Committee of this House for the purpose of showing that 153,000 people had gone into the North-West Territories and Manitoba between 1883 and 1885, and, when the census was taken, I think it was found that there were about 123,000 short of those numbers. If the people were returning by the thousand every year, why did not the census exhibit that fact? I I have no doubt that, if the census were taken again, the same result would occur, and the same mistakes would be shown as were shown on previous occasions on the part of hon. gentlemen. Hon. gentlemen come here and indulge in confident predictions and tell us what is transpiring. Mr. Speaker, we know what is transpiring there. We know the condition of things in the North-West Territories, and we know that, as long as a great railway corporation, built largely out of the funds of this country, carry wheat from St. Paul to the seaboard at a cheaper rate than they carry it from Winnipeg to the seaboard, the people will naturally go to the south of the line rather than to the north, and therefore hon. gentlemen should interfere if they can where their interference will be effective. The hon. the Minister of Finance seems to have taken fright in reference to the prohibition question. He thought he was going to lose a large amount of revenue from the adoption of a prohibitory law, and he has that phantom before him whenever any question affecting the tariff is brought before the House. Whenever the tariff is discussed in any form he asks: "Where are you going to get the revenue?" What is the revenue from binding twine? It is $1,200. So the hon. gentleman is afraid that the loss of this $1,200 will create a deficit that will affect the public credit. I think, from the argument which the hon. gentleman has addressed to the House, and after the extraordinary argument of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs), that it is evident that in this matter the hon. gentleman was not looking to revenue. I thought this tax was put at a high figure to prevent revenue being obtained. The argument was that this tax should not go into the treasury, but into the hands of special favourites of the Administration, into the hands of those who enjoy a monopoly to the extent at least of 25 per cent. What was the object of the hon. gentleman in imposing this tax? His object is to keep up the taxation, to keep out the American article, and if he keeps out the American article he does not get the tax. I could understand the argument of the hon. gentleman if he were taking an excise tax from the home producer equal or nearly equal to the tax which he is demanding from the foreign importer. It is only in England that they do that sort of thing, but the hon. gentleman will not follow the example of England. He prefers to follow the example of another country. He tells us of the

monopolies which exist on the American side of the border. How are those monopolies produced? They are produced by the very system which the hon. gentleman is seeking to establish in this country. They are produced by that system of which the hon. gentleman is always a consistent or inconsistent supporter in this country, and he is here to-night to defend this monopoly, which can only exist, as it does exist, by the interference of the Government, and to the detriment of the agricultural population of this country. The hon. gentleman says that we represent the farmers as a very poor class. Well, Sir, are they not a very prosperous class at the present time, and they have been less prosperous year after year for the last ten years. The hon. gentleman tells us what the present Government have done for the agricultural population of this country. I can tell him what they have done. They have reduced the value of farm lands throughout the country by about 30 per cent.; they have made every agriculturist poorer to that extent by the legislation which they have adopted and by the fiscal policy which they have pursued. The hon. gentleman talks about building up the towns and villages of this country. Where are the villages and towns that he has built up? Why, Sir, the villages and towns have been killed by the policy of this Government. The few manufacturing institutions that existed in the towns have been killed by that policy, or they have had to unite and to remove to some great centre which the hon. gentleman has fostered and helped, but the villages and towns have been well nigh extinguished by the policy which the hon. gentleman has pursued. The hon. gentleman has been wrathful this evening because my hon. friend said that the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) was too much interested in this question to be trusted, as far as his argument was concerned. The hon. gentleman seemed to think that was a most outrageous argument to address to this House, that it was an appeal to the prejudices—of course, not of this House, because we are said to be too intelligent to be affected by any such appeals—but that it was an appeal to the agricultural population without. Well, it is a rule in court that a man ought not to be a judge in his own case; it is a rule that, where duty and interest come in conflict you cannot act; it is a rule in this House that a man is not supposed to vote in a question in which he is interested; and, under the circumstances, is it extraordinary that my hon. friend should state the proposition he did? We have not yet reached such a stage of sublime and ideal perfectibility that we are uninfluenced by our own interests. I suppose that most men are to a greater or lesser degree influenced by their occupation in their actions, and if the hon. gentleman refuses to recognize that fact I do not think he could very long continue to act as Finance Minister. Now, the hon. gentleman has told us, as other hon. gentlemen have done, that it is with perfect propriety that the Government keep the tax on the binding twine—that the farmers are better off in consequence of this tax that the Government have placed on binding twine. They are all going to make it cheaper by a 25 per cent. tax than if they had free trade. The hon. gentleman tells us that the way that our institutions are built up, and that industry is diversified in this country, is by the interference of the Government, by the burdens which Parliament has imposed upon the population of this country. Well, Mr. Speaker, what an unfortunate condition the people of this country would be in if some one were generously to pay the public debt. If the Government of the United Kingdom were to interfere on behalf of the people of this country, and to resume the public debt and relieve us from taxation, we would become bankrupt, we would have no excuse for taxation, and our industries would be ruined. That is the logical outcome of the argument which the hon. gentleman has addressed to the House. Now, I wish to say a word or two with reference to some statements of the Minister of Customs. The Minister of Customs says: Why, we are all in the same boat; why, you sat on this side of the House many years ago, and when you were sitting here you were in favour of high taxes, just as we are in favour of high taxes now; and he maintained that we were not then in favour of relieving the people of taxation any more than they are in favour of relieving them from taxation now. Well, the hon. gentleman overlooked the difference at that time, I think a genuine difference. We never maintained that the hon. gentleman's views were just the same as our own, that his opinions of the proper fiscal policy of our country were just the same as ours. The hon. gentleman said: Oh! you put a duty on tea and on coffee! Well, we did tax them, and what was the reason? Because they were proper objects for taxation. Then we put a tax on tea. It did not affect the price of any other article, and all the tax the people paid went into the public treasury. Can he say the same thing in regard to the tax on binding twine? Does he see no difference? Why, last year $1,200 went into the public treasury from that article, and I dare say there were a hundred thousand dollars of taxes that went into the pockets of the manufacturers. Is that all the same thing? The rule of taxation laid down by Adam Smith a hundred years ago was, that you should tax the community in such a way that all the taxes you impose should go into the public treasury. That was the policy we adopted; we think that was a sound policy. What we complain of in the policy of the hon. gentlemen is, that they impose millions of taxes upon the people of this country that never find their way into the public treasury at all. The hon. gentleman said, speaking about the tax on sugar, that we imposed a higher tax on that article than the Government does to-day. Yes, Sir, we did; but all the tax went into the public treasury. The hon. gentleman says sugar is cheaper now than it was in our time. That is true, but it is not because of the difference in taxation; it is because sugar is cheaper in the markets of the world by 50 per cent. than it was 13 years ago. Centrifugal sugars, in 1878, were selling for nearly five cents a pound in the Island of Cuba, and in 1886 they were selling for less than two and a-half cents a pound in the same island, caused by the great sugar industries of Europe; and there was no possibility, if the hon. gentleman wished to relieve the people of this country of taxation, of keeping up the price to any such figure as the price of sugar is at this moment. The hon. gentleman says that he has relieved the people of this country of a tax on sugar. Well, Sir, the more appropriate time to discuss that will be when the motion of my hon. friend for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) comes again before the House. But I

will just say this in passing: The hon. gentleman has retained a tax of $1,800,000 on the sugar that will be consumed in this country, and not one dollar of that goes into the public treasury. And in whose interest was it done? In the interest of two or three manufacturers, who employ 400 men; and if you were to wipe out the whole of the sugar tax and pension those men on the public treasury of this country at $400 each, the people of this country would save a million and a quarter—more, a million and a-half, by pensioning every labourer in Canada engaged in the sugar industry, rather than retain the tax which the hon. gentleman has kept on. Yet the hon. gentleman comes to the House and talks about the relief that he has given to the people of this country. He has created and attempted to maintain an enormous monopoly in this country, a monopoly that can never be in the interest of the population, because it has taken a large sum of money from hundreds of thousands of people who can ill afford to pay it, and given it to those who do not need it at all. Then the hon. gentleman tells us that in the United States a kind of plough that they send abroad for $9 is sold at $18. How comes that about? Why, by that very system of protection which the hon. gentleman is seeking to fasten upon the people of this country. Such a condition of things could not exist otherwise, and the Minister of Customs knows well that there are many articles protected in this country that are sold in the first instance at two or three times the cost of production. I remember very well when I was a member of the late Administration we had to seize a large number of sewing machines that were being imported, called the Singer sewing machines, because they were imported at what we thought less than their value, and when experts were brought on from New York they proved that those machines that were entered here at $17 each cost actually to produce them about $9. They had been entered at nearly double their value, and their retail price to the people of this country was something like $48. Now, I would like to know who it was that needed protection—the poor woman, who was earning her living by the use of that sewing machine, for which she paid $48, or the manufacturer of a like machine in Canada, who was producing it here at the time under a protection of $7.50. The hon. gentleman knows well the enormous profits on most of these protected manufactured articles which the people of this country have to purchase. I say there is no justification for the maintenance of these protective duties, and that the fiscal policy which the Government has adopted in this country is one that is disastrous to the industrial interests of this country. During the last thirteen years it has sent 1,200,000 people across the borders to the United States; it has increased the population of that country and diminished the population of this. It has lessened the value of the farm lands of this country, it has diminished the income of the farmers, it has done irreparable mischief to a large section of our population, because it has induced them to look to the Government and to the protective policy of the Administration for their profits, rather than to the careful management of their business, and to the careful and improved appliances with which that business is now carried on. Now, I am not going into a discussion of the general policy of the Administration. I have undertaken to answer a few of the observations made by the Minister of Customs and by the Minister of Finance that have been addressed to this House. I say that the statements made by the hon. gentlemen on this side, and by the mover of the resolution, show that the article of binding twine is sold to the farmers of this country at a higher price than it ought to bear, and that it is a burden—an unnecessary tax upon the agriculturists of this country. I will say further, that I believe when the Government asked my hon. friend to let this motion stand they had some notion of adopting the policy suggested in that motion. I apprehend that the Minister of Finance would not have the audacity to ask this House from day to day to let the motion stand if the subject was not under consideration. The hon. gentleman, I am sure, did not for a moment intend to ask the House to allow the motion to stand and leave it open to be believed that the matter was under the serious consideration of the Government with a view to an alteration of their policy in that particular if such an intent was not seriously entertained. And when the hon. gentleman has now this evening resisted this motion, he ought to have gone further and told the House why it was that, after considering it for two months, they came to the conclusion not to place this article on the free list, but to continue the tax on the agricultural population. Was it because there were among the supporters of the hon. gentleman men of influence and power, whose opinions the hon. gentlemen were not at liberty to disregard, and they thought it to be of more consequence to consider their wishes than the interests of the agricultural population? If so, I think the hon. gentleman has had another attack of weakness, and he has yielded on this occasion, not to that which was best, but to that which was most selfish, and that doing so he has inflicted serious injury on the agricultural population of Canada.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). It was not my intention to seriously disturb the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) when I rose from my seat a few minutes ago. My object was simply to call attention to the fact that it was not at the request of the Government, nor at the request of the Minister of Finance, that the discussion of this resolution was postponed. I think the hon. member for Bothwell had no desire to misrepresent the facts, and I therefore felt it my duty to put him right as regards who it was that asked that this resolution be deferred. The hon. gentleman will find in *Hansard* of 13th May, page 191, when Notices of Motion were called, that the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) said:

"I would suggest to the Minister of Finance to allow these two notices appearing in my name to stand for a little time, so that I may not be under the necessity of watching them every day—say till a week from Monday."

Mr. MULOCK. That is exactly what he said.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Then the Minister of Finance answered:

"That will be the minimum."

Therefore, the hon. member for North York is responsible for deferring the discussion on this resolution since Monday in the early part of May. This is the point to which I desired to call the attention of the hon. member for Bothwell when I interrupted him. It was not my intention to make

a speech, or to do anything else but call his attention to the fact that it was the hon. member for North York who asked for the postponement of this resolution. As I am on my feet, however, I may be pardoned for saying a few words on the question of the National Policy, which has been opened up in all directions by the discussions to-night. I think that the first object of a Minister of Finance should be to raise a sufficient revenue for the purpose of defraying all the legitimate expenses of the Government during the year. The National Policy therefore has for its object, first, to raise a sufficient revenue for all the annual requirements of the Government. This is the essential requisite of the National Policy or of any other policy that would be adopted by a wise Government of such a Dominion as ours. The National Policy has subserved that purpose fairly well. It has given us sufficient revenue for the purpose of providing public works throughout the Dominion, which are useful and necessary for the purpose of distributing the products of this vast Dominion; but we find that the object of the Opposition is to tear to pieces the National Policy by shreds and patches. They desire to take one item at a time, and ultimately they hope to destroy its usefulness altogether. At one time they attacked the duty on flour, which I observe is not intended to be done during the present session. At another time they attack the duty on coal, at another time they attack the duty on corn, then the duty on rice, and last, but not least, the duty on binding twine. They attack one line after another, until they hope at last to obtain that grand policy which they term unrestricted reciprocity, regardless of how they can raise the revenue for the purpose of meeting the annual demands on the treasury. There is not an hon. gentleman opposite who does not admit that we require a revenue of $40,000,000 annually for the purpose of defraying the legitimate expenses in this Dominion. Any Government that will undertake to govern this Dominion with a less annual revenue than $40,000,000 will undertake to do so to the prejudice of the best interests of the country, and therefore if the Government will undertake to so reduce the revenue as to diminish public expenditure on railways, canals and public works which are necessary for the country, they will fail to fulfil their duty to the people. But we are told that the duty on flour increases the price of the flour, that the duty on coal increases the price of the coal, and that the duty on every commodity increases the price of that commodity on which the duty is placed. We believe very differently; we believe that the price of any article on the market which is useful or necessary for the consumption of our people is regulated by the supply and the demand. I do not believe there is an intelligent member of the Opposition who will doubt that position. The principle is this, that if you increase the supply of a commodity which is required for home consumption, which is useful or necessary, beyond the demand in the Dominion, the price must fall. There is no member of the House, no intelligent farmer, miner, fisherman or labourer, who does not know that if a policy is calculated to increase the quantity of any commodity required for consumption there is a tendency to lower the price of that article. We had during last session, a short discussion on the price of flour. Those who occupied seats in the House during the past session may recollect such a discussion taking place. Those who were here then, I have no doubt, may have restrained their decision from moving this year in the direction of taking the duty off, very likely because those who took a prominent part in proposing that reduction last year fell by their folly. I may refer to the discussion which occurred on that occasion, because it was rather a spicy one, and it occurred in very much the same way as this discussion arose to-night. It was a kind of innocent interjection of mine in the House, and it brought me to my feet to explain the reason why I asked what I considered at that time a pertinent question. The then hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) was speaking on the question of taking the duty off flour, and I, in my innocence, asked him a question, and the dialogue was as follows :—

"Mr. CAMERON. Will my hon. friend permit me to ask him a question?

"Mr. MITCHELL. Yes; twenty of them.

"Mr. CAMERON. There is a duty of $1 a barrel on flour imported into the United States. Does that increase the price of flour in the United States?

"Mr. MITCHELL. We are not exporters of flour to the United States.

"Mr. CAMERON. The hon. gentleman knows there is a duty of $1 on the flour going into that country. Does that increase its price?

"Mr. MITCHELL. They do not import flour from Canada, and I will tell my hon. friend that the value of the flour in the United States is regulated by the markets in Liverpool.

"Mr. CAMERON. He cannot answer the question.

"Mr. MITCHELL. I have answered it.

"Mr. CAMERON. Does it increase the price of flour?

"Mr. MITCHELL. I will tell you what it does. If we exported Canadian flour into the United States——

"Mr. CAMERON. Say yes or no.

"Mr. MITCHELL. If we exported flour to the United Sates——

"Mr. CAMERON. That is no answer——"

My hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) was a little wrathy, and he invited my humble self to go outside and he would discuss the matter with me there. I was not in the mood to go out just then, but I intimated that possibly when we would be leaving for home we might stay out a little while to cool ourselves off. But finding that the question was not sufficiently explained, the hon. member for Halifax—not any of the present members for Halifax—was determined to give the member for Inverness a cowhiding which he would not forget for the balance of the term, and here is what occurred; it is rather spicy :

"Mr. JONES (Halifax). I was not surprised at the enquiry of the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) relating to the importation of flour by the United States, because that gentleman has not that familiarity with business which would enable him to deal with that question.

"Mr. CAMERON. I have not had so much to do with sugar as you.

"Mr. JONES (Halifax). If he had he would know that if the duty in the United States was $5 a barrel on flour, it would not raise the price of Canadian flour if it went there.

"Mr. CAMERON. Would it increase the price of American flour?

"Mr. JONES (Halifax). Not one cent.

"Mr. CAMERON. That gives up the whole case.

"Mr. JONES (Halifax). If a son of mine six years old were to ask me a question of that kind, I would give him a spanking and send him to school, and tell him to learn the principles that govern commerce."

That was high-fallutin. The discussion continued:

"Mr. CAMERON. And when he had learnt them you would not understand them from him.

"Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman asked whether the price of American flour would be raised. He put us in the position of the United States. But we do not raise any breadstuffs in Nova Scotia at all, and, therefore, the cases are not parallel."

He had to shift himself from the position of a representative of the Dominion, to the position of a representative from Nova Scotia, but I did not like to be pinned even then and the remarks continued:

"Mr. CAMERON. Why not?

"Mr. JONES (Halifax). Simply for the reason that we do not raise any breadstuffs in Nova Scotia at all.

"Mr. CAMERON. Do they raise breadstuffs in the city of New York? Does a school boy know that."

The point I desire to make is this: that it is a singular fact that my hon. friend the then member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) and my hon. friend the then member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), who were then unquestionably appealing to the prejudices of the people of this Dominion, and who appealed to their prejudices in vain, because they are much more intelligent down by the sea than they expected they were; those two hon. gentlemen who were taking advantage, as they supposed, of the ignorance of the people were elected to stay at home. I believe seriously that those who have come down to the duty on binding twine will find themselves in the same place. Why, we only import binding twine to the value of about $5,000 a year and we collect a revenue on it of about $1,200, and yet hon. gentlemen opposite appeal to the prejudices of the farmers of the whole Dominion, not excluding Prince Edward Island, where they do not use much binding twine, in order to convince them that they will be ruined unless the Government will take the duty off binding twine. Now, I desire my hon. friend opposite to take a leaf from the argument of the former member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), and the former member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), and to observe the fact that as five dollars a barrel on flour imported into the United States from Canada could not possibly increase the price of flour in the United States to the extent of one cent, as the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) stated, simply because they produced more flour in the United States than is required in that country for their home consumption. Why not apply the same argument, the same reasoning and the same amount of common sense on this side of the line? As in Canada we produce more flour than is required for home consumption, the duty of fifty cents or seventy-five cents will not increase the price of flour in Canada to the extent of one cent. The intelligent farmers, who require a good deal of flour besides the coarser grains which they produce in Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, know that this is a fact; the fishermen by the seas and the miners also know that this is a fact. As long as Canada produces more of any commodity than is required for home consumption, so long will the price of that commodity be as low as possible, consistent with a living profit to the producer or the manufacturer. Now, the very fact that twine is manufactured in Canada to an extent equal or nearly equal to the requirements of the country convinces me, at least, that the price of twine cannot be materially increased on account of the duty imposed upon it; and if twine should be manufactured in Canada to a greater extent than is required for home consumption, it would not increase the price of twine in Canada to the extent of one cent a pound or a ton. My hon. friends opposite ought to consider carefully every line of goods on which they propose to reduce the duty, and ascertain first whether the imposition of a duty is calculated to foster the manufacture of such goods in the Dominion to such an extent that the product will be in excess of the demand in the Dominion. If that is the case, the invariable result must be that the prices of articles will fall, sometimes, often, I may say, even below the cost of production. The sugar interests of this Dominion more than once have suffered. Refiners more than once since the adoption of the National Policy have had to sell sugar below the cost of production, and they therefore failed. At the present time they are in a prosperous condition and they will continue to be in as prosperous a condition as long as that interest of the Dominion is so regulated by a wise National Policy that the result will be ample revenue for the requirements of the Dominion and the placing of goods in the hands of the consumers, the farmers, the fishermen, the miners, the artisans, the lumbermen, the labourers and all the poorer classes of the people, at the lowest possible figure consistent with living prices for those who produce these articles and manufacture them. I did not intend to speak at such length; but I have much pleasure in supporting the Government in refusing to take the duty off twine or any other article which is at present embraced in the National Policy.

Mr. MULOCK. I desire to make a personal explanation. The hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) read from *Hansard* some remarks made by me; and I wish to say, by way of explanation, that so far as I understand, it is not the custom of the reporters to record the observations of a member of the Government when a member on this side of the House is about to move a motion, if any member of the Government says "stand"; the motion stands as a matter of course, and the *Hansard* reporters take no note of the remark. With regard to the quotation, what occurred on that day was just what occurred before and has occurred since until to-night. The hon. Minister of Finance said "stand," and I am sure he will remember it, and my remark which followed the request that it should stand. That request did not originate with me, but I did not wish to have the motion stand *de die in diem*; I wanted something more definite. In further proof that I was not the cause of the delay, I may say that even up to this day the hon. Minister of Finance asked that the motion should stand. I know that there is no desire, now that the discussion is over, to misrepresent me any further.

Mr. FOSTER. Allow me just one word in personal explanation, and I will state my impression. My impression was that at the first the hon. gentleman asked if the motion could stand. His impression is different. After that, whenever the motion came up, I think the hon. gentleman is right in saying that I said "stand," and I did it with the impression that the hon. gentleman was not pressing his motion.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman will admit that I had no conversation with him except what took place across the floor of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, only what took place across the floor of the House.

Mr. BOWELL. A statement was made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) which I desire should not go in *Hansard* without the most explicit contradiction on my part. He said he had a recollection—which he could not have had because the circumstance to which he alluded never did take place—of an Orange deputation coming here to insist on my being taken into the Cabinet. I pronounce that to be incorrect. There was no more truth in that statement than there was in the affidavit the hon. gentleman made in reference to the ex-member for Dundas (Mr. Hickey).

House divided on motion of Mr. Mulock:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,	German,
Allison,	Gillmor,
Amyot,	Godbout,
Armstrong,	Grieve,
Bain,	Guay,
Barron,	Hargraft,
Beausoleil,	Harwood,
Béchard,	Innes,
Beith,	King,
Borden,	Landerkin,
Bourassa,	Langelier,
Bowers,	Laurier,
Bowman,	Lavergne,
Brodeur,	Leduc,
Brown (Chateauguay),	Livingston,
Brown (Monck),	Macdonald (Huron),
Burdett,	McGregor,
Cameron (Huron),	McMillan,
Campbell,	Mignault,
Carroll,	Mills (Bothwell),
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Monet,
Casey,	Mousseau,
Charlton,	Mulock,
Choquette,	Paterson (Brant),
Christie,	Perry,
Colter,	Proulx,
Davidson,	Rinfret,
Dawson,	Rowand,
Delisle,	Sanborn,
Devlin,	Semple,
Edgar,	Somerville,
Edwards,	Spohn,
Fauvel,	Sutherland,
Featherston,	Tarte,
Flint,	Trow,
Forbes,	Traux,
Fraser,	Vaillancourt,
Frémont,	Watson,
Gauthier,	Welsh,
Geoffrion,	Yeo.—80.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Adams,	Léger,
Barnard,	Lippé,
Bergeron,	Macdonald (King's),
Bowell,	Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Burns,	Macdonell (Algoma),
Cameron (Inverness),	Mackintosh,
Carignan,	McAllister,
Carpenter,	McDonald (Victoria),
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McDougald (Pictou),
Coatsworth,	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Cochrane,	McKay,
Cockburn,	McLean,
Corbould,	McLennan,
Costigan,	McLeod,
Craig,	McNeill,
Curran,	Madill,
Daly,	Marshall,
Daoust,	Miller,
Davin,	Mills (Annapolis),
Davis,	Monerieff,
Denison,	Montague,
Desjardins (Hochelaga),	O'Brien,
Desjardins (L'Islet),	Ouimet,
Dewdney,	Patterson (Colchester),
Dickey,	Pelletier,
Dugas,	Pope,
Dupont,	Putnam,
Dyer,	Reid,
Earle,	Robillard,
Fairbairn,	Roome,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),	Ross (Dundas),
Foster,	Ross (Lisgar),
Fréchette,	Ryckman,
Gillies,	Savard,
Girouard,	Skinner,
Gordon,	Sproule,
Grandbois,	Stairs,
Haggart,	Taylor,
Hazen,	Temple,
Henderson,	Thompson (Sir John),
Hodgins,	Tisdale,
Hutchins,	Tyrwhitt,
Ingram,	Wallace,
Jamieson,	Weldon,
Joncas,	White (Cardwell),
Kaulbach,	White (Shelburne),
Kenny,	Wilmot,
Kirkpatrick,	Wood (Brockville),
Langevin (Sir Hector),	Wood (Westmoreland).—100
LaRivière,	

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Mr. Tupper,	Mr. Davies,
Mr. Ives,	Mr. Hyman,
Mr. McCarthy,	Mr. Préfontaine,
Sir Donald Smith,	Mr. Mackenzie,
Mr. Stevenson,	Mr. Scriver,
Mr. Bergin,	Mr. Lister,
Mr. Chapleau,	Mr. Simard,
Mr. Desaulniers,	Mr. Legris,
Mr. Masson,	Mr. McMullen,

Motion negatived.

GRAVING DOCK PAPERS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I beg to lay on the Table the papers connected with the graving dock at Kingston.

Sir RICHARDCARTWRIGHT. Dothey include the contract signed by the parties Bancroft & Connolly?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. All the papers are there.

Mr. AMYOT. Are they the originals?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The papers I promised on Friday are there. They are all the papers we have.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1.20 a.m. (Tuesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 7th July, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ROCKY MOUNTAIN RAILWAY AND COAL COMPANY.

Mr. TAYLOR moved that Bill (No. 125) respecting the Rocky Mountain Railway and Coal Company be read the second time to-morrow.

Motion agreed to.

LOCAL JUDGES OF ADMIRALTY.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The assent of the Crown having been given to this resolution, I move that on Thursday the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution :—

That it is expedient to provide that the salaries of Local Judges in Admiralty, as such judges, shall be as follows :—

The local judge of the District of Quebec, $2,000 per annum ;

The local judge of the District of Nova Scotia, $1,000 per annum ;

The local judge of the District of New Brunswick, $1,000 per annum ;

The local judge of the District of Prince Edward Island, $800 per annum ;

The local judge of the District of British Columbia, $600 per annum ;

The local judge of the Toronto District, $600 per annum ;

And that each such judge shall be paid such travelling allowance as the Governor in Council from time to time determines.

Motion agreed to.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT—CONTRACTS.

On the Orders of the Day being called,

Mr. LAURIER. I rise to a question of privilege. I have to make a complaint to the House that the Order of the House given some days ago, which was accepted by the Minister of Public Works, to bring before the House all the papers connected with the graving dock contract, has not been fulfilled. The hon. Minister on Thursday last promised to the House that he would bring down all the papers, without any restriction, connected with that work. In order to show how complete that promise was, let me read what took place on that day. Mr. Mulock spoke as follows :—

"I would suggest, so as to prevent any misunderstanding, that all the papers in the department, from the very commencement to this present moment, should be produced. I mean all the specifications and conditions that were referred to in the original advertisement for tenders, the tenders themselves, all the correspondence, and all other papers of any matter and kind connected with the contracts, whether let by tender under that advertisement or otherwise, and also a statement showing the changes in the contracts.

"Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Before six o'clock I answered the hon. gentleman, and a couple of other hon. gentlemen, that I would bring down the papers, and I meant by that all the papers."

So there could not be any possible misunderstanding as to what was meant by the promise made by the hon. Minister when he stated to the House that he would bring all the papers without any reservation, connected with this contract. My hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) had asked, among other things, for all the tenders in connection with this graving dock, but, while I find among the papers the tender of the successful tenderer, Mr. Andrew C. Bancroft, I do not find the tender of the Messrs. Connolly who also tendered for this work. This is an omission which is very important under the circumstances, for I have no hesitation in asserting, in the full view of my responsibility as a member of Parliament, that the tender signed by Andrew C. Bancroft is in the handwriting of Michael Connolly. I have good reason to be aware of the handwriting of Michael Connolly, because, when I was acting on behalf of Mr. Tarte when an accusation for libel was brought against him, I had about twenty letters of Michael Connolly in my possession, and I have no hesitation in saying that this tender upon which the contract was awarded is in the handwriting of Michael Connolly. That was signed on the 28th March, 1888, and there is another letter dated the 4th April, 1889, as follows :—

"A. GOBEIL, Esq.,
Secretary, Public Works Department.

"DEAR SIR,—I beg to inform you that since tendering for the construction of the Graving Dock at Kingston, Ont., I have entered into an agreement with Messrs. N. K. and M. Connolly, of Quebec, to join with me—should my tender be accepted—in the construction of the same. As the Messrs. Connolly are well known to the department, and have all the necessary plant and implements for an immediate commencement of the work, I trust my tender will receive the favourable consideration of the department.

"I have the honour to be,
"Your obedient servant,
"ANDREW C. BANCROFT."

I have no hesitation whatever in stating that that also is in the handwriting of Michael Connolly. The tender is signed Andrew C. Bancroft, but in a handwriting which is unknown to me. Under these circumstances, it was all the more important that the pledge which was made to the House the other day, and which was tantamount to an Order of the House, that all the papers, and especially all the tenders, should be brought forth, should have been attended to, and certainly the House has not been treated as it should have been when this tender has not been produced. At this moment I make no charge against anyone, but it is evident a gross fraud has been perpetrated on the Department of Public Works. It is evident that the Messrs. Connolly have tendered under two names —in the name of Connolly, and in the name of Bancroft. If this tender has not been brought forward, I insist, and I am sure the House will bear me out, that it should be brought forward at once.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I remember perfectly well, as the hon. gentleman has said, that I promised all the papers. I thought, when the papers were brought down, they were all here, but I see that the memorandum is only a list of the tenders with the prices. I am now writing to my deputy to tell him to send at once all the original tenders if that has not been already done.

Mr. TARTE. Would the hon. gentleman be kind enough also to bring down the cheque given by Bancroft. I think the cheque is still in his department, and it may be a very important paper to have. While I am on my feet, I may also call the attention of the hon. Minister to this fact : that, on the very same date, the 4th April, on which the letter was written by the so-called Bancroft, but written and signed by Michael Connolly, another letter was written by the two Connollys and signed by Mr. Connolly himself. These two letters show that on the same day the very same man tendered twice—once under a false name, and once under the true name of their firm.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If the hon. gentleman knew how the cheques are treated, he would understand that what he asks cannot be given. When a tender is received from anyone, with his tender there is a cheque accepted by a bank, no matter what bank. When the tenders are open and the list is made, if it is a lump sum, the amount is put in the list and the amount of the cheque is put

in another column. If the amount is not a lump sum but is on schedule prices, then the tenders are put in the hands of the proper officer in order to extend the schedule and obtain the exact amount of each item. Then, when that is done, the list, having been made and signed by the deputy and the chief of the branch, is laid before the Minister so that the Minister may see what is the result. On that being submitted to the Minister, the lowest tenderer, as a rule, is accepted; if it is a small amount the Minister need not go to Council. If it is a large amount, it goes to Council and an Order in Council is passed, and when the Order in Council is passed and received in the department, all the cheques of the tenderers are sent back except the cheque of the tenderer whose offer has been accepted. That cheque, which is to the order of the Minister, is endorsed by the Minister and sent to the Department of Finance, and there, as soon as the contract is signed, as I understand, the cheque is sent to the bank and cashed. Therefore the cheque cannot be given in this case any more than in any other case.

Mr. TARTE. I also called the attention of the Minister to the fact that a letter of the 4th April was sent in by the Messrs. Connolly.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot help that, if it is so.

Mr. TARTE. That may be, though I am sorry that it cannot be helped.

Mr. AMYOT. We have been asked to vote $60,000 for the amount paid under the special warrant. The original contract was for $260,680. I have seen the report, which values the whole work, not at that sum, but at $450,944. We would like to have the details of all these expenses. How is it that besides the price of the contract, there are $50,000 for widening? Surely that was not decided upon after the work was nearly completed, upon a subsequent report of the engineer. There must be some details for that. There is also an estimate for valves, $3,000; for caissons, $20,000; hauling gear, $5,000; pump plant, $25,000; engine house, $15,000; shop tools, $2,500; coal shed, $1,000; store house, $2,000; residence for dock master, engineer and offices, $5,000; fence and gates, $2,500; bilge blocks and shores, $2,500; electric plant, $2,500; refund of expenses to the 30th June, 1889, $33,763.87; superintendence, $30,000. We want details about that. We see that the total cost of the contract is $260,000; but there are $200,000 more, and we want to know something about that. We want to know why these expenses have been incurred; therefore, I hope the Minister will understand the necessity of bringing these items before the House.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I hardly think this is the proper time to go into these items; but I may say to the hon. gentleman that what he wants to get is the estimate the chief engineer made after the contract was given for the different items that will be required to complete the works of the dock. For example, we have put down for widening, $50,000, but that work will not cost $50,000, as I stated, it will cost $31,000 or $32,000. Then you have valves, then you have caissons; we have put down $20,000 for caissons, but the caissons, by the contract, will cost only $18,000, and so on. Therefore, it is impossible to get the details the hon. gentleman wants now. Then other items have not been given; these are things that will come later on. For example, you have here shop tools, $2,500; that comes later on. Then, coal shed—that will be in order later on when the dock is about completed. Then, you have the fencing and gates, $2,500; then, you have shores, and these bilge blocks, $2,500. Then, you have store house, etc.,—that is another thing that is not given there. Then, residence for the dockmaster, electric plant, and so on—tenders have not been called for any of these things; all this work has not yet been done. They will come later on as the wants of the dock will require. That was the estimate made by the chief engineer, of what all the works would probably cost.

Mr. TARTE. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to put a question? Did he ever see that man Bancroft? I believe this is a fair question.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will not refuse to answer the question, but the hon. gentleman must remember that the leader of the Opposition asked for the papers yesterday. I sent at once to have them produced, and most likely I will have them in an hour or two, as soon as the deputy has collected them in the department.

Mr. AMYOT. I understand the position to be this: It is said in the report to which the Minister of Public Works referred a moment ago, that the amount voted by Parliament will be spent in a few days, and that he requires $60,000 on special warrant. We want the details on which he bases his estimates; we want the details of what has already been spent under the contract. I suppose his report is not altogether made to mislead the House, but to give us an estimate about one-third or one-half more than the real cost of the work. These estimates must be of some use, I presume, for somebody. We want to know where we are in respect to that dock. I do not want to discuss the details, but the hon. gentleman will see that we are fairly entitled to the fullest information possible under the circumstances.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Though it is not quite in order, nevertheless I will give an answer to the hon. gentleman in a very few words. If the hon. gentleman will be kind enough to look at the report of Mr. Perley, Chief Engineer, recommending the above Governor General's warrant for $60,000, he will see there what that money is required for.

SHAREHOLDERS OF THE WINNIPEG AND HUDSON BAY RAILWAY COMPANY.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the Government Orders of the Day are called—I observe that Bill (No. 119), the agreement with the Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway Company, is not yet printed. The Government, I presume, have got a list of shareholders of that company, and I think we ought to be put in possession of the names of the parties with whom we are treating, to whom we are presenting the subsidies. I desire to know if the Government are prepared now, or will be prepared in a day or so, to lay on the Table a list of the shareholders of that railway, with the details of the amounts paid up, &c.?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I will give what information I have with reference to the promoters of the railway.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is to be an incorporated company, and I want to know if the Government have a list of the stockholders.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I will enquire.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They know with whom they are dealing, I suppose, in plain English.

WAYS AND MEANS.

House resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. FOSTER moved:

1. *Resolved*, That towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty for the financial year ending the 30th of June, 1891, the sum of $2,594,597.64 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

2. *Resolved*, That towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty for certain expenses of the public service of the financial year ending the 30th of June, 1892, the sum of $2,389,854.26 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

3. *Resolved*, That towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of public service for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1892, the sum of $2,398,845.81 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Resolutions reported.

Mr. FOSTER moved the second reading of the resolutions.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I desire to ask the Minister of Finance, with respect to that item to which I specially directed his attention, the Governor General's warrant for $302,000 in the unprovided items, whether he has any further information to offer.

Mr. FOSTER. No further information.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not want to raise a discussion, as it might delay business, but I would suggest this: I desire that either he or the Minister of Customs, who is acting Minister of Railways, will order Mr. Schrieber to attend the next meeting of the Public Accounts Committee, and we can investigate that matter at our leisure.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose it is the function of the Committee to order a witness to attend, but I will have the motion passed in the morning at the Committee.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister of Railways can order his official to attend without any inconvenience or detriment to the public service.

Mr. BOWELL. I will see that he attends.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When will the Committee meet?

Mr. FOSTER. To-morrow morning at 10 o'clock.

Resolutions concurred in.

SUPPLY BILL.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 127) to grant to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for paying certain expenses of the public service for the financial years ending respectively 30th June, 1891, and 30th June, 1892, and for other purposes relating to the public service.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first, second and third times, and passed.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 13) to provide for the exercise of Admiralty jurisdiction within Canada in accordance with the Colonial Courts of Admiralty Act of 1890.—(Sir John Thompson.)

WAYS AND MEANS.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster: "That the resolutions adopted in Committee of Ways and Means on Tuesday last, the 23rd instant, be read a second time;" and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, when I had the pleasure of moving the adjournment of the Budget debate, the House had just listened to an admirably delivered speech by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), an hon. gentleman who, I need not say, is listened to on this side of the House with a pleasure scarcely less than that which greets him among those to whom he is bound by ties of party association and party friendship. I am not unaware, Sir, that it must ever be a task, particularly to those who, like myself, are quite unused to taking part in the debates of this House, to make a satisfactory answer to one of that hon. gentleman's very forcible and rather seductive speeches. But, to-day, and under these circumstances, the task is somewhat lessened to me, because the hon. gentleman consumed the greater portion of his time in criticizing the arguments of the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), —arguments which, I submit, were very little disturbed by the very keen criticism to which they were exposed, and hence need very little defence at my hands this afternoon; and, in the second place, lessened, too, by the fact, and the hon. gentleman will excuse me if I say it, because I thought the hon. gentleman was attempting an attack upon a Budget speech, with a greater portion of which it did seem to me that the hon. gentleman was in more or less hearty accord. Indeed I did think as he proceeded on his way so eloquently and so ably, that he was to a much greater extent in accord with it, than he was in accord with many of the statements, with many of the expressions, and with many of the arguments that had at an earlier stage of the debate fallen from the hon. gentleman who had preceded him upon that side of the House. Sir, we have now had two speeches from the benches to your left in reply to the hon. Minister of Finance who made his financial statement the other afternoon, and after listening to those speeches, one by the hon. member who has preceded me, who has always occupied a very prominent place in his party in this House, a gentleman who has not only occupied a prominent place in his party, but who at one time occupied the responsible post of financial critic upon that side of the House; and the second speech, not from an ordinary member in the ranks of the Liberal party, but from an hon. gentleman who at present occupies the important position of financial

critic to the party in this House, whose ability we very well recognize, and who has had a very long experience both in office and out of office, upon matters of trade, of commerce, and of finance,—Sir, I say, after listening to those two speeches, I think we upon this side of the House may well be excused for the compliments which we are disposed to pay without stint to the Minister of Finance, not only for his admirable statement upon the finances of the country, but also upon the success and the ability which has characterized his discharge of the duties which have devolved upon him during the last three or four years in connection with the Government of this country. I speak for myself, Sir, but at the same time I believe I am speaking for those who are around me, when I say that, notwithstanding a taunt here, or a sneer there, that may have been hurled against the hon. gentleman and have fallen harmless at his feet, we, on this side of the House at least, are proud of his ability and proud of his success, and regard him as no unfitting successor, and as no unfitting associate of these brilliant Canadians, whether in the past or in the present, who have come to us from the "shreds and patches by the sea." Mr. Speaker, I believe that we might well feel on this side of the House, I believe that the Government have every reason to feel, after the speeches by the two prominent gentlemen to whom I have referred, that they might well allow the speech of the Finance Minister, unsupported by anything further which may be said by this side of the House, and accompanied by what has been said, or what may be said by hon. gentlemen to your left—I believe that they might feel well satisfied to allow that speech to go to this House and to this country, and be assured that they would suffer nothing by the act of omitting its defence in this House. Sir, I should certainly have made no remarks in this debate had it not been for the statement very frequently hurled against members from Ontario upon this side of the House, that we are unwilling, and quite unwilling, to come to the defence of the Government upon the various question of the day. I speak my own mind, and I believe I speak the mind as well of those around me, when I say that some who will take part in this debate are taking part in it simply for the reason which I have just assigned. For that reason, and for the reason that I do not often ask your attention, Sir, and that I do not often ask the attention of this House, I hope that the members of this House will pardon me if I transgress for a time upon their attention this afternoon, while I deal in my own humble way with those subjects which have been touched upon in the Budget speech, and while I deal as well with the amendment which has been proposed by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), leading as he does the financial and commercial forces upon the other side of the House. I have said, Sir, that we have listened to the Budget speech in its criticism with a great deal of pleasure; and why not? What are the facts? After all the denunciation, after all the declamation that we have heard from press and from platform during the past year, here, face to face with the public records, face to face with the deliberate judgment and intelligence of this House; my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson), able as he is—and I wish to detract none from his ability,—my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), able as he is, and no man here wishes to detract from his ability—these two gentlemen, by far the ablest in the ranks of their party in this House, meet the financial statement of the Minister of Finance, I submit, more in compliment than in criticism, and passing by the changes which were made in the tariff, though unreadily and unwillingly, they are forced to admit that this Government has had its finger upon the pulse of this country, and that this Government is anxious to look well to the interests of those with a management of whose affairs they are charged. Now, Sir, after passing by these points, and I submit I have not drawn too strong a picture, we have had both hon. gentlemen, and particularly the hon. gentleman from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), following the strain of former years, and indulging in that old song, that song of despair, and of wreck, and of ruin, with which the ears of hon. gentlemen on the other side of this House have been pleased and tickled in days gone by, and by which hon. gentlemen opposite have been endeavouring to win the affections, and to win the confidence of the people of this country, and the people of the country across the border as well. Now, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the remarks which have fallen from my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson), I desire to say just a few words upon one or two of the points upon which he makes contention, and to leave the other points upon which he spoke until I come to deal with them as they were spoken of by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who preceded him. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) is a practical tradesman, and, I believe, a very good tradesman, and a credit to the trade to which he belongs. He is intelligent upon the subject which he discussed in this House; there is, perhaps, no man in Parliament who knows better than he does the subject of sugar, with which he dealt for a long space of time when he spoke to the House upon that question; and, Sir, I shall not attempt to follow him in the somewhat intricate arguments and minute details which he gave in connection with that business; I will leave that to my hon. friends upon this side of the House who are engaged in the same trade, and who are equally, I presume, able with himself, and who will answer him upon the minute details which that gentleman has brought forward. But looking at the question as one outside the trade, I did conclude, after the three-quarters of an hour nearly which the hon. gentleman spent upon the sugar question,—I did conclude that he was forced to come to this conclusion: that after all, the Minister of Finance had brought down a Budget speech and announced changes in the tariff which had given a great portion of the sugar of this country absolutely free to the consumers, and with regard to the balance of it, he had brought down such a tariff that the people of this country—according to the Liberal organs, according to the organs of commercial associations, and according to the hon. gentleman's own arguments—were to-day receiving sugar at from between $1\frac{1}{8}$ cents and 2 cents less per pound than they could purchase it for before the tariff came down. And that, Sir, after all his maze of argument, after all his able dealing with that subject, was the hon. gentlemen's admission—that sugars of a certain grade were free, and sugars above that grade had been reduced from $1\frac{1}{8}$ to 2 cents a pound. Coming from the hon. gentleman,

I think that is a compliment which the hon. Minister of Finance may very well take to himself. Now, Sir, my hon. friend from South Brant declared that the breakfast table of the people of this country was not free. Well, I suppose that, like wealth, freedom is largely a comparative term; and I suppose that when we compare the freedom of the breakfast table to-day with the freedom of the breakfast table in other days, we are not making an unfair comparison. Hon. gentlemen opposite pose as those who would reduce the duties and give the people of this country cheap living and free breakfast tables. I think someone has said that we must read the future by the past of men; and certainly, if we read the future of hon. gentlemen opposite by their past we are justified in saying that they have no right to claim to be the party of low taxation or the party of free breakfast tables. I need not state the fact, for it is well known in this House, that under hon. gentlemen opposite tea was taxed by that abominable specific duty, to which my hon. friend from South Oxford so frequently refers as being the most iniquitous tax that could be placed upon the people of any country. I need not say how coffee was taxed by another of those abominable specific duties, or how molasses was taxed twice or three times as much as it is at the present time, or how sugar bore the very heavy tax which has been so frequently the subject of criticism in this House. And yet my hon. friend from South Brant, remembering these facts very well, but attempting to damage the position of the Government, and in face of the fact that we have by the action of this Government tea free, coffee free, sugar almost absolutely free, molasses almost free, still contends the Government has not given this country a free breakfast table after all. Sir, I do not require to deal with that subject any longer. I think the hon. gentleman's contention is sufficiently answered by the facts of the case. Let me say that if the tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite on tea, coffee and sugar had been in vogue, and were in vogue to-day, there would have been a taxation upon the people of this country higher than the present taxation by no less than $4,000,000 upon the breakfast tables of the country. Now, Sir, I want to deal for a moment with my hon. friend's statement, which contradicted, to a large extent, the statement of the hon. member for Albert with regard to the importance of the sugar-refining industry in this country. I may say at once that I am not acquainted with that industry; I may say that I know nothing practically about it; and I may say that I have not consulted any of my hon. friends around me who do know about it, for fear that their evidence might be considered biassed and, therefore, unacceptable to this House. But, when the hon. gentleman stated—and he took a great deal of pains to figure it out from the census—that only some 800 people were employed in the sugar refineries of the country, he evidently forgot that, when his friends were on this side of the House, their blundering tariff compelled the refiners of this country to close their doors. We know that that subject was brought up in the House of Commons of Canada, not by men who supported the party in power at the present moment, but by men who supported the hon. member for South Oxford and his friends, and that on that occasion Mr. Jones, a good Liberal, made the very same statement that the hon. member for Albert made the other night, that thousands were employed in the sugar-refining industry of this country; and the very same statement was made by Mr. Workman, who then represented the city of Montreal and supported hon. gentlemen opposite. He declared, not that hundreds, but that from 15,000 to 30,000 people were either directly or indirectly engaged in the work of sugar refining in this country. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition smiles one of those seductive smiles which we on this side of the House are always glad to recognize on his handsome face; but when the hon. gentleman smiles, though it may be a smile of ridicule, it will not be directed at me for if he turns to the *Hansard* of 1876 there he will find the statements of his good friend Mr. Jones and his good friend Mr. Workman; and I think I can leave the question of the correctness of those statements to be settled between those Liberals of the past and the Liberals of to-day. Now, my hon. friend from South Brant contended that there was an enormous protection to the sugar-refining industry of this country; and after all, when you come to figure it out, I think there is, according to the statement of the hon. gentleman as to the price of sugar, a duty of something like 17 or 18 per cent. in favour of the refiners of this country. My hon. friend shed a tear in the interest of the poor people of this country who were taxed so enormously for the advantage of the refiners. Now, Sir, my hon. friend is a manufacturer himself; he is a good manufacturer; and I do not complain of the protection he is getting. I am glad to know that his industry is prospering as it is; I am glad to see him not only extending his home factory, but planting factories in other towns in Ontario under the fostering influence of this National Policy; but when the hon. gentleman wept, as he did metaphorically, for the poor consumers of this country, he ought to have wept, too, for the consumers of sweetened biscuits, who are taxed 35 per cent., the consumers of non-sweetened biscuits, who are taxed 25 per cent., the consumers of candy, who are taxed 1¼ cents a pound by that horrible specific tax and 35 per cent. *ad valorem*, the consumers of jellies and jams, who are taxed 5 cents a pound, and the consumers of pickles—the hon. gentlemen must take the sour with the sweet—who are taxed 35 cents a gallon. I do not for a moment find fault with this, though I think there is a little inequality, the hon. gentleman's raw material, sugar, being somewhat reduced in price, according to his own contention. But the hon. gentleman will, no doubt, this session or next session go with me to the hon. Finance Minister and ask him to lower a little the duty on sweetened biscuits, and pickles, and jellies and jams, in order to make this tariff a thoroughly consistent tariff. Now, Sir, I admired and enjoyed very much the pleasant banter which the hon. gentleman gave to us on this side of the House. He asserted in his pleasant way that we are ready to applaud anything—that we applauded the imposition of taxes and applauded the reduction of taxes; and my hon. friend, with that ability which he always displays in this House, drew a magnificent picture of the members on this side rising and tossing up their hats in very glee when the Government reduced the taxes, and added that on the imposition of the duty we had risen and tossed up our hats in very glee a few years ago. Well, Sir, I do not think there is anything inconsistent in our cheer-

ing the reduction of a tax upon a necessary of life, more particularly when that reduction, enormous as it is, is made in the taxes of the people without disturbing those great national industries which it is the business of this Government to foster, and of which this country is justly proud. I wonder if my hon. friend used to rise in his seat and cheer when the hon. member for South Oxford was the Finance Minister of this country, and when my hon. friend, who then sat very close to where I am now, was offering a hearty support to the hon. member for South Oxford's policy upon many of the questions in that hon. gentleman's tariff. I do not think he used then to feel very happy. I do not think that he then was very well satisfied, or that his satisfaction ever rose to the height of a cheer. Sir, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was then the Finance Minister of this country, and my hon. friend—an intelligent man, a conscientious man, and perhaps few more conscientious men sit in this House—sat behind him; and my hon. friend then took the opportunity, upon every possible occasion, to rise in his place, and, as the defender of the industries of this country, beg for God's sake that the life-blood should cease to be crushed out of this country by competition with the country to the south of us. I do not quote these opinions of the hon. gentleman to show his inconsistency, because I believe that is a position which no hon. gentleman should take in this House. If I may be permitted to refer to a previous debate, I may say that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), last night, expressed my sentiments exactly when he said that a man may change his opinion and still be regarded as thoroughly consistent; but when I look back into the pages of *Hansard* I find my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson) giving utterance to arguments in this House which he has never yet answered. I find the hon. gentleman then used language of which he has never used the equal since he has been compelled to change his opinions, and I am free to take the better arguments of the hon. gentleman and present them to this House for consideration as against the weaker arguments which he makes to-day. Why, Sir, he objects that we should have a tariff of 17 per cent. or 18 per cent. on sugar. But we had a protection of 17½ per cent. in 1876 upon manufactured imports, and then the hon. gentleman, standing up here in his place as an adviser and supporter of the Minister of Finance, said:

"At the present time we have a protective tariff of 17 per cent. on some articles, and the question which should engage the attention of the Minister of Finance is, whether an additional duty, no matter how much it may be"——

Specific or *ad valorem*, be it 20 or 25, or, for that matter, 100 per cent.—

—"no matter how much it may be on certain articles, will not promote the interest of this Dominion."

My hon. friend will find, by the *Hansard*, that he expressed those opinions in 1876. Once more, he said:

"The Finance Minister should ascertain, if possible, what articles are being slaughtered in our markets, what industries are being crushed out in our midst, what enterprises could be successfully fostered in this country, and then should frame a tariff that would be defensive in its nature. He being a champion of our interests should use, not offensively but defensively, that weapon which has been placed in his hands in order to prevent the life-blood of this country being drawn from it."

Mr. MONTAGUE.

Sir, I could quote page after page, column after column, directed in very much the same way to this House. And they are arguments the hon. gentleman has never answered since he has been compelled or chosen—I do not care which—to contend upon the other side of this question. Now, I want to show the House what a magnanimous man my hon. friend from South Brant is. He has not the least bit of resentment in his good nature, and he has a very good nature. Why, what is the picture? The hon. gentleman came to the rescue of his hon. friend from South Oxford, and he came to it manfully and heartily. Does the hon. gentleman admit that he was a manufacturer, and that, as a manufacturer, he was asking for an increase of the tariff in 1876? He will not deny it. Then, admitting that, does he remember that the hon. member for South Oxford went through the Province of Ontario and declared to the farmers, during the recent campaign, that when the manufacturers came to him and asked him for protection he said to them (I say it under my breath, Sir): "I told them to go to the father of lies." I allow my hon. friend from South Brant to draw his own inference. I shall not suggest to this House the treatment he received, but, putting things together, I say that he, the hon. member for South Brant, is as gallant as he is kind, is as chivalrous as he is able in this House. I do not need to say that the hon. gentleman was among those who advocated a very strong tariff as affording a very good protection to the farmers of this country; and I do not think that the hon. gentleman to-day will rise in his place in the House, and I do not think any other hon. gentleman on the other side will rise and say that he would ask the farmers of this country to return to the relative position, as compared with the people of the United States, which they held from 1873 to 1878. Why, what did he say? He said, on the 21st February, 1876, that the agitation was general for protection among the farmers. He said:

"There is no doubt that throughout the length and breadth of the country, at the present time, this question agitates all classes of our community."

And I can well understand the fervour with which the hon. gentleman spoke those words. Again, he said:

"I am cognizant of the fact that this subject is agitating them to their very depths. At my last election, when my opponent told them they need not expect any protection from the Reform Government, I had to assure them that whenever this subject came up in the House I would raise my voice in their behalf."

I am afraid his opponent was right. I am afraid my hon. friend from South Brant trusted too confidently in the good judgment and intelligence of his leaders, when they came to deal with the interests of Canadian agriculturists. In order, Sir, to alarm the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches once more he said:

"There will be a petition here of 100,000 grangers asking for protection to the agricultural industries of this country."

I shall not refer further to that hon. gentleman's contentions. They are contentions which at that time were meeting, and afterwards did meet, the approval of the people of this country, and I am bound to say, I giving the hon. gentleman full credit for his convictions, that if to-day he were asked in his own county: Will you take off the duty on your agricultural produce and allow the Americans to slaughter in our markets again with-

out our securing their market in return? he would not reply that he would, and if he did, he would not find five men in the county he represents, or in the county I represent—and I may make that statement deliberately—who would say: Let us return to the jug-handled policy followed when these gentlemen were in power. My hon. friend asks us to suggest a scheme for the relief of the terrible distress which the hon. gentleman from South Oxford has declared exists among our tillers of the soil. Suggest a scheme! the hon. gentleman never, in the light of the record of his friends, should have used any such term in this House. Suggest a scheme, Sir!! Does the hon. gentleman remember the scheme that his hon. friend from South Oxford suggested, in 1878, when, confronted with tumbling interests and bankrupt manufacturers and impoverished farmers on every side, he said to the farmers, upon the platform at Fergus, in the Province of Ontario: You must be more frugal; you must be more industrious; you must work harder and eat less. Sir, I hope whatever scheme the Minister of Finance may bring down to this House, that for Heaven's sake he will not be compelled to say to the people of this country: Work longer hours and with a steadier will, and eat less when you go in to that free breakfast table in the morning, in order that you may better your condition. Now the hon. member for South Brant complains that we were in this House given very much to attacking the hon. member for South Oxford. I disclaim any such intention so far as I am concerned, and I think hon. gentlemen on this side of the House will disclaim it as well. But the hon. gentleman must remember that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is the mouthpiece of his party on questions of trade and commerce. He lays down to this House the policy which his party are supposed—I say supposed, because I do not think they really have any policy in reference to this question—are supposed to have adopted. Therefore it is our duty to show, as we believe we can show, the falsity of his premises and the illogical nature of his arguments, as well as the deductions which he makes from those arguments in his speeches. The hon. gentleman admitted he attempted to create prosperity by the system which he adopted when he was in office, and he failed. I disclaim any intention to attack the hon. gentleman personally when I deal with him in regard to this matter and with his contentions in this House. I shall not use a word in regard to his personal character. In dealing with public subjects I trust I shall not take from the speeches which he delivered in Ontario even a single selection from that vocabulary of abuse, that vocabulary of vilification, speeches, Sir, which contain more abusive terms, more terms of vilification of his opponents than all the speeches of all the public men who through all the years have discussed Canadian public questions before the citizens of this country. My hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon) expected the hon. gentleman to feel happy when he was listening to the speech of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. I do not think the hon. gentleman had a single reason to feel happy. Sir, what are the facts? I do not say that it has come from the mouth of hon. gentlemen opposite, but in the press representing those hon. gentlemen we have seen for the last twelve years the statement that when one event came to the Conservative party, success would perch on the banners of those hon. gentlemen opposite. That event has happened, Sir, and, within a few weeks we have been told that under the shadow of that great bereavement the Liberal Conservative party would go to atoms. And yet, Sir, the hon. gentleman was compelled to look across the floor at a new Government formed under a new and able leader still controlling the destinies of the country—with ranks behind them no less solid—if slightly smaller—than in days gone by. He had, Sir, no reason to be happy, for once more—and for the hundredth time—the ships he had sailed for sunny isles "had never come to shore." He saw himself face to face with no bright prospects in the present. Nor was the past any better. I fancy, as he sat there, Sir, listening to his successful opponent, that he was tracing the pictures which hung in memory's hall. No doubt he was comparing the position of the present Finance Minister with the position which he occupied as Finance Minister in this country. No doubt he was making points of difference between his record during those five years and the record of my hon. friend who now occupies the position. My hon. friend the Finance Minister was able to come down to the House with a surplus of revenue over expenditure. The hon. gentleman scarcely knows what that pleasure is. The present Minister of Finance was able to announce a reduction of $3,500,000 of taxation, and, as the magical words fell from his lips, the hon. gentleman opposite must have remembered his statements in this House when he piled up millions of taxes on the people of this country. He must remember that he never was able to reduce a dollar of the burdens on the people. Then the hon. gentleman remembered that he was never able to say anything in the House when he was a member of the Ministry of that day in reference to the prosperity of this country. In 1875 he came to this House and prophesied that there was likely to be an era of hard times, that a storm would probably arise on the political horizon. In 1876 he said that we were undoubtedly in the storm. In 1877 he said that we were drawing moderately close to clear water, and in 1878 he said that the storm was nearly over, but that the country was still suffering from the ground swell. There are those on this side, Sir, who are uncharitable enough to believe that the hon. gentleman was, instead of suffering from the ground swell, feeling the premonitory effects of the cyclone which struck him later in the year, and from the effects of which neither he nor his friends have yet recovered. The hon. gentleman was not only not able to congratulate the House on the prosperity of the country, but he made predictions which were not fulfilled, while the present Minister of Finance was able to come here and show that every prediction that he had made was fulfilled and that every prophecy had been justified by the subsequent results. Let the hon. gentleman go back and trace the results of what he will find recorded in the walls of his memory, and see how he panned out as a prophet. In 1876 he said we would have a reasonable surplus, but it resulted in a deficit of $1,900,788. In 1877 he said the reason for the deficit was abnormal, and that it would not occur again, but the next year he came down with his

usual smiling face and showed the usual result of a deficit of $1,460,027. In 1877 he said it was very likely that we should have a surplus in the next year, but in 1878 he had to report a deficit of $1,128,147. Once more he ventured to prophesy for the next year, but he was not here; his successor, however, was compelled to come down with a deficit of $1,937,999. My hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon) was unkind and unfair when he expected that, under those distressing circumstances, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) should have listened with a smiling countenance to the speech delivered the other day by the Minister of Finance. Beginning his speech, the hon. gentleman opposite attacked the public works of this country, and his argument was that the public works did not pay. My hon. friend behind me said that was the argument of a demagogue. I shall not use that term, because I think it may be unparliamentary, but I can only say that if in any township council a councillor used the argument against the construction of a macadamized road that it would not pay he would be laughed out of the council and out of the community. We did not expect, when we commenced to build our harbours and our lighthouses to provide for the safety of lives and property, when we undertook to construct the finest system of canals the world has ever seen, that we were going in that way to bring dollars into the public treasury, and no one knows that better than the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman went once to the money markets of the old world, unfortunately for this country, and he issued a prospectus in which he said, speaking of the expenditure upon public works in Canada:

"The whole of the debt has been incurred for legitimate objects of public utility. The indirect advantage from these public works has already been found in the remarkable rapidity with which the commerce and the material prosperity of the Dominion have been developed; while a substantial increase in the direct returns may fairly be expected from the improvements now in progress, and to follow the steady progress of population and trade."

Once more, I do not want to put the hon. gentleman of the past beside the hon. gentleman of the present, and say that he is inconsistent; but I think my legal friends around me will say that they would rather go to a judge who is in a good temper and a pleasant frame of mind than to one who is in a bad temper. I will take the hon. gentleman when he was in the pleasing position of a seat in the Government of this country, when his mind was supposed to be at ease, and his spirit was supposed to be happy, and I ask this House to accept his judgment in that happy mood, rather than the wild declamations which he makes in this House after long-continued disappointment in the political arena of this country. Now, then, the hon. gentleman was quite right when he said that we were to secure indirect returns. Sir, does he know that by the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway from the town of Pembroke, in which you live, to the sea, 300 towns have sprung up under the fostering influence of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that the assessment of those towns, far below their actual value, is to-day, by actual returns, no less than $125,000,000? This does not include any of the farming land opened up or increased in value along the route. Does the hon. gentleman know, as my hon. friend the Minister of Finance stated last night, that we are to-day getting our freight carried—which is a direct advantage to the people of this country—on account of the competition, for a little more than one-third what it was some years ago? Does he know that by the returns brought down to this House, we have six times as much mileage, we have carried five times as much freight, we have five times as many passengers, as the railways did in 1867, and the income of those roads is only four times as much as it was in 1867? This, Sir, tells it, it appears to me, better than words can tell, the story of reduced freight rates in the country, due to competition, and that competition due largely to the aid we have given railway construction in Canada. But let us deal with this in a broader sense. I quote the words of the hon. gentleman in 1875, when he said:

"We have chosen to take upon ourselves a truly imperial task, a greater task than that which was ever undertaken by any nation of our age and our resources, that of colonizing and of developing an enormous extent of territory, not so much for our own benefit, but for the benefit of the generations yet to come. This is a task, Sir, for the performance of which we may well ask our people for any reasonable sacrifice."

Sir, that was the task to the performance of which the Conservative party set themselves in 1879; that was the task that was the life-dream, aye, more than the life-dream, the life-work of the statesman who has gone; and I tell you in the light of the facts that it might well be said that over his bier shone the light of more than the dawn of the completion of that great work which was outlined in the speech of my hon. friend in 1874. What have we done? We have built our harbours, we have dredged our rivers, we have constructed our public works, we have made this great system of canals, we have kept our bond with the provinces to the east by constructing the Intercolonial Railway, we have kept our bond with the Province of British Columbia to the west by the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and in doing that we have opened up those provinces which must yet, Sir, be the hope of the future of this Dominion; because it must be well known to every hon. gentleman in this House that it is upon those plains of the North-West, that it is in those mining camps, in those coal fields, and in those cities of the future that must be employed the millions whose presence within our shores can alone work out the destiny which God and nature intended should be the destiny of this country. Now, Sir, after all these things have been done during the past 12 years, my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, comes down to this House and is able to declare to us that we are only bearing an interest burthen of 6 cents per head by the public debt more than we did in 1879. Now, Sir, I do not desire to speak lengthily upon the subject of the hon. gentleman's contention as to the "shreds and patches" of the Dominion. My hon. friends behind me somewhat resent that. Well, we do not mind this kind of attacks much from the hon. gentleman in Ontario. We have heard the hon. gentleman before. He has called us corrupt, he has called us selfish, he has called us mad, and more than that, he has said, in his own aristocratic way, that we were lazy—in other words, he has said we had "too great an aversion to manual labour." However, I may say that some of my hon. friends take this matter too much to heart. He does not mean it; it is only one of those ebullitions of temper that the hon. gentleman experiences

when he speaks against the people, and when the people continue to vote want of confidence in him. However, I just desire to refer to this matter for a moment, because I was somewhat impressed—I may confess to my hon. friends from Nova Scotia that I was somewhat impressed by the charge that has been thrown across the House, that these men from the east were getting too much, that we had purchased Nova Scotia: and perhaps after all some of my friends—metaphorically speaking, of course—might have a few dollars jingling in the "pockets of their constituencies" "for political considerations." However, I looked up the records on this question of the time when the hon. gentleman was in power, when he had his friend, Mr. Jones, here as his chief lieutenant from Nova Scotia, and the hon. gentleman went back to Nova Scotia, and what was his plea? Was it that this good Liberal Government had taken care of the finances of this country? Was it that he had diminished the expenditure? No, Sir! He issued a manifesto which I have here, and which hon. gentlemen can see, claiming support for the Government of the hon. member for South Oxford, and why? Because, they had spent in the province of Nova Scotia nearly $500,000 in five years more than the Conservative Government had spent in seven years, the figures being as given in this bragging manifesto of Mr. Jones: Liberal Rule, $1,127,794 in five years; Conservative Rule, $650,228 in seven years. Now, Mr. Speaker, I thought after that the hon. gentleman should not bother this House with a discussion as to what may or may not be spent in the province by the sea. I was glad when my hon. friend—I only interject the remark here—I was glad when the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) rejoiced for us over the completion of the great Canadian Pacific Railway. It is true his rejoicing comes a little late, but better late than never. The hon. gentleman will rejoice still more when I read him a few figures which have been published in Bradstreet, and which will tell the tale that the wild-cat scheme of only a few years ago, that railroad which would not pay—I do not care to use the word he used—the lubricating oil upon its wheels, that road has in the past year, from May, 1890, to May, 1891, increased its income by $285,000, and in that increase stands $161,000 more than the decrease of receipts of any trunk line that exists upon the continent to-day. Those are the figures with regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, Sir, I desire, for a few moments, to deal with the question of the agricultural ruin which my hon. friend said prevailed throughout the length and breadth of the Province of Ontario. I am here to admit that in Canada, as in other portions of the Empire, and the other portions of the civilized world, there is, to a certain extent, a depression hanging over the occupation of agriculture. This must be very generally admitted, and I need not discuss the reasons; they are evident to every gentleman who sits in this House this afternoon. Go, if you will, to the continent of Europe, and you will see what prevails there; you will find that in Belgium Government commission after Government commission has failed to suggest a help for the need that exists; you will find that in Germany the little farms of the peasants are being taken from them by mortgages; you will find that in France 3,000,000 of the 8,000,000 landowners have actually become subjects of public and of private charity; you will find, too, that under the sunny skies of Italy, with, perhaps, the most fertile soil to be found upon the continent of Europe, no less than 150,000 of its agricultural labourers are leaving that country every year to seek homes in other portions of the world. Now I come to the United States of America. What, Sir, is in the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite? If there is anything in that policy at all—I do not deal now with anything except dry, hard facts—if there is anything at all in that policy it must be because the farmers of the United States are richer than the farmers of the Province of Ontario, and of the Dominion of Canada. Sir, my hon. friends upon that side of the House, when you come to discuss this policy, do not want any matter of sentiment mixed up with it. They say it is time to do away with sentiment. Sir, I am not one of those who believe that in discussing a question of this kind, a question upon which may depend the future life of the country, you can entirely discard sentiment. I take it for granted that every hon. gentleman admits that in the upbuilding of a nation one of the most potent factors of its progress and advancement is a healthy and strong and individual national sentiment. I take it for granted that is the truth in respect to this people, or any other people. But I am willing for the moment to completely sever this question from a question of sentiment, and, if I do so, I ask hon. gentlemen to get down to the same hard matter of fact basis and to separate their contentions from the wild mass of speculation and assertion—wild, I say—which they so frequently produce in this House. Now, Sir, last year I took one of the best means that was open to me to discover the state of affairs in the United States. I opened up correspondence with every bureau of agriculture, with every statistical office in the United States of which I could obtain the address, and I am here to state for a few moments the information I gained and the conclusion at which I arrived. Let me say once more on the question of sentiment, that if we are to entirely disconnect the question from sentiment, then it becomes a mere business proposition, and it must be dealt with on a sound and hard business basis. It then becomes a question simply of partnership between the farmers of this country and the farmers across the line, and as the very first action taken by a business man would be to make enquiries as to the condition of the other party with whom he might be endeavouring to secure a partnership, so in this matter—a matter, I say, of trade partnership—let us inquire what is the condition of those with whom we are asked to go into partnership. The House, I hope, will not weary for a moment if I read briefly, and I will only read briefly, some extracts; and I ask hon. gentlemen who speak on this question not to depend on declamation and assertion, but to produce evidence as to the condition of affairs in the Province of Ontario or any other portion of Canada. I am here to state that I believe there are no farmers on the face of the earth to-day who are more prosperous than the farmers of Ontario at the present time. I have not here the actual figures that I can employ to establish that fact, but if hon. gentlemen have statements of agricultural papers, if they have reports of agricultural associations, if they have statistics collected by the officers of the people of

Ontario which show anything else, I will very quickly recede from the position I have taken. Let me speak for a moment with respect to the State of Maine, a great State, of which Mr. Blaine is the statesman. There is a statement in the report for 1890 by Mr. Z. A. Gilbert, Secretary, on page 3, as follows :—

"There is undoubtedly much discouragement amongst our farmers: depreciation in farm values has gone on very rapidly for some time and has now reached a stage which is truly alarming, reaching in many cases 25, 35, and even 50 per cent., and the end is not yet. So much is this depreciation the case that farms have scarcely a selling value, and if by any uncontrollable circumstances any considerable number of farms were to be placed upon the markets, it is doubtful whether purchasers could be found."

I need not refer to New Hampshire. The description of the same condition in that State, on page 7 of the report, will be found by hon. gentlemen if they will read it. I need not refer to Vermont, where 161,000 acres are abandoned, and where the report which is in my possession says :

"Our lands are not worn out, but are abandoned because there is no good market for the products of this State."

I have the statement for the State of New York, which I will not read, but place in the hands of the reporters, because I desire to have it in the *Hansard*.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then I will read it. The Bureau of Agriculture in 1888 says :

"On the whole, New York farmers are more in debt than they were ten years ago. There are a large number of farms which were purchased a few years ago and mortgaged, which now would not sell for more than the face of the mortgages, owing to the depreciation of the farming lands, which, on an average, is fully 33 per cent. in ten years. Probably one-third of the farms in the State would not sell for more than the cost of the buildings and other improvements, owing to the shrinkage."

The State Assessors in 1890 say :

"We find a general depreciation in the value of farm lands. We have visited fourteen counties, and in all saw the same condition of affairs. Farming property is growing less and less valuable. No one wants to buy lands. The reasons for this are many. In the first place, the farmer here cannot compete with the western farmer. There is for this cause very little grain now raised within our borders. Potatoes bring no price. Butter is selling in the dairy districts at 14 cents and other products are equally low. In a few years you will see most of our present owners tenants. Everywhere we are confronted with the statement that farm lands are depreciating, that sales are infrequent and the industry continually growing less profitable. In many instances mortgage liens upon farms represent their full value, and unencumbered farms are unusual and exceptional. In one of the first agricultural counties we noted forty-six mortgages resting upon farms in five of its principal farming towns. The assessed value of the farms was 75 per cent. of their full value, and the encumbrance aggregated nearly their assessments for purposes of taxation."

Do the hon. gentlemen want more?

Mr. CHARLTON. From what report is that quoted?

Mr. MONTAGUE. From the report of the State Assessors, Messrs. Wood, Ellis and Williams. I will now give the statement of Governor Hill, published a short time ago and made in his inaugural address. He said :

"It seems to be conceded that farming lands during recent years have largely decreased in value, and that the occupation of farming is gradually becoming less profitable than formerly; that the prices for farm products have been greatly and ruinously reduced; that wider and better markets, although much needed, are not forthcoming; that taxes are numerous and oppressive as well as unequally distributed, and that a general depression seems to pervade nearly every agricultural interest."

Mr. FOSTER. That was in his inaugural address?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes. In regard to Connecticut, I do not need to adduce evidence here. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) made this statement, when he appeared before the electors of Ontario :

"That the average annual reward of the farm proprietor of that State for his expenditure of muscle and brain was $181.31, while the annual wages of the ordinary hired man is $386.35."

The hon. gentleman will remember he used that statement, and it is contained in the *Globe's* report of the hon. gentleman's speech. And speaking to the farmers to whom he is offering riches by partnership with American farmers, he with astounding consistency said at Chatham as follows :—

"A pleasant state of things, is it not, for the farmers of Ontario to look forward to? How do you like the prospect, any of you, of making about half as much out of your farms as the average wages of your own hired man? How do you like the possibility, as stated by Mr. Colby, President of the Council, of seeing your farms selling for $3, for $5 and for $10 per acre."

In regard to New Jersey, at pages 326 and 330, it is stated in the official report :

"No one will lend money upon the farms of New Jersey, so poor have they become."

In Illinois there are farm mortgages to the amount of $416,000,000, on which there is overdue interest to the amount of $14,242,754. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) talked about chattel mortgages the other night, and declared that we had 6,000 chattel mortgages in twenty-eight counties of Ontario. Those were the figures given to the country by Mr. John Dryden, Minister of Agriculture for Ontario, and he stated that in the twenty-eight counties the number of mortgages to which reference was made amounted to $2,046,345. Upon the same basis you would have for forty-five counties $3,288,773. This would be 12 mills on the dollar upon the property in Ontario liable to chattel mortgage, or about $1.50 *per capita* of the population. Let the hon. gentleman take the official reports on what is known as the Imperial State of Illinois, the statistics collected by the Labour and Statistical Bureau in 1887, and he will find the following statement :—74,740 chattel mortgages, representing an indebtedness of $20,354,000, with interest unpaid amounting to $2,000,000, or equal to $5.50 *per capita* as the amount of chattel mortgage indebtedness in that State. I desire to speak for a moment of the State of Ohio, which, it is very well understood, is one of the best agricultural States throughout the Union. In 1888 the mortgages on the farms of that State amounted to $330,990,000, and the interest to $26,000,000 per annum, or only $1,000,000 less than the value of the total wheat crop of the State. I have here the correspondence of Washington Gladen, and at page 316 of the November *Forum* of 1890 he says :

"In Ohio farms are offered for beggarly rents, and even on these favourable terms farming does not pay. Tenant farmers are throwing up their leases and moving into the city, well content to receive as common labourers $1.25 a day, and to pay such rents and to run such risks of enforced idleness as the change involves."

That is correspondence based on reports from the State of Ohio. In regard to the State of Indiana, I have had personal correspondence with the State Librarian, Mr. Dunn, and I may here state that I

and under personal obligation to almost every one of the statistical and agricultural officers of the various States for the prompt manner in which they responded to my call. Mr. Dunn declares in his article in the *Political Science Monthly*, which he has prepared from official documents, as follows :—

"The increase in farm mortages from 1872 to 1879 was $60,000,000: from 1882 to 1888, $46,000,000, or an increase in thirteen years of $106,000,000."

I need not speak of Michigan, because its report is in the library, and every hon. gentleman can consult it if he wishes. The burden of debt is $129,000,000 in that State, and the interest required annually is $9,000,000, or the value of the product of about 20 acres of each farm in the State. One of my friends who went there, unfortunately from the County of Haldimand, states that the condition of affairs there is as an instance : That to-day they are receiving only $15 or $18 for a first-class animal which in the Province of Ontario, in his old home, would bring from $25 to $30 in the market. I do not give the official figures for Missouri : I give the statement made by Mr. Mansur in the House of Representatives. He says that in his county real estate is worth $1,850,000, that the mortgages are $1,012,000, and that this does not include city, town or village property, and the cause he gives in his speech in the House of Representatives to be as follows :—

"Fat beef, 1½ cents per pound : fat hogs, 3 1-10 cents per pound ; fat shipping cattle, 3 cents ; wheat, 62 cents per bushel, and oats, 14 cents per bushel."

And he asks the House of Representatives if, under these conditions, they can expect anything less than the mortgages and the despair which is coming up from the farmers of Missouri. Now, Sir, I wish for a moment to refer to one State in concluding this part of my subject, and I wish first to refer to one particular county in that State. My hon. friends will remember very well that Mr. McKinley was Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and that committee investigated the condition of agriculture, and of every other industry in every State of the Union. They will find upon page 862 of that report the evidence of the representative of the farmers of York County, Penn. He states there that that county is a splendid county, that its climate is good, that its soil is good, but he states that notwithstanding they are an industrious and practical people, the following is the condition of affairs there to-day :—

"They (the farmers) are not prospering. They are slipping backward year after year instead of gaining. Our wheat sells at a price below the cost of production. It is now 74 to 76 cents, corn 36 to 40 cents. Fattening cattle has declined wonderfully. It is rare for feeders to get market price for corn fed to the stock. Dairying is not remunerative, even when conducted with the most approved machinery and appliances and under the best known system."

What are the facts here, within fifty miles of the capital of the State of Pennsylvania, within a hundred miles of Washington, New York, Brooklyn and Philadelphia, those great centres of wealth and commerce and population of that great American Republic? We have here the farmers of the County of York, Pennsylvania, saying that they are slipping backward, that they are going behind ; and yet my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) holds up the flag of hope to the farmers of Ontario, and tells them : You will grow rich by securing partnership in that great sixty million market which lies across the border. Now, Sir, let me say to my hon. friend that the answer I get for all this is : Oh, these people are under protection ; these people are suffering from the same curse as our farmers are suffering from——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONTAGUE. And my hon. friend opposite says "hear, hear." That appeals to his intelligence, and to him it is satisfactory. Now, Sir, the hon. gentlemen upon the other side of the House might use that argument if to-day they were free traders, the hon. gentlemen upon the other side of the House might use that argument if they were Cobdenites, but instead they are Wimanites. What does the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) say in reply to this condition of affairs in the United States. He says : We are going to make our farmers rich by having the sixty million market across the border. I say to him : Yes, but these farmers in the United States are poorer than our Canadian farmers are ; and his answer is : Yes, of course, because they are suffering from higher protection than we are. That may be a reasonable position, but I am bound to say that if there is no other reason than that for the contention the hon. gentleman ought never to have made it in this House. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) smiles ; he smiles because we are being ruined by the McKinley Bill, he smiles because we have not got a market across the border, and because there is a duty upon Canadian produce going in there ; he smiles because our farmers are kept out of that market and their prices reduced, because, as the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright says : We have got to pay the duty upon every bushel of grain and upon every article we send to the United States. The same hon. gentleman took a very wonderful quantity of pains in 1878 to prove conclusively that it was the Americans who paid that duty, as his farmer pic-nic speeches will prove ; that it was not us ; that we had nothing to do with it ; that it did not lower our prices here, but that it was the poor Americans across the border who paid these duties in order to secure the products which the Canadian farmer had to spare. It was not the inconsistency of any argument that I was making at which the hon. gentleman was smiling ; it was a smile when he thought of the occasion when he used those arguments in the sweet gone by. Now, Sir, let me say that it is a pleasure to turn to the condition of the farmers of Canada. There is no doubt about it that they have had some bad crops, and that they are in some places suffering from the effect of these bad crops ; but, Sir, what evidence has the hon. gentleman offered as to any serious condition among the farmers of Ontario? When the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) pictured the farmers as ruined and decayed, the hon. gentleman who sits in front of me asked : Where does it exist? And, in his usual style, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) answered : Everywhere. Now, Sir, I have followed the hon. gentleman, in mind, of course, and through the newspapers, in his tour in the Province of Ontario, and I am bound to say that the hon. gentleman was just as cautious then as he is now. Speaking at Renfrew, he said to the farmers there, when he talked about stagnation and ruin :

"I do not mean to say it is in this part of the country."

I quote the exact words, and I have the speeches here, although it is not necessary to read them, and I will not. In Guelph, he said to the farmers:

"I do not say you are so affected here, but you are very exceptionally situated."

In Oxford, the county which he himself represents, and he will remember it very well, he said:

"You are so situated as to feel it less than almost any other part of our people."

At Oakwood, in the constituency of my hon. friend from South Victoria (Mr. Fairbairn), one of the most prosperous places on the face of God's earth to-day, a place where magnificent farm mansions are rising up on every hand—and I venture to say that the hon. gentleman, when he looked upon the prosperity that was existing among the farmers there, had not the heart to tell them that they were impoverished and going to ruin—he said:

"He would not presume to speak of the condition of the farmers there, but pointed elsewhere."

Mr. Speaker, there is some author who says: "He is a wise prophet who places the date of the fulfilment of his prophecy at a time sufficiently distant that he may not live to see his own confusion;" and so, Sir, he is a wise preacher of despair who places the situation, the locality of that despair and of that ruin, at a distance sufficiently great that the evidence may not be confronting him in the audience, or in the newspapers of the section, of the falsity of these statements which he makes. Now, Sir, in reference to what the hon. gentleman said as to decrease of population, I might point to statements made by my friends here that the population was decreasing in the various States of the Union, not only in the old States, but in some of the newer and some of the more recently populated States. Once more I turn, however, to a time when the hon. gentleman was smiling in power, and I see from what he stated about the depopulation of the older districts in Ontario that what is occurring is just exactly what the hon. gentleman, in the cooler moments of office, said would occur, without any degree of want of prosperity existing in this country. This is the Budget speech of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright)—a very handy document—delivered in 1874, when the hon. gentleman was Minister of Finance. He said:

"I find, Sir, on looking over the returns for the Province of Ontario, the largest and most populous province of the Dominion, that out of the 88 electoral districts into which it is divided there were only 35 in which the increase was 10 per cent. during the ten years. Precisely the same thing has occurred, under the same conditions, in the great State of New York and other States of the Union, which are in the most highly prosperous condition. I am, therefore, justified in warning the House that, so far as regards the older provinces of the Dominion, we ought not to look for any very large increase of population."

That, Sir, is on page 18 of the Budget speech of 1874, delivered by the hon. knight from South Oxford. With regard to the hon. gentleman's exodus, I shall not say very much. The hon. gentleman referred to it, and re-referred to it; he opened his speech with it and closed with it; he made several divisions in his speech, and in each he had a little interlude on that subject. So lovingly did he dwell upon it and so often did he return to it that I was strongly reminded of the words of Oliver Goldsmith—I must apologize for entering the domain of poetry, which belongs to my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin)—when, in the "Deserted Village," he said:

"I still had hopes, my long vexations past,
Here to return, and die at home at last."

Mr. Speaker, when the day comes for my hon. friend to depart from the scene—which I trust may be long hence, because our great public men are going too fast—the enterprising anatomist who examines his vital parts will find on the innermost walls of the innermost chamber of the hon. gentleman's heart a picture of some poor National Policy-burdened Canadian fleeing from a 30 per cent. tariff here to enrich himself under a 60 per cent. tariff in the hon. gentleman's Beulah land across the border. My hon. friend, referring to the hon. gentlemen who come from the Province of Manitoba and from the North-West Territories, says: "I do not blame these people in the western provinces of our Dominion, for they are fellow-sufferers with ourselves." Looking at the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly), at my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Ross), as well as at my good-natured and able friend who sits on the other side, and who, unfortunately, is too strong in his constituency, I say that these hon. gentlemen are not here to admit that they are fellow-sufferers with anybody in this Dominion. There is not a man of them who will rise up in this House and say that the people of Manitoba will trade positions with the people of any other part of the American continent. There is not a man of them who will stand up and say that he has anything to tell but a story of ever-widening acres, of multiplying towns and villages, of increasing numbers of homes dotting the prairies from Winnipeg to the Rocky Mountains. When the hon. gentleman talks about suffering in the Province of Manitoba and the North-West he cannot produce a single agricultural paper, or any paper published between Winnipeg and the sea, he cannot point to a single petition brought down to this House, which will show the people of Manitoba and the North-West to be anything but a happy, prosperous and contented people, satisfied with the present and ever hopeful for the future. Now, Sir, my hon. friend from South Brant said that he hoped that the people who had gone away in the exodus had gone to the end of the earth and were now returning. Well, Sir, I do not know whether or not they went to the end of the earth, but they went very near to it, to a place called Dakota; and I am happy to be able to inform the hon. gentleman, that having got very near to the end of the earth, they are returning, and that already this year one thousand of them—people originally from the counties of Kent, and Elgin, and Lambton, and Middlesex, drawn from the country by the wail and cry of the press of hon. gentlemen opposite—have left the despair and ruin in Dakota, and have come to be "fellow-sufferers" in the Province of Manitoba and the North-West Territories. Now, Sir, I want for a moment to correct some of the figures which the hon. member for South Oxford has given to this House. I do not pretend to have a special knowledge of trade or finance. I look to hon. gentlemen like the hon. member for South Oxford to give us this information; and when that hon. gentleman rose in his place and told us that the foreign trade of this country was decreasing I accepted the statement without any question whatever. I was, it is true, too credulous; but at the same time, Sir, I did actually accept that statement as correct, as many through the length and breadth of the Province of Ontario will accept it. Sir, what

is the statement? The hon. gentleman took from the Trade and Navigation Returns seven out of some fourteen or fifteen countries with which we trade: he took five countries with which our trade had actually decreased: whether by mistake or with pretended fairness, he took two countries with which our trade had slightly increased: but he omitted to take the others with which our trade had increased during the years of which he spoke from 50 to 1,000 per cent. He spoke of France, Spain, Portugal, Italy, Holland, Newfoundland and the West Indies: but he forgot to mention South America, where our trade has increased $300,000: Belgium, where it has increased 150 per cent.: China and Japan, where it has increased 50 per cent.: Germany, where it has increased 700 per cent.: and Australia, where it has increased 1,000 per cent. during the same period of time: and, Mr. Speaker, it is due to this House that the hon. gentleman should tell us why he did that. It is due to the junior members of the House, it is due to the members behind him, that he should say whether it was in error or intentionally that he quoted those figures which showed a decrease and did not quote those which showed an increase. Then, Sir, he left out another increase, the greatest increase of all—the increase of our trade with Great Britain, which, from 1878 to 1890, increased from $33,743,000 to $48,353,000. And he did all this, Sir, without regard to the fact that at the same time our trade with the United States had decreased from $42,000,000 to something like $40,000,000. The following table from the Trade and Navigation Returns shows our exports in 1873 and 1890:—

EXPORTS FROM CANADA.

	1873.	1890.
Great Britain.....	$33,743,000	$48,353,000
United States.....	42,072,000	40,522,000
Germany.....	76,000	507,000
Belgium.....	17,000	41,000
South America.....	1,285,000	1,551,000
China and Japan....	46,000	61,000
Australia.....	41,000	471,000
Other countries.....	277,000	695,000

Now, let me say the condition of Ontario is not such as the hon. gentleman would have us believe it to be. Mr. Davidson, the President of the Board of Trade of Toronto, in his annual address, says:

"We rejoice in the fact that during the last year the agricultural interest in Ontario was sensibly improved. * * * The crops reached an all-round good average, and demand for them was active at fair prices."

Mr. Davidson goes on to speak further, and I will hand his remarks to the *Hansard*——

Mr. LAURIER. I object. That is contrary to the rules of the House.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I will read a portion of his remarks. I know I am wearying the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. LAURIER. I simply rise to remind the hon. gentleman that it has always been understood that nothing should go into the *Hansard* but what has been spoken on the floor of the House.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am sure that my pleasant friend, the hon. leader of the Opposition, rises, not with the object of interfering——

Mr. LANDERKIN. Oh, no: we like your speech better than your figures.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend looks very wise: he endeavours to convey the impression that he has an idea. I may apply to him the language of another poet:

"His wit invites you by his looks to come,
But when you knock you find there's no one home."

Mr. Davidson goes on to say that the Ontario farmer makes a much larger profit than does his American neighbour, and he proves this statement by a table which gives the average yield per acre for the last eight years, and which shows that upon the articles he mentions the farmers of Ontario have had over a million dollars of advantage over the farmers of the United States. I shall not read the table, because it would take too long. Mr. Cox, the President of the Bank of Commerce, and not a supporter of the Government, but a gentleman who ran as a candidate under the auspices of the hon. member for South Oxford, speaking at the annual meeting of the Bank of Commerce, said:

"There are unmistakable evidences of prosperity which anyone can understand."

Once more, Mr. Walker, the General Manager of the Bank of Commerce, says:

"During the past year the farmers of Ontario paid their implement notes and interests on mortgages and instalments quite as promptly as in former years, and in some districts they paid much more promptly than before."

Again, Mr. Hague, the Manager of the Merchants Bank—and no one can be better posted on the condition of the country than a bank manager—says——

Mr. MULOCK. Give us the farmers' opinion.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend is a lawyer farmer who sits in his law office in Toronto and weeps over the condition of the farmers. I say there can be no better authority on the condition of the country than the bank managers, because the banks come not only in direct contact with the farmers in the payment of those notes, but also in direct contact daily with the people who depend on the farmers for their sustenance and support. Mr. Hague says:

"I cannot share in the opinion held by some that the farmers of Canada, as a whole, are suffering. They are undoubtedly having a trying experience in some districts, but in many others they have done well and are prospering. Bank deposits are a plain proof of that. The manner in which farmers live is another proof of it. The continuous increase in cattle, horses, sheep and all the appliances of prosperous farming is apparent in many parts of the country."

Mr. Gooderham, President of the Bank of Toronto, says:

"The crops were only fair, but enhanced prices were obtained. The cheese industry was, I am happy to say, prosperous. The production and export was the largest in the history of the trade. The prices were good, and the farmers, factory men and dealers all made money. The export of cattle was very active, and the number exported far in excess of any previous year. Prices were good. Farmers and feeders both did well."

Professor Shaw, of the Agricultural College, a Liberal, who comes from the constituency of my hon. friend from South Wentworth (Mr. Carpenter), and who to-day is Mr. Mowat's right-hand man in the Agricultural College of Ontario, shows by a table, which I will not read, as it will take too long, that, on the article of pork alone, the farmers of Ontario are gaining $1,000,000 a year more than they

would have gained had they secured the prices which rule in the corresponding parts of the United States. My hon. friend smiles, but he knows very well that Mr. Shaw is not a partisan of this Government.

Mr. LAURIER. I am smiling at the idea of your sending a Commissioner to the United States to obtain a treaty of reciprocity in natural products.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If my hon. friend will permit me, I will deal with that point a little later on. The *Globe* of 6th June has the following article:—

"Thursday was the 4th of June and the crucial day in the dry goods trade. But to many it proved the most satisfactory experienced for years. It is generally thought that if 75 per cent. of the dry goods paper is taken up at this date it is satisfactory, but this year 95 per cent. was the experience of one leading house of this city—the best 4th of June they ever had."

Then, Sir, the business of banks themselves offer the same criterion. We learn from Mr. Cox that during the year the Bank of Commerce had its interest-bearing deposits increased by $5,000,000. The Bank of Montreal has had its interest-bearing deposits increased, and its shareholders, with $18,000,000 invested in the country, are satisfied with the present and hopeful of the future. The profits of all the banks have been, I notice, no less than $3,500,000. What is another test? Another test is the amount of life insurance effected in the country; because the people who are impoverished do not increase their life insurance policies. In 1877 the hon. gentleman said, during the Budget debate, that the amount of life insurance was a fair test—or words to that effect—of the prosperity of the people. Well, in 1879 the amount of life insurance in force in this country was about $86,000,000, and in 1890 the people had become so poor that they were only able to insure to the extent of $218,000,000; and while the life insurance effected during the year 1879 was $11,000,000, in 1888 our people had become so poor that they were only able to insure during that year to the extent of $40,000,000. Let me for a moment read the condition of the country, as presented in the different board of trade reports. The President of the Board of Trade of Winnipeg says:

"I am fully satisfied the trade of the country is in a very healthy state."

The Toronto and Hamilton Boards of Trade say the same thing. The hon. member for South Brant did not deal very much with this blue ruin cry. I looked through his speech carefully and listened to it carefully, and could not find that he said much about it. Why, if the hon. gentleman had told us his sentiments, he would have told us that he represents a constituency in which is situated a city, than which there is no more prosperous city on the continent of America to-day. I am proud to be his neighbour in that respect, and I am proud to see that the Board of Trade of Brantford says:

"The statistics of the city show an increase of over half a million dollars in the assessed value of property, arising chiefly from the fact that there has been a general advance made in the value of real estate for assessment purposes. Nowhere do merchants enjoy a more general prosperity."

And I ask the hon. gentleman if the merchants of the city of Brantford are enjoying greater prosperity than those of anywhere else; and if they do, I am fair in drawing the inference that the artizans, farmers and others who trade with the merchants have not become those serfs and slaves, and have not been reduced to that wretched condition in which the hon. member for South Oxford represents them to be. Let me, Sir, in the light of the facts I have cited, and after listening to the speech of the hon. member for South Oxford, read a few words, and only a few, from the columns of the *Globe*, in what I venture to believe is a fitting comment thereon, written a few years ago:

"Mistrust all figures professing to show that Canada has retrograded instead of advancing. Avoid association with the teachers of despair; old men who, with worn-out powers, assert that national suicide is the only course of national salvation, may be excused by consideration of their senility, but young men who echo their doleful refrain can never seem otherwise than contemptible."

That is the opinion of the Toronto *Globe* about those who preach of retrogression, and despair, and ruin in the Province of Ontario and the Dominion of Canada. Could comment be more fitting? Now, the hon. gentleman from South Oxford did not, in this House, state his causes for the ruin which he depicted as existing among the farmers of Ontario. He did, however, condescend to be more specific in the constituencies where he addressed meetings on this question. I have his speeches here; and at Pembroke, I think it was, he told the people they were suffering from this ruin because of two causes: First, because of high taxation; next, because of excessive competition. I shall not deal with the question of high taxation, because the hon. gentleman, a few moments later on, said that our taxation is very nearly that of the United States, and consequently I do not see any relief to be gained by joining hands with a people who, according to the hon. member for South Oxford, are taxed as highly as we are, and who, according to the records of the past few years, are taxed a great deal more than we are. But I will refer to the question of excessive competition. The hon. gentleman put a problem. It appears to me, he said, that the problem is: Given five millions of people in half a continent, how shall they make a living? And he solved it in this way, according to his policy: "Multiply the sphere of their operations by two and their competition by twelve." The hon. gentleman had a much more serious problem which was troubling his spirit at the time, and that was: Given a few disgruntled and disjointed politicians and a million farmers, how are the gentlemen to get into power? The hon. gentleman has not solved this last problem yet. He says we are suffering from intense competition, and yet the relief he offers us is to join hands with a people who raise $150,000,000 worth of breadstuffs more than they require for their own use, who raise provisions and meat to the extent of $135,000,000 more than they consume, who have annually live stock to the value of $32,240,000 worth more than they require. In other words, he says we are suffering from intense competition, and then asks us to get rid of it by joining hands with a people who raise enough for themselves and $400,000,000 worth to spare—$400,000,000 worth which they are compelled to send to the lands beyond the sea. I am bound to say that, if the hon. gentleman considers that the only solution of the difficulty, he had better return to the proposition he made in Fergus in 1878. I want to refer for a moment to a calculation which the hon. gentleman made. I do not refer to it seriously, because it does not need serious consideration from this House; and I say that with

due respect to the hon. gentleman. The calculation was something like this : Give us this policy, and from one million horses we should receive $37 each additional, or $37,000,000 in all, as an addition to the wealth of our farmers. Given twenty-two million acres of land and the increased value would give us, at $10 per acre, he says, $220,000,000 of an increase in the value of land in the Province of Ontario under his policy of Unrestricted Reciprocity. This is a statement which should not have been made by the hon. gentleman, but which might fittingly have been made by Colonel Sellers in the celebrated "Gilded Age." If the hon. gentleman has a magic wand by which he can produce wealth in that way he should use his power for those poor distressed farmers in the various portions of the United States of America, and should tell them how, with a market of 60,000,000 people, he is going to increase their land in value, which, as we know, is gradually lessening in price. The hon. gentleman referred to the question of a market, and he said that dealing with all the foreign markets except the United States was an utter fallacy ; and speaking of the trade which was likely to be interfered with between Canada and Great Britain, he called it "a paltry fraction of insignificant trade." These smaller markets may be more or less valuable, but we know at all events that the great and prosperous nation with which he asks us to join hands is stretching out its hands in endeavouring to secure those markets of which the hon. gentleman speaks so contemptuously. Let me tell him that nothing but a feeling of hostility to everything British, even to a British market, could induce him to say that our trade with Great Britain which is likely to be interfered with is "a paltry fraction of insignificant trade." In 1890 Great Britain took $48,353,690 of our products, while the United States only took $40,522,810, and, while the trade with the United States has been greatly lessened, the market of Great Britain has been increasing in its demands for our products. That market is almost unlimited in its requirements. In Great Britain they require annually 110,000,000 lbs. of fresh beef, 55,000,000 lbs. of canned meats, which we can produce, 6,500,000 lbs. of other meats, 106,000,000 lbs. of lard, 117,000,000 lbs. of tallow, 189,000,000 lbs. of butter, 203,000,000 lbs. of cheese, 427,000,000 lbs. of ham and bacon, 26,000,000 lbs. of salted beef, and 140,000,000 cwt. of breadstuffs, as well as $16,000,000 worth of eggs, all of which classes of goods we can supply, and supply well. The hon. gentleman says this is all prospective. A few years ago gentlemen spoke of the cattle trade in the same terms, but we find that the export of cattle, which twelve years ago amounted to only $500,000, in 1890 amounted to $7,000,000. A few years ago men like the hon. gentleman sneered at the cheese trade with Great Britain, but to-day we are exporting cheese to the value of $9,349,731 per annum. Then, of the great butter trade with the British islands Canada can be relied upon to supply a great portion, and that with great advantage to the farmers of Canada. While the hon. gentleman is preaching blue ruin in this House to the farmers of Ontario, his friends in the Provincial Government are doing the opposite. They are doing their best to induce the farmers, to instruct the farmers, to produce an article of butter of a quality which will find acceptability in the markets of Great Britain. They have appointed their dairy commissioner, who is instructing the people everywhere throughout the province how to manufacture an article which is best appreciated in those markets. While the hon. gentleman is minimizing the value of this trade here his friend the Hon. Mr. Mowat—and it is to his credit—is instructing the farmers how to open up the market for butter in Great Britain. The hon. gentleman wails about the McKinley Bill, but the agricultural college which is run by his Ontario friends, in Guelph is progressing, and Mr. Shaw, the professor in that college, has recently written an article for the press in which he shows that there is room for an export of $9,000,000 worth of lambs from Canada to Great Britain. In that he says there is a prospect of wealth for the farmers of Ontario. He has recently written an article for the press referring to trial shipments and to their success—an article in which he says the farmers of this country may sell to British consumers, if they will raise them, 1,000,000 lambs annually, that will bring $9 per head. This trade with Great Britain is that to which my hon. friend refers as "a paltry fraction of insignificant trade." If he will read the American reports, if he would attend the meetings of American stock associations or agricultural societies, he would find that the great point of discussion is how they shall be prepared to send to the British isles the great classes of products which that country requires. He asks how that trade will be interfered with? In the first place, we are likely to endanger the whole of the great cattle trade we have with that country. The hon. gentleman may say that we can keep up the quarantine regulations between this country and the United States in the same way as those regulations are kept up between the different States. That may be true ; but the hon. gentleman knows that there is a great jealousy on the part of the British stock-raiser in regard to the cattle imports. He knows that it is only with great care and great management that we have been able to keep up that trade with Great Britain ; but, if we were to turn our back on the mother country, and to discriminate in favour of the United States, the result would undoubtedly be that an embargo would be placed on Canadian cattle as upon the cattle of the United States and according to Mr. Dodge, the eminent statistician of the American Government, that would involve a loss to Canadian cattle-producers of from $10 to $15 per head upon all the cattle sold by them in the British markets. The hon. gentleman has admitted in this House, as he did in the country, that he would discriminate against the mother land, and his reason was that the discrimination could not be avoided. Why could it not be avoided? Surely matters of revenue would not bother him. He sweeps away by the motion in your hand, Sir, almost every vestige of the revenue of this country, and yet he says we have to discriminate against Great Britain because we cannot avoid it. What is the reason? It can only be because that policy will be dictated by the American Union, and we would have to come to the American terms. The same reason, I think I shall be able to show, would render it unavoidable that we should have a union of tariffs between these two countries. I shall not deal with the question of discrimination at length, but I say that the hon. gentleman has

no voice in favour of discrimination from the Province of Ontario, except from a very few constituencies. In few constituencies indeed did the people vote directly upon their policy as defined by the hon. gentleman. Here it was announced as free trade, there it was unrestricted reciprocity, and elsewhere it was commercial union; and up in the constituency of Algoma his public speakers there called it partially unrestricted reciprocity. I also find that the *Globe*, just before the election, said that unrestricted reciprocity meant unrestricted reciprocity restricted only by the views of those who framed the measure. I also find that on 13th February the *Globe* stated that full and sufficient notice would be given of every change the Liberals might make in this respect, and that they and the Republican leaders would no doubt arrive at unrestricted reciprocity "only by steps and stages." In other words, unrestricted reciprocity, that is, unrestricted reciprocity restricted by the opinion of those who are making the negotiations, immediate unrestricted reciprocity that is to be introduced by steps and stages. Sir, surely there is nothing indefinite about that. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the hon. gentleman that he has not voiced the opinion of the farmers of Ontario in favour of discrimination against Great Britain. Let him turn to the reports of the Central Farmers' Institute, and he will find that it was impossible to carry a resolution in that Institute which in any way looked towards discrimination against Great Britain in our trade. The hon. gentleman turned to gentlemen on this side of the House and said: "When you object to discrimination against Great Britain you are bastard loyalists,"—it is not a very nice term, but it was the term the hon. gentleman used. Sir, we are not the first to refuse to discriminate against Great Britain. When the hon. gentleman was in power he sent his ambassador to Washington, and he must have agreed to the policy of the Cabinet of which his friend Mr. Mackenzie was Premier, who, when he spoke on this question, declared that it was one of the conditions that no advantage should be given to the Government of the United States that was not given to Great Britain. And when he applies the term "bastard loyalists" to men who say they will not discriminate against Great Britain, it recoils upon his own head and upon the head of a much abler man than himself, who once took a prominent part in the affairs of this country, and who occupies still a prominent place in the hearts of its people, and who now sits enfeebled by his side. Now, I want for one moment to refer to another subject, partly in defence of my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon). There was a discussion between the hon. member for South Brant and my hon. friend from Albert. When my hon. friend was discussing Imperial trade, the hon. member for Brant exclaimed: "Oh, you are Imperial Federationists; the policy of the Government is Imperial federation." Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend, I believe, is a member of the Imperial Federation League, and I have no hesitation in saying that I am a humble member of the league myself. I am a member of the league, not because I believe in the probable early fulfilment of the fonder hopes of those who are its more enthusiastic members, but I am a member because the wide principle on which that league is based, the principle which guided its formation and dictates its policy, is the principle of drawing closer and stronger the bonds which bind together the various portions of this great Empire—or better, let me say drawing closer the sisterhood of nations that nestle now in the shelter of British greatness and British power. But my hon. friend did not discuss Imperial federation; he discussed Imperial trade; and I venture to say there is no man in this House who will declare that a trade league with the United Empire would not be advantageous to the people of this country. What would it do? Sir, it would do this: with the minimum of disadvantage to our national industries, it would give our farmers the very greatest advantage that they could hope to enjoy in any market. Unlike commercial union with the United States, instead of giving us a market that is already crowded it would give us a market which demands a great deal more than we can supply; and unlike commercial union, too, instead of making less strong the ties which bind us to the Empire it would increase and strengthen those bonds which unite the Britain across the sea with what we hope will be the greater Britain on this side of the Atlantic. Well, when my hon. friend discussed that question he discussed the question simply of Imperial trade, the advantage of which any one can see in this House or in this country. It must, Sir, be evident to all, that this House could perform no better service than promoting such a league with the mother country. My hon. friend said to the Minister of Finance: You have been indefinite in stating your policy. Well, Sir, I do not think there is any very grave indefiniteness in the policy of this Government. As I understand it, we believe that there is a wild extravagance in the claims of so great advantage to be gained by this country under the unrestricted reciprocity—I mean the claims made by hon. gentlemen opposite; at the same time, we are not bound to any particular name or to any particular designation. We know that there are matters of great concern between these two countries. There are matters in question which should be settled, matters of long standing dispute. We know also there are advantages which we could secure, and for which we in return would give them advantages in our market. We know this, and hence we are pleased that the matter is likely to be referred to a commission to settle certain questions in dispute and to arrange if possible a mutual trade between the two countries. Let me say that we on this side of the House are not hostile to the people of the United States; we are perfectly aware that concessions must be made, and we are willing that the Government shall make the concessions, as long as they do not make concessions for which we get no corresponding concessions in return. That is the policy of this Government, I believe, and it should be the policy of any Government that hopes to hold the confidence of this House and the confidence of the people of this country. Mr. Rusk, the Secretary of Agriculture in the American Government, said in a recent speech:

"So far as reciprocity means 'never give something for nothing' I favour it; whenever it is evident that a treaty of reciprocity means the benefit of the large part of the American people I agree to it, and whenever it is evident that reciprocity with this or that country, or in this or that product, would injure any industry of that larger part of our people, I am against it. I am for America first, last and all the time."

That, Sir, I claim should be the policy, substi-

tuting the word Canada for America, to a large extent, of the people of this country. First, the hon. gentleman says we on this side of the House do not want a reciprocity treaty. Now, I say that the history of the past shows that we have never been opposed to an honourable arrangement between these two Governments of the questions in dispute, and of the questions in regard to trade. He says, again: We cannot get it; and he uses that word in a manner that is born almost of actual knowledge. Now, why can we not get it? This is a matter of international agreement. Has the hon. gentleman offered, like another individual (Mr. Farrer), advice at Washington which he knows has been accepted as to how to drive Canada to her knees? Has the hon. gentleman positive knowledge upon that question? What is his reason? How does he know that the people on the other side of the line are not willing to trade with this country? If they are willing to negotiate with hon. gentlemen opposite and not willing to negotiate with hon. gentlemen on this side of the House they are interfering with the domestic affairs of this country in a manner which any gentleman upon either side of this House will resent. On the other hand, what is their reason for refusing, if they have any? Their reason is, that they believe that hon. gentlemen opposite will give them very much better terms than hon. gentlemen upon this side, and that is the very reason why the people of this country should not trust hon. gentlemen opposite to carry on the negotiations. He says his party can do it. Well, I think the hon. gentleman was in power between 1873 and 1879. He sent a negotiator to Washington. That gentleman proposed a fair and honourable treaty, so fair that some of his own friends objected to it most strongly. Does the hon. gentleman intend to go still further? Does he intend to give them more advantages and more money—because he offered them then to give up the result of the arbitration upon our fisheries, which yielded us $5,000,000—does the hon. gentleman intend to give them more advantages than he did under the offer made by Mr. Brown, the plenipotentiary of this Dominion to Washngton? Now, let me say that the reason given in the country why we could not get a more extended trade arrangement was a very unfair reason; the reason given by the hon. gentleman was, that we, upon this side of the House, were hostile to the people of the United States. The hon. gentleman from South Oxford said that we had pursued an "insolent and a hostile policy." Let me tell the hon. gentleman that we have pursued no such policy. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), down in Port Perry, grew, according to the *Globe*, wonderfully eloquent and vehement when he denounced the policy of this Government, which had estranged from us the people of the United States. I need not say to him, in the light of the facts, that we, as a party, and particularly this Government, have never done one single thing which should disturb the cordial relations that exist between this country and the people of the United States. We have endeavoured to trade with them, we have endeavoured to be friends with them, we have endeavoured to live alongside of them in neighbourly relations, as becomes the two great daughters of a still greater mother, and if the people on the other side of the line refuse to trade with us upon the ground that we have shown hostility, it is only because other gentlemen on the other side of the line have, by their speeches, sown the seeds of incorrect knowledge and information regarding this country among the people of the United States. If the policy of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House is indefinite, what is the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite? The hon. member for South Oxford, in his amendment, proposes:

"That the Government should forthwith reduce all duties on articles of prime necessity, and more particularly on those most generally consumed by artizans, miners, fishermen and farmers; and further, that the negotiations which the House has been informed are to open at Washington in October next, should be conducted upon the basis of the most extended reciprocal freedom of trade between Canada and the United States, in manufactured as well as natural products."

What is that policy? Is it unrestricted reciprocity, or is it commercial union, or is it what the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) called a fair and honourable treaty. It looks to me like a resolution on which the hon. gentleman could go to the people of Ontario and say, as he did say, he did intend to discriminate. It looks to me like a resolution with which the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) could go to the people of his county and say he did not intend to discriminate. It looks like a resolution with which the leader of the Opposition could go to the country and declare he intended to take down the Custom-houses; and with which the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) could say he did not intend to take down the Custom-houses. It looks to me like a resolution on which one man might declare it meant one thing, and another man might declare it meant another thing, and a third man, hard pressed, might say it meant nothing at all. We have been challenged by the great organ of hon. gentlemen opposite to look at the unity prevailing in their ranks. Let me read a description of that party from the Toronto *Globe:*

"The party of to-day, the party of the future, is that which moves with hope high and head erect and banner flung behind Laurier and Cartwright, and Mills, and Charlton, and Davies, and Paterson, and Mulock, and Mowat, and Hardy, and Ross, and Fraser, and Mercier, and Langelier, and Joly, and Scriver, and Blair, and Fielding, and Greenway"——

And, Mr. Speaker, what breath I have after repeating all those conjunctions is taken away by the announcement which follows—

"and under the sympathetic eye of Edward Blake."

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

After Recess.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair before dinner I had detained the House much longer than I had expected to detain it. I ask the pardon of hon. members for having done so, and I promise that, in offering a few remarks at the close of my speech, I will not occupy very long the attention of hon. gentlemen, who have been kind enough to return, notwithstanding the long speech to which they listened before dinner. I wish at the outset to say that in dealing with the question of the volume of trade in the country I did not refer to one point to which I desired to refer, and which I believe should be referred to in this House, in consequence of a statement made, not only in this House, but in the country, by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). When that hon. gentleman referred, in this House, to the volume of trade between 1888 and, 1890

making the remark that it has decreased up to 1889, he qualified that statement by saying that he would not charge the Government with having caused that decrease. Although the hon. gentleman made that qualification in this House, I speak with a certain knowledge of his speeches made throughout the Province of Ontario when I say he did not make that qualifying statement when he made his statement before the electors, who did not understand, like hon. members of this House do, all the intricacies of that question. The hon. gentleman, dealing with the trade question during the election campaign, said this: that in 1873 we had $217,000,000 as the volume of trade, and that in 1889 it has actually decreased from the amount in 1873. The hon. gentleman made no qualifying statement; the hon. gentleman did not state in his election speeches that we could not exactly measure the prosperity of the country upon that principle or basis, as he said in this House. He left it to be inferred by the people that under the National Policy, and under the rule of this country by hon. members on this side of the House, our industries had so declined that the volume of trade had decreased. He forgot to say to the people that the whole decrease had occurred under his own administration. Not only did he do that, but when speaking at one place in Ontario he referred to the fact that we had stated that our policy was somewhat of a British policy, and he referred to that circumstance in these terms:

"Such men's loyalty I rate at its true value. It is exactly on a par with the 35 per cent. over-proof loyalty of that ring of manufacturers whose loyalty has resulted in a tariff which in 16 years has cut down our importations from Great Britain from $68,000,000 on a population of 3,757,000 to $42,000,000 on an alleged population of 5,000,000—a loyalty that is yet so fervent that it will not permit you to trade with the United States, lest you should discriminate against British goods."

Let me say to the hon. gentleman and his followers that this is a most unfair statement to make in the country before the people, who do not understand practically the details and intricacies of this question. It is true that up to this time there had been a decrease, but that decrease had occurred between 1873-79, when hon. gentlemen were themselves in power. The increase had taken place, as the increase in the whole volume had taken place, during the time when hon. gentlemen on this side of the House were controlling the destinies of the country. Let me state the figures:

TOTAL TRADE.

1868	$131,077,532
1873	217,801,203
1879	153,456,682
1890	217,697,390

BRITISH TRADE.

1873	$68,552,776
1879	30,903,130

Showing that the decrease is under the rule of the hon. member for South Oxford—the great increase has been made since his defeat. So much was this made of in Ontario that I met on the platform in South Victoria a gentleman who declared that the imports of a country were a test of its civilization, that under the National Policy the imports must naturally decrease, and consequently the civilization of the country would go backward. If that be so, under the Government of hon. gentlemen opposite, the imports having decreased 25 per cent., and if the imports of a country constitute the test of its civilization, we have only to have 20 years rule of hon. gentlemen opposite when the trade of this country would not only be ruined, but we would become aborigines instead of civilized beings. I desire to refer again to a question which I touched upon before recess, and I will only touch upon it very briefly. The hon. gentleman, in the course of his speech in this House, declared that it was the first principle of the National Policy to discriminate against Great Britain. The hon. gentleman forgot to mention one single article on which we have imposed duties against Great Britain greater than those against the United States. As a matter of fact, we make no discrimination whatever, and the hon. gentleman knew that very well. Upon this question of discrimination I wish to read two or three extracts, and I do not wish to make any comments whatever. I am not here to challenge the loyalty of any man. I am here to say that his loyalty is a matter that a man must reconcile as between himself, his conscience and his God. But I am here to present facts to this House, to read to hon. gentlemen their speeches and the speeches of those with whom they are associated, and leave it to the House and the country to draw their own inferences and conclusions. On the question of discrimination I find the following despatch from Lord Knutsford to the Governor General, dated 25th November, 1890:

"Any reciprocity would, as previously, be framed so as not to place imports from this country at a disadvantage, and it is presumed, of course, that Canada would wish to retain control of her own tariff, with a view to possible extension of her trade with the colonies and England."

That is the voice of England. Here is an extract from the speech of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in this House:

"I am here as a Canadian representative to advise the Queen of Canada what is best for the interests of the people of Canada, and if it is best in the interests of Canada, it will be her duty to take that advice. Let us understand this question and thresh it out. For my part, I would rather see an ounce of loyalty in the people of Canada than a ton of this windy, worthless, spurious, bastard loyalty of these 35 per cent. loyalists."

That is extract No. 2. Extract No. 3 is one from the Toronto *Globe* of 4th February, 1891, published in the face of the general elections in this country. Speaking of discriminations it says:

"This policy will be persisted in, whatever the ultimate consequences may be."

Extract No. 4 is from the speech of Mr. Erastus Wiman, the erstwhile leader of hon. gentlemen opposite, who declared:

"It is said England would not agree to this scheme, even if Canadians desired it. If so, then England might have on hand another Boston Tea Party."

I think, Sir, that these extracts should go together upon the pages of *Hansard*, in order that hon. gentlemen, as well as the people of the country, may understand exactly how these gentlemen stand upon the question. Now, Sir, I think that hon. gentlemen opposite stated for the pleasure of the House—I think that my hon. friend for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) stated—that it was with them not at all a question of coming into power, that it was not a question of being anxious to secure place and patronage in this Dominion, but it was simply a question of principle, and a question of the advancement of the best interests of the large majority of the people of this country. I should

like to be able to thoroughly appreciate that largeness of soul, and that disinterestedness of nature, which makes hon. gentlemen opposite so chivalrous in this particular. When these gentlemen speak about a matter of principle, I ask them if there ever was in this country a party who were more willing to change their principles upon a moment's notice for the purpose of getting into power than the party composed of hon. gentlemen opposite. Why, Sir, in 1887 they were Protectionists. The Hon. Mr. Blake, who was then their leader, declared that the manufacturers need not be afraid of him; and in order to show that the financial head of this Cabinet that was about to be formed in his own imagination had the same feeling, Mr. Blake declared that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and himself had a general agreement upon that question. In the fall of 1887 the hon. gentlemen opposite were commercial unionists, their candidates were commercial union candidates, their newspaper was a commercial union newspaper, and column after column of the Toronto *Globe* was occupied in advocating commercial union between this country and the United States. And then, Sir, after failing with commercial union we find then adopting unrestricted reciprocity, or rather, they changed the name of their policy to unrestricted reciprocity. My hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who I am sorry to see is not in his seat just now, is very fond of quoting extracts from Lowell's Bigelow papers to this House, and I trust that I may be permitted to quote an extract from Bigelow which may apply to hon. gentlemen opposite:

"As for principles; I ain't got nothing of the sort;
I ain't a Whig, I ain't a Tory,
I'm just an office seeker in short."

And I may further refer to the language of John Randolph, who once said to his opponents in the American Senate:

"Principles—the hon. gentlemen have seven principles: five loaves and two fishes."

I may say to the hon. gentlemen opposite that just before recess I had dealt with the amendment which the hon. gentleman from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) had moved to the resolution which had been placed in your hands, Mr. Speaker, by the Minister of Finance. I wish to speak a few moments further upon that amendment and upon other matters which bear upon it. I have read an extract to the House which I fear some gentlemen did not hear, and which I hope I may have the privilege of reading again, because it deals particularly with what follows in this same argument:

"The party of to-day, the party of the future, is that which moves with hope high and head erect and banners flying behind Laurier, and Cartwright, and Mills, and Charlton, and Davies, and Paterson, and Mulock, and Mowat, and Hardy, and Ross, and Fraser, and Mercier, and Langelier, and Joly, and Scriver, and Blair, and Fielding, and Greenway, and under the sympathetic eye of Edward Blake."

Well, Mr. Speaker, there are two or three omissions; my friend from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) and my friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) are not included. However, Sir, speaking of the matter of union among the hon. gentlemen opposite, I ask why this amendment was not moved as a direct amendment for unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union? I ask any hon. gentleman to take the amendment moved by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and to tell me what it means? I ask him whether it is commercial union; I ask him whether it is unrestricted reciprocity, or whether it is a fair and honourable treaty to which my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson) referred. I say that any one adopting lines of policy such as the hon. gentlemen opposite have been so much divided upon might adopt that resolution, and say that it is a resolution which expresses their opinion upon their policy which they are advocating. As we are said to be so divided on this side of the House, I should like to say a few words as to the unity which prevails among the benches to your left, Mr. Speaker, particularly upon this great trade question. Let me say that if hon. gentlemen opposite are in harmony, then, Sir, the definition of harmony must be changed to mean a union of discords; for I take it, Sir, that there never was in the history of this country a party advocating a policy in whose ranks there were more misgivings, there were more misunderstanding, and in which there were more contradictions, than in the ranks of hon. gentlemen opposite upon the particular policy which they are supposed to support in this country. Let me point out for a moment that my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) made some speeches during the campaign which I read in the newspapers. He declared that this policy was a thoroughly practical policy, which could be carried out; and then in complete union and harmony with him is my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), who declared that it never could be carried out unless the Americans were fools. There is my hon. friend, the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who in giving an interview to a Chicago newspaper, declared: "Let us have commercial union, and let the consequences be what they will."

Mr. CHARLTON. I beg the gentleman's pardon; I never had anything to do with a Chicago newspaper, and the statement made by my hon. friend is entirely without foundation.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then my hon. friend made the statement during the election campaign, and declared: "Let the consequences be what they will." I have not his speech under my hand just now, but I can produce it for the pleasure of the hon. gentleman afterwards. Then we have my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, who declared that he will not adopt any policy which will destroy our union with Great Britain. Then we have my hon. friend from South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong), who moved a commercial union resolution in this House; and we have the hon. gentleman from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who declares that commercial union is not the policy of the party opposite. We have my friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen), who inveighs against the duty upon coal oil; and we have my able and smiling friend from Lambton (Mr. Lister), who rises in his place to defend the duty upon coal oil. We have my hon. friend from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), who remonstrates in this House against the combines; and we have my smiling and able friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson), who has grown up beneath the shadow of a friendly biscuit combine. We have my friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who declares that he will discriminate against Great Britain; and in perfect harmony with that hon. gentleman is the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scri-

ver), who in the face of his conscience and his constituents was afraid to advocate discrimination against Great Britain; and in still more striking harmony with him is the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), who declared that he would have nothing to do with any policy that gave advantages to the people of the United States which were not given to the people of the old land as well. Sir, they are a harmonious lot on the other side of the House. Sir, they are united upon their trade policy. Harmony! Unrestricted reciprocity here, commercial union there, and a fair and honourable treaty somewhere else, while behind them in the shadow, ever speaking and never welcome, is that single voice that during the election campaign declared these men all wore masks. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask the hon. gentlemen themselves why this resolution is not a definite resolution? I ask the hon. member for South Oxford how he can find fault with what he calls the indefinite manner in which the policy of this Administration is explained by the Finance Minister, and then in the face of that accusation move such an amendment as this? Now, Sir, let us examine for a moment the contents of this resolution. The first proposition in it is to reduce all the taxes upon the prime necessaries of life. What are the prime necessaries of life? Surely they include what we eat and wear, the tools we use in the various industries in this country—in short, if you carry out the terms of the first portion of that resolution you take down the tariff wall from almost every article in this country, with the exception of a few luxuries that are consumed by the wealthy classes; and after proposing that, the hon. gentleman looks up as smiling as you please, and says: Then go to Washington and endeavour to get a fair reciprocity treaty.' Now, I do not know that I can do better than read to the hon. member for South Oxford one of those excellent speeches of the hon. member for South Brant. In 1876, when the hon. member for South Brant was advocating a duty on agricultural products, he said:

"We do not know whether negotiations tending in that direction may soon be opened or not; at least, members of this House are not in possession of that information. The question, is whether in the event of further negotiations the imposition of a tax on grain would operate in our favour. Fancy a commissioner, delegated by this Government and sanctioned by the British Government, sent to Washington to negotiate such a treaty. The question might be asked what he desired? He replies: 'I wish to have a free market in the United States for the products of our forests, fields and mines.' Then the United States commissioner might ask: 'And what will you give us in return.' Our representative replies: 'The free use of our markets for similar products of your country.' The astute American would naturally say: 'We have that already: I do not see that you offer us anything.' We must remember we should have something to offer when we attempt to open up a new reciprocity question. I need not remind this House that the great lever we had before in negotiating a reciprocity treaty is ours no longer."

I think, Sir, my hon. friend from South Brant has completely answered that portion of the resolution which commands this Government to take off the duties upon the necessaries of life, and then says: Go to Washington and try and negotiate a fair and advantageous treaty with the United States. Now, Mr. Speaker, though we have not the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite laid down in this resolution—because I claim that it is a resolution which may mean anything or nothing on the trade question—we have that policy laid down in the speech of the hon. member for South Oxford. He declared that that policy was unrestricted reciprocity with the people of the United States. And just here let me call attention to the fact that my hon. friend from South Brant severely let that question alone. He did not for a moment discuss it. My hon. friend from Albert declared that you never can have unrestricted reciprocity without commercial union. The hon. member for South Oxford said that nobody but a child would say that; he said anybody but a child could understand it. And yet my hon. friend from Albert, who is no child, did not understand it, and my hon. friend from South Brant, able and eloquent as he is, did not undertake to enlighten him. It is not difficult to teach a child, especially an apt child like my hon. friend, and I think the hon. member for South Brant should have undertaken that task and have said a word in explanation, as only a word would have been required, if, as declared, the matter is so simple. Now, the whole matter, it seems to me, is boiled down to this: Are we to abolish the Custom-houses along the borders or not? If that is to be done there is no necessity to offer any argument as to whether we can have unrestricted reciprocity without a union of tariffs. The hon. leader of the Opposition has given the keynote of that policy in his speeches in the Province of Quebec; and what is that keynote? The hon. leader of that party, as reported in the *Globe* newspaper, declares: We will have freedom of trade; we will sweep away these restrictions; we will sweep away the Custom-houses between these two countries. My hon. friend says this is not so. Well, his speech, as reported in the *Globe* newspaper, says this:

"This policy involves full and absolute reciprocity, not only in natural products, but also in manufactured articles, without any restrictions whatever. When the Liberal party comes into power it will send commissioners to Washington, according to the principles affirmed by the Cartwright resolution of 1888, to propose a mutual agreement by which there will be free trade along the whole line, doing away with restrictions vexatious and detrimental to both countries alike, and removing the Custom-houses that go so far to cause friction between two countries designed by nature to exist side by side in friendly relations."

Mr. LAURIER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to tell him that the speech to which he refers was delivered in French, and that there was not a French reporter present.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LAURIER. I am quite willing to say that the report in substance gives the sense of my remarks, but is not *verbatim*.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Well, Sir, this extract has been printed in newspaper after newspaper; it has been before the country for months; and my hon. friend has never until now made a public declaration that the report may be incorrect. It shows that hon. gentlemen opposite are in a very bad condition when they have to rise in this House and repudiate the reports of their speeches as printed in their own organs. Now, I ask the hon. gentleman whether or not he delivered any such speech as that?

Mr. LAURIER. I have just told you.

Mr. MONTAGUE. You said nothing just now about the Custom-houses?

Mr. LAURIER. I have told the hon. gentleman that the speech was delivered impromptu, and that there is no *verbatim* report of it. The hon. gentleman does not expect me to say that I said

this word or that word. I have just said that the report gives the substance of my remarks, but not my *verbatim* remarks.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman does not remember it. I do not ask him to remember it; but the reporter was there and took it down.

Mr. LAURIER. I say that I spoke in French, and that there was not a French reporter there.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then, will my hon. friend say that this is not his policy? Sir, I have waited for the leader's answer, but none has come. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman's position is very much like this resolution. He is, I am afraid, very like a certain little animal which it is very hard to catch: when you hit him he is not here, when you hit him again he is somewhere else, and when you hit him the third time he is nowhere at all. The hon. gentleman is the leader of a great party. I have very great respect for him; I am proud of him as a Canadian, and as a Canadian orator. I look upon him, however, as the leader of a great party, as a man who in this House should not be afraid to answer a question as to the policy which he and his party are supposed to be advocating; and I ask the House to look at the spectacle of the great leader of a great party in this country, who, when asked a simple, fair, practical question as to the policy of his party, says: "I am not obliged to answer," or something to that effect. I leave that matter with the House; and I believe the hon. gentleman will not say that such a policy would not be necessary under a system of unrestricted reciprocity. But if the hon. gentleman does not say so, it has been said by other hon. gentlemen on that side of the House. I need not refer to-night to the speech delivered by my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), who declared, quite a time ago, when discussing this question of unrestricted reciprocity, that it is impossible; but, if my hon. friend now goes back upon his speech—my hon. friend is denying before I say what I was going to say. I was going to say that the hon. gentleman made a speech in which he said:

"As for unrestricted reciprocity we could not get that unless the Americans were arrant fools."

Now my hon. friend retorted the other night that that was somewhat of a chestnut. It would have been a chestnut if the hon. gentleman had ever answered it. But he never made on the other side of the question an argument so logical and sound as that which he gave the people, when he said we could not get this policy unless the Americans were arrant fools. If the hon. gentleman denies that statement, and I have never heard him deny it——

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You could not have been in the House then last session or the session before, for it has been brought up every session, and each time I gave the explanation.

Mr. MONTAGUE. But not a denial, and the difficulty is that your explanation always requires an explanation. I may say to the hon. gentleman that if he did not say so, then his great newspaper, the Toronto *Globe*, did; and there is absolute proof of that, because the files of that paper are in the library, and any hon. gentleman may refer to them. The *Globe* said in 1877:

"Obviously the Washington Government will not enter into the unrestricted reciprocity which Canadians wish for unless Canadians will consent to apply to themselves the same commercial conditions as apply to the American states that have unrestricted reciprocity with one another. That is to say, Canadians must recognize that they cannot hope to enjoy continental free trade unless they shall agree to make a Customs union with the continent."

That is the opinion of the Toronto *Globe*; and the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who will speak on this question, said, in the constituency which I have the honour to represent, in the same year:

"The application of the principle between Canada and the United States would require that the two countries should have the same Excise rates and the same tariff on imports from all other countries."

How are hon. gentlemen going to get over the difficulty? I just name one small difficulty for them to get over, and if the hon. member for North Norfolk or the hon. member for Prince Edward Island will explain how he is going to meet the difficulty I may say that the whole question is practically solved. I ask these hon. gentlemen to take one article. Take, for instance, the question of free trade between these countries as applied to articles manufactured from tin-plate. In the United States there is a heavy duty on tin-plate; in Canada there is no duty. Under unrestricted reciprocity between this country and the United States, without a Customs union, you would have the American manufacturers, who have put millions of dollars into tin-plate plant and factories, competing with a line of goods brought free of duty from a country where the people get their raw material—tin plate in this instance—duty free. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to explain how they are going to get over that difficulty, as well as innumerable others which would arise under unrestricted trade between this country and the United States without a Customs union? There would be difficulties constantly arising, and these difficulties would have in some way to be settled. They would have to be settled by the weaker giving way to the stronger; and I would prefer, though I want none of it, if we entered into any such arrangement as that, under which we would constantly have to give way, that we should go the whole way at once, than take any such course as that. Well, Sir, hon. gentlemen opposite went before this country with a policy. They declared that policy to be such-and-such a policy, and that they knew they could put it into operation if given the chance. Now, they were either humbugging the people—I use the word, I hope, in a parliamentary sense—or they had some understanding with our neighbours, under which that policy could be operated. If they were not humbugging the people they had some understanding with some great party, or with some section of some great party, or with some moulder of public opinion in the great Republic. Now, if they had not that understanding they stand here in the position of men who went to the people without a policy which they could not practically put into effect. In other words, they were humbugging the people. I do not think hon. gentlemen opposite will take the latter position; but if they had some understanding with some party or some section of some party or some great leaders on the other side of the line then these hon. gentlemen are bound, by all reason of justice and fair-play, by the opinions and interpretation of that policy as given by those public men on the other side of the line. I say they must be bound

by the opinions of their allies, by the definitions of their associates, by the definitions of those men through whose aid they hope to carry that policy into effect should hon. gentlemen opposite get into power, which Heaven prevent. Will any hon. gentleman in this House point to a single great leader, or to a single section of any great party, or to a single section of the press of the United States, which refers to this policy as anything other than a commercial union policy between the United States and the Dominion of Canada? In other words, the men that hon. gentlemen opposite have dealt with, the men who were their allies and colleagues on the other side of the line, say that what they contemplate is commercial union and nothing else. Now, I shall not say what commercial union is. It appears to me, though I do not wish for a moment to impute motives to hon. gentlemen—as I have said, it is not my business, or the business of any member of this House, to attack the loyalty of other members,—that is a question between themselves and their conscience and their God—but I say it is my duty, as it is the duty of every gentleman on this side of the House, to point out what we believe to be the inevitable and legitimate consequence of the policy these hon. gentlemen have been advocating in this House and country. Sir, they may disclaim as much as they like a union of tariffs, but everybody can understand that that policy can never be carried out without a union of tariffs. The Toronto *Globe*, speaking of the New York *Tribune*, says:

"That paper is probably nearer to the Administration at Washington than any other American journal."

What does the New York *Tribune* say? That newspaper, speaking for the Administration on the other side of the line, nearer to it than any other journal, according to the *Globe*, says this:

"Allowance must be made for the anxiety of Canadians of opposite parties to represent their wishes in the most popular form. But the Halifax *Chronicle*——"

Which, I understand, is a Liberal paper—

—"makes statements which appear to need prompt correction. It argues in favour of absolute and unrestricted reciprocity between the United States, with each country at liberty to adopt whatever tariff it may prefer, and represents this, and no more than this, as the deliberate purpose of one party in the Canadian contest."

Then it goes on to say:

"If this is the fact, one party of Canadians closely resembles the baby which cried for the moon, and got into a rage because the moon would not consent to be grasped. This nation has not the slightest notion of allowing Canada to open a back door as wide as it may please, while tariff enactments by the United States are closing the front door against sundry importations at New York and Boston. If anybody is really silly enough to propose that such a plan is entertained by Americans he does not live in this country."

That is the opinion of the great journal which stands next to the Administration on the other side of the line, and I think, Sir, that great journal is talking in a sensible manner. Then, Mr. Wiman, who was associated with these gentlemen more or less during the campaign, made a speech upon February the 4th, on the eve of an election down in the State of Kentucky. I have not heard any contradiction of the statement he then made. I have not heard any gentleman disclaim by letter or voice that Mr. Wiman had authority to make that statement. This is what he said:

"In the meantime it proposes [that is the Liberal party] that duties shall be maintained against foreign goods including those from Great Britain, as high as those that now prevail in the United States. This action of Canada would indicate a freedom from European domination in fiscal affairs of vast interest to the American people."

That is the opinion of Mr. Wiman during the election campaign. I do not think it needs any argument in this House to show that unrestricted reciprocity cannot be carried out between the two countries. We can quite understand that commercial union is a workable scheme, if it could be adopted by the two countries; but the objection we have, and which every true Canadian has, to that policy is this, that under it the Americans must control our tariff, and controlling our tariff they will control our revenue, and controlling our revenue they will have the future of this country in their hands. To that policy, or to any policy which disturbs our relations with the old land—under whose protection our young nationality has been fostered and kept from harm—gentlemen on this side of the House, Sir, can never agree. I thank you, Sir, and hon. gentlemen, for the kind manner in which you have listened to my remarks.

Mr. CHARLTON. We have listened to the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) for well nigh three hours, and I must congratulate that hon. gentleman upon the improved tone of his speech as compared with the last one I recollect hearing him make in this House, which was a bitter attack on another hon. member. The speech of to-night is unexceptionable in its tone, though I shall be unable to agree with many of the conclusions to which my hon. friend has arrived. The speech of course will sound strangely familiar to those audiences throughout the country that were addressed by the hon. gentleman during the canvass, but it is new here, and I shall ask the indulgence of the House while I briefly review some of the points made by the hon. gentleman. At the outset, I want to impress upon my hon. friend the fact that, notwithstanding all he has said upon the policy of reciprocity, the great farming communities of the Province of Ontario, the richest of the farming counties, have pronounced in favour of reciprocity. The farmers of that great province have clearly indicated that their views are the reverse of those which have been expressed by the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague).

The hon. member sets out with the assertion that the Liberal party, when in power, had nothing in its record by which it could claim that it had ever removed a burden from the people, but that, on the contrary, it had increased taxation and had added to the burdens on the shoulders of the people; and in illustration of this he instanced the fact that the articles of tea and coffee and molasses were taxed. The truth is that the Liberal party, when they were in power, reduced the revenue collected from the people by a very large sum. The revenue of this country in 1874–75 derived from Customs exceeded $15,000,000, while in 1878–79 it fell short of $13,000,000. The Government, so far from increasing the taxation, reduced the revenue derived from Customs by a fraction less than $2,500,000. I shall go into that question more fully later on, but I now present that plain statement in answer to the statement of the hon. gentleman that the Liberal party had not

reduced the burdens on the people. As to the taxation upon tea, coffee and molasses, I may say that I consider that form of taxation infinitely preferable to taxes which are levied on articles which can be produced in this country. Political economists are agreed upon that point, because the taxation imposed on articles which cannot be produced in the country does not raise the price of any article which is produced by the people of the country. The taxation is taken directly from the people and goes into the treasury, and does not raise the price of an article produced in this country for the benefit of the producer. That is what is called incidental taxation, and upon the articles upon which duties are now imposed in Canada this amounts to from two to two and a-half times as much as the taxation which goes into the coffers of the Government. The imposition of a duty on articles which are produced in a country enables the producer of the domestic article to put up the price to almost the same amount as the cost of the imported article with the duty added.

The hon. gentleman refers to the sugar question and reviews the speech made by my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson). It will be noticed that he sails very cautiously along the borders of that speech and wisely refrains from assailing any of the positions taken by my hon. friend. He says he will not enter into any of the elaborate calculations of my hon. friend, and he is very right in not doing so, but he endeavours to throw discredit upon the statement that not more than 800 people were employed in this country in refining sugar. He tells us that the Hon. Mr. Jones took the position that from 30,000 to 50,000 people were employed in refining sugar.

Mr. MONTAGUE. No; I said that Mr. Jones stated that thousands were employed, and that Mr. Workman said 30,000 were employed. The hon. gentleman will find that in the *Hansard* of 1876.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. member will find that Mr. Jones and Mr. Workman were referring to the employment of people in importing, carting, handling and refining sugar, but that those who were employed in refining the sugar were very small in number. In Great Britain the number employed in refining sugar is placed at 3,000, in a population of 36,000,000, and it must be remembered that they refine sugar not only for themselves but also for the export trade and that they supply millions of people outside of Great Britain.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that at the present time?

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes; and I venture to say that the calculation of my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson) in estimating the number of people employed in refining sugar in Canada at 800 is probably over the mark and is a very liberal estimate. On this question, I would ask my hon. friend the Finance Minister why, when he was imitating the American policy, he went so much further than the American Government has gone in the direction of protecting the refiners. He has adopted their policy as to raw sugar and their policy as to the protection of the refiners, and he has gone three-tenths of a cent further. They give a protection of five-tenths of a cent, which gives the refiner one-half cent more than he is entitled to, but that amount of duty is not sufficient to satisfy my hon. friend, or rather his friends the refiners, so he gives a protection of eight-tenths of a cent per pound, the result of which will be that the refiners will fleece the people of Canada by an amount of one million to one million and a half of dollars a year by the operation of this Bill. Granulated sugar is sold by Drummond of Montreal at 4½ cents a pound, and by other Canadian refiners at 4⅝ cents, while in the United States it is sold at 4¼ cents. The result is that the refiners in Canada get from ¼ to ⅜ of a cent per pound more than the American refiners. The yellow sugar that is sold in this country for 3⅞ cents per pound is sold in the United States for 3$\frac{5}{16}$ cents per pound, or $\frac{3}{16}$ of a cent per pound higher in this country than in the United States, by virtue of this provision of my hon. friend's tariff, and the refiner, not satisfied with the rate that he put upon yellow sugar when the tariff change was made, has advanced the price ⅜ of a cent per pound since this tariff went into operation; and I venture to say that when this House adjourns the refiners of this country will advance the price of granulated sugar, as they are easily able to do if they can combine among themselves, by virtue of this protection that enables them to put the price up $\frac{5}{16}$ of a cent before the competition of foreign refiners can disturb the monopoly which the tariff gives them. Now, the refiner under the new order of things has a better position, and can make more money than he could before. In the first place, he requires a very much smaller amount of capital to prosecute his business. Before, his sugar cost him perhaps 35, 40 and even 50 per cent. more than it does to-day, and the tariff change reduces his capital by nearly that amount. Before, he gave a discount of 2½ per cent. on sugar sold at 6½ cents and paid for within 14 days; he now gives the same discount of 2½ per cent. on the sugar sold, and 4½ cents a pound, and the difference in this discount between 6½ cents and 4½ cents pays the freight on the sugar between Montreal and Ottawa, or Montreal and Toronto. The position of the matter is simply this: that the Government have made a slavish imitation of the American policy, with the exception that they have given the refiners of this country still greater advantages than those unjust advantages they enjoy in the United States by virtue of their protective duty of ½ a cent a pound on their sugar.

Now, the hon. gentleman has made some remarks with regard to the position occupied by my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson) and myself, with regard to the protection question many years ago. I do not know that it is worth while alluding to that, but there was one remark made by that hon. gentleman with regard to the industries of the country at that time, that I do wish to allude to. He tells us that in 1878 we were confronted in Canada by "tumbling industries." Now, the fact of it is that we had in 1878, before the adoption of protection, the most prosperous and healthy manufacturing system upon this continent, and it had grown up under a revenue tariff of 15 per cent. up to 1876, which was increased to 17½ in that year. In 1871, under the operation of a revenue tariff of 15 per cent. we had a development of manufacturing interests in the Dominion of Canada which reached the production of $220,000,000 worth of goods, and employed 189,000 operatives, and this was eight years before the protective policy was put into force by

the hon. gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches. In 1881 the production of goods in Canada was $309,000,000, and the number of operatives employed was some 230,000 or 240,000. At that time the country had scarcely begun to feel the effects of the protective policy adopted in 1879; so it is folly to talk about the "tumbling industries" that confronted us in 1878. I venture the assertion that on the whole, and in the main, the manufacturing industries in Canada were in a healthier and stronger and better position in 1878 than they are in 1891.

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman next proceeds to tell us that my hon. friend at my right (Sir Richard Cartwright) never knew the pleasure of a surplus. But we have one, he says, and we have been enabled to take off $3,000,000 of taxes. Now, Sir, they have taken off taxes to a large amount and transferred a portion of that sum from the Government coffers to the pockets of the refiners. They have remitted the taxes upon raw sugar, but they have increased the taxes upon refined sugar, and they have adjusted their tariff in such a way as to enable the refiners of this country to take out of the pockets of the consumers of sugar something less than $2,000,000 a year. It is not a very brilliant stroke of statesmanship when we come to consider it in all its bearings. The hon. gentleman asserts that my hon. friend, who was Minister of Finance from 1873 to 1878, never knew a surplus; the assertion may be true, but it is necessary to bear in mind the condition of things that existed during the period that the Liberal party held office in this country. I suppose my hon. friend from Haldimand is not ignorant of the fact that there was a world-wide depression existing at that time. It was existing in Canada, in the United States, in Great Britain, and in every other civilized country, and the Government of that day had great difficulties to wrestle with. It was inevitable that the revenue should fall off, because the ability of the people to pay, the ability of the merchants to import and sell, were curtailed by the operation of that depression. But I shall show later on that the management of the finances of this country by my hon. friend during that period was a triumphant example of sagacity, forethought, care, shrewdness and economy.

Then we are told by the hon. gentleman that all the predictions that my hon. friend the then Minister of Finance made were falsified, and that all the predictions that have been made by his successors have been verified. Well, what about that prediction made some time ago that about this time we should have received $69,000,000 from the sale of Government lands in the North-West? How is it about that? I might, if I chose to trouble the House, name other instances in which the predictions indulged in by hon. gentlemen opposite have not been realized.

I wish to devote a few moments to the position taken by the member for Haldimand in reference to reciprocity. It surprises me that the Government of which he is a supporter should have taken so much trouble in this matter, if the position he himself takes is a correct one. Why, he tells us that this partnership that we are seeking to enter into with the American farmers, is a matter that we need not bestow so much trouble about, because they are worse off than we are, they are so poor that we do not want to have anything to do with them, and it is all folly to talk about partnership with the American farmers. He says the price of land is declining in the United States, the farmers are in a condition of poverty, every farm in the country is mortgaged, the interest is not paid, the price of butter is low, the price of corn is low, and on the whole the condition of the farmers in that great country is so melancholy that we want to steer as wide of them as possible, and we ought not to dream of ever entering into partnership with the farmers of the United States. Now, let me ask, what induced my hon. friend the Minister of Finance and his colleagues to dissolve the House in February last for the purpose of appealing to the people of this country upon that very question? Why did they make that an issue of the contest? Why did they assign as a reason for dissolving the House, that they wished to consult the people of this country as to the propriety of embarking upon negotiations upon a certain line laid down by them, to obtain reciprocity with the people of the United States? Were they not practising grave deception upon the people of this country? In dissolving the House upon the pretext that they wished to consult the people of Canada about entering into partnership with these poverty-stricken farmers on the other side of the line, were they not mocking the people of this country? Why has my hon. friend gone down to Washington? Why did Sir Charles Tupper go down there twice, and why has he made an arrangement to go back in October? If this thing is not desirable, if it is not in the interest of the people of this country to get reciprocity, why is all this fuss made over it? It is a very singular condition of things, indeed. The truth is that we are not asking for a partnership with the farmers of the United States; we are asking for the chance of becoming their rivals and their competitors; we are asking for liberty to attempt to sell our wares, not to the farmers of the United States, but to the urban population of that country, to the people of the great cities of that country. There are within 400 miles of us 6,000,000 of people in the cities of the United States, and it is these markets we want to reach, and not markets in which our people would have to compete unfavourably. It is true, I presume, that there is a certain degree of depression existing among the farmers of the United States. They have had the blessings of protection longer than we have had them. They have had them since 1861, and we have had them since 1879, and during that period the American farmers have contributed their quota to the enormous revenue the country has collected from Customs duties, and two and a-half times as much in incidental taxes, enhancing the cost of domestic goods. It is calculated that American consumers have paid on an average every year since 1861 from $600,000,000 to $800,000,000 as incidental taxes in the increased cost of domestic goods, that increased cost being due to the duties imposed on corresponding classes of goods imported. That will account for a considerable degree of depression existing among the farmers of the United States.

Then the hon. gentleman asks us: What evidence have you to offer as to depression existing among the farmers of Ontario? Has the hon.

gentleman travelled through this province and this country with his eyes closed? Is he incapable of seeing a thing when placed before him? No observant man can go through the Province of Ontario or through this Dominion without being impressed with the fact that depression does exist, and every person conversant with the value of farm property, and with the condition of the farmers of Ontario notably, is aware that farm values have declined at least one-third within the last 12 years, that the mortgage debt has increased, and the farmers are in a less favourable financial position than they occupied 10 or 12 years ago. The hon. gentleman in alluding to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said that when my hon. friend came to end his earthly career, and the inner anatomy of the hon. gentleman was examined—I was rather horrified at the proposal to have a post-mortem examination at this stage of my hon. friend's life—it would be found that there was impressed on the interior of that anatomy a gloomy image of Canadians fleeing from a country with a 20 per cent. tariff to a country having a 60 per cent. tariff. Whatever may be the occasion of Canadians leaving this country, whether they are leaving a country with a low tariff to go to a country with a high tariff or not, whatever may be the truth in regard to this matter, the indisputable fact stares us in the face that hundreds of thousands of Canadians have gone, and there are at this moment 1,000,000 Canadians in the United States. For some reason they have gone there, and it is evident if we could have retained that number, with their posterity, in this country, we would have been infinitely better off, we would have had a larger population and greater resources; and if we can do anything by the readjustment of our policy in the future that will put an end to, or diminish the exodus of the people of Canada that has characterized the history of this country during the last eight or ten years, it is the duty of every patriotic man to desire that it should be done.

Then the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) dwelt upon the extension of our trade with Great Britain, and he drew a comparison between the trade of the last fiscal year and that of 1878. But he neglected to go a little further back. If he had gone back to 1873 he would have been able to make a comparison between our trade with Great Britain in that year amounting to $107,000,000 and our trade with the same country last year amounting to $91,000,000, and he would have been able to impress on the House the fact that the trade with Great Britain had fallen off.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It was under your regime.

Mr. CHARLTON. It was a little before our regime. I admit we had come into power just at that time.

I was struck with, I will not say an unfair statement, for no doubt the hon. gentleman made a mistake, but with an unintentional misrepresentation of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and his position, based upon a statement which it was represented my hon. friend had made in the debate some time ago. The hon. gentleman represented that my hon. friend had said that the trade with Great Britain was a paltry and insignificant fraction of our trade.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I did not say that.

Mr. CHARLTON. The truth is that my hon. friend made no such assertion with respect to Canada.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. What I said was that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), when speaking of the trade likely to be interfered with between this country and Great Britain by unrestricted reciprocity, said it was a paltry fragment of trade. The hon. member for South Oxford will not deny it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman is entirely wrong. I will tell him what I did say. I pointed out what is the fact, and which everybody who knows anything about the matter ought to know, that the trade which Great Britain has with Canada is an insignificant fraction of Great Britain's whole trade.

Mr. CHARLTON. The impression made by the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) with respect to the matter was the reverse of that. He conveyed the impression that the hon. member for South Oxford had said that the trade of Canada with Great Britain was an insignificant fraction of the trade of Canada.

We have had something said about discriminating against Great Britain. I should like to enquire what the National Policy does? Does it not discriminate against Great Britain? Do we not attempt by the operation of that policy to shut out entirely British manufacturers from this country? While we are enjoying British markets for our cheese, live animals, the products of the soil, and are doing an export trade amounting last year to $48,000,000, are we not attempting to cut Great Britain out of our markets by the operation of the National Policy? We are discriminating against Great Britain by the operation of that policy, and we have been doing so since the policy was inaugurated. Those hon. gentlemen who talk about discriminating against Great Britain are the slavish imitators of the American fiscal policy. There never is a change made in the American tariff but they are ready to imitate it.

Then the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague)—and it is astonishing what a breadth of territory the hon. gentleman covered—made some reference to Imperial Federation. He told us that he and the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) are Imperial Federationists in the near future. They expect to realize something out of it some time. I do not know how soon. It is a simple fact, so far as my observation goes at least, that no man who advocates Imperial Federation gets down to anything definite. There is something hazy about their theory. Do they tell us on what basis they propose to establish this federation? Do they tell us what is to be the tariff arrangements between the countries? Do they tell us how the different portions of the federation are to be taxed for the navy and army? Do they tell us on what basis the representation is to be fixed? Are the colonies to be represented on the same basis of population as in the United Kingdom, and is India to swamp the whole concern with its 250,000,000 of Hindoos against 40,000,000 of Saxons in the rest of the Federation? What is the principle on which they propose to base the federation?

Do they expect that England will again adopt differential duties, re-enact the Corn Laws and give preferential duties to the colonies? The whole scheme is a piece of moonshine. It sounds well. It might be a very good scheme if realized and carried into operation; but the difficulties are insurmountable, and it cannot be done.

The hon. member for Haldimand tells us that his party has always been willing and anxious for an honourable arrangement regarding reciprocity with the United States. What is an honourable arrangement in his estimation? Is the proposal made by the hon. member for Oxford an honourable proposal? I think it is. I should like the hon. gentleman to tell us whether it is a dishonourable proposal. We are all in favour of an honourable arrangement, but the difference between us is, that we are in favour of a practical arrangement and hon. gentlemen opposite are in favour of an impracticable arrangement. We honestly want reciprocity; we mean business and mean to obtain it. Hon. gentlemen opposite will take it if they can get it on their own terms. That is the difference between their position and ours on this matter. We believe it is a good thing; they believe exactly the reverse. We are told by hon. gentlemen that their party have never pursued a hostile policy towards the United States, that the United States have no reason whatever to cherish any feelings other than those of a friendly character towards them. Not three years ago the present High Commissioner of Canada in his place in this House declared that he went to Washington and found that, in consequence of the indiscreet action of the Canadian Government in regard to the fisheries and other matters, the two countries were on the verge of war, and he denounced the action of this Government for its folly in this matter in imperilling the interests of Canada, and leading us to the brink of a rupture of the friendly relations between the two countries. In the face of these declarations by Sir Charles Tupper, my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Montague) who is not a very old politician or statesman, tells us with the greatest gravity to-night that there is no existing reason for the United States entertaining any feeling other than that of the most friendly character towards the hon. gentlemen who sit upon the Treasury benches. We have had the character of the amendment of my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) called into question by the member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague). He says it does not mean anything, and that we cannot tell what it does mean; but, let us look at the amendment for a moment, and we will see that it conveys its meaning clearly. It says:

"That the negotiations for reciprocity should be conducted upon the basis of the most extended reciprocal freedom of trade between Canada and the United States in manufactures as well as natural products."

What do the words "most extended" mean? Why, no definition will fill that bill but unrestricted reciprocity; anything short of unrestricted reciprocity is not the "most extended" kind of reciprocity in natural products and in manufactures. The resolution of my hon. friend from South Oxford states exactly what it means; its language is definite; its language contains a definite statement as to the position of the Liberal party in this country with regard to this matter. We are going in for the most extended reciprocal freedom of trade between Canada and the United States in manufactured as well as in natural products. We understand that. I do not know whether my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Montague) does understand it or not, but if he cannot understand it I should think it hardly worth while to try to explain it to him. However, I think the hon. gentleman does understand it, for he wants to know in the next breath what we mean by unrestricted reciprocity. He professes to know possibly what commercial union means, he thinks he can comprehend that, but he says he is at a loss to understand what unrestricted reciprocity is. Suppose we talk about that for a moment. The hon. gentleman raises a difficulty in the matter, he says: "Mr. Speaker, what are we going to do about the matter of tin-plate? Tin-plate would be manufactured into wares in the United States and it would be manufactured into wares in Canada; tin-plate is a foreign product, and are you going to allow it to be sent back and forth between the two countries?" I say: Certainly not. What we mean by unrestricted reciprocity in natural and manufactured products include the productions of the two countries. Tin-plate is not a production of Canada or of the United States, and it is a very easy matter to define what is the production of a country.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman is totally wrong.

Mr. CHARLTON. Not at all.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Tin-plate is manufactured in the United States.

Mr. CHARLTON. The manufacture of tin-plate in the United States is like Imperial Federation: it is in the future.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There is one factory in Pittsburgh which has $5,000,000 capital invested in it.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman's information is like a good deal of the information which he has given to the House to-night: it is not reliable. The McKinley Bill was put into operation last October for the purpose, among other things, of fostering the business of manufacturing tin-plate in the United States, and, as I said awhile ago, the manufacture of that article in the United States is like Imperial Federation, it is in the future. There is talk of bringing some Welsh tin-plate makers to the United States, and starting the business, but as I understand the matter it has not commenced yet. But if it is started, if the time ever comes in the United States when the tin is mined in that country, when the plate is made in that country, and when it is a product of American labour, then under unrestricted reciprocity it would be entitled to admission to Canada, but if the tin-plate was an imported article it would not. It would simply be a question to decide what were the products of the labour of each country, and to decide what should pass between the two countries free of duty. Of course, we would have to have a line of Custom houses.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, certainly; we have the right to impose upon articles coming from the United States which were exported from abroad exactly the same duties and restrictions which we

would impose on these same articles coming to our own ports, and the United States has the same right with regard to ourselves. Unrestricted reciprocity simply covers the natural products, or the manufactured articles which are the product of the labour of the other country, and if in the case of any article which comes into one country an attempt is made to import it to the other, it is not a product of the labour of that country, and it will not be entitled to free admission. That is unrestricted reciprocity.

Mr. FOSTER. How about woollen goods?

Mr. CHARLTON. The same thing. If we import woollen goods we cannot send them to the United States.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose we import the wool and make them?

Mr. CHARLTON. Perhaps we might make some arrangement about our woollen tariff that would be satisfactory. We do not expect to go to Washington to arrange this matter and not attempt to smooth away the difficulties that may lie in the road. We expect to remove these difficulties; we are not so helpless as these hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House in this matter, and if we cannot remove that difficulty we are not obliged to make the treaty. That is all there is about that.

An hon. MEMBER. Tell us what you are going to do in Washington?

Mr. FOSTER. I will tell you in October next.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is my hon. friend going to do about wool and tin-plate when he goes to Washington; what is he going to do about the various difficulties which will arise in making a tariff? My hon. friend has had a good deal to say about commercial union, and if the hon. gentleman wishes to go in for commercial union, it is a very plain and simple arrangement; it will remove certain difficulties possibly, it might make the revenue difficulty that would confront the country a less serious one, it may be easier to arrange the tariff, and make it more simple in its work, it would dispense with a Custom-house line; and if my hon. friend the Finance Minister wants commercial union we will consider the policy which he will propose in that matter. But just now I am speaking about unrestricted reciprocity.

Mr. DENISON. Tell us whether you are in favour of commercial union or not?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am talking about unrestricted reciprocity. I am talking about the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) which is now before the House, and of which I am a supporter. That is what I am talking about, and the hon. gentleman might as well ask me whether I was a Universalist or a Baptist, or whether I believed in evolution. He has no right to interrupt me with such questions. I believe in unrestricted reciprocity. That is what I am talking about, and that is what I am advocating at the present time.

My hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Montague) asked the leader of the Opposition a question: he proposed to catechise that hon. gentleman, and he felt somewhat indignant that the leader of the Opposition would not submit to a catechism by the authority from Haldimand. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition stood upon his rights when he refused to be categorically examined by the hon. member for Haldimand. Now, Sir, I do not know that I have much more to say with regard to the speech of the hon. member for Haldimand. I will say that I listened to it with a good deal of pleasure. It was delivered in very good style, indeed, I think the hon. gentleman is a great acquisition to his side of the House, and I am sure his own friends will be glad to hear him, whether or not we have the same feeling with regard to him on this side of the House.

I now propose to go a little more extensively into the consideration of the financial history of this country: the financial history of the Administration which preceded the present one, the financial history of the present Administration, and I propose to analyse briefly the financial record of these two Governments. It is a notable fact, that whenever an attempt is made to justify the financial history of the present Administration that attempt is always accompanied by an attack upon the financial record of my hon. friend to my right. I wish to-night to spend a few moments in placing before this House and before the country the actual condition of our finances, and in making a criticism of the financial management of the two Governments. Now, Sir, a marked feature of the financial history of this country under the Mackenzie Administration was, as I said a few moments ago, the world-wide depression that existed. All countries were in financial difficulties. Canada was not alone in this respect. Canada, in fact, escaped with less damage than almost any other country, and the financial affairs of Canada were managed in this crisis with singular prudence, as I shall be able to prove to this House beyond controversy. It is true, the Government was subjected to the necessity of meeting deficits. It is true, moreover, that my hon. friend at my right (Sir Richard Cartwright) had under consideration the propriety of effecting a change in the tariff that would obliterate those deficits and yield a larger revenue. That proposition, however, was overruled by the members of the Maritime Provinces, who set up the claim, a very proper claim, that they had entered this Confederation with the understanding that the duties should not be increased. They protested against the increase, and my hon. friend and his colleagues in office accepted that protest and declined to go further than to advance the duties to 17½ per cent. and sought to tide over the difficulties of the country by the strictest economy and the utmost possible retrenchment. Now, let us see how they succeeded. My hon. friend always took the position that as soon as the depression had passed away, the revenue afforded by the then existing tariff would be sufficient for the years to come. He was not permitted to remain in office long enough to demonstrate whether that should come true or not, because he went out of power before the depression had ceased, and a change in the tariff was made, so radical in its character, that we are unable to say definitely and positively whether his predictions would have been realized or not. But we have in the financial history of the United States during the same period the data which will enable us to arrive at a conclusion, which I believe will be perfectly satisfac-

factory and reliable. The United States were similarly situated with ourselves ; they were suffering from the same depression; the consequence of that depression was a diminution in their revenue ; and if in the United States after the depression passed away there was a rapid increase of Customs revenue without a change in the tariff, then I say that the prediction made by the hon. member for South Oxford with regard to the finances of this country if he had remained in power would have been realized. Now, Sir, let us see what the financial experience of the United States during that period was. In 1874 the Customs duties of the United States were as follows :—

1874	$168,103,000
1875	157,167,000
1876	148,071,000
1877	130,956,000
1878	130,170,000

Up to the year 1878 there had been a continuous decrease. Then the tide turned, not very markedly at first, but without any change in the tariff, the revenue in the following years was :

1879	$137,250,000
1880	198,159,000
1881	220,410,000

From 1878 to 1881 the revenue from Customs duties increased $90,240,000, or 68 per cent., without the change of a single item in the tariff list of duties. If that was the result in the United States, who, in the name of common sense, would dispute the correctness of the forecast made by the hon. member for South Oxford that when the depression passed away the revenue of the country would increase sufficiently to meet the necessities of the Government ? There can be no question about it. Now, Mr. Speaker, I propose to go into the question, not very extensively ; but I propose to make a few points with regard to the financial administration of my hon. friends.

First, with regard to an assertion made by my hon. friend the Finance Minister that the Government of Mr. Mackenzie had never done anything for the country in the way of reducing the burden of taxation, and with regard to a remark made by my hon. friend from Haldimand that that Government had nothing in its financial record to commend it to the people of this country by virtue of its economy or prudence or reduction of public burdens. Let us see what the cold facts are. In 1874-75 we may say the Government was firmly in its seat, and had arranged what its policy should be. It had come into power in 1873 ; but its fiscal policy may fairly be said to have been set on foot by the end of the fiscal year 1874. So I take the year 1874-75 as the first year for comparison and 1878-79 as the last year, though this is an unfavourable year for that Government, because our extravagant friends opposite were in office nearly nine months of 1878-79. Now, the Customs taxes for the year 1874-75 amounted to $15,351,000, and for the year 1878-79 they amounted to $12,900,000, a reduction in that time of $2,450,000. How does that fact compare with the assertion made by the hon. Minister of Finance and by his lieutenant to-night that the Mackenzie Government had never reduced taxation, had pursued a course of extravagance, and had done nothing in the interest of the country ? Now, let us see what the revenue from Excise amounted to. The total Excise taxes in the year 1874-75 amounted to $5,069,000, and in 1878-79 to $5,390,000, or an increase of $321,000, which would leave a net reduction in both Customs and Excise taxes between 1874-75 and 1878-79 of $2,129,000. Now, there was a deficit in that first year of $1,937,000 ; but if you add the deficit, there still was a reduction of taxation of about $200,000 above the deficit and above the expenditure of the country in that first year.

Now, let us make another comparison. We will take the taxes of 1874-75, and the average taxes of the succeeding years, and we will see what the average reduction was, if there was an average reduction. The taxes from Customs and Excise for 1874-75 amounted to $20,664,000, and the average taxation from Customs and Excise from 1875-76 to 1878-79 was $18,157,000 ; so that the average reduction of taxation from Customs and Excise in the years 1875-76, 1876-77, 1877-78, and 1878-79 was $2,507,000, the average deficit $1,625,000, and the average saving to the people from the reduction of taxation was annually $881,000 more than the expenditure and the deficit combined.

Now, Sir, suppose we compare the taxes from Customs and Excise for the periods extending from 1874-75 to 1878-79 and the period extending from 1878-79 to 1889-90, and let us see what the result will be. Let us then see how the financial record of the present Government will compare with the much abused record of my hon. friend at my right. In 1874-75, our Customs taxes and Excise amounted to $20,664,871 ; in 1878-79, they amounted to $18,476,613, showing a reduction of $2,188,258 between 1874-75 and 1878-79, or a reduction of 10 per cent. Compare that with the financial record of the present Administration, starting with 1878-79, the last year of the Mackenzie Government. Take this Customs and Excise taxation in 1878-79 of $18,476,613, and compare it with the same taxation of the last financial year, and what do we find ? We find that in 1889-90 the taxation from Customs and Excise amounted to $31,587,071, or $13,110,438 more than it was in 1878-79, while in 1878-79, it was $2,180,000 less than it was in 1874-75 the first year of the Mackenzie Administration. Or the taxation increased 70 per cent. during the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite against a reduction of 10 per cent. during the period of office of my hon. friend from South Oxford ; or, again, an increase of 70 per cent. under this Administration in taxes against an increase of 22 per cent. in population, showing that our taxes from Customs and Excise, under the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, increased more than three times as rapidly as the increase of population.

Let us make the comparison on the basis of Customs alone, because Customs is an involuntary tax, whereas Excise is a voluntary tax. No man is obliged to pay one cent of an Excise tax. In fact, that tax might be entirely destroyed by the individual action of every man in the country, and the country would be better off if there was not a pound of tobacco or a mouthful of beer or whiskey consumed in it, and if there were consequently no Excise revenue. But the Customs revenue is an involuntary tax. In 1878-79, the Customs revenue amounted to $12,900,659, and in 1890 it amounted to $23,968,953, showing an increase under hon. gentlemen opposite of $11,000,000, or 85 per cent.

against a decrease of over 10 per cent. during the period of my hon. friend's incumbency in office. In 1878-79, the Customs tax was $3.11 per head, and that was the last year my hon. friend from South Oxford had anything to do with the finances of this country, and I base that on a population of 4,150,000 souls, whereas the Customs tax last year was $4.80 per head, so that the increase in the *per capita* tax between 1878-79 and 1889-90 was $1.69, or an increase in the Customs tax between the last year my hon. friend from South Oxford was in office and the present year of 54 per cent. I heard it asserted to-night that the Customs tax is as low now as it was in 1878-79. Nothing of the kind; on the contrary it is 54 per cent. higher, or $1.69 per head higher.

I come next to the consideration of the question of the net debt of this country. It has been stated that the Mackenzie Government were more extravagant than the present Government in the matter of incurring debt, and the record shows they did increase the debt largely. The net debt in 1875, on the 30th June, was $116,008,378; on the 30th June, 1879, it was $142,990,197, showing an increase under the Mackenzie Government of $26,902,809, or 22 per cent. Now, if we could get an exact statement, if we could take it from the time the present Government came into office to the end of October, 1878, perhaps the statement would be a little more favourable; but this is as near as we can arrive at it, on the basis of the fiscal year, showing an increase of $27,000,000 in round numbers in the debt under the Mackenzie Administration. Now, this is not in consonance with their record in respect of taxes and expenditure, because they reduced the taxes and the controllable expenditure of the country; and the question is, how did they come to increase the debt of the country by $27,000,000? They did it by carrying out the obligations incurred by their predecessors—simply that, nothing less and nothing more. There was, perhaps, about $100,000 increase of debt for which the Mackenzie Government were responsible, being an expenditure on the St. Peter's Canal; but outside of that, every dollar incurred was in consequence of the binding necessity on the Mackenzie Government to carry out in good faith the stipulations and contracts made by their predecessors. They were obliged to go on and complete the Intercolonial Railway; they were obliged to proceed with the enlargement of the canals and with the expenditure on public buildings; and they were obliged to do something with regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway. I repeat that, with the exception of less than $100,000, the Mackenzie Government was not, in any sense whatever, responsible for the increase of the debt, and you may charge the increase, every dollar of it, except the small sum I have mentioned, to the Administration that preceded them in office. But how does this increase in debt compare with that which took place under the Government that succeeded. The Mackenzie Government left office with a debt of $142,990,187 on the 30th June, 1879; and on the 30th June, 1890, our debt amounted to $237,533,211, showing an increase of $94,543,434 under the present Administration, or 66 per cent. of an increase in our debt between 1879 and 1890, as compared with an increase of 22 per cent. of population in same period. I think those connected with the Government of Mr. Mackenzie have nothing to feel ashamed of with regard to their financial management, so far as I have presented it.

Let us take another feature of their management; and it is always satisfactory to me to dwell upon the financial record of the Mackenzie Government. There is not a flaw in that management. If the present Finance Minister would copy the careful economy and thrifty management which my hon. friend from South Oxford displayed when in office, the country would be a great deal the gainer. Let us look at the expenditures; and if the hon. Finance Minister will give his attention to the figures, I am sure he will find something worthy of his emulation. We had in 1874-75 an expenditure of $23,713,071 chargeable to the Consolidated Fund. I propose to make a comparison of expenditure, after deducting the interest charge and the sinking fund, as the balance will show the expenditure which the Government may be said to control to some extent. Our interest charge, in 1874-75, was $6,500,790, and our sinking fund was $555,773, and our expenditure, less sinking fund and interest, $16,657,508. That was the state of affairs in 1874-75. In 1877-78, which was the year when the Mackenzie Government had full control, as during the following year they were nearly nine months out of office, the expenditure was $23,503,158; the interest charge, $7,048,883; and the sinking fund, $945,746. The expenditure that year, less the sinking fund and interest, was $15,508,529, showing a decrease in expenditure, as compared with 1874-75, of $1,048,979, or 15 per cent., leaving out of the question the interest and sinking fund. Now, that is a pretty good record—a decrease of $1,048,000 in the controllable expenditure of the Government. If my hon. friend would emulate that example and give us some instances of that kind in the future, we would be able to reduce our debt and get to a sounder financial basis; and I commend to him the example set by my hon. friend from South Oxford. In 1878-79, the expenditure was $24,455,381; the interest charge, $7,194,734; and the sinking fund, $1,037,-219; and the expenditure, less sinking fund and interest, was $16,223,348, showing a decrease between 1874-75 and 1878-79 of $434,000, and two-thirds of the year 1878-79 was under control of hon. gentlemen opposite. Let us compare that with the records of those who have succeeded the Mackenzie Government and have managed the country since. In 1889-90, we expended $35,994,031. The interest that year was $9,656,841, and the sinking fund $1,887,237, the expenditure, less interest and sinking fund, amounting to $24,449,953, or an increase since 1878-79 amounting to $8,226,607, or 51 per cent. in the expenditure, leaving out the interest on public debt and the sinking fund, against an increase in population of less than 22 per cent. In view of these facts, the statement made by my hon. friend the Finance Minister, and the statement made by my hon. friend the member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague), that the Government of Mr. Mackenzie was a reckless Government, that it increased the taxes, that it did nothing for the good of the people, and that it left an unsavoury record in regard to the finances, is a sheer piece of effrontery. I venture to say that there has not been so good a financial record made by any government,

since Canada had a government, as the record of the management of our affairs by the Mackenzie Administration.

An hon. MEMBER. Tell us about the deficits.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is my hon. friend so stupid that he did not listen to the statement that, during the depression which existed from 1874 to 1878, the Mackenzie Government refused to increase the burdens upon the people, that they waited for the tide to turn and that, instead of adding to the taxation, they waited until the change of affairs would come; but, even adding the deficit to the expenditure there was a large balance to their credit every year.

Then, comparing the expenditures between this country and the United States, which I would not do but that I know hon. gentlemen opposite think a great deal of their friends on the other side of the line, having adopted their policy in reference to the sugar duty and other portions of their policy, we find that the revenue derived from Customs in the United States in 1889-90 was $229,668,584, on a population of 63,000,000, or $3.65 a head, while in Canada we collected from Customs $23,968,953 on a population of 5,000,000, or $4.80 per head, leaving a difference against Canada of $1.14 per head compared with the Customs taxation in the United States. Then we must consider that the surplus of the United States amounted to $105,344,000 or $1.70 per head, while our surplus amounted to only $3,885,000 or 78 cents per head, and that the Americans incurred enormous expenditures from which we are almost entirely exempt, and yet they got along with a Customs revenue of $1.14 less per head than we did. They expended on pensions $106,936,000; on the army $44,582,000, and on the navy $22,006,000, or a total of $173,524,000, making a *per capita* expenditure on those items of $2.75. We spent in Canada for items which nearly correspond to these, that is, for Mounted Police, pensions, militia, ocean and river service, $2,351,553, or 47 cents per head. The Americans spend five and a-half times as much as we do on these items, and if we were to reduce the United States surplus, pensions and army and navy expenditure, which amounts to $4.45 *per capita*, to the Canadian limit of $1.25 *per capita*, the United States Customs could thus be reduced $3.20 per head, that would allow them to get on at 45 cents a head, while we find it necessary to expend $4.80 a head, allowing the expenditure of the two countries for these purposes to be the same *per capita*.

If we come to the debt comparison we find that is not satisfactory either. On the 31st May, 1891, our net debt amounted to $234,142,372, while the American net debt was $849,138,508. According to the United States Treasury Balance Sheet, of the 31st May last, which leaves out the Pacific Railway Bonds from the net debt statement, on the 31st May we owed in Canada on the basis of a population of 5,000,000, $46.82 a head, while the United States owed $13.07 a head, or, in other words, our debt was three times and a-half greater *per capita* than theirs.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that simply the federal debt?

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there no difference between our federal debt and theirs?

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, there is this difference: that we assume certain expenditures for the provinces which they do not for the states; but if the hon. gentleman were to include the state debts and our provincial debts, I think he would find that their debts, in proportion to their population, would bear about the same ratio as I have stated, because the debts of the Province of Quebec, and some of the other provinces are greater in proportion to our population than the debts of the individual states. There is one feature of this debt to which I want to call attention. We commenced in 1867 with a debt of $75,757,134. To-day the debt is three times as great as it was then. The United States in 1867 had a debt of $2,678,126,000, and it is now less than one-third of that amount. Their debt was incurred in order to preserve the life of the nation. Our debt has been incurred by extravagance, folly and corruption. We have so debauched the public conscience that apathy or corruption reigns in every department of the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. That is rot.

Mr. CHARLTON. You may laugh, but it is true. The country has been damaged by the debt contracted for the money which has been squandered as it has been and as it is being to-day. These railway subsidies which have been granted in order to bribe provinces, this squandering of money in every direction has so debauched the public conscience that you can scarcely arouse it to recognize even the gravest political crimes. I am willing to give the Finance Minister credit for desiring to exercise economy. There is great room for it, and I hope he will exercise it. We are deeply in debt. If we take our interest charges amounting to $9,656,000 and deduct the receipts on investments amounting to $1,082,000, we find the net interest we pay is $8,574,000, or $1.75 *per capita*. The United States interest amounts to $36,099,000, or about 56 cents a head. The public debt in Canada amounts, as I have stated, to $46.82 a head, while in the United States it only amounts to $13.07 a head. There is certainly room for serious reflection as to the respective financial positions of these two countries.

Now, that brings me to the consideration—and I shall not detain the House long in reference to this matter—of the great question that is before the people of this country to-day. As I have said, we are in a position that is not an enviable one. We have a very high scale of expenditure, and we require to strain our exertions to the utmost even to provide the revenue necessary to pay the interest and to meet the expenditures which hon. gentlemen opposite wish to inflict upon the country, and we feel, upon this side of the House, that it is incumbent upon the patriotic people of this country to try to secure a condition of things which will put this great Dominion into a better position. In looking over the field we think we have found a solution for the difficulties under which we are labouring, provided we adopt that solution in connection with an economical administration of public affairs. Now, my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, in the course of his speech in presenting his Budget statement, said that the abrogation of the reciprocity treaty in 1866 proved a real good to this country. Now, Mr. Speaker, if that is the honest sentiment of that hon. gentle-

man, what have we to hope for from him? If he has no more sense than to say to this country that the abrogation of that treaty, which for twelve years conferred such great benefits upon Canada, which increased the exports of this country to the United States from $10,000,000 in round numbers to $40,000,000 in round numbers—when he gets up and gravely tells us that the abrogation of that treaty proved a real good to the country, certainly I am unable to give him credit for possessing much common sense.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is what your own friends said.

Mr. CHARLTON. No, they did not.

Mr. MONTAGUE. George Brown said so.

Mr. CHARLTON. He did not.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I beg your pardon.

Mr. CHARLTON. If George Brown ever said that it would lower him in my estimation. Now, Sir, I would ask my hon. friend if he considers a diminished trade a blessing to this country. Did not my hon. friend from Haldimand point with great satisfaction to the fact that our trade was increasing with various countries, that our trade had increased with Great Britain, that our trade had increased with the South American countries and with Germany? And in face of that assertion my hon. friend the Finance Minister takes a position which is tantamount to saying, that it is a blessing to this country that its commerce with our great neighbours to the south of us should diminish and decrease. Now, how much has that trade decreased? Let us look for a few moments at that question. In 1866, we had an export trade from the colonies, now comprising the Dominion of Canada, to the United States, of $39,950,000; in 1868, only two years having intervened after the repeal of that reciprocity treaty, that trade had fallen from $40,000,000 in round numbers, to $27,500,000, excluding from the account bullion and articles not the produce of Canada. Since 1866 there have been 16 years in the history of this Dominion during which the export trade of this country to the United States has fallen below the figure of the last year of that reciprocity. Why, Sir, no longer ago than 1886 our trade was more than $3,000,000 less with the United States than it was in 1866, and last year our trade was barely $575,000 more than it was in that year. The trade that had risen from $10,000,000 to $40,000,000 in twelve years, has a beggarly increase in the last year of about $575,000 over the trade of twenty-three years before. Why, under the impetus given to trade by that reciprocity treaty, if the same condition of things had continued, the exports of Canada to the United States, beyond a peradventure in the year 1890, would have been $100,000,000 in place of the $40,452,000 of last year, yet my hon. friend the Minister of Finance says the abrogation of that treaty proved a real good. I suppose that he and his friend the Minister of Customs would look upon the total obliteration of trade with the United States as a benefit—I presume they would. I think it would be in keeping with the views that they express from time to time with regard to this matter.

Now, Sir, this great continent, with its fifty-one commonwealths, speaking the English tongue, offers an almost illimitable field for intercommunication in trade, and wherever the shackles on trade are stricken off, the increase in the volume of that trade is almost fabulous. I shall not trouble the House with any statistics with regard to the volume of that trade among the various American states where no restrictions exist, but it is a trade fabulous in its volume, and one condition of Canada's prosperity is that the barriers that separate this country from its great natural markets to the south, should be removed, and that we should be allowed to participate in that great sweep of energy and business that characterizes those 44 states comprising the American union. We say that all the records of the past, all the facts that we can gather with regard to the business of this country, and the wants of these two countries, prove beyond a peradventure the assertion we make with regard to this matter, that we languish by reason of our not being permitted to participate in the benefits of intercontinental trade. That fact is beyond controversy and indisputable. Why, as I said awhile ago, we have great centres of population and business almost at our doors, and to a large share of this business the Province of Ontario, by virtue of its geographical position, is entitled. It has a geographical position which is superior to that of any one of the Western States, superior to that of any of the American States except the States of New York and Pennsylvania. We are living at the very door of New York, Brooklyn, Philadelphia, Albany, Boston, and those great cities require the articles that we raise in abundance, require the articles the product of which we can extend to almost any extent we choose. It is not the poor farmers of the United States the hon. gentleman speaks of that we want to form a partnership with, but we want to reach the markets that those farmers enjoy, and reach those markets unobstructed and unimpeded by tariff exactions and restrictions. Our egg trade is a large one, and we may form some conception of the real demand for our articles when I tell you that the city of New York in seven days would consume the whole of the eggs exported from Canada last year, and this fact shows that the market that would be open to us in that country is practically without limit.

My hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, in the course of his remarks, made some rather flattering allusions—and I thank him for them—to the Mining Commission of the Ontario Government, and to the recommendations of that commission. I was pleased to learn from the hon. gentleman that he had given attention to those recommendations, that they had been influential in procuring from him some modifications in the Customs regulations with regard to the duties upon mining machinery. Now I would like to call that hon. gentleman's attention to some other recommendations made by that commission. The commission visited various portions of Ontario between Ottawa and Rat Portage, and examined a great number of men with regard to the mining business, and they found, I may say universally—there was, I believe, but two exceptions, one who was engaged in the petroleum business, and one who was a salt manufacturer—but with these two exceptions, out of 200 witnesses examined, every witness stated, either voluntarily or when asked the question, that the great need of the mineral

interests of Canada was free access to the markets of the United States. I wish to trouble the House with just one extract from the recommendation and arguments presented by this commission. In the third section, which relates to commerce and economic conditions, the report says, on page 219:

"The fact that Canada and the United States are geographically one great country—with a conterminous boundary line from ocean to ocean, naturally drawn to each other by the provisions and requirements of nature, having common interests that compel intercourse except in case of actual war, having populations of the same race and language, each country finding it impossible to ignore the existence of the other, and each enforcing restrictions upon trade with the other at the cost of great inconvenience and loss—is a fact that stands out in as bold relief as does the opposite fact that the two countries in their political autonomy are separate and distinct. The natural intimacy of association and connection existing between some portions of the American Union is not as great as that existing between Ontario and Quebec and the Eastern, Middle and Western States, or between the Marine Provinces and the states upon the Atlantic seaboard, or between Manitoba and the North-West and the states of the Upper Mississippi Valley, or between British Columbia and the states of the Pacific Slope. A considerable portion of the boundary which separates the two countries, is a grand waterway, comprising great stretches of mighty rivers and four great inland seas. These lakes and rivers invite commercial inter-communication, and serve to link together, in the bonds of common interest, the two countries, rather than to separate them. Upon their waters the commercial marine of both countries is actively employed in transporting the products of each country to the markets of the other, or in conveying the productions of the fruitful west to the seaboard states and provinces. For the improvement of this great natural highway, each country has spent enormous sums, and the vessels of either country may pass from Duluth or Chicago to the sea without hindrance, but indebted to the public works, constructed by both, for the ability to do so. Great as is the magnitude of the commerce that floats upon this imperial highway of rivers and seas, it is but the advance wave of the mighty tide that shall come when the agricultural and mineral resources of the great countries naturally tributary to these waters are fully developed and the shackles upon trade between kindred states and provinces are removed.

"The energetic zone of North America may be said to lie between the 38th and the 48th parallels of latitude. In the galaxy of Anglo-Saxon commonwealths within this zone not one occupies a more commanding commercial position than does the great Province of Ontario. With reference to commercial interchanges between the east and west, neither hostile tariffs, separate nationality, nor commercial belligerency have been found sufficient to deprive this province of the commercial advantages to which nature has declared it to be the heir. The Ontario Peninsula is projected back like a wedge into the territory of the United States, and across it lies the short cut of travel and traffic between Michigan and the east, between Chicago and New York, and between the North-Western and Eastern States. By the lines south of Lake Superior and eastward from Sault Ste. Marie through the territory of Ontario, northern Michigan, northern Wisconsin, Minnesota, Dakota and Montana will find their shortest and cheapest route to the seaboard. The agricultural portion of Ontario is nearer to the great centres of population and manufactures in the Middle and Eastern States than are Michigan and Indiana, or any portion of the vast region to the westward of these states, while the mineral district of Ontario, extending along the north shores of Lakes Huron and Superior, command as its servant in reaching the great centres of production with its ores and minerals the navigation of the great lakes and the entire network of railways and canals radiating from them, reaching to the seaboard and penetrating the continent in every direction. Quebec, commanding the St. Lawrence and the natural outlet of the great lakes to the sea, is great in the commercial possibilities of the future, and but for the checks placed upon the natural currents of commerce would not have witnessed the diversion of its flow to other channels and the dwarfed growth of the cities that nature designed to number among the leading commercial centres of the world."

* * * "To both Canada and the United States nature has been a prodigal mother. In the resources she has given, each is possessed of boundless wealth. What Canada especially needs is population and capital to develop this wealth. Her economic condition is one of comparative poverty in the midst of fabulous stores of undeveloped riches. Without doubt she is in this respect largely governed by forces beyond her control, and under the circumstances of her environment perhaps the results attained ought to be considered fairly satisfactory; and, except perhaps in the matter of the exercise of greater care in the increase of expenditure, taxation and public debt, very little more could have been done under existing conditions. But existing conditions require to be changed. The demand is an imperative one. A careful survey of the field shows that the country is in a false economic position. We are prevented from proving to the world our splendid capabilities. It is not for the lack of energy, intelligence or courage that the Canadian falls short of the most wonderful achievements of any English-speaking people. It is not the fault of our political institutions that our economic condition is not more favourable; for our laws are good, and the structure of our Government an admirable one, that requires only honest and prudent administration to demonstrate its excellence. That Canada does not exhibit as high a ratio of increase in population and wealth for the last two decades or more as the United States have done, and that our economic condition is as unsatisfactory as it is, may be clearly traced in a large degree to commercial belligerency between this country and the United States, mutually discouraging and repelling the convenient, extensive and profitable exchange of productions natural to our immediate neighbourhood and geographical affinity."

This is a matter of advice that I think my hon. friend would confer a great benefit on the country by adopting, as he did when he adoped the advice of the commission in respect to the duty on mining products. It is of vital importance that we should have access to this market of 65,000,000 of people who are at our very elbow, and until the present restrictions are abolished we will not be able to realize the destiny that is marked out for this country.

But the Minister of Finance tells us that Canada may find unlimited markets in other directions without reciprocity. These are, I believe, his exact words. We have to turn from 65,000,000 of people, and turn to what? Go to the Spanish American population of South America, to the Mexicans, to the mixed races of the West Indians. We must send frozen smelts to the negroes of the Congo, and build up trade, every dollar of which will cost us a dollar and a half to develop. This is the remedy which the hon. gentleman proposes for non-access to that great natural market which lies at our very door, and which will afford us ample chance of growth and prosperity if we can enter it. The hon. gentleman says the West Indies are well disposed to us. I propose, and I hope I will not weary the House by presenting some very striking collections of statistics of exports to the various countries, to contrast our exports to the United States with our exports to all the countries of the world except Great Britain, and to do this in the products of the mine, the forest, animals and their products, agricultural products, manufactures and miscellaneous. The products of the mine we sent to the United States to the value of $3,963,257. To the rest of the world except Great Britain, $261,685, or fifteen times as much to the United States as to all the rest of the world except Great Britain. The products of the forest we exported to the United States to the value of $10,247,640, to the rest of the world, except Great Britain, $1,832,631, or five and a-half times as much to the United States as to all the rest of the world except Great Britain. Of animals and their products we exported to the United States to the value of $5,966,474, to the rest of the world except Great Britain $1,633,941, or four

times as much to the United States as to all the world except Great Britain. Of agricultural produce we exported to the United States to the value of $7,519,253. To the rest of the world except Great Britain $716,961, or 10 times as much to the United States as to all the world but Great Britain. Hon. gentlemen opposite are afraid that if the tariff walls were thrown down our manufactures would be ruined, yet we exported to the United States to the value of $2,667,282, and to the rest of the world except Great Britain, $1,857,755. Our miscellaneous export to the United States amounted to $76,773, to the rest of the world, excepting Great Britain $381, or two hundred times as much to the United States as to the rest of the world. If we summarize these figures we find that the total exports of the products of the mine and the forest, animals and their products, agricultural produce, manufactures and miscellaneous to the United States amount to $30,440,679, as against $6,304,343 to the rest of the world, except Great Britain, or five times as much to the United States. Yet the Minister of Finance tells us we can provide ourselves with other markets which will compensate for the lack of reciprocity with the United States; that we can dispense with the American market which takes five times as much from us as the rest of the world, except Great Britain, even under the present restrictions.

I will now make a comparison between our exports to Great Britain and our exports to the United States. Now, the exports of animals and their products and the exports of the products of the forests, are larger to Great Britain than to any other country; but of the exports of the mine we send to Great Britain to the value of $630,815, and to the United States $3,963,257; of fisheries, we export to Great Britain to the value of $2,707,422, and to the United States $2,850,528; of agricultural produce we export to Great Britain $3,661,826, and to the United States $7,915,293; of manufactures we export to Great Britain $1,816,147, and to the United States $2,667,282; of miscellaneous exports, we send to Great Britain $5,352 and to the United States $76,773. If we sum all these up, we find that in the exports of the mine, fisheries, agricultural produce, manufactures, and miscellaneous exports, we send to Great Britain to the value of $8,821,062, and to the United States we export to the value of $17,473,133, or we sent almost $2 to the United States for every dollar we send to England, except in animals and their products and the exports of the forest.

As my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has spoken about the West Indies being so well disposed about our trade, I propose to draw a comparison between our exports to the United States on the one hand, and our exports to the West Indies, Mexico, Central America, and South America on the other hand. Let us see how that comparison will pan out. Of animals and their products we exported to the United States to the value of $5,966,474 and to all South America and the West Indies we exported to the value of $24,255, or we sent to the United States $250 worth of animals and their products, for every dollar we sent to the West Indies, including Mexico, Central America and South America.

M. FOSTER. Are those our export figures?

Mr. CHARLTON. They are taken from our Trade and Navigation Returns for 1889-90. We sent of agricultural products to the United States $7,519,253 worth and to all the other countries I have mentioned $357,155 or we sent $21 worth to the United States for every dollar's worth we sent to all these countries; and yet we are told that the West Indies are well disposed to us, and are going to offer us a market that will compensate us for the market which we lose for all these articles in the United States. What nonsense that is? Of manufactures we exported to the United States to the value of $2,667,282, and to the West Indies, Mexico and the South American States, $99,011, or we sent $27 worth of manufactured goods to the United States for every dollar's worth we sent to these new countries, where there are no manufacturing industries. I am sure my hon. friend the Finance Minister is surprised at this. We sent of the various articles I have named a total of $16,153,009 worth to the United States and to the West Indies, Mexico and South America, we sent a total of $480,421 worth, or in other words we sent of all these articles to the United States, $33.50, for every dollar's worth we sent to all these countries which I have mentioned. Yet my hon. friend the Minister of Finance proposes to abandon that market in the United States, to leave it aside as not worth looking after, and to compensate us for the loss of that great market by sending to the creoles, the negroes, and the half-breeds of these countries, and trying to get a substitute for this great market in the United States which is not a quarter as much benefit to us to-day as it would be but for the absurd restrictions that both countries impose upon trade. Of articles, the export of which would be greatly increased if the duty were removed, we export to the United States: products of the mine to the value of $3,963,257, products of the forest to the value of $10,247,640, animals to the value of $5,966,474, agriculture to the value of $7,519,253, manufactures to the value of $2,667,282, or a total of $33,214,434. We export these goods to the United States and the trade in every one of these articles is diminished, cribbed, cabined and confined by absurd commercial restrictions and by heavy duties which prevent the expansion of that trade to the limits it would inevitably reach if these restrictions were removed. Notwithstanding all these restrictions and barriers, as I have shown you, the comparative volume of the trade with the United States as compared with all these other countries, is 33½ times greater, and it is five times greater than our trade with all the world outside of Great Britain.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we export to the United States a certain line of articles for which we are almost exclusively depending upon that country for a market. We export larger to England than to the United States, of cheese, animals and forest products, but for horses, sheep, poultry, eggs, hides, wool, rye, barley, beans, malt, potatoes and hay, our market is almost exclusively with the United States, and we are largely dependent on that market, for the sale of lumber, fish, pease, &c. We sell very little of these articles anywhere else, and we must to a large extent, simply cease producing these articles if the United States market is debarred us, because it is impossible to find a substitute market for these articles anywhere else.

Now, Sir, the idea that my hon. friend entertains, if he does entertain the idea, that the abrogation of the reciprocity treaty of 1854 with the United State, was a benefit to us, is an idea that strikes me with astonishment. The reciprocity treaty increased our trade with the United States fourfold in twelve years, and after that treaty was abrogated it has left the increase of our exports to the United States, after twenty-three years have elapsed, only $575,000 more than that trade was in 1866. These bald facts placed before my hon. friend the Minister of Finance ought to convince him that reciprocity is a matter of vast moment to this country. I repeat that the growth of our export trade to the United States, if it continued at the same ratio of increase as the increase from 1854 to 1866, would have given us an export trade to the United States, to-day, of more than $100,000,000 in place of about $40,000,000 which we now have. We are losing the opportunity to fill this country with a large population, to increase the prosperity of this country, and to keep our people at home for the lack of that great market to which our people go for the purpose of supplying the wants of that market from a source of supply from which they can fill their orders without being met by Custom-house officials

There are some other features in this question which are not often dwelt upon, and which were brought very prominently under my notice in connection with investigations of the Ontario Mining Commission, of which I was chairman. I could not but be struck with the great possibilities which opened for this country for trade with the United States, if the restrictions upon the importation of minerals into that country were removed. I will trouble the House for a few moments with some statistics with regard to the possibilities in this branch of trade with the United States, which is a somewhat novel point in this discussion. My hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Montague) confined his remarks exclusively to the agricultural features of the problem, but we have something else besides the farming industry of this country. We have the lumber industry, which is the second greatest industry in Canada, and which would be greatly benefited by free trade; we have got the fishing industry which would receive vast benefits from free trade, and we have the mining industry—and I propose now to direct my attention for a few moments to what might be the benefits accruing to this country through the free admission of our ores and minerals into the markets of the United States. The production of minerals in the United States last year was estimated at $584,000,000, and that was about five times greater *per capita* than the production of minerals in the Dominion of Canada, although we know that the Dominion is prominently a mineral country, and that Ontario is one of the richest mineral countries in the world. Now, last year the United States made use of $25,000,000 worth of building stone, and we are shut out of that market by heavy duties. The duty on marble going into the United States is 65 cents per cubic foot, and on ordinary building stone, 11 cents per cubic foot, and the operation of that duty destroys our trade. The export from Ontario to the United States last year was $147 worth of stone, and the export from the whole Dominion was $54,823, while the consumption in the United States was $25,000,000. Now, it happens that our quarries are situated in the most favourable locations for supplying the demand for structural material. We have in Canada almost all the valuable quarries to be found in the basin of the great lakes. Marble, freestone, granite and sandstone are abundant in the country extending from Kingston to Port Arthur, north of Lake Ontario, Lake Huron and Lake Superior; and many of these quarries are situated on the margin of the water, conveniently accessible to lake vessels. The Ontario Mining Commission examined a marble quarry on Garden River, which was 500 feet high, a mile wide and extended back into the country for a distance of 50 miles. The Nepigon sandstone quarries produce the best sandstone for building material on this continent, according to both fire test and frost test. This material could be shipped by water through the canals connecting the lakes, and could be laid down in Chicago, Milwaukee, Detroit, Cleveland, Buffalo, Erie and Toledo; or it could be transhipped and sent by way of the Erie Canal to New York or Brooklyn. The products of the quarries of the Maritime Provinces could also be shipped by water to the ocean ports of the Eastern States. It was the estimate of the Mining Commission that of the $25,000,000 worth of building stone used in the United States, Canada would supply at least $5,000,000 if the American duties were removed. That would mean the employment of at least 10,000 people, and it would mean the payment of almost the entire amount of that money for labour and transportation.

Then, there was exported from Canada to the United States under the list of unenumerated articles, which comprise brick, tile, lime and cement, $15,503 worth; and the production of brick and tile in the United States is $47,000,000, of lime $23,375,000, and of cement $5,186,000, or a total production of those articles amounting to $75,561,000. The American duty on brick and tile is 25 per cent., on lime 6 cents per cwt. including weight of package, and on cement 8 cents per cwt. including package. After careful investigation the Mining Commission arrived at the conclusion that Canada's natural advantages for engaging in the trade of supplying brick, tile, lime and cement to the United States would swell the export trade in these articles from less than $12,000 to over $4,000,000, because our sources of production are within easy reach of the localities where most of these products are chiefly used in the great cities of the north. And here would be 8,000 or 10,000 people employed in industries that now employ literally none. Then, we have boundless quantities of iron ore. In Ontario we have immense quantities most favourably situated, easily worked and close to navigation, so that the ore could be shipped with great facility to the furnaces of Ohio, Illinois, Western Pennsylvania and Western New York, while in Nova Scotia we have vast deposits close to deep water on the sea that can be shipped cheaply to any of the Atlantic ports of the United States. Last year a trade was done in iron ore from the mines of the Lake Superior district of 6,000,000 long tons, and we in Canada are just as favourably situated for supplying the demand, but are debarred from participation in that enormous trade by the duties imposed on iron ore. If these were removed, the Mining Commission, after careful investigation, arrived at the conclusion that

not more than five years would elapse before Canada would export to the United States from the mines west of Port Arthur and north of Lake Ontario, and from the mines of Nova Scotia at least 4,000,000 long tons of iron ore per year, putting into circulation for labour and transportation $10,000,000 per year. Now, we have in these three items $19,000,000, which, according to the estimate of the Mining Commission, would almost immediately be added to the business of Canada, mainly in payment for labour, if the American tariff wall were taken down. Why, Sir, almost as great benefits would be derived by Canada from the expansion of its mining business as from the whole agricultural expansion that would result from taking down the tariff wall.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Whose estimate was that?

Mr. CHARLTON. That was the estimate of the Royal Commission of Ontario, composed of the Chairman, A. Blue, Secretary, Mr. Coe, practical iron miner, William Hamilton Merritt, mining engineer, and Dr. Bell, geologist.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I meant, who made that particular estimate?

Mr. CHARLTON. These matters were taken into consideration by the commission. Perhaps I had as much to do with many of the estimates as anybody else—Mr. Blue and myself—but these estimates are probably far within the mark. Now, Sir, if we had the tariff wall taken down, in addition to the expansion that would take place from the export of our iron ore, our excellent building stones, our brick, lime, and cement, we would greatly increase our exports of coal, copper, nickel, gypsum, mica, asbestos, phosphates, plumbago and salt; and we would very greatly stimulate the production of silver and gold, of both of which we have enormous quantities in Western Ontario. The silver district in Port Arthur is probably the richest in America, and there are large deposits of gold as well; and the removal of the duty and the influx of American capital into that region which would follow would give an immense stimulus to the production of these metals. There is no question that within three or four years there would be added to the business of the country in all these lines annually at least $25,000,000, which would be expended mainly for labour. Now, I ask the hon. Finance Minister if that is not a matter of more importance than the fostering of a few sickly manufactures in some city or town that cannot exist without the pabulum of the Government to sustain them. The fact is, the importance of reciprocity cannot be over-estimated. We fail to realize the great possibilities to this country in obtaining access to the markets of the 65,000,000 people to the south of us—a people with a rush of business, possessed of ample capital, and with a spirit of enterprise which would immensely develop the resources of this country and add to the business of our people.

Now, my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, tells us that it is through no fault of Canada that the McKinley Bill was passed. It was asserted by some of his colleagues in St. John that it was the fault of my hon. friend from South Oxford and myself; but I suppose the hon. gentleman does not endorse that assertion, and I have great pleasure in saying that I believe the hon. gentleman is right, and that it was not in consequence of the action of Canada, and not for the purpose of punishing Canada, that the McKinley Bill was passed. The McKinley Bill was the outcome of a political necessity. The Republican party of that country, the high protectionist party, had to deal with the farming population. The farmer began to realize, dimly in some cases and pretty vividly in others, that the tariff had been robbing him for a great many years, that he had been made the prey of monopolists, and had contributed by his hard earnings to build up the colossal fortunes of such men as Andrew Carnegie and other manufacturing nabobs; and he was getting rebellious. Under these circumstances the Republican party found it necessary to placate the farmers, and, like our friends opposite, some years ago, they persuaded the farmers that they were going to give them protection. I say the agricultural schedule of the McKinley Bill was passed, not through any fault of ours and not through any desire to injure us, but to conciliate the farmers of the United States, and these high duties of 30 cents a bushel on barley and $30 on horses, and others in proportion were for the purpose of deluding the American farmer into the belief that he was going to get higher prices for these products through the imposition of those duties. He has not got higher prices, because our production is so small compared with his, that it takes simply so much out of our pockets and puts nothing into his, and I hope he will eventually realize this fact and secure the abolition of the Bill. But whatever influence caused the passage of the Bill, there is one feature of the case unfortunately we cannot lose sight of, and that is that it is a very bad Bill for us; and the question is how are we to get rid of it. The question is not how was it passed, or whose fault was it that it passed, but what are the influences we can bring to bear which will rid us of this measure so detrimental to the interests of our agricultural population? My hon. friend says that Canada has made, time and again, offers of reciprocity to the United States on a fair basis. On what basis have we offered them reciprocity? On a basis they told us from the commencement they would not accept. What is the use of making offers to a man year after year, which he spurns, and which he says it is no use making. Why, it is a piece of mockery, and the offer has been made, not because our hon. friends had any idea that they could obtain reciprocity, but to amuse the Canadian public and deceive them with the belief that the Government were doing something in the direction of getting reciprocity. So, last February, our friends opposite, fearing that if they waited until the proper time to hold an election they would be turned out of office, concluded to dissolve the House; and that they might have a pretext for dissolution, they declared that they wished to appeal to the country for a sanction to enter into negotiations to secure a reciprocity treaty on the basis of the treaty of 1854. This was a false pretence; this was trifling with the public. They had no reason to suppose they could get a treaty on that basis, because they knew they could not; and yet they solemnly dissolved the House and appealed to the country, assigning that as a reason, deceiving the country with a proposition to obtain a treaty on a basis on which they knew it was impossible to obtain it. Well, the course the Government has hitherto pursued

on this question is a disingenuous course; it is a course of false pretences from beginning to end. They had no desire to secure reciprocity, and I doubt if they would accept it on any basis. I repeat that the whole course of the Government has been a course of false pretences with regard to this policy. Now we stand face to face with the question. Our hon. friends have to go to Washington in October. They say they are going down on the invitation of Mr. Blaine. I would like to enquire of the hon. Finance Minister who procured the invitation from Mr. Blaine? Did my hon. friend write for it himself, or did the British Minister go and beg it? I suppose there was a kind of invitation to go down, no doubt an intimation that they would be received, but the assertion which has been made that the invitation came primarily from Mr. Blane, that Mr. Blaine expressed his desire that hon. gentlemen should go down to Washington to talk reciprocity, and that he invited them to go, without being in any way prompted to issue that invitation, I gravely doubt. And we know that during the progress of the election contest last February, Mr. Blaine placed himself upon record as substantially denying the assertion of the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches that they had opened negotiations and had a fair prospect of obtaining reciprocity on the basis of the treaty of 1854. They dissolved Parliament for the purpose of appealing to the country and to get the sanction of the people with regard to these negotiations, which they professed to have had in progress at Washington; and in the midst of the electoral contest which they precipitated on the people under this pretence, a letter was published addressed by a member of Congress to Mr. Blaine, asking if it were true, and we had Mr. Blaine's letter in reply asserting it was false, asserting that there was no such proposition before the Government at Washington, and that the Government would entertain no proposition for reciprocity except unrestricted reciprocity, so that hon. gentlemen opposite have been trifling with the people since last February. They have been placing before the people false pretences in regard to this matter, and their game was partially spoiled by the fact that the American Secretary of State would not lie under the imputation placed upon him, but stated that the assertions made were entirely outside of the truth. These gentlemen went to Washington some time ago. Their stay there was rather short. I do not suppose they got so far as to talk about unrestricted reciprocity in natural products or anything else. But my hon. friend the Finance Minister is again going to Washington. What is he going to do? Is he going to continue this game of hoodwinking and deceiving the people by holding out the assertion that he is honestly working for reciprocity, that he is engaged in negotiations to that end, and that he has reasonable hope to expect success? Is that what he is going for? Probably it is. Is he prepared to go and treat on a basis on which we can obtain reciprocity, or does he intend saying to Mr. Blaine: if we can get reciprocity in natural products we will take it; but if we cannot, we will have nothing to do with you. I would like to know if the hon. gentleman is prepared to go further than was stated in the reasons given by the Government for dissolving the House. If he is not, he may as well stay at home and bring this little comedy to an abrupt conclusion. But if he is prepared to go further, what is the length he is prepared to go? If he is prepared to obtain reciprocity on the basis we propose, why denounce us as disloyal and say that we advocate a policy detrimental to the country. He must do one thing or the other. Either close this thing down or get reciprocity and cease traducing the party which is favourable to getting reciprocity on the only terms on which we can get it.

Our hon. friends have a great deal to say about discriminating against England. Now, whose interests are we in charge of here? Are we in charge of the interests of England or of the interests of Canada? Are we to guard against discriminating against England's interests, primarily and exclusively, or have we something to say about Canadian interests? Suppose we turn our attention to the question of discrimination against Canadian interests. If this country is languishing for a certain trade policy, if it is languishing for access to certain markets, and if access to these markets can be obtained, and if we refuse to obtain them through some sentimental feeling with regard to a country over which we have no control, are we not discriminating against our own interests? What troubles me is the question of discrimination against Canada. England will take care of herself. It is not essential to England's prosperity that we should adopt a policy that will impoverish us. It will ultimately be to the benefit of England if we adopt a policy that will benefit ourselves; if we see clearly before us that this policy will benefit Canada, we may rely on it it will ultimately benefit England. But we have been discriminating against England since 1879 to the utmost of our ability. We have been seeking to shut her out of our markets as much as we possibly can, although we have been all the while depending on England for a market for a large quantity of the products of our soil; and the men who inaugurated that policy and who defend it to-day are the men who stand up here and talk about discriminating against the mother country. Now, the object of that policy I suppose my hon. friend will tell me is to build up the home market here. I do not know if he will deny that. I assume that is the object of that policy. Suppose, if that is the case, that we get access to the markets of a country where they have had the same policy in force for thirty years and where they have gone as far as we can hope to go in twenty-five years more, if we can get access to the markets of that country free and can get all the advantages which we can hope to obtain here in another quarter of a century, would not that be a good thing, even from the hon. gentleman's own point of view? If protection is good and if we can get free access to the markets of that country which has had the policy of protection in force for so long, it will make the attainment of the object of the hon. gentleman 25 or 30 years nearer than if we had to depend upon that policy in our own country. Of course, my hon. friend sees that plainly, being a protectionist and being engaged in the task of building up a home market. It is said that, if we adopt this policy, we shall lose our standing in the English market, and that England will retaliate. England does not give us free access to her markets on our account. She opens her markets to the whole world, and it is on her own account and in her own interest that she does so, in order that she may obtain raw material for her manufactures and food for her artizans at the lowest

cost. She will continue to do that, no matter what policy we may adopt. England's policy is a free trade policy, and the trade policy of one of her colonies in America will have no influence whatever on the historic policy of England in opening her markets to the productions of the whole world.

It is said that we will have very serious revenue difficulties to meet, and that if we adopt unrestricted reciprocity we cannot possibly meet the revenue difficulties which will occur. I pointed out to my hon. friend that when we had a population of 4,200,000 we were able to get along with an expenditure of $24,000,000 a year, or about $12,000,000 less than we are expending to-day. Was any public interest sacrificed because our expenditure was $12,000,000 less than it is, and is it not possible for us to go back to the basis of expenditure even of the year 1881-82, or nearly so, and then we would save the whole amount which would be lost on the duties on American imports, which is about $8,000,000? We had a surplus of nearly $4,000,000 last year, and we certainly could economize, if it were necessary to do so, so as to get our expenditure back to about the point at which it stood in 1881-82. If we do that, we dispose at once of the revenue difficulty.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that the only revenue difficulty? Is that the only revenue you would lose?

Mr. CHARLTON. My hon. friend might claim that the importations from the United States would be larger, and that those from England would be smaller.

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly they would if you discriminate.

Mr. CHARLTON. But my hon. friend forgets that this policy is calculated to increase the resources of Canada, to increase the wealth of Canada, to bring back the million Canadians who are now in the United States, to stop the exodus of nearly 100,000 people who are going every year to the United States, that it is calculated to open our mines, our fisheries, our lumber interests, calculated to give a better market to our farmers, and to add enormously to the material wealth, the population, and the tax-paying resources of this country. It is possible that it may take a year or two to readjust matters, and it is possible that a deficit may have to be met for two or three years, but let it be met. The country will be glad to meet a deficit on that account, rather than to see its money squandered in useless railway subsidies. This is a policy which will make the country prosperous, and populous and great, and the country will be glad to meet the slight difficulties which may arise.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has not met the difficulty as to how he is going to raise the revenue?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If you have wealth and population, I think the difficulty will solve itself.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think it will.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do.

Mr. FOSTER. Actually, I cannot get it through my head.

Mr. CHARLTON. Some assertions were made during the late campaign which were very unfair to me. The Minister of Justice stated in Toronto, and I think the Minister of Finance himself stated, that I had accepted as true the proposition that direct taxation must be resorted to if we adopted this policy. I did nothing of the sort. I had pointed out, as a matter of theory, that direct taxation had its advantages and that it would be better to have direct taxation than not to have this system adopted with all its advantages; but I did not admit that direct taxation would be necessary, and I do not admit it now. I am going back a little over the ground I have taken. We have now in the United States about 1,000,000 Canadians. In 1880 we find that there were 712,368 Canadians in the United States, and that 930,000 children had been born in that country of Canadian parents. On the same proportion, taking the population at 1,000,000 Canadians in the United States in 1890, there would have been 1,259,000 children of Canadian parents born in that country. That represents a loss to this country of the best blood of Canada. Between 1871 and 1881 we had nearly 400,000 immigrants coming into Canada, and in 1881 we had only 15,000 persons of foreign birth in the country more than we had in 1871, so that we lost almost the whole of the foreign immigrants. I calculate that between the emigration of native Canadians and immigrants coming to Canada and then going to the United States, and the children of these people born in the United States, we have lost 3,600,000 people. That appears to be a large estimate, but say 3,000,000. If Canada to-day had 8,000,000 instead of 5,000,000, and had profitable employment for them and markets for the products of their labour, could not my hon. friend get more revenue out of 8,000,000 than he could out of 5,000,000? We propose the adoption of a policy that would put an end to the condition of things that has led to the loss of 3,000,000 people to this country. We propose to adopt a policy which will put an end to a condition of things under which our population has increased only 18 per cent. in the decade between 1871 and 1881, while that of the United States has increased 30 per cent. We propose to adopt a policy which will increase our population at least 12 per cent. more than it now increases in a decade, a policy which will make Canada a prosperous country, a policy that will give her better markets and better prices than she now has for the products of the soil, of the forest, of the fisheries and of the mines, and which will give to the labour of the country a net return double what it is now. That policy, increasing the population, increasing the wealth, increasing the net returns of labour, must, in the end, adjust any revenue difficulty and leave this country in a position where it can pay its necessary expenses.

Mr. FOSTER. How?

Mr. CHARLTON. By increasing the population, by increasing the wealth, by increasing the productive capacity of this country, by increasing our exports, by increasing the returns from labour, by increasing the money that goes into the pockets of the people as a result of their labour.

Mr. FOSTER. How does it increase your revenue from import taxes?

Mr. CHARLTON. If we have unrestricted reciprocity and command of our own tariff, can we not

adjust our tariff in such a way as to provide means for raising a revenue?

Mr. FOSTER. But you are going to have free trade.

Mr. CHARLTON. If we take the burdens off the people in one direction will they not be satisfied to allow a like burden to be put on in another direction? If the country has a wealthy population, and a population earning more money, will the people not be willing to run their Government out of their increased earnings as a return for the blessings they will enjoy under unrestricted reciprocity instead of the depression, the debt and the interest charges that you are piling up upon them, and this eternal howling about loyalty, and about the difficulties of the position, and the impossibility of adopting a plan that will give prosperity to the people because you refuse to remit some of that tax under which the nation is staggering.

Mr. FOSTER. You will not meet the question.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have met it, and overlapped it, and demolished it, and my antagonist has not sense enough to see it.

Mr. FOSTER. You have not told us yet how to raise a revenue.

Mr. CHARLTON. If you will put us on that side of the House we will tell you, and we will let you learn by actual demonstration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal said about loyalty, and on this point I would like to know what is the difference between my hon. friend and myself. If he goes down to Washington prepared to secure reciprocity on the basis of natural products, while I am in favour of a broader system of reciprocity, what is the difference? The difference is in kind, is it? Not at all; the difference is in degree simply. He is disloyal as well as myself; I may be a little more disloyal than he is because I go further. But if reciprocity in any sense is disloyalty, then reciprocity in any degree or shape is disloyal.

Now, Sir, there are unquestionable forces at work towards the consummation, at some future day, of a political union between this country and the United States.

Mr. FOSTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. They are forces that we cannot reach, and my hon. friends here cannot reach, by legislation. They are natural forces, and what are they? Why, the exodus of our people to the United States is one of them. A million of our people are in the United States with all their descendants, and you have communication between this million of people and their friends in Canada, the people in Canada learning of the United States, learning of its institutions, hearing their sons and their daughters praising its institutions and speaking of that country in terms of the highest commendation, and prejudices gradually breaking down. This exodus is a powerful force, working towards ultimate political union. You cannot help it, you cannot control it; but you can lessen it by adopting a policy that will keep these people at home, as we propose to do. Then proximity itself is a force working for it. These two people, side by side, with their business relations and their social relations, becoming better and better acquainted with each other, learning how little difference exists between the two—this itself is a force working in that direction. Then similarity is another force. The two people are of the same race, they speak the same language, they have the same institutions, the same laws, they have the same form of Government, and this of itself, when it becomes apparent to the people in each country, is a force that works in the direction I speak of. Then the injury done to both people from the existence of the Customs line is another great force. No man having paid a Customs duty on an article that he has bought for his own use and has imported into either country but has felt that if he could demolish that system he would demolish it, he would trample upon it, he would spit upon it—that is his feeling with regard to a Customs tariff. That system existing between these two countries and the injury resulting from it is a force working powerfully towards political union.

Mr. FOSTER. But you intend to retain it.

Mr. CHARLTON. Not at all; I intend to mitigate it, to diminish it. I do not intend to retain the monstrosity that my hon. friend is defending, which is a beast of a very different colour. Then the question of future peace between the two countries is another force working for political union. Here is a possibility of future war. The people see it; they see in the future that great disasters may befall them because they are living under separate Governments. And that itself is a force beyond our control, and working in the same direction. Then the idea that by political union the cost of great armaments could be saved in the future is another powerful reason for union. The attraction the greater has for the less is another force, and these forces, I repeat, are all working in this direction, and they are forces that are beyond our control, that we can do nothing with. When my hon. friend talks of reciprocal relations between the two countries as being likely to precipitate this result, it is sheer nonsense. On the contrary, they would be as likely possibly to postpone this result as to hasten it. Political union has, in my opinion, little or no bearing upon the cry of disloyalty which my hon. friend raises against an agitation of this kind. Now, I repeat, none of these forces are within the reach of legislation, so we may leave them on one side. We will have to let nature take its course, we will have to submit to the result, whatever nature decrees it shall be; but in the meantime let us promote our own well-being, our own prosperity, by diminishing the burden that rest upon us, by securing better markets, by keeping our people at home, by striving to make Canada a great people. That is our duty. Why, Sir, the condition of things that exists now, I will say to my hon. friend the Finance Minister, promotes rather than retards the approach of this consummation. In making the preservation of our autonomy so costly, in retarding our progress, in denying to our country its natural markets, all these things have a tendency in the direction my hon. friend deprecates. I repeat that political union is not an issue in this question, that it has little to do with this question. We have no business to consider it in connection with this question. The question we are considering is quite a different one, and we contend that our policy, if adopted, will give to this country more men, will give it more money, will give it better and more markets, will give it

greater material progress, will give it a greater development of its latent resources. We are talking about the policy of my hon. friend, and we claim that it will secure all these blessings to this country. It is for that reason that I support this policy, not that I believe it has any immediate bearing upon the question of annexation one way or the other, but because I believe it is a policy that would benefit Canada, promote the material interests of Canada, and prove a blessing to our people in every respect.

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT—PRODUCTION OF PAPERS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In accordance with the promise I made this afternoon, I lay on the Table of the House the original tenders that the leader of the Opposition wished to have. I thought of bringing down also the papers about the smaller contracts for the pumping plant and the caisson, as I thought they might be required, and I think I will have them probably in two or three days.

Mr. LAURIER. What contract do these papers refer to?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. They are in connection with the contract for the machine shops. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 8th July, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. WALLACE moved:

That the Order of the House of the 25th June last, to the effect that it is desirable that any witnesses called before the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts be examined under oath or affirmation touching any matters coming before them, be rescinded, as in the opinion of the Committee such an order should not be asked for from the House except upon the recommendation of the Committee.

Mr. LAURIER. I think such a motion as this requires notice.

Mr. WALLACE. This motion is made by the instruction of the Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is no notice, and my opinion is that the motion will require the usual notice.

Mr. WALLACE. Then I will leave it as a notice. I may state that the motion was unanimously passed by the Committee, and is to be followed by another motion which was also passed by the Committee.

Mr. LAURIER. If the Committee adopted such a resolution and made a report to that effect it would come up for discussion, but such a motion requires notice.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I understand that is to be followed by another motion giving power to the Committee to examine witnesses under oath.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You have that power already.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. In the Committee to-day it was stated by one of the members of the Government that that power ought not to have been given to the Committee without the Committee asking for it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is nonsense.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). The motion which was carried in this House was mandatory. The proposed motion is simply that the Committee shall have power to do this. It is left optional with the Committee.

Mr. MULOCK. The other resolution was optional.

Mr. SPROULE. The point taken was that this power was given without the Committee having recommended it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This House can give the Committee such instructions as it sees proper. It does not require a report from the Committee.

Mr. WALLACE. The previous resolution had no notice given of it, and, as most of the members of the House did not understand the purport of it, it was smuggled through.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What possible objection can the Chairman have, or can the Committee have to a resolution enabling them to swear witnesses. It is said that now an investigation is going on which is being conducted by one of the members of the Committee, and it was said that he desired that witnesses should be examined under oath, as the matter was one of grave public importance. Some of the witnesses have been examined under oath, and it seems a very extraordinary thing that the Chairman of the Committee should now propose that this order of the House should be rescinded. What reasons can there be for that?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I wish to correct one statement of the member for West York (Mr. Wallace). He says that motion was practically smuggled through this House. I was the seconder of that motion, and I emphatically deny that there was any smuggling about it. It was moved by Mr. Mulock and seconded by myself, and put by the Speaker and carried by the House. There was no desire on the part of either the mover or the seconder to smuggle it through. We thought we had a right to ask for the power to swear witnesses, and we asked for that power in an open manner. I think it is entirely out of place for the member for West York (Mr. Wallace) to say that we tried to smuggle this motion through the House.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) knows very well what the practice is, and that the motion should have been brought before the Committee before it was submitted to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is nothing now before the House. I have ruled that this motion requires notice.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 132) for the relief of Mahala Ellis.—(Mr. Wallace.)

Bill (No. 131) for the relief of Adam Russworm.—(Mr. Wallace.)

Bill (No. 128) to incorporate the Incorporated Construction Company of Canada.—(Mr. Wallace.)

Bill (No. 130) to incorporate the Chatsworth, Georgian Bay and Lake Huron Railway Company.—(Mr. McNeill.)

Bill (No. 134) for the relief of Isabel Tapley.—(Mr. Wallace.)

Bill (No. 133) for the relief of Thomas Bristow.—(Mr. O'Brien.)

DEEPENING THE ST. LAWRENCE RIVER CANALS.

Mr. COATSWORTH asked, Has the Government taken into consideration the advisability of deepening and enlarging the canals along the St. Lawrence River, to allow of sea-going vessels coming up to the ports on Lake Ontario? 2. If the question has been considered, what steps have been taken in the matter? 3. To what extent is it proposed to deepen and widen the canals? 4. Has the work been commenced, and how far has it progressed? 5. What is the estimate of the probable cost of the work? 6. What is the largest draught of vessel for which the St. Lawrence River between Montreal and Lake Ontario is navigable at present? 7. Could not the St. Lawrence River and canals between Montreal and Lake Ontario be made navigable for sea-going vessels of the largest size that come up to the port of Montreal? If so, what would be the probable expense?

Mr. BOWELL. 1. No. 2. No. 3. So that vessels drawing 14 feet can pass from Montreal to Lake Ontario. 4. Work was begun in 1873, and about half of it is completed. 5. $22,250,000 for a 14 feet channel, that is to complete. 6. Nine feet at ordinary stages of the water in the river. 7. This subject has not been investigated by the engineers of the department, and no estimate has, therefore, been made.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Say a hundred million.

Mr. BOWELL. I think it would take a couple of hundred millions, as near as I can ascertain.

DISMISSAL OF EUGÈNE SOUCY.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, Has a person named Eugène Soucy, who, in 1888, was, for drunkenness, dismissed from his position as conductor on the Intercolonial Railway, been appointed to another position on the same railway? If he has been so appointed, to what position and on whose recommendation?

Mr. BOWELL. Eugène Soucy, who was dismissed for drunkenness in 1888, was re-employed by a party whose name I forget, but I hope I will find it in a minute. As soon as the superintendent, Mr. Pottinger, heard of his re-employment, he discharged him.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Can you tell me when?

Mr. BOWELL. No; I cannot. If it is on my memorandum, as soon as I get it I will let you know.

MR. JAMES ALLEN.

Mr. McNEILL asked, 1. Is it known in the Department of Indian Affairs that Mr. James Allen, referred to in questions put by the member for South Grey, was for about a quarter of a century one of the most respected members of the county council at Bruce? 2. How long has Mr. Allen been employed as Indian agent by the department? 3. Since he has been acting as Indian agent, has Mr. Allen's conduct been such as to cause this department to give any credence to these charges? 4. Are all of these charges, of which the department has any cognizance, preferred by Indians? 5. Are baseless charges frequently preferred against Indian agents by Indians? 6. Is it within the knowledge of this department that the last of these charges preferred against Mr. Allen is untrue? 7. Has any enquiry been held as to those charges? If so, what is the result of the enquiry? 8. Has the department received any communication as to these charges from the Rev. Wm. Savage, Methodist missionary of Saugeen Reserve? 9. If so, what is the purport of it?

Mr. DEWDNEY. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say: 1. The department has reason to believe that Mr. James Allen filled an important position for some time in the county council of Bruce. 2. Mr. Allan was appointed Indian agent on 7th November, 1887. He has, therefore, been employed by the Indian Department $3\frac{7}{12}$ years. 3. Mr. Allen's conduct since his appointment has not been such as to lay him open to the suspicion that such charges could be true of him. 4. All of the charges referred to by Mr. Landerkin on the first occasion were laid by Indians; those referred to by Mr. Landerkin more recently were made by Mr. John Creighton, of Southampton, County of Bruce. 5. Charges which are found upon investigation to rest upon very slight, if any, foundation, are sometimes made by Indians against agents. 6. The last charge against Agent Allen referred to by Mr. Landerkin, namely, that he was so illiterate as to scarcely be able to sign his name, is not borne out by the evidence which the reports received from that officer furnish as to his intelligence and capability. 7. An investigation has been held into the charges. The report of the Inspector of Indian Agencies and Reserves has been only recently received, and it is at present under consideration. 8 and 9. A communication has been received from Rev. Wm. Savage, Methodist missionary on Saugeen Reserve, as to the charges made against Allen, and Mr. Savage speaks in the highest terms of Agent Allen.

DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY SUPPLIES.

Mr. FORBES asked, What are the names of the several persons or firms who tendered to supply Dorchester Penitentiary for the current year with supplies as required? What was the amount of the tender accepted, and what were the amounts of the several tenders, and was the lowest tender accepted?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Most of the matter enquired about would be more suitable for a return; but I will send the papers containing the information to the hon. gentleman, so that he may afterwards move for a return if he desires to do so. The lowest tender has been accepted, except in one

case, for dry goods. What was actually the lowest tender, a few dollars lower than any of the others, was received a few days too late, and I thought I could not accept it.

STEAMER *STANLEY*.

Mr. PERRY asked, Is it the intention of the Government to lay before Parliament during the present session a return to an Order of the House of Commons made 12th May, 1891, having reference to the steamer *Stanley*, the number of trips made to and from the mainland and Prince Edward Island, cost, &c., during the winter of 1891?

Mr. TUPPER. It is the intention of the Government to lay these papers before the House during the present session. I may take this opportunity of explaining to the hon. gentleman briefly the reason of the rather long delay that has occurred in preparing these papers. It would have been no trouble to have promptly laid on the Table the papers covered by the motion moved by the hon. gentleman on this question. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) moved an amendment, however, to the motion of the hon. gentleman asking for these papers, to the effect that the correspondence between the agent at Charlottetown and the department should also be brought down. That is very voluminous, indeed. It has all been prepared, however. It was ready a short time ago, and would have been brought down then, but I discovered that the papers did not fully comply with the terms of the motion, since they referred also to correspondence with the Post Office Department. I immediately communicated with that department, and in a short time the papers from that department will be ready, and it will be possible to complete the return and bring it down.

POSTMASTERSHIP OF HOLSTEIN.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Who is the postmaster at Holstein? When was he appointed?

Mr. HAGGART. There has been no postmaster appointed in the place of the postmaster who has resigned at Holstein.

BIG BAY WHARF, NORTH GREY.

Mr. SOMERVILLE asked, What was the nature and extent of the work done at Big Bay wharf, in the township of Keppel, North Grey, during the summer of 1890, the total amount expended being $2,065? What are the details of this expenditure?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The work done at Big Bay consisted in taking down to the low water level nine cribs and the outer block, rebuilding the same to the original height of 10 feet above low water, and filling them with ballast, renewing the springers across the opening, and replanting the whole of the roadway, the total length of the work being 400 feet. The cost was $2,000 for the work and $65 for the clerk of works.

TRENT VALLEY CANAL WORKS.

Mr. BARRON asked, What has been the total cost of erecting and constructing the locks and canals at Fenelon Falls, Buckhorn, Lovesick and Burleigh, respectively, on the route of the Trent Valley Canal? What has been the total revenue from the Fenelon Falls lock and canal since its construction?

Mr. BOWELL. The total expenditure was as follows:—Fenelon Falls, $125,529.81; Buckhorn, $123,954; Burleigh and Lovesick, $260,209.92; total, $509,693.73. The late Mr. John Page, Chief Engineer of Canals, made an award, dated 29th January, 1890, of $31,332 (not detailed), which covered claims on Buckhorn, Burleigh and Lovesick lock gates and Burleigh and Lovesick locks. In the total of $509,693.73 is included an amount of $2,056, balance due on final estimate for lock gates at Buckhorn, Burleigh and Lovesick, which is also included in the award of $31,332. Fenelon Falls lock was opened for traffic on 1st July, 1889. The amount of revenue for 1889-90 was $41.17; for 1890-91, $84.96; total amount of revenue, $126.13.

TARTE-McGREEVY ENQUIRY—COUNSEL.

Mr. McMULLEN. Some days ago I asked for the name or names of counsel retained by the Government in connection with the enquiry in regard to the charges made by Mr. Tarte now being conducted by the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and what is the rate of remuneration to be paid to each of such counsel. The Minister of Justice replied that the names of the counsel retained were Messrs. Osler from Toronto and Henry of Halifax, and he added:

"I am not quite prepared to give the hon. member this afternoon the other details which he asks for, and it may be better that the question should stand, in order that I may be able to inform him, besides the particulars, of the instructions which these gentlemen have received."

I should like to know if the Minister is now prepared to answer the balance of the question?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I cannot, for the same reason that prevented me the other day. Those gentlemen, I am sorry to say, have not been paid, and I have not fixed the rate of remuneration yet. I will give the information to the hon. gentleman, and the instructions also, if he would like to have them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I wish to ask the hon. Minister a question before we get away from this subject. I understand that, practically, the counsel to which the Minister of Justice refers are counsel that are for the defence of Mr. Perley and the Department of Public Works. It is certainly impossible to distinguish between Mr. Henry and Mr. Osler in the matter, and if the investigation is carried on in that way I would ask whether the Government contemplate paying all the counsel who are before the committee—that is, other than the counsel for the witnesses.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The two counsel referred to are employed by the Public Works Department, under these circumstances: When I told the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Mc Mullen) that I would give him the instructions to counsel I wished to be more specific on that point than I could be in stating them from memory. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to state from memory, subject to correction by the writing, I will state from my recollection that the instructions are these: The enquiry relates to the expenditure of a very large sum of public money, as to which, indefinitely, certain charges have been made against the Public Works Department, as well as certain definite charges against particular officials

of that department. Inasmuch as this enquiry is proceeding under the instructions of this House, the Government thought it proper that counsel should be employed, not only to watch the investigation from day to day, but to aid in the investigation, for the purpose of eliciting all the facts surrounding that matter; with a view, not to the defence of any particular officer merely, but with the view of eliciting all the facts in every possible way. So far from these instructions confining counsel to the defence of any particular person or department, the instructions require that if any person should be implicated in any impropriety whatever the matter should be followed up to the fullest extent, and then counsel would assume the position of counsel for the prosecution, instead of being for the defence.

DUTY ON SUGAR.

On the Order being called for:

The House to go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—That it is expedient that sugar be placed upon the free list.

Mr. MULOCK. With regard to this motion, I understand that, according to parliamentary practice, inasmuch as the subject-matter of this motion is not under consideration in the discussion of the motion of the Minister of Finance, that it would not be in order for me to move this motion now. If that is the parliamentary practice, I would have no other course to pursue now than to allow my motion to be absorbed in that of the Minister of Finance. I intimate now that my object in letting the motion drop is in deference to what is the parliamentary practice, and of course, Mr. Speaker, you are the one to rule on that.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is quite correct as to the practice. This motion would anticipate a discussion on an Order set down for consideration on the Orders of the Day, and therefore, according to the rules of parliamentary practice, it could not be taken up.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is a point of some importance to settle. I am not going to object to my hon. friend letting his motion stand, as it may be more for public convenience; but permit me to call your attention to the fact, Mr. Speaker, that it appears to me that the motion discussed on Monday, as to binding twine, stood in the same category as this motion, so far as I can see.

Mr. SPEAKER. I will try to indicate to the House why I think not. The question as to the second reading of the report of Committee of Ways and Means has direct reference to the question of sugar. There was no reference to the report of the Committee of Ways and Means on binding twine at all, and it was because there was direct reference to the motion in reference to sugar that I ruled that the two motions did not stand upon the same footing.

Mr. MULOCK. It will be quite in order for this motion to be made on the motion of the Minister of Finance.

Mr. SPEAKER. Certainly.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

ALLOWING MOTIONS TO STAND.

On the Order being called for the three motions on the Order paper in the name of Mr. Davin: the first with reference to the policy of the Government on immigration to the North-West Territories; the second with reference to the conduct of Lawrence W. Herchmer, Commissioner of the North-West Mounted Police, and the third with reference to prairie fires in Manitoba and the North-West Territories.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Stand.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask what the object is in asking these motions to stand. It is well understood that it is an abuse of power given under the rule to ask a motion to stand, unless the Government proposes to deal in some way with the subject, or unless they require, for some reason or other, further consideration. A motion should be dropped from the paper unless the member is prepared to proceed with it, and except, of course, there is a reason on the part of the Government, such as I have indicated, that it should be allowed to stand.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. With regard to the motions in the name of the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), I think there is a very fair reason why they should stand, unless the hon. gentleman asks that they should be dropped. For instance, the policy of the Government with regard to immigration will come up when the Estimates are before the House for supplies for immigration, and the discussion will come up better in that connection.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is a reason why the motion should be dropped, because you do not propose to take the discussion in connection with another matter.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It very often happens that a member is willing to defer his motion until he acertains from the discussion on the Estimates what the policy of the Government will be, and failing to get satisfactory assurance or explanation then, he may desire to go on with his motion. For that reason, I did not think it was wise to press the hon. gentleman to drop the motion, although I think it would be better that it should not be pressed. As regards the second motion, the facts are these: The hon. gentleman asked for a report on Mr. Herchmer's conduct; and that report has not yet been delivered to the Government, but I promised it will be brought down as soon as it is ready. I presume the hon. gentleman desires the motion to stand until the report is brought down. With reference to the third motion, dealing with prairie fires: inasmuch as the hon. gentleman has a Bill on the subject, I presume he will allow it to drop.

Mr. DAVIN. That motion can be dropped.

ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK.

Mr. TARTE (translation) moved for:

Copies of all advertisements calling for tenders for the construction of a caisson in the Graving Dock at Esquimalt; the names of the tenderers, and of that one or those who obtained the contract; the amount paid for this caisson; and all correspondence respecting its construction.

He said: Mr. Speaker, since circumstances have led me to study the working of the Department of Public Works, I have found that most contradic-

tory decisions are constantly rendered, it seems, according to the times or according to the manner of the persons who are in any way connected with them. If you go back four or five years, you see that one day such or such a tender is declared too low, although made by responsible parties. If you go one or two years further back, you find decisions just the opposite. The motion I now make is based upon facts which I can have no doubt of, but about which I would like to be further enlightened. If I am not mistaken, when the question came of building a caisson at Esquimalt four or five tenders were received, some higher, some lower. The lowest was that of Carrier, Lainé & Co., certainly one of the best established firms of the country, one of the most responsible firms of the country. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, if I am well informed, the then Chief Engineer of the Department declared that the contract should not be given to the firm of Carrier, Lainé & Co. because its tender was too low. I repeat it, this firm is one of the most responsible firms of the country; it must be worth at least a quarter of a million. And what do I see, Mr. Speaker? On the 23rd June, 1885, the Engineer of the Department, without even asking them if they were ready to do the work, declares that their tender is too low. What further do I see? I find that on the 19th of the same month, without any communication having taken place, the firm of Carrier, Lainé & Co. declare that they desire to withdraw their tender, and why? For reasons which they say they do not wish to give. So, Mr. Speaker, on the 3rd of June the Chief Engineer of the Department of Public Works had declared that this firm, which was worth a quarter of a million, could not do a work for which it had tendered for forty thousand dollars. On the 19th that firm, having doubtless concerted with the highest tenderer, declare that it is not ready to do the work. I say, Mr. Speaker, that this fact, although it bears on no very considerable sum of money, is one of the straws which shows which way the wind was blowing then, and which way the wind is blowing now. I call to this fact, as many others have done before me to other facts, the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works, who is listening to me now. In his Department, for the last ten years, as I have just said, the most singular things and the most scandalous decisions are met with. It should be time that the Province of Quebec, if not the whole country, know how matters stand. It should be time to know when responsible houses, responsible firms, honourable men, business men, tender to this Department, they are to be treated according to the rule of right, and, I will add, according to the rule of honour. I will ask, further, if it is not time that the House open its eyes. I wish to anticipate nothing, but neither do I wish to leave in the shade facts which deserve the attention of my colleagues; and if I am speaking French at this moment, it is from the wish to be better understood by the hon. Minister of Public Works, who is still at this moment the chief of his race in the Government. So, Mr. Speaker, I offer the motion of which I gave notice a few days ago.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member, I have to say that there will be no objection to the papers requested being brought down, especially as these papers are already before the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I could not examine them to answer the hon. member; but, as far as I know, the firm of Carrier, Lainé & Co. had, on 17th June, 1885, I believe, sent a letter asking to withdraw their tender, and it is on the 24th or 25th of the same month that the Order in Council was passed granting the contract to the Dominion Bridge Company. I cannot answer the hon. member beyond this, but I like to believe that his information is not altogether correct. However, the papers will be brought before the House.

Motion agreed to.

QUEBEC EASTERN RAILWAY.

Mr. VAILLANCOURT (translation) moved for:

Copies of all petitions, correspondence and documents whatsoever respecting the grant of a subsidy to the Quebec Eastern Railway.

He said: Mr. Speaker, before presenting the motion of which I have given notice, I hope that the House will permit me a few remarks to explain the object of this motion, and to draw the attention of this House to a scheme of public interest in which the Province of Quebec, and particularly the counties on the southern shore of the St. Lawrence, is concerned, and which will certainly interest the whole Dominion before long. In 1868 there was formed in Quebec a company which was incorporated by a statute of the Province of Quebec, under the name of the "Quebec Eastern Railway Company," and given power to build a railway from a point on the Quebec Central Railway, in the Parish of St. Anselme, across the Counties of Dorchester, Bellechase and Montmagny to the Maine frontier. This company, Mr. Speaker, had another object in asking for incorporation, that of developing the immense lumber, farming and mining resources of the whole valley of the St. John River. On this vast tract of land, lying between the Alleghaney Mountains and the Maine boundary, are immense forests which only require the woodman's axe to open to agriculture from 75 to 80 parishes, which would, later on, rank amongst the most bountiful parishes of Quebec. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, rich mines are to be found in the parishes already established which are to be crossed by this railroad; among others, mines of asbestos, pronounced by experts as very rich, have, a couple of yeary ago, been discovered at St. Léon de Standon, in the County of Dorchester. These mines, however, cannot now be worked to profit, owing to the difficulty of communication, they being at least thirty miles from any railway. Another advantage to be derived from the construction of this railway, should it be extended as far as Moose Head Lake or Herron Lake, to join the Canadian Pacific, would be that this road would furnish the short route so much needed and so long desired by the people of Quebec. The building of a bridge at Quebec would make this line a very important one, and give to the Canadian Pacific access to the Atlantic ports. The Quebec Legislature has already granted to this company a subsidy of 100,000 acres of land, and I am informed that the company has also applied to this Government for subsidies. These are the reasons why I move, seconded by Mr. Amyot, the resolution now in your hands.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) I fully concur in the remarks just made by the hon. member for

Dorchester (Mr. Vaillancourt). I am happy to see this important question brought before Parliament. This railway scheme is not to be neglected, because it is in the interest of an old province, for we are not, I hope, to mind only the needs of the new provinces. We have spent, without murmur, without grumbling, millions, I would almost say hundreds of millions, to open a new country. Among others, the Province of Quebec has generously subscribed her share. It now comes before Parliament and declares that in the old Province of Quebec—this cradle of the British power in North America—there is an immense tract that can be colonized, through which we may build a railroad, which shall be the true Short Line, and which will considerably shorten the way between the Province of Quebec and the Maritime Provinces, on Canadian territory exclusively. I need not say that behind the chain of the Alleghanies there is an immense territory of most fertile land, interspersed with lakes, where numerous parishes can be established. One will admit with me, that when the short route between Montreal and the Maritime Provinces was built a road was built passing partly over American territory, the practical usefulness of which might cease at any time. Let us suppose that a day should come when the United States would refuse our goods the right of passage in bond over their territory, the usefulness of that road would become very problematical. The railway in question, from the County of Dorchester to the Maritime Provinces, would be built entirely on Canadian territory. Secondly, it must be kept in mind that sooner or later the city of Quebec must have an easier means of communication with Lévis, to connect its railway system with that of the south shore. If the Government keep their promise—and we shall soon know whether they do—we shall have a bridge. If, on the contrary, they entrench themselves behind the railway companies, and say: we will give such a sum, provided the Canadian Pacific or the Grand Trunk, or the Saguenay Railway, or, in short, the other railways converging at that point, subscribe such other amount. If the Government do this, it will be as a means of eluding their promise; but then it shall be the duty of all the members for the Province of Quebec, and of Parliament, to insure the earliest possible construction of large steamers to carry cars from one shore to the other. Now, the road that we are asking for will be a short route, that will materially contribute towards bringing a new trade to the city of Quebec, that will also add to the trade of the present railways on the north shore of the St. Lawrence, and that will greatly contribute to the development of that part of the country. The Local Government has already made considerable sacrifices for this railway; it has caused it to be explored at different points, in order to get information on the probable cost of construction and on the return it might bring. Under these circumstances, I have been happy to second this motion for the papers in connection with the matter. It is now a question of putting the facts before the country, in order that our efforts may take a practical turn before long.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I must congratulate my hon. friend for Dorchester (Mr. Vaillancourt) for having brought this question before the House, and I congratulate also my hon. friend for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) for having given his support to that measure. I have only a word to add to what was said by my neighbours. I entirely corroborate the opinions they have expressed, and I may add that if the Government is not already pledged to give subsidies to that railway, the Government candidate, during the last election in my county, pledged himself in the name of the Government to obtain subsidies in favour of that road. The question was debated in a prominent way. It was to be seen which was the candidate the better able to force the Government to grant such subsidies, and my opponent, who is a railroad man, who is the promoter of the Labrador railroad, claimed himself to be the stronger. He argued that he had promises from the Government, and added that when the question should come before the House he would only have to say the word and the promises that the Government had made to him would be fulfilled. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the present Government is a just Government, and when they make promises, be they to an opponent or to a supporter, they keep them, they always fulfil them. I arise now to ask the Government, in the name of my county and in the name of my opponent in the last election, to fulfil the promise that they made of giving subsidies to this road, if such promise was made. And I do not doubt that the promise was made, for I am convinced that a good Conservative never brings forth such a fact without being authorized. I, therefore, ask if the promise was made—and it was a very justifiable promise—that it be fulfilled, and that the Government give a subsidy to this line, which is to be of the highest importance to this country, and which is to be, as was said by the hon. member for Dorchester and for Bellechasse, a genuine short route, especially when we have a bridge between Quebec and Lévis. When the Federal Government has given such a subsidy this line, with the help of the Local Government, will soon be an accomplished fact, and the Government who authorize the candidates to make promises to the electors will have redeemed those they have made. So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that before long this railway will be put on the same footing as the others. I do not ask that it be given as much as the Canadian Pacific was given, but I ask for our share of the public moneys, and I hope that when the subsidies are brought before the House the same justice will be done this road that was done the Bonaventure Railway, with which the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Joncas) declared himself satisfied. I hope that when the subsidies are brought before the House justice will be done to this road, as well as to the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, which the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Fauvel) has especially taken under his protecting influence.

Mr. BOWELL. I have no objection to bringing down all the papers. They simply consist of one petition from Mr. Faucher de St. Maurice, asking for a subsidy. If the hon. gentleman desires that petition to be brought down I will lay it on the Table as soon as possible.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I will now translate into French, a little freely, the words of my colleague, now acting as Minister of Railways, as to the remarks made by the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette).

I may tell him, with regard to the expressions used by his opponent during the last campaign, that the desire of this candidate was evidently that the road should be built, and that there should be granted it a subsidy. If in the heat of debate with the hon. member he said that there existed promises on this subject, I am sure that the hon. member will not hold rancor against him for having gone a little far in his speeches. As to the justice of the Government, the hon. member may be certain that the Government means always to be just, and if until now we have not been able, and if we are not able now, to do what the hon. members wish us to do for this road, I am convinced that these gentlemen will remember that London was not built in a day, and that sometimes a little time is required to discuss a question, to put it before the public, to put it before the Government and before the House. I congratulate the hon. member who has made this motion on his *début* in this House. He will not fail to see that the question, which is the subject-matter of this motion, has not as yet much occupied the deliberations of the House; consequently it will be an occasion for him to utilize his talent and his time, and I am convinced that he will not fail to give it all the earnestness which a new member always devotes to a matter of this kind. Mr. Speaker, there are not many papers to bring before the House, but should there be but one it shall be brought.

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I understand that the declaration of the Government is this: This road will receive the help of the present Government at the same time as the Quebec bridge—that is, when two Sundays come together. Such is practically the resumé of the declarations that are made to-day. I also understand that we shall have to wait till the Grand Trunk, the Canadian Pacific, the Quebec Central and all the railways, past, present and future, have come to an understanding, for the construction of the Quebec bridge and of this road.

Motion agreed to.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY EMPLOYÉS.

Mr. CHOQUETTE moved for:

Copies of all paper writings, documents, depositions, &c., respecting or in connection with the enquiry held at St. Flavie, on the line of the Intercolonial Railway, into the conduct of Mr. Hormidas Ouillet, superintendent of the workshops of the said Intercolonial Railway, as well as in relation to any other employés.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no objection to bringing down all the papers in reference to the special case mentioned in the motion; but it asks also for all papers in connection with investigations in relation to any other employés on the railway. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he would confine these to some date.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. The investigations were all on the same day.

Mr. BOWELL. With that understanding, I am willing that the motion should pass.

Motion agreed to.

ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK.

On the Order being called for:

Copies of the tenders received and accepted for the construction of a caisson in connection with the Esquimalt Graving Dock; the report of Mr. H. F. Perley in this connection; and all other correspondence referring to this contract.—Mr. *Tarte*.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am sure that if the hon. gentleman were here he would ask for these papers, and perhaps the House will allow it to form part of the other motion which was passed a few moments ago on the same subject, so that all the papers may be brought down together.

Mr. LAURIER. I will move the motion.

Motion agreed to.

RETURN ORDERED.

Copies of all Orders in Council granting aid toward the building of the Souris Branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and all correspondence between the Minister of the Interior and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in reference to the same.—(Mr. Daly.)

CANAL CONTRACTS.

Mr. TROW moved for:

Copies of all tenders for the enlargement or construction of the undermentioned canals, and of all works chargeable to capital account connected therewith, as removal of shoals, forming of basins, aqueducts, weirs, raceways and dams, since Confederation; as well those completed as those in progress:—

1st. Enlargement of Welland Canal;
2nd. do St. Lawrence Canals from Prescott to Lachine;
3rd. do Lachine Canal;
4th. do Ottawa Canals from Grenville to St. Anne, both inclusive;
5th. Construction of Culbute Canal;
6th. do Trent Canal from Fenelon Falls to Burleigh Rapids, both inclusive;
7th. do Tay Canal;
8th. do Murray Canal;
9th. do Yamaska Canal;
10th. do Aux Lièvres Canal, progress up to date of last estimate;
11th. do Sault Ste. Marie Canal, progress up to date.

The return to contain the following information about each section or contract, as the case may be:—

A. Information concerning tenders:

(*a.*) The date on which the tenders were received;
(*b.*) The date on which the tenders were opened;
(*c.*) The date when the tenders were finally computed;
(*d.*) The date on which the abstract of amount of tenders was submitted to Minister;
(*e.*) The names and addresses of bidders;
(*f.*) The total aggregate amount of each tender, beginning with the lowest;
(*g.*) The amount of the cheque accompanying each tender;
(*h.*) The date of the return of the cheques to the successful bidders;
(*i.*) Whether interest was allowed on each cheque while on deposit;
(*j.*) If so, how much;
(*k.*) The reason why cheques of unsuccessful bidders were detained after their position was known;
(*l.*) Whether the invitation for tenders was by advertisement open to public competition, by private circular to a select few, or by special arrangement with some fortunate individual; with all correspondence, reports of engineers, reports to Council and Orders in Council referring thereto;
(*m.*) Whether the contract was awarded to the lowest bidder; and if not, why; with all correspondence, reports of engineers, reports to Council and Orders in Council relative to the same;
(*n.*) If the lowest bidder declined accepting the work when awarded, why; with all correspondence, reports of engineers, reports to Council and Orders in Council relative thereto;
(*o.*) In case of declension by the lowest bidder, whether the contract was offered to the next in order, and if he declined, to the next, and so on until an acceptance was obtained; the reasons assigned by each for declining, with all correspondence, reports of engineers, reports to Council and Orders in Council relative to the same;
(*p.*) Whether the department was aware that bidders declining to accept their bids were partners of the successful contractor or got compensation?
(*q.*) Whether the cheques accompanying the tenders of parties declining to accept the award were forfeited; and if any, which?

(*r.*) The date when such forfeited cheques were returned; with all correspondence, reports of engineers, reports to Council and Orders in Council relative thereto;

(*s.*) Whether interest was allowed on any such forfeited cheques for the time detained, and if so, how much;

(*t.*) After publicly calling for tenders for any of these works and receiving them, when all were rejected, and why: with all correspondence, reports of engineers, reports to Council and Orders in Council relative thereto;

(*u.*) When second or third tenders were called for the same job, side by side the aggregate of the respective bids by the same party, showing the increase or reduction, as the case may be, over the first bid, and the percentage reduced or increased.

B. Information concerning contracts:

(*a.*) The date of contract;

(*b.*) The date fixed by the contractors for the completion of the work;

(*c.*) The date when the contract was actually finished and accepted by the Government, and the cause of its delay or expedition; with all correspondence, reports of engineers, reports to Council and Orders in Council relative thereto;

(*d.*) The contractor's name and address;

(*e.*) The following information in one table, which shall contain all the items of the contract schedule, as well as any new items added to the schedule after the contract was signed, the latter to be designated as new. The said table to contain in the

1st column, the number of the item in contract schedule;

2nd. The designation of the class of work or material of such item;

3rd. The estimated quantity of such item;

4th. The completed quantity of such item or the quantity used to date;

5th. The contractor's price per unit or lump sum of such item;

6th. The engineer's estimate of the price per unit or bulk sum for such item, and the engineer's name (if more than one estimate, the price set by each);

7th. The price actually paid per unit or bulk sum for such item;

8th. The aggregate cost of such item, as per contractor's price;

9th. The aggregate cost of such item, as per engineer's estimate;

10th. The amount actually paid for such item:

11th. The difference, whether increase or diminution, between the contractor's aggregate price and the amount paid for such item;

12th. The difference between the engineer's estimate and the price paid for such item:

(*f.*) All correspondence, reports of engineers, reports to Council and Orders in Council relative to the addition of any new item to the contract schedule, after the contract was signed, and relative to the price allowed per unit or lump sum for such new item;

(*g.*) All changes, whether in location or dimensions of the prism of the canal, or in the site or dimensions of structures, after the contract was signed; with all correspondence, reports of engineers, reports to Council and Orders in Council relative to such changes;

(*h.*) Whether such changes caused any such deviations from the contract prices, and if so, how the prices were determined; with all correspondence, reports of engineers, reports to Council and Orders in Council relative to the fixing of such prices;

(*i.*) All claims made for extras by the contractor, giving each extra claim, both as to quantity and prices, in detail; with all correspondence, reports of engineers, reports to Council and Orders in Council relative to such extras, and price per unit or bulk sum;

(*j.*) The date of each such claim for extras;

(*k.*) How much has been paid on each claim for extras; with all correspondence, reports of engineers, reports to Council and Orders in Council relative to such extra payments;

(*l.*) What claims for extras were submitted to adjudication, the nature of the tribunal, whether official or special, before which such claims were heard, the names and callings of the individual or individuals forming such tribunal, the mode of selection and constitution; with all correspondence, reports of engineers, reports to Council and Orders in Council relative to such tribunal and appointment;

(*m.*) The date of the appointment of such tribunal;

(*n.*) The date of the first assembling of such tribunal, and where;

(*o.*) The number of days such tribunal was in session, and where;

(*p.*) The award of such tribunal, with date and amount;

(*q.*) The names of the counsel and engineers employed in conducting the enquiry on behalf of the Crown, and the amount paid for compensation to each, including all expenses in connection therewith;

(*r.*) Whether the amount of the award was paid without appeal, and date;

(*s.*) Whether the case was appealed, and the amount of final payment;

(*t.*) The total costs paid by Government, whether on account of original tribunal, or after appeal;

(*u.*) What claims for damages were made by the contractor; with all similar information relative to damages as is contained about extras from (*i*) to (*t*) preceding, both inclusive.

He said: I desire to get these papers, or summaries of them, in such form that we can inspect them at any time. If it is inconvenient at this late period of this session to bring all the papers down. I would accept as many as can be prepared conveniently in the meantime, and the rest can be brought next session.

Mr. BOWELL. I scarcely think my hon. friend from Perth is serious in asking for a return of the character mentioned in his motion. He has little conception, I fancy, of the amount of work that it would entail upon the department. I have in my hand two returns of almost similar character. One covers contracts let by the Department of Public Works from 1st July, 1867, to 27th March, 1878, giving most of the information he asks for, and containing 200 pages. There is a blue book also of similar character, containing similar information for the period from 27th March, 1878, to 10th March, 1879. I have taken some little trouble to ascertain what amount of labour would be entailed upon the department in the preparation of this return, and the cost; and for the information of the House I will state a few of the facts. I find this motion embraces 177 contracts, each of which contain about 15 pages of printed matter or about 45 pages of handwriting, which alone would make 7,965 pages. It comprises also 177 tenders of about 2 pages each of printed matter or 6 pages of handwriting, which would make 1,062 pages. In connection with these 177 contracts there are 177 forms of specifications, averaging about 20 pages of printed matter or 60 pages of handwriting each, being 10,620 pages, or a total of 19,647 pages for these 177 contracts alone. Then there are no less than 49,000 letters received, averaging, say, a page of writing to each letter, which would make 49,000 pages, and there are 30,000 letters sent from the department, averaging a page each—though I may state, for the information of the committee, that the clerk who compiled this statement makes it 3 pages to each letter, but I have reduced it to one page. That would make 30,000 pages more, making a total number of 98,647 pages of handwriting. Then there is the copying of 177 extensions of tenders, which would necessitate the work of one man for months, and would make nearly 100,000 pages of foolscap, making a total of about 198,647 pages, requiring about 412 reams of paper. I am not taking into calculation at all the printing after these returns are laid on the Table. The cost would be about $30,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much?

Mr. BOWELL. The total cost given me of preparing this return would be from $29,000 to $34,600. If the House thinks it is advisable to incur this expense, I certainly can have no personal objection. I was going to say, did I not know the industry of my hon. friend, that I was afraid he had been imposed

upon by some person, perhaps clerks, who would like employment during the summer.

Mr. MULOCK. During the rest of their lives.

Mr. BOWELL. No doubt. With these facts before the House, and in view of the fact that 328 pages of this matter have been printed already, does the House think the country should incur the expense. If so, let it pass the motion. I do really think there are motions made sometimes of this character, sometimes of another, for some particular object, without the slightest regard to the expense entailed on the country in preparing them, and in nineteen cases out of twenty they are valueless when prepared. If there is any particular contract or any number of contracts or specifications that the hon. gentleman desires, and if they are in the Department of Railways and Canals, I can assure the hon. gentleman I will order their preparation and bring them down at the earliest possible day; but in view of the statement I have made, the hon. gentleman should withdraw his motion.

Mr. TROW. In my motion I do not ask for one-tenth of what the hon. gentleman speaks. In the first place, I ask for no correspondence. I ask for tenders, and whether the lowest tenders have been accepted, or whether they have been accepted in rotation, and various other questions of vital importance. There is a very great expense going on now for want of this information, in the Committee of Privileges and Elections. If these papers can be put in some shape, so that the members could examine and criticise them, that might relieve the Government, if there be a little expense in bringing them down. I have placed a number of them together, and the expense will surely be much cheaper when they are put in bulk than if called for in eleven separate motions. The hon. Minister states the greater portion of them are in the blue book; if so, there is no necessity to copy that portion, as I can get the blue book. If the hon. Minister will allow me the privilege of examining these papers as they are brought down—I mean those the Minister can conveniently put his hands upon—that is all I desire.

Mr. BOWELL. Surely the hon. gentleman could not have read his motion, or he would not make the statement he has just made. He asks for a good deal more than the tenders. In the first place he asks for the tenders. Then he asks for all correspondence, reports of engineers, changes in location, claims for extras, and so forth.

Mr. MULOCK. Supposing the correspondence was left out, what would the return cost?

Mr. BOWELL. The correspondence would be about 49,000 pages of letters sent from the department; then there is the copying of the 177 extensions. Do you want that left out?

Mr. MULOCK. What are extensions?

Mr. BOWELL. Carrying out tables, schedules, &c.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would suggest that the matter should stand over for further consideration by the hon. gentleman. He will see he asks for copies of all tenders. If this information could be condensed and tabulated he might get in that way all he wants.

Mr. BOWELL. Would it not be well to let the matter drop, and put a new motion on the paper, stating exactly what the hon. gentleman wants. It is trifling with the House to ask for a return of this kind.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved that the debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

SAWDUST ON LA HAVE RIVER, N.S.

Mr. KAULBACH moved for:

Return of all letters, correspondence, petitions and papers between all persons and the Department of Marine and Fisheries, relating to sawdust on the LaHave River, Lunenburg County, N.S., with the object of having the river relieved from the operation of the said Act.

He said: I regret having to bring this subject to the notice of this House, but its importance demands it. This is a matter of no small moment to the interest of the people residing on and near the banks of the La Have River, particularly to the merchants and traders doing business—in fact, all in the enterprising and thriving town of Bridgewater and the County of Lunenburg generally. The importance of this subject is my only apology for craving the indulgence of this House for a few moments. The object of my remarks is mainly relative to the operation of the statute respecting the disposal of sawdust on said La Have River, and to show how the rigid enforcement of the Act relating thereto is greatly tending to destroy the trade and business of that place. The La Have is a river of very considerable importance, taking its rises in Queen's, Annapolis, and King's Counties, and running through the entire width of the County of Lunenburg till it reaches the sea. On this river a great number of mills are erected, and so constructed, many of them, as to render it impossible to save the sawdust. In fact, I may say, the owners of the small mills, in most instances, are so poor as to be unable to bear the expenses to place in their mills the dust-saving apparatus necessary. But independent of the expense of the dust-saving machinery referred to, I contend that the small mills up stream are so far removed from the navigable waters that the small quantity of dust made by them, the river being tortuous, is caught up in the lakes, eddies and winds before it reached the tidal or navigable waters. I am sorry I cannot speak so definitely regarding the three gang mills at the head of the tide, as I have an idea that some of the sawdust from these mills deposits itself in the coves and shallow portions or flats of that river, and doubtless a portion in the channel, but still, I believe, not to lessen the depth of water in the ship channel, as the displacement of water by the sawdust would naturally raise the waters of the entire river, and the force of the water by the current in the channel in its course to the sea would, as a natural consequence, allow the water of said river to continue its normal depth. This is not alone my own opinion, but that of many who have been living in the valley of the La Have for many years. Some parties have been indulging in the luxury, if such it may be called, of charging me with using my influence to retard or obstruct the industry of Lunenburg on the La Have, to injure the Messrs. Davisons, doing business on that river, which many might believe was perfectly true, not knowing me better, but which I disclaim in every sense of the term as calumnious, unjust, uncharitable, and

wholly untrue. My object and aim has been, is at present, and I hope ever shall be, to assist in every legitimate way possible the promotion of the lumbering, or any other laudable industry on the La Have, as far as is consistent with the interest of the people of the La Have and my duty to my constituents. As the representative of the county I am virtually the mouthpiece of the people, and as such I feel I am bound to state the sentiments of the people, particularly when expressed so forcibly, as appears by the petitions so numerously signed, and presented to this House this session, one of which was presented by myself, although not forwarded to me direct. As such representative or mouthpiece I feel myself bound to advocate the claim of the La Have to have exemption from the operation of the law, the same as many other rivers similarly placed, notably the Ottawa, opposite these buildings. This should not be viewed from a political standpoint, although the Bill relating to sawdust was promoted by the Liberal party in 1873, and became law, but considered and acted upon with a view to the best interests of the particular locality which is injuriously affected by the carrying out of the law, as in the case of the La Have. The industry of lumbering is one of the most important in the County of Lunenburg, and many hundreds are dependent upon it for a livelihood, and to curtail it would very seriously affect the general prosperity of the place, which was practically shown last year when the lumbering industry on the La Have was suspended. This does not affect the mill-owners alone, but all lumbermen on that river having logs to saw, as will appear by a telegram received by me a few days ago, which reads as follows :—

"SPRINGFIELD, ANNAPOLIS, N.S.

"To C. EDWIN KAULBACH, M.P., Ottawa.

"My logs in Bridgewater will be ruined if river not exempted at once. Answer."

Now, this is only one of a number of cases, and it is not the lumberman alone, but the poor man who had performed the earnest toil in the woods all the winter as well, together with the raftsmen, merchants supplying goods, and a number of others. I contend this is a hard case, and again I ask, in consequence of such sacrifices, that this river be exempt. Now, with regard to fish. The facilities afforded for the ascent of fish on this river are said to be good. Sceptics would say, only fairly so. Some fish-ways, in my opinion, might be improved, but with the lately-invented "Hockin" fish-pass, which has recently been patented, and met with the approval of Mr. Wilmot, Superintendent of Fish Culture in Canada, and of Colonel McDonald, Fish Commissioner of the United States, at Washington, and which for simplicity of construction and apparent utility bids fair to supersede all other fish-passes ever invented—I feel we need not be alarmed, but that we will be able to have through this new invention—just praises to Mr. Hockin, the patentee—all artificial barriers in the shape of mill dams, &c., overcome, and the finny tribe passing to the head waters and spawning beds of our various rivers—La Have not excepted. The Government have, no doubt, been considerably embarrassed by the arguments used on both sides from day to day regarding the effect of sawdust in rivers, but in this case, it appears to me, they need have no hesitancy or doubt, as the petitions that have been presented the present session, so numerously signed, prove most conclusively that the trade of the country, to the people of Bridgewater and the La Have, is pre-eminently above all interests, and it is what the people of the La Have desires. I, therefore, feel bound as the representative of the people to press their claim, which under the circumstances appears to me so just. I have endeavoured to present this case to the House in as clear a manner as possible, and to show the serious results that have ensued, and the still more serious consequences that will naturally follow to the mill-owners, and the trade and commerce of the whole country, if the enforcement of the Act is continued. I would, therefore, ask that the Government take this matter into their serious consideration, and recommend to His Excellency the Governor General in Council the exemption of the La Have from the operation of the Act, claiming that the La Have has as great a right to the privileges of exemption as the Ottawa, already referred to, and other rivers of this Dominion.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I am somewhat interested in the motion that has been made by the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach), inasmuch as the operations upon the River La Have affect quite largely my constituents. It is a fact that the lumbering operations on the River La Have, more particularly those operations that have been under the control of Messrs. Davisons, for the last three or four years, have been almost entirely stopped, and this has retarded business very considerably in the town of Bridgewater and all along the valley of the La Have, up to Springfield, in Annapolis County. We have a law upon the Statute-book that was passed in 1873—in fact, with reference to this matter of sawdust, we have two laws, one having reference to the protection of navigable waters, and the second referring to the subject of sawdust, which reads as follows :—

"No owner or tenant of any sawmill, or any workman therein, or other person, shall throw or cause to be thrown, or suffer or permit to be thrown, any sawdust, edgings, slabs, bark or rubbish of any description whatsoever into any river, stream or other water, any part of which is navigable or which flows into any navigable water; and every person who violates the provision of this section shall, on summary conviction, be liable, for a first offence, to a penalty of not less than $20, and for each subsequent offence to a penalty of not less than $50.

"The several fishery officers shall, from time to time, examine and report on the condition of such rivers, streams and waters, and prosecute all persons violating the provisions of this section; and for enforcing the said provisions such officers shall have and exercise all the powers conferred upon them for like purposes by the Fisheries Act.

"The Governor in Council, when it is shown to his satisfaction that the public interest would not be injuriously affected thereby, may, from time to time, by proclamation published in the *Canada Gazette*, declare any such river, stream or water, or part or parts thereof, exempted from the operations of this section in whole or in part, and may, from time to time, revoke such proclamation."

Now, then, as far as the protection of navigable waters is concerned, it is largely under the control of the Governor in Council to decide whether the throwing of sawdust, edgings or slabs into navigable streams is an injury to those waters. With reference to this particular River La Have, although I am aware that there have been official reports from the officers sent to make such reports upon this river, I have not read them thoroughly. No doubt they are in the department, and I have no doubt that the Minister of Marine will give us

every information with reference to these reports. But there is one thing that I am well aware of, and that is that the people who are largely interested themselves have made a most decided report with reference to this matter, which report was contained in a very largely-signed petition, circulated both in the County of Lunenburg and in the County of Annapolis, asking that this River La Have be exempted from the operations of the Sawdust Act that I have just read, and also from the operations of the Fishery Act as well. This House is supposed to make laws for the benefit of the people, and the people of the County of Lunenburg say that they are willing to risk that the River La Have be injured in its navigation provided that they be allowed to go on with their lumbering operations. They look upon the lumbering operations of the Messrs. Davisons and others up and down the La Have River as something of extreme importance, and they are, it is true, of the utmost importance to those people, not so much, however, to the Messrs. Davisons as to the people and the country at large. It is of greater importance to the poorer people, in my opinion, than it is to the Messrs. Davisons, for I rather think that it is money in the pockets of the Messrs. Davisons at the present time, at all events, that they do not go on with their lumbering operations. Their timber lands are growing, and lumber is at a discount at the present time. But while the Messrs. Davisons can stand it, can the people stand it, who are asking the Governor in Council to relieve them of the operations of this Sawdust Act? They say: No; we are willing to risk whatever injury may be done to the navigation of the La Have for the sake of the benefit that we know will accrue to us by reason of the commercial operations of the Messrs. Davisons in carrying on their lumbering. They have some three mills, I think, that have entirely ceased running for, I believe, the last two years—although I am liable to correction on that point; but I think they have not been in operation for the last two years, on account of the enforcement of this sawdust law, and it is causing a great deal of inconvenience and a great deal of loss to the people throughout that valley. Now, there is another Act with reference to this sawdust, which reads as follows:—

"And every one who throws, or allows to drift into any stream frequented by fish, sawdust or mill rubbish, shall incur a penalty not exceeding $100: provided always, that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries may exempt from the operation of this sub-section, wholly or partially, any stream or streams in respect of which he considers that its enforcement is not requisite in the public interest."

This provision in that regard is left exclusively to the discretion of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Now, it is a fact, I presume, that fish do frequent the River La Have, but, as I said before, the people do not consider the injury to the fishing business as sufficient to counterbalance the injury that is done to the people themselves by the cessation of lumbering operations. Some arguments may be raised with reference to the question whether the sawdust in itself is an injury to the fishing business. However, it has been decided that it is, inasmuch as we find this Act upon the Statute-book; therefore it is not competent for us to enter an argument as to whether the casting of sawdust into the river is an injury to the fishing business. With respect to this particular river, the people by their petitions largely signed—the hon. member for Lunenburg presented two or three petitions, and I presented about the same number—have given a decided expression of opinion as to their desire that this river should be relieved from the operation of the Act. The Governor General in Council has seen fit to relieve some rivers, and rightly, too. The Ottawa has been relieved from the operation of the Act, and that action has caused some discussion, and some adverse opinions have been expressed as to whether or not it was proper that this should have been done. However, it has been done; and if the Ottawa River, for instance, is relieved from the operation of this Act, the people of Lunenburg and the people of Annapolis who are interested in lumbering operations on the La Have River hold that their river should be relieved from the operation of the Act. I am forced by the circumstances and the pressure of my constituents to impress this firmly on the mind of the Minister of Marine, and I have much pleasure in having this opportunity of doing so.

Mr. FLINT. I agree very heartily with the opinions expressed by the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) and the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) in regard to the desirability, in the interest of the people connected with lumbering operations on La Have River, of the Government, if possible, exempting that river from the operation of the law relating to the passage of sawdust into that river. Before I sit down I will move an amendment to the motion of the hon. member for Lunenburg, in order to bring the whole subject before the House and the country for fair, impartial and candid consideration. The amendment is to add to the motion the following words:—

Also a list of the rivers and streams exempted from the operation of the Act; and a return of all correspondence, documents and papers between all persons and the Department of Marine and Fisheries relating to such exemptions.

The object of the amendment is to bring the whole subject before the House and the country. While I am perfectly aware that the Government and the officers are between the fires of two parties on this subject, I quite agree with the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) that much can be said on both sides. To a large number of hon. members it may possibly appear to be a question of not very great importance, but to those who are engaged in lumbering, as well as those interested in the river fisheries, this subject is one of almost overwhelming importance, and merits patient consideration at the hands of Parliament. There is, I believe, in the reports and documents of the Marine and Fisheries Department, a large mass of testimony from experts and others in connection with the subject. This subject pertains not only to the fisheries, but to the navigation of the rivers. It has been contended that sawdust fills up the rivers, that it creates poisonous gases in the waters, destroying fish life, and has a tendency to impede navigation also. I think it is wise for the House, in considering this matter, to look upon a feature of it which has not been dwelt upon as largely as it might have been in the correspondence I have had the pleasure of perusing. There is a distinction between the effects of sawdust and the effects of other materials and rubbish emptied into a river. I believe that it is capable of proof that the evil effects of sawdust are very slight indeed, while it is proved that the effect of

emptying slabs and deal ends and rubbish of that kind in connection with sawdust is very damaging, in reference not only to the passage of vessels but as causing obstruction by sawdust, of which so much complaint is made. I do not intend to discuss the matter at length to-day, because it may possibly come up at another time, and I can then go into the evidence which I have in my possession from experts and from persons well acquainted with this matter to show that the effects of sawdust are not damaging to fish life. While I would not go so far as some persons have intimated in the documents, and say that sawdust is beneficial to fisheries, yet we have an immense mass of testimony from persons competent to give a fair opinion that the effect of sawdust alone is not to diminish or destroy fish life. I will not occupy the time of this House by reading these opinions, because it would be unfair to do so at this stage of this discussion; but I presume the returns when brought down will be placed in the hands of hon. members who are interested in the large mass of evidence given, and which otherwise might properly be read to the House. I ask for the exemption of the La Have River from the operation of the Act, as I understand that as powerful arguments in all particulars have been given against the exemption of the Ottawa and some other rivers as can be given against the exemption of the La Have. The La Have, and the Medway, which is very near it, are very ancient lumbering rivers. For over 100 years on the Medway, and for almost the same length of time on the La Have, lumbering operations have been going on, and for the last 50 or 60 years to a very great extent. Yet the rivers have been prolific of fish and are so to-day, and they are by no means in that condition which would appear from the reports made to the department. In asking, then, for a complete statement of the case to be laid on the Table of the House, I think I am serving the public interest; and on some future occasion, if the Government is not inclined to recede from the very strong position it has taken, there may be brought before this House the arguments in favour of the exemption of such rivers as the La Have. I think there should be no exemption, or that the law should be modified in some way as to apply impartially to all rivers and streams on which lumbering operations are conducted. The very fact that there is exception allowed leads to suspicion, and attempts may be made to mislead the Government as to the injurious effects of sawdust by competing and rival mill-owners. It has often been contended that it is a very trifling matter for mill-owners to arrange their machinery so as to obviate the necessity of emptying sawdust into rivers; but, in the case of the La Have, that is practically impossible, and the enforcement of the present Act, in connection with the great competition prevailing in the lumbering business, will practically put these men out of the business for all fair competition. When one river is exempt and another is not exempt it is easy to see that the mill-owners and those interested in a river not exempt from the operation of the Act are placed in an embarrassing position in regard to competing in the lumbering markets of the world, because they have to incur the expense of disposing of their sawdust and refuse in some other way. In my opinion the great difficulty, as in the case of the Ottawa River, as far as my information leads me to believe, arises from the dumping of boards, and slabs, and broken pieces of lumber of that kind into the river, which gives the sawdust an opportunity of lodging in firm banks, and so creates the difficulty which has been complained of. I agree with the substance of the concluding remarks of both the hon. gentlemen who preceded me, in pressing upon the attention of the Government the importance of the lumbering industries on these rivers, not the owners of the mills alone, but those who are engaged in procuring the lumber and those who are engaged in operating the mills, to the number of a great many hundreds of persons, who are practically out of employment owing to the fact that the owners of the mills are unable to run the mills, in consequence of the expense that would be occasioned if they were compelled to carry out the law as it is at present interpreted by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I agree with the member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) that if a conflict does come between the fishery interest and the lumber interest that the fishery interest must give way. I am not prepared to say that that conflict has arisen or is likely to arise, but there is no comparison between the value to the people, and the value to the country generally of the lumbering interests, as compared with the value of the fishing interests. If that circumstance does arise, then I say that to promote the welfare of the people generally the fishing interests must give way. At the same time, I do not believe that there is any occasion whatever for the fishery interests in this particular being compelled to give way. The evidence in my possession leads me to believe that the quantity of sawdust in the river does not in the least degree injure the fishery, and that if you keep the slabs and edgings from the river the spring currents and the heavy freshets will effectually clear the river. Sawdust does not become packed solid like mud, at the bottom of a river, and it is easily dislodged, and in the spring of the year when the currents are heavy the sawdust is invariably moved seaward. Sawdust has been pouring into the River La Have for nearly a hundred years, and I believe that the navigation of that river, as far as ships go up to load, is as good to-day as it has been the last fifty or sixty years. I have evidence in my possession which tends to prove this, and, consequently, I think both in regard to the navigation of the river, in regard to the effect on the fish, and in regard to the vast importance of the lumber industries to the operatives, and to the owners of these large mills, the Government should take seriously into consideration whether they cannot, in answer to the large number of petitions they have received, exempt the La Have River from the operation of this law as well as they have exempted other rivers in other portions of this country. I beg to move as an amendment in addition to the main motion:

And also a list of the rivers and streams exempted from the operation of this Act; a return of letters, correspondence, petitions and papers between all persons and the Department of Marine and Fisheries relating to any such exemptions.

Mr. DEVLIN. I had occasion some time ago, at all events in conversation, if not in the House, to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to this important question. The law passed regarding the throwing of sawdust, and

slabs, and edgings, and other material, into the rivers, is a very wise one, if we take into consideration the experience which we have with regard to the Ottawa River. We know as a matter of fact that it might prove a great inconvenience to the mill-owners if they were prevented from throwing sawdust into the Ottawa River; their interests certainly must not be passed over slightly, because their interests are very great; they have done much, no doubt, to build up the trade of the Ottawa valley, and to develop the towns and villages in that valley. They have built up a wonderful industry, the greatest, perhaps, in the Dominion of Canada, and their interests must be seriously considered; but there are other interests which we have no right to pass over altogether, and it is to those interests that I call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. As far as the throwing of slabs and edgings and other material into the Ottawa River is concerned, I do not think that as much damage is done as would result if these slabs were not picked out of the river, because they are regularly and continually gathered up. But, on the other hand, what is the result of throwing sawdust into the river? It cannot be disputed that up to a few years ago the fishing in the Ottawa River from this city downwards was excellent, but to-day constant complaints are received that at various points along the Ottawa River where at one time the fishing was good no fish can now be obtained. So much is this the case, that numbers of those who formerly obtained a livelihood by fishing in the Ottawa are now obliged to turn in some other direction in order to obtain that livelihood. It may be said, perhaps, that these people can work as well as anybody else at other occupations, and that this should be no reason why mill-owners should be prevented throwing sawdust into the river. That may be so, but nevertheless this is a case in which the interests of a portion of the community suffer from the fact that sawdust is thrown into the river. If you look at the Ottawa River to-day you will see large beds of sawdust floating down the stream, and these beds of sawdust go forty and fifty and sixty miles down, and with what result? It is well known that many lands along the Ottawa River are low lands; in the spring these lands are flooded, but nevertheless, as soon as the water disappears, these same lands are again prepared for cultivation, and when the harvest comes excellent crops are taken from them. I would particularly call the attention of the House to a fact in connection with this. A farmer residing near Papineauville has a very good farm, a farm which he values highly and from which he has for a number of years taken an excellent living. This spring the water was very high in the Ottawa River, and the sawdust which floated down actually floated over this land, and when the water receded the sawdust remained, forming a coating of several inches in depth, with the result that this very fine farm was virtually, and, in truth, destroyed. That is another consequence of allowing sawdust to be thrown into the Ottawa River. It was, I believe, observed last winter that the sawdust has the effect of poisoning the water in some places. How true this may be I do not know; but this fact has been brought to the notice of the public through the press, and these are matters which should not be neglected. Of course, the lumber industry is a wonderful industry; the mill-owners have gone to great expense in building these fine mills; we are proud of what they are doing for the country, but these other interests to which I called the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries are deserving, I think, of some consideration, and, so far as I am concerned, I think that the law passed in reference to throwing sawdust into rivers, and to which reference has been made by some hon. gentlemen, was a good and a wise law, and that it should not be slightly cast aside; and when it is asked that the operation of the Act should be suspended, a great deal of prudence should be exercised.

Mr. FORBES. Before the resolution is passed, I should like to say a few words, only by way of congratulating the Counties of Lunenburg and Annapolis on at last having members in this House forced to take this matter in hand on behalf of the people of those counties, and I trust that their efforts will be successful. This is the first time that members representing those counties on that side of the House have made fair and reasonable efforts to accomplish the desired object. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows that under the law he has the right to direct the proceedings and operations of people on rivers with regard to sawdust, and it has been pointed out to him on several occasions by members representing the Counties of Lunenburg and Annapolis that the action of the sawdust does not affect the navigation of the River La Have, nor is at all injurious to the fish in that river. The hon. Minister has had before him for a number of years the report of Mr. Rogers, an official of the Government, who therein stated:

"I yesterday took two men and a boat and carefully examined the river at low water with a pole, and found it as free from sawdust in the channel (and it is nearly all channel for a mile below the bridge) as it was a century ago, and it will always be so, no matter how much sawdust is thrown into it. Below the point, just where the ship *Scotia* grounded four years ago, of which I then informed you, there is still considerable sawdust, but no more than there was then. I found by testing with a pole at every ten feet or so across the channel (which I did at five or six different points where the sawdust is found, and at two-thirds ebb tide and in the shallowest water) that there was from twelve to fifteen feet, and this is where the most sawdust is found.

"The captain of the tug, who is continually towing vessels up and down the river, still assures me (and in politics he is a friend of Mr. Kaulbach's) that the harbour is not filling up, nor does he believe it ever will. He says the channel is something narrower at the point referred to, but no shallower."

I could give a number of selections from Mr. Rogers' report to the same effect, but it is not at all necessary for me to do so. The hon. member for Ottawa County (Mr. Devlin) speaks of the disastrous effects of sawdust in the Ottawa River, but he is not positive upon any particular point except that the sawdust flows upon shallow land. I say to him that I believe the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has power to exempt certain rivers from the operation of the Act, for the simple reason that if a stream flows between high banks there is no danger of land being flooded, and therefore there can be no danger from sawdust in that river. Such is the case with the La Have River. The banks are high, and there has never been any complaint from the owners of any lands along the banks of that river. As regards the action of sawdust on fish, it is well known that it has no injurious effect. Sawdust has flowed down the La Have River continuously ever since it has been used

as a basis of lumber operations, except during the last three or four years, and the fishing qualities of that river are just as good as ever. As regards the Medway River, in Queen's County, the sawdust is carried out by the current, and has never settled on the bottom to any injurious extent. The great danger of throwing stuff from the mills into rivers is not from sawdust, but from slabs and cuttings from logs. These, if from pine logs, sink readily to the bottom, and thus form an impediment against which the sawdust collects. If the Government takes in hand this matter it would be reasonable for them to cause these slabs and cuttings to be burned or otherwise destroyed. The objection which mill-owners have to destroying sawdust is the serious cost it entails upon them for machinery for the purpose. The production of lumber on the Ottawa River is 800,000,000 feet a year, so that the cuttings going into that river must be enormous; but in the La Have River the product of lumber does not much exceed ten or eleven million feet a year. On this river the cuttings and sawdust flow out to the sea, so that they become of no consequence. If the Ottawa River has been improperly used by the mill-owners there, that is no reason why the La Have River should be subjected to the same restriction. I trust, therefore, that the efforts of the hon. member for Lunenburg and the hon. member for Annapolis will prevail, and if my services are of any use to them at any time in this respect they can command them. I do not think, however, that it is so important to get the ear of this House as to get the ear of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to whom the law has given the power to exempt rivers from the operation of the law. If they could get both of his ears it would be still better, but one of them may be sufficient to accomplish the desired object. I trust that the hon. members will endeavour to secure his attention to this matter; and when they, with the mill-owners on the river, come to represent the facts to the Minister in his office, I think their efforts will be efficacious.

Mr. BORDEN. My hon. friend who has just taken his seat has expressed the desire that we might be able to get the ear of the Minister rather than the ear of the House. I may tell him that he may have very little hope of getting the ear of the Minister if the hon. member for Lunenburg and the hon. member for Annapolis have not been able to get his ear. The hon. gentleman began by congratulating those two counties on having in this House at present two representatives who could look after the interests of their constituents; but I would remind my hon. friend that, so far as Lunenburg is concerned, it had in the last Parliament a representative who endeavoured, to the best of his ability, to look after the interests of the people of the county. We all remember that Mr. Eisenhauer, the late member for Lunenburg, brought up this question more than once, and gave it a most important place in the discussions of the House last session, by making a motion upon it in amendment to going into Committee of Supply. So far as the present hon. member for Lunenburg is concerned, if I have read aright the reports of Mr. Rogers, formerly fishery overseer in Nova Scotia, that hon. gentleman is largely responsible for the action that has been taken by the department with reference to the River La Have, because Mr. Rogers stated in his reports that Mr. Kaulbach had represented to him and the department that the navigation of the mouth of the La Have River was interfered with by the sawdust which came down from the sawmills on that river. I am glad to find now that the hon. gentleman, under a sense of his responsibility as a member of this House, has changed his mind in that respect, and is now anxious to undo the mischief which he appears to have been largely instrumental, if it be mischief, in bringing about. Now, it seems to me, without going into a discussion as to whether sawdust is injurious to fish or not, the special point with reference to the river in question is, has it been treated in an exceptional manner? I do not say that it has; but we have to face this fact, that the large and important river which flows past this building does not come under the operation of the Act, while, as I have already pointed out, the Act was applied to the La Have River, in the first instance, not because of the destruction of fish, but because of the interference to navigation—and the La Have River is precisely on the same footing as the Ottawa. I contend it is not fair that the hon. Minister should discriminate against any particular river. The charge has been made, and made in this House, by Mr. Eisenhauer, that the discrimination was made, in the instance of the La Have River, because the gentleman engaged most largely in milling operations on that river belongs to the Liberal side of politics. I do not say that, but it is only right that this question should be understood, and the great point I see in it is that a charge is made against the department of unfair discrimination against the millers on this river because they are found to be politically opposed to the Administration. Now, having seen that the County of Lunenburg, represented here by a Conservative, and the county of Annapolis, represented by a Conservative—who, however, during the last Parliament, did not consider it important for him to interfere in this matter, as he has done to-day—have declared in favour of removing the restriction as regards this river, I hope the hon. Minister, seeing that both sides of politics, so far as Lunenburg is concerned, are in accord on this point, will give the matter his most careful attention, and, if there be any wrong, see that it is rectified.

Mr. FRASER. I trust the amendment moved by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) will be incorporated in this motion. With us the matter does not create any difficulty, as the Act is a dead letter. There has not been a single prosecution in the County of Pictou or Guysborough, so far as I know, since the Act passed. I blame no one for that. I do not say that is the fault of the Government or of their officers, but I think everybody admits that the sawdust does no harm. Of course, there are not so many mills on the streams in the Counties of Pictou and Guysborough, as in this large river La Have, but still there are mills there. I only mention this to point out the construction which should be put upon the Act in all cases, and that is, to enquire into each individual case, and apply the Act or not according to circumstances. It may be that the sawdust is detrimental to fish and perhaps to navigation. If an immense quantity of

sawdust were put into a river like the La Have, that might interfere with navigation, though I very much doubt it, but in the small streams, particularly of eastern Nova Scotia, you can hardly see any trace at all of sawdust. The Government should enquire into the individual cases. Perhaps that has been done in this case on the present occasion. I know there has been a good deal written by ex-officers of the Government about the La Have River, and that gives me all the greater pleasure to know that the hon. member for Lunenburg is moving in the matter to-day. I am glad, because it indicates that he, at least, has come to the conclusion that a large number of gentlemen have sent a petition here asking that the Act, so far as this river is concerned, should not be put into operation, are well founded in their demand. There are times, I suppose, when it is well to put the Act into operation, but I think it should only be operated when the interests of both fish and navigation are larger than the other interests, and I am satisfied, from what I know of the La Have River, that such is not the case there. I know something about the Messrs. Davisons, to whom reference has been made, and I think a great deal of injustice has been done them. I think a great many men have been kept from work, and their business interfered with, perhaps from the best of reasons, as otherwise the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would not have interfered; but, I think, in view of the petitions and stand taken by the hon. members for Lunenburg and Yarmouth, both of whom are interested in this matter more than any other gentlemen, the Government should accede to their request.

Mr. TUPPER. The subject brought before the House on this motion is one of very great importance, not merely to the locality mentioned, but to the fishing industry in Canada, in every province; and I know of no province in which that question assumes such great importance, bearing in mind the many investigations which have been made into the question itself and the result of those enquiries, than the Province of Nova Scotia. If time permitted, I could satisfactorily demonstrate, even to those gentlemen who have given some attention to the subject and are interested chiefly, it appears, in the particular localities of Bridgewater and the La Have River, that, so far as the pollution of that river is concerned, this question is one not merely affecting the people along the river. There is, it is true, a local interest, but I could produce the most satisfactory evidence to establish that the keeping of these rivers free from pollution of all kinds and the keeping of them open, is a matter of tremendous importance to one of the greatest interests, if not the greatest, possessed by Nova Scotia.—I mean its fishing interests. Everyone acquainted with the shore fisheries of Nova Scotia is aware that one of the chief reasons, if not the chief reason, why those fisheries have so long supplied such valuable employment to the inhabitants of that province and produced such an enormous amount of wealth annually, is the fact that the rivers have been, the most of them, kept in such a condition as to attract the anadromous fish, which bring after them the larger and more valuable fish; and on the other hand, it will be found from the reports of the Commissioners of the American and New England States that their coast fisheries have been well-nigh ruined simply because the interest that has been supported to-day in this House so earnestly and ably, has succeeded in putting out of sight the fishing interests in those localities where the two came into collision. It is because of the polluted and deplorable condition of the rivers going to the sea in the New England States, and the consequent absence of anadromous fish, that the shore fisheries there, which at one time were so plentiful, are now nearly extinguished, and the fishermen have to come to our coast for their catch year after year. I am very glad indeed that this subject has been brought before the House and that hon. gentlemen have not concealed statements made outside of the House, and which reflected upon myself to no inconsiderable degree. In the administration of the Act, which offends to be a most unpopular Act and which I admit a very powerful interest, I have been charged with partiality, or to put it in plainer language, with having been dishonest. It has been stated that on this river, because the politics of some mill-owner whose name has been mentioned were of the Liberal stripe, I have used the Act as a means of persecution against that gentleman. In any case I would scorn to do such a thing, but the best and quickest answer to that statement is that I never met the man and knew nothing about him until he complained of the operation of the Act. The hon. gentleman complains of the operation of the Act on the La Have River, but the Act was not in force on the Medway River, and I believe the same gentleman owns and operates a mill there, where the law is not enforced. This gentleman went into the County of Annapolis, which is represented in this Parliament and was in the last by a political friend of mine, a supporter of the trade and general policy of the Government, and there, notwithstanding urgent appeals, Mr. Davison found that this law was enforced and he complied with its provisions. After stating that it was impossible to comply with the law on the La Have, he went into Annapolis and complied with it, and the circumstances were the same in both counties. The hon. member who spoke to-day from Queen's, N. S., may not be aware that friends of mine and political opponents of his have persistently urged me from the time I took office not to enforce the law, but he will bear me out in the statement that I gave no instructions contrary to those which I had previously given, and these were that, where the Act had not been suspended in the proper way, it should be rigorously enforced. I have never acted except on that principle. It is true that, as the hon. member for Queen's said, the Act was not enforced on the Medway because the officers in my department reported that there was no object in enforcing the law, as the sawdust complained of was carried out to sea, and the hon. member for Queen's corroborates the statements made in these reports. There was therefore no object, according to these reports, in enforcing the law, and it was suspended until it was shown to be incorrect that the sawdust did not interfere with that river. I am in a position, and I suppose it is necessary, to give a most satisfactory statement as to this question of dealing with the sawdust question generally, and the manner in which it has been dealt with by me since I have been Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Before doing that, however, I will refer the hon. gentlemen to some facts which are apparently

not known to them to-day. I found on record in my department a petition sent in in 1880 and signed by a large number of influential persons, complaining of the pollution of the River La Have and the injury which was being done to navigation and to the fisheries by what they called the sawdust nuisance. I find that, in 1876, when Sir Albert Smith was Minister of Marine and Fisheries, instructions were given which were evidently due to reports he had before him, to rigorously enforce the Act upon that river and to see that the law was carried out. Our same friend who has been mentioned to-day, and who evidently must be a man of great influence in Queen's, Lunenburg and Annapolis counties, came to the front then and pleaded for time to arrange his mode of disposing of the sawdust. It was stated to-day that no arrangements could be made to save the sawdust, and that the enforcement of the Act meant closing down the mills; but in 1876, this gentleman pressed upon Sir Albert Smith that, if he was given time, he would arrange his mills in accordance with the law. He was given time, but the arrangements were not made. He continually pressed for time. When the papers are brought down, the House will see that this gentleman, who has been operating for many years on the La Have, has induced the department many times to suspend the operation of the Act on his own pledge that, if time were given to him, he would make the necessary arrangements. He has failed to carry out his pledge, and he now pretends that I am endeavouring to vent political spleen against him because his political opinions do not agree with mine. In 1877, after the non-performance of his promise, the fishery officer reported to the department that the navigation and the fishing interests were being destroyed by the deposit of sawdust in the La Have, and asked for instructions. Then came a petition from the same gentleman, after he had been fined for not complying with the law, for a refund, and petitions for investigation, as similar petitions have come and do come from every quarter of Canada when you attempt to enforce the law. The hon. member for Guysborough has truly said that the law has been a dead letter in certain districts, and, when it is enforced, there is at once a demand for investigation. As a matter of fact, there have been three or four careful investigations made in regard to this river by officers who are supposed to be capable of judging, and who are certainly more competent than I am, or than any member who has spoken to-day is, to judge of that matter. Those officers unite in the opinion that the reason for enforcing the Act on the La Have River, is the same reason which induced Parliament to pass this legislation at first, and that should induce Parliament to enforce it. One gentleman has been referred to who is supposed to hold different views on that subject. That is Mr. Rogers. It is not necessary to call attention to some peculiar characteristics of this man, who was an officer of the department until a short time ago, but, after he had become enamoured of the fish-way, and thought it was the most wonderful of all that this country had ever seen, he changed his views in regard to the sawdust question. By that change of a base he naturally hoped, I infer from what the papers seem to show, that he would make immense profits from the Rogers fish-way, and there was apparently a compromise by which he changed his views in reference to sawdust. I find that in 1879 this officer, who is quoted to-day by the member for Queen's, N.S. (Mr. Forbes), to the effect that sawdust was innocuous to the fisheries, and that the River La Have has not been injured in its navigation or fisheries by the deposit of that stuff, that he reported that several feet of sawdust had accumulated in the bed of this very river, that vessels had been stopped by it and the Messrs. Davisons admit this, and offered to prepare to dispose of the sawdust. On this point, I call the attention of the House to the few remarks made by the hon. gentlemen, who, no doubt in good faith, are reproducing the sentiments now entertained and expressed to them by the Messrs. Davisons in later years. But the Messrs. Davisons were reported to have admitted that the sawdust was interfering with navigation to such an extent that vessels were stopped by it, and they offered to prepare for their own sakes to dispose of the sawdust, but asked for time again, they got time; but, as it is evident to the House, they did not carry out their part of the bargain. An enquiry was made by Lieutenant Gordon, an educated man who has given his time to the fisheries, during the last fishing season, on the coast of Nova Scotia, and has studied the subject in all its bearings, regardless of party strife or party advice in that province, and I think there will be a general testimony with reference to his success in the administration of his duties as a fishery officer. In the last annual report there will be found a very full and interesting report that he has given of the soundings that he made. He has shown just how much sawdust there is there, and how much the admiralty charts have been changed by this deposit in the bed of that river, showing that the charts were wholly unreliable so far as the La Have River is concerned, from the changes made in the soundings by the deposit of this sawdust. Mr. Wilmot, superintendent of the fishery culture, has made, I think, two separate and full reports after two separate and full enquiries. Although I profess to have no particular knowledge upon the subject other than the conclusions drawn from the reports of men who are supposed to be familiar with the subject in this country and in other countries, so anxious was I, however, to see that no injustice was done to the people of that locality, that at the urgent suggestion of the member for Lunenburg, I again asked for a report; I may say that the report of Mr. Kinney, inspector of the district, drew the conclusion that it would be consistent with the principle of the general Act to suspend the operation of the law in the River La Have, although the report seemed to me not at all a strong report; it made no very strong arguments. I again had reference to Lieutenant Gordon, he having dealt with all these subjects in a report in which he gives full reasons for maintaining the law, and as long as that law, which he considers is a most wise and beneficial one in the interest of the fisheries, is upon the Statute-book of this country, he is in favour of maintaining it in the La Have River. That report is so full, as I said before, that it was not necessary for me to go so fully into certain phases of this question as I would otherwise have felt it necessary to do. I consider this subject as an exceedingly important one, and I am very glad to seize this opportunity to go fully into the question and into the policy that I have been acting upon in the administration of this de-

partment. As it is now six o'clock I shall have to conclude my remarks, but I shall have something more to say when this subject comes up again.

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

After Recess.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 77) respecting the Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company.—(Mr. LaRivière.)

BAIE DES CHALEURS RAILWAY.

Mr. CURRAN moved third reading of Bill (No. 82) respecting the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company.

Mr. COCKBURN moved:

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be recommitted to the Committee of the Whole House in order to amend the first part of the proviso added to section 5, by striking out the words "and the company shall also be subject" and substituting therefor the words "and the company and the railway shall also be subject to all the liens and."

He said: What I propose to do is simply to put in the word "liens" in addition, and also the words "and the railway." The Bill is giving Dominion powers to a company that has hitherto been acting under a charter from the Quebec Government, and I believe the company that built this road has transferred all its rights and powers to another company. In the name of the contractor I desire that these words shall be added so that under the new company he may be in precisely the same position as he was under the company which ceased to exist. I am told that paragraph 5 is large and comprehensive enough to meet the case, but I am also told by competent legal authorities that owing to some peculiarity in the law in the Province of Quebec, it is desirable to remove all doubts by inserting the words I have mentioned.

Mr. CURRAN. This Bill has been placed in my hands by the gentlemen who are about to undertake the work which, I believe, had ceased under the old company. The fifth clause of the Bill reads as follows:—

"Nothing herein contained shall alter, diminish, or prejudice any matter, or claim, rights, powers, or privileges of any creditor of the company, or of any person or corporation having any claim of any nature or sort against the company."

That section is as comprehensive as it is possible to make any section in the English language, and is so general in its nature that it is in the most desirable form for the protection of all rights and privileges of any kind or description. When the Bill was brought before the Railway Committee, my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) suggested that in addition to the general clause, the following words be added:—

"The company shall also be subject to all the liabilities and obligations of the company existing at the time of the passing of the Act, and any suit, action or procedure pending, or judgment existing at the time of passing this Act may be continued, completed or enforced against the company in the same manner as if this Act had not been passed."

The legal advisers of the company now asking for this legislation were present. They took cognizance of the addition which was thought to be added to this section. That was agreed to then and there without further trouble. Other amendments were also made. New obligations were assumed by this company. Under the old Act they were privileged to build to Gaspé Basin. Under the present Bill they assume the obligation of going there, and the privileges, rights and claims of all parties were further secured to the extent of the mileage under the new Bill. We did everything we could to satisfy their demands. Now, after having acceded to all that was required, my hon. friend comes here and asks for an alteration in the legislation. For my part I must confess that I do not see that there is anything but surplusage in what is asked. I have received a telegram stating that the new company, although assuming the operation of the road, are opposed to the introduction into this Bill of the four words proposed. The hon. gentleman has not shown any way in which the addition which he desires to make is necessary, that it will affect any particular lien, that the word "lien" is at all necessary, or that it is necessary to introduce the word "railway" in this connection. The hon. gentleman should show that some particular rights will be jeopardized by this legislation, and when he has done so, it will be time enough to ask the House to introduce the words he has suggested. But up to the present time there is nothing to justify the departure from that which was agreed upon by the Railway Committee, and I suggest that the motion of my hon. friend be rejected.

Mr. IVES. I received a telegraphic message this afternoon from the General Manager of the Eastern Townships Bank, asking me to support the proposed amendment of the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn.) From the explanations I obtained from the telegram, I gathered that the bank is interested in a large claim; I think it is probably Mr. Macfarlane's claim, he having been the sub-contractor who did the chief work on the railway. I am aware, in a general way, that Mr. Macfarlane did this work, that he had some trouble with the principal contractor, and the result was, that Mr. Macfarlane brought a suit against the contractor or the company upon a lien on some bonds or on the road itself. I am aware that the bank is largely interested in the collection and enforcement of this claim, and it seems to me that the objection of the new company is not one that should be entertained, unless it can be shown that this amendment would impose on the company some obligation which they should not be asked to assume. As I understand from the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), who opposes the Bill, he claims that the general terms of the section, as originally suggested to the committee, were, that the company should assume and pay all debts and stand in precisely the position of the old company. That is all we ask. That being the position, the promoter of the Bill should leave it to the House to judge as to the propriety of adding the words which the creditors desire to have added.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. gentleman state what these words are?

Mr. IVES. The chief word is "lien," and it is also proposed that the company "and the railway" shall be subjected to all liabilities and obligations.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The object of the amendment is to retain to a sub-contractor an alleged lien

he possesses against the company, he not having of necessity a claim against the company itself.

Mr. IVES. That is the position. He has brought the suit and recovered judgment I understand for $180,000. That is the amount of damages he has established in the court. Now he claims that he has the right to retain the road, or something connected with the road, until he is paid by the company, or before the property is taken out of his hands. There is a large public interest at stake here, and so long as the hon. gentleman promoting the Bill does not object to assuming precisely the position of the old company, it can do him no harm; if it does him no good it will do him no harm. If he has preserved to these parties all the claims they can properly exercise there can be no harm done by adding this word "lien." I am sure the House, in a case of this kind, will insert a word in the Bill which one of our leading financial institutions seems to think necessary to preserve the claim of the late sub-contractor with reference to this road. I trust my hon. friend will withdraw his objection and allow these words to be added.

Mr. JONCAS. The Bill now before the Committee has passed through a good deal of discussion already both before this House and before the Railway Committee. I had myself some objections to the Bill at first, as this enterprise is pregnant with vital importance to the County of Gaspé, and I had some doubt about the judiciousness of accepting this Bill, but the new directors of the company having come here and given guarantees to the satisfaction of all parties interested, that they were men of high financial standing, that they were men of business, and able to carry out the work; then I ceased my objections. At that time my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) who is representing here the interest of the Ontario Bank, had also some objection to the Bill, as he wanted some provision that the bank he represented would also be guaranteed. I had an inverview on the subject with my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) and it was agreed in the Railway Committee that he would amend that clause of the Bill which was not satisfactory to him. This clause in the Bill which has already been read, and which I will read again, did not satisfy my hon. friend from Toronto. The clause was as follows :—

"Nothing herein contained shall alter, diminish, or prejudice, in any manner or form the rights, power or privileges of any creditor of the company; or by any person or corporation having any claim of any nature or sort against the company."

I told my hon. friend from Toronto to draft an amendment stating what he wanted, and he drafted the following amendment which was added to clause 5 :—

"And the company shall also be subject to all the liabilities and obligations of the company existing at the time of the passing of this Act, and any suit, action or proceeding upon, or judgment existing at the time of the passing of this Act may be continued and enforced against the company in the same manner as if this Act had not been passed."

This amendment which my hon. friend from Toronto drafted himself was discussed in the Railway Committee, and agreed to by all parties interested. My hon. friend from Toronto now comes here this afternoon and says that he is not satisfied. What does he want more? My hon. friend from Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives) has said that Mr. Macfarlane had obtained a judgment against the company, but I am not aware that that is the case. If my information is correct Mr. Macfarlane has not obtained a judgment, nor even established the amount of his claim yet. Mr. Macfarlane has sued the company, and the case is still pending I admit, but he has not at all proved the amount of his claim. This company has no objection whatever to pay Mr. Macfarlane's claims to-morrow, if it is established by a court of justice that the company owes Mr. Macfarlane eighty thousand, or one hundred thousand, or one hundred and fifty thousand dollars, or whatever the amount may be. The company has no objection to pay him, but the company says this: We cannot admit Mr. Macfarlane's claim, we want his claim to be proved before a court of justice before we pay. I take it that the amendment added to clause 5 by my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) covers everything, but the hon. gentleman is putting useless obstructions in the way. The company was asking for an extension of time for three years to Paspebiac and five years to Gaspé, and I got the Bill amended so as to give them only two years to Paspebiac and four years to Gaspé Basin. We have also put the company under the obligation of building this railway as far as Gaspé Basin. Under the obligation of this Bill they have to go as far as Gaspé Basin, and if we go on amending the Bill and putting obstructions in their way, the result will be, perhaps, that the company will withdraw their Bill and the County of Gaspé which is so deeply interested in this road will be longer deprived of its benefits. I hope my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) will not insist on this motion. I might further add that the company has obtained from a court of justice in Montreal the possession of sixty miles already built, and they intend erecting bridges for this sixty miles of road, and putting it in operation. As all the privileges of the creditors are guaranteed by clause 5 and the amendment suggested by my hon. friend from Toronto, they have nothing now to fear, they have nothing to lose, their claims are protected, and I do not see why they come here to offer obstructions to the Bill.

Mr. DENISON. The hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Joncas) finds fault with the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) because when he suggested an amendment in the Railway Committee, he did not make his amendment sufficiently full and clear. One of the objects of coming to this House, I take it, is that after the Railway Committee passes a Bill which is not sufficiently satisfactory, this House can amend that Bill in any particular in which it choses. Now it seems to me that from the admission of the promoter of the Bill (Mr. Curran) that the object of this clause was to render safe, and as they were before, any claims that might be held against the company, I cannot see why he should object to having one small word, "lien," inserted in the Bill so as to make the intention still more clear. If the object of the promoters of the Bill is not to interfere with any present rights, I cannot for the life of me see why they should object to having the Bill altered in the manner proposed by the hon. member for Centre Toronto. If there is anything vital in the objection of the hon. member for Centre Montreal, it must be that the Bill in its present shape would put the company in

a better position than they would occupy if the word "lien" were added. If that is the case, the Bill may wipe out some claim which exists against the present company, and if the House once admits a principle of that kind, there is nothing to prevent any other company coming here and, by getting legislation of this kind, wiping out old claims against it. I do not say that such is the case now; but if there is no other real objection to the word "lien" being inserted, it would look as if there might be something of that kind.

Mr. TROW. It strikes me forcibly that the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Centre Toronto is just and reasonable. It is a protection of vested rights. I am well acquainted with the contractor, Mr. Macfarlane, and I know from his own statement that this company is indebted to him to the amount of $170,000 or $180,000. He has done his work and is entitled to his pay. The matter has been in litigation for some years. His property was mortgaged in consequence, and about three-fourths of it was taken from him in consequence of his not having been paid for the construction of this road. I understood that the creditors were intended to be provided for by section 5. If so, it would surely be no injury to the company to make the rights of the creditors still more secure by inserting the words proposed by the hon. member for Centre Toronto.

Mr. McALLISTER. This Bill was referred to the Committee on Railways and Canals some four or five weeks ago, and the hon. member for Centre Toronto, who is a member of that Committee, had ample opportunity during that time to ascertain what the laws of Quebec were and to have his amendment framed in such a way as to meet the case it is intended to meet. He did offer one amendment in the Committee which was readily acceded to. But it seems that he is not satisfied with that now, and therefore proposes another. Now, I think that section 5 of the Bill fully protects the creditors by retaining to them the same rights that they possessed under the old Act; but the hon. member for Centre Toronto, being doubtful of it, had an amendment added to that section to make sure of it. If any persons were satisfied to make advances to the company or to the contractors on the strength of the security they had under the old Act, or on the strength of the credit of the company, I think it unreasonable that they should now come and ask Parliament to place them in a better position than they were in before. If they had any lien before, this Act does not take it away from them. This one word might be very harmful to the company in the event of their endeavouring to float bonds abroad. We know how cautious capitalists are, and the word "lien" might mean a great deal in a country where the lien does not exist. I think it would be unfair to grant to creditors of the old company any rights or privileges which they did not possess before.

Mr. LANGELIER. I am in a position to give some explanations on this subject, because I had a good deal to do with the litigation which has been mentioned; and when the facts are understood, I think no member of this House will oppose the amendment of the hon. member for Centre Toronto. I will not go into the history of this railroad. It was incorporated several years ago by the Legislature of Quebec. After its incorporation the company entered into a contract with Mr. Armstrong for the construction of certain portions of the line. Mr. Armstrong had to give up his contract, as he could not carry it out, and then he entered into another contract with Mr. Macfarlane, a well known railway contractor, to go on with the work. It was not an ordinary sub-contract, because the company joined with Mr. Armstrong, and they themselves became parties to the contract with Mr. Macfarlane. That contract provides most explicitly that Mr. Macfarlane shall be entitled to hold possession of the road until he is fully paid the amount of his contract. Under that clause Mr. Macfarlane acquired a lien on the railway, outside of the general lien allowed to him by the laws of the Province of Quebec—a lien, not on the company, but on the railway. Mr. Macfarlane has a very large claim, which has been the subject of litigation. It is contended, on behalf of the company, that they are going to contradict the evidence; but up to this moment the evidence in court establishes a claim of over $180,000 in favour of Mr. Macfarlane; though, as the case is still pending, we cannot say absolutely whether Mr. Macfarlane's claim is well founded or not. But even supposing it were not well founded and would be set aside by the court, that does not affect the present Bill. The company comes here and asks for a federal charter. I think we are all agreed that we are not to legislate away by a federal charter rights conferred on parties by a local charter; and the promoters of the Bill understand that very well, for they make provision to that effect in clause 5 of this Bill. That was the Bill as originally drafted and as referred to the Railway Committee. When it came up before the Committee, an amendment was moved by the hon. member for Centre Toronto and agreed to by the Committee. The amendment was to this effect:

"And the company shall also be subject to all the liabilities and obligations of the company, existing at the time of the passing of this Act, and any additional proceeding pending or judgment existing at the time of the passing of the Act will be continued and enforced against the company in the same manner as if the Act had not been passed."

Then another sub-section was added, and it is this sub-section it is now proposed to amend by a mere verbal amendment, which will not alter at all the clause:

"The right, powers and privileges and obligations of the company respecting the construction of its line shall apply in the extension of mileage from the junction with the Intercolonial Railway."

The mistake committed in the Railway Committee, a mere verbal mistake, consisted in this: They reserved a lien on the company—a lien which cannot exist and which does not exist on the company, but on the railway. By the way the amendment was drafted, it would reserve simply a lien on the company, which lien cannot exist, and the amendment now proposed is to alter that wording and reserve a lien on the railway. It does not give any right to parties which they had not before, but is simply intended to preserve the rights, if any, which they had. If nobody had a lien on the railway before, he will not have it under this Act; and if anybody had a lien before, he will continue to have it. I do not think any one is prepared to take away from any creditor any lien he may have had under the local Act, and I cannot see how the amendment proposed can be objected to. The hon. member for Montreal Centre says the

company are opposed to that amendment. I do not think so. I saw this afternoon the gentleman who represented them here, and he told me of another amendment to which the company objected, and objected very rightly. He heard that it was to be proposed to refer back the Bill to the Railway Committee, in order to introduce an amendment to prevent the company from issuing any debentures before all its debts and liabilities were paid. That would be absurd, as no company could issue debentures to construct its road, if it could not do so before the road was finished and all its debts paid. But that is not the amendment proposed. The hon. member for Montreal says it is a mere surplusage; well, if it is, it will do no harm, and, if it is not, it is absolutely necessary that it should be in the Bill. If it is not a surplusage, the result of leaving it out will be to legislate away rights which belong to the creditors of the company; and if it is a surplusage, it will do no harm to the company. Were this amendment intended to give creditors rights which they have not now, I would oppose it, as I am in favour of the Bill, but no one contends that it would give to anybody rights he has not at present. The majority of those who have the interest of the company at heart will be in favour of the amendment. To reject it would do more harm to the credit of the company than good, because if it was reported in the public press that an attempt had been made to legislate away in this House the rights which creditors had, the impression would prevail that what was undone by an Act this year could be equally undone by another Act in another session.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. When this Bill was before the Railway Committee the other day, the amendment suggested by the hon. member for Centre Toronto was accepted, and the intention of the Committee certainly was not to create new liens or to suppress existing liens. Their intention was that the rights and privileges existing should be preserved, and I have no doubt that if the word "lien" had been suggested at the time, the Bill would have been amended in such a way as to preserve it. Under these circumstances, it would be better that we should send back the Bill to the Committee with instructions to consider this amendment, and thus be able to arrange the Bill in such a way as to meet any just claim. I would therefore move, in amendment to the amendment:

That all the words after "that" in the amendment be struck out, and that the Order for the third reading of the Bill be discharged, and the Bill be referred back to the Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, with instructions to consider the matter of said amendment.

Amendment to amendment agreed to.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 50) to incorporate the Steam-Boiler and Plate Glass Insurance Company.—(Mr. Hyman.)

Bill (No. 79) respecting the Canadian Land and Investment Company (Limited).—(Mr. Ross, Lisgar.)

Bill (No. 102) respecting the Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Company (Limited).—(Mr. Sutherland.)

Bill (No. 61) respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Carpenter.)

Bill (No. 92) to incorporate the Anglo-Canadian Electro Storage and Supply Company.—(Mr. Mackintosh.)

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 125) to incorporate the Rocky Mountain Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 129) to incorporate the Manitoba and Assiniboia Grand Junction Railway Company (from the Senate).—(Mr. Davin.)

PRIVILEGE—ORANGE INFLUENCE.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before the Orders of the day are called I wish to refer to a matter that took place the night before last, and to give an authority for a statement made by myself at that time, and contradicted by the Minister of Customs. I do this in justification of myself, and to show why I made the statement I did with regard to the influences brought to bear in favour of the Minister of Customs by members of an order to which he belonged when he received the appointment to the office he now occupies. It is a matter of no very great importance. I do not suppose it is anything derogatory to the character of the Minister of Customs, that he had influences brought to bear in his favour, but as he chose to deny the assertion, I wish to read, in justice to myself, one of the authorities that might be quoted in support of the statement I made. I find that a report is contained in the Toronto *Globe* of the 12th of October, of a meeting of a lodge of Orangemen upon Yonge Street of that city, and after the meeting and the transaction of the ordinary business of initiating members, &c., the members of the lodge adjourned to a hotel and partook of a dinner, and speeches were made upon the occasion. Mr. James Beatty, formerly a member of this House, was one of the guests, and spoke. Mr. William Morton spoke, and the Grand Master of the New Orange Lodge, Mr. Richard Reynolds, made a speech in the course of which he used the following language.

Mr. DAVIN. What is the date of the paper?

Mr. CHARLTON. The paper is dated the 12th of October, 1883:

"He was suspended for interfering with their little scheme to squeeze money out of the members of the Ottawa Government and put it in their own pockets. That was their little game. The new brotherhood was being persecuted by these men, whose anger and malice were aroused. If there was nothing in the organization, it is strange that they should bring their iron-clad rules to bear to expel members of the order for joining an institution. He did not blame Clarke, Marshall & Co., for they were making their living by what they did. Marshall, collector at Portage la Prairie, found it necessary to come east. Clarke took a trip west and kept a tug to take him like a prince from place to place. He had the political cure which would heal all diseases. Clarke Wallace was also necessary to teach the people of Algoma how to vote. Bennett had a Government position and should have stayed at home and attended to Inland Revenue matters. Then, there was Mr. Mackenzie Bowell with a salary of $7,000 to $8,000 a year, who could not have been elected for any constitutency except by the Orangemen. When on a deputation from the Grand Lodge to Ottawa a few

years ago, to present a memorial to the Governor General, he (Mr. Reynolds) and the other members were requested by Mr. Bowell to bring him as an Orangemen before Sir John Macdonald so that he should not be left out if Sir John should succeed in carrying the approaching election. As Orangemen they discharged their duty in that respect, and the result was that Mr. Bowell was taken into the Government. Look at the gratitude he displayed. When the Orange Incorporation Bill came before the House of Commons, he sat in his seat as if he had taken a heavy dose of morphine which had caused him to lose his senses; and when Mr. Curran, of Montreal, levelled his sneers at the Orange body, there was no one to defend it. Brother White, in many ways, deserved respect, but he had not sufficient backbone, and the old lot had again got hold of him. The brotherhood would let those men know that their villainy, trickery, debauchery and fraud could no longer be practised with impunity on the rank and file of the Orange body. They could carry the country before them, and make such men quake at their influence."

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member is an old member of Parliament, and he knows that he is transgressing the rules.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have finished what I wanted to read. I will freely acknowledge that, perhaps, I was hardly justified in asking the attention of the House to this matter, but I felt, from the very explicit denial made by hon. friend, who cast a reflection upon my own veracity, that I was at least justified in giving the authority for the assertion I made.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not desire to enter into a discussion as to the statements made by Mr. Reynolds. If the members of the House knew that man as well as I do, they would place just as much confidence in him as they have in the member for North Norfolk. Neither is it my intention to enter into what is done inside of an Orange lodge, or out of it. It is upon my public acts that I desire to be judged exclusively, by my acts as a politician and as a member of the Government. I do not hesitate to say that Mr. Reynolds, when he made that statement, stated what was absolutely false, and what, if I were out doors, I should characterise by one little word of three letters—or, perhaps, I might add another letter to it. My hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) will understand very well what I mean. I do not wish to enter into the whole history of this man. I would be justified in telling this House, as his name has been brought before its notice, that he was expelled from the order. I would be justified in telling this House why he endeavoured to organize another society, with which the order of which I am a member has nothing to do, and I thank God I know none who occupy any positions who are of that character for bigotry and intolerance which always characterised Mr. Reynolds and those by whom he is admired. I must repeat most emphatically, in as strong language as I used the other night in regard to the statement made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), that the statement made by Mr. Reynolds in regard to myself, that I either asked him or any other man living to intercede on my behalf to obtain a position in the Government is as false as hell. I can tell the hon. gentleman more. I have letters in my possession to-day from prominent men belonging to the Conservative party who were asked to interview the late Premier on my behalf, and I told them distinctly that that would be contrary to all British precedent, and if a man had no merits other than that urged by others he was not entitled to a position in any Cabinet. I received a letter from a late Minister, who has gone to his long home, thanking me for the course I had taken, and stating that he believed that it was strictly in accordance with British practice and precedent that any statesman called upon to form a Government should be left to deal with the matter exclusively by himself without any interference. That is the position I occupy in this House, it is the position I occupy in this country. As to my standing with those with whom I have been associated in the Orange Order since I was 18 years of age, I will not attempt to defend, more particularly against the insinuations of the gentleman who represents the north riding of the County of Norfolk. I am quite content to leave my private reputation, my political standing, my consistency as a politician, my standing with my constituency, and place it on a par with his in these or any other capacity. The statements, I repeat again, made by him and the sneers he threw out are only worthy of just such a man as he, who did deliberately make an affidavit against his fellow member, while he had the evidence in his hands showing the same to be false.

Some hon. MEMBERS. "Order."

Mr. CHARLTON. I rise to a point of order, and I call on the Minister of Customs to withdraw that statement.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. Minister must withdraw the statement, that any statement made by any member in his seat in Parliament is false.

Mr. BOWELL. I bow to the decision of Mr. Speaker, and if I used the expression to any hon. member, that any statement made by him here is false, of course I withdraw it. The other expression with respect to acts outside the House has nothing to do with it.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not wish any further discussion, and I hope the House will proceed with the Orders.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I think it would be very unfair, after the charges made by the Minister of Customs, if the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) should not be allowed an opportunity to reply. I, therefore, move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker, in connection with this motion to adjourn I wish to say but a few words. In the course of a debate that took place here, and which resulted in this discussion to-night, the Minister of Customs, quite without provocation, quite gratuitously, used most insulting language towards me, language he was not justified in using. I felt called upon at that time to reply to the hon. gentleman, and, in the reply I made, I simply gave utterance to a statement which was supposed to be a matter of common notoriety. The charge had been made that influences had been used in the hon. gentleman's behalf by an order to which he belongs. I do not think the circumstances of the case called for the towering passion that the hon. gentleman got into, or called for the unjustifiable and unparliamentary language he used, and I feel that, whether he has lowered the dignity of this House or not, he has lowered his own dignity by the course he has taken. I felt called upon to-night to read an article that formed

part of the basis for the opinion that I had formed with respect to this matter. I read that article, and the hon. gentleman rose and put in a disclaimer, and I am quite willing to accept his disclaimer; but I hold that I had the right to read it, and to place before this House the reason that actuated me in making the statement I did make. I believe the Minister of Customs in getting into a towering passion has not acted in a manner very creditable to himself. I certainly have done nothing more than to defend myself from the accusation, the unjustifiable accusation, he made. I have done nothing more than to read to this House the report of a meeting, in which report we have the assertion of a gentleman—I do not know what his character may be, but I always understood he was a gentleman of truth and veracity—the explicit statement of a gentleman as to the influence that had been used by him and by his brother Orangemen for the appointment of the Minister of Customs; and it is simply a question of veracity between the Minister of Customs and Mr. Reynolds.

Mr. BOWELL. I am willing to leave it there.

Mr. CHARLTON. He was a member of the Orange Order in good standing.

Mr. BOWELL. He was not.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have not asserted, after the Minister of Customs made his disclaimer, that I was not willing to receive it. It was improper for him to rise in his place and to use the language and evince the spirit he has done. With respect to the affidavit: will he be kind enough to produce the affidavit? He has made an assertion based upon a current rumour, upon nothing as tangible as the assertion I made. I call on the Minister of Customs to produce that affidavit before he makes any further remarks. He is attacking a gentleman in this House in that matter without any justification, and without any knowledge of the circumstances; and in this whole matter the Minister has evinced bad spirit and bad taste. He has evinced that spirit, which perhaps he has acquired by the imperious manner in which he has carried out the Customs laws in dealing with importers and by allowing his minions go up and down the country trapping men, it is asserted, to violate the law, half of the fines going into their own pockets. He has become an imperious despot towards those beneath him.

Mr. WALLACE. I wish to say as regards the Orange Order that I have had a pretty active acquaintance with that order for a large number of years, and that so far as I know there had been no petition, no letter, no memorial, no request from that body, either individually or as a body, that Hon. Mr. Bowell should be taken into the Cabinet at that time. Mr. Bowell was taken into the Cabinet on his merits as a member of the Conservative party. So far as the authority of Mr. Reynolds is concerned, he was, as the Minister has stated, an expelled member of the Orange Association, and one who attempted, but unsuccessfully, to get up a rival association under the auspices of members of the Reform party. I do not think the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is justified in designating the Orange Order as he has done before this House, more particularly as not many months since he expressed a very ardent desire to become a member of that association.

Mr. CHARLTON.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not think I need say anything more to the very charitable and courteous member for North Norfolk. If he will remember, and it is very unfortunate for this House that his memory is not always good, he will know that I said nothing in my remarks which called for the attack made by him, nor justified him in making any personal reference to me. My remarks were simply a criticism upon his public acts. I said nothing whatever about the member for North Norfolk in his private capacity. He asked me to define his policy. I said it was of such a chameleon character it was impossible to do so, and I gave my reasons. His reply to that was, that members of the Orange Association had waited upon the late Premier in order to secure for me a position in the Cabinet, and that then I had basely, I think it was much stronger language he used, betrayed those who had befriended me. That was a personal reference to myself which I denounced as untrue, and I again repeat that it is untrue. I did use strong language, I admit, and would use it again under similar circumstances, because his remarks had no reference whatever to the subject under discussion. Neither do I think that he was justified in dragging in either the Orange Order, or my connection with it, under the circumstances. So much for his statement as to my unwarrantable attack, as he calls it, upon himself. He is one of these goody-goody men who think he has a right, not only to insinuate charges against his fellow members, but to accuse them of all kinds of rascality. I do not think that the adjectives in the English language are sufficiently numerous to enable the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to describe the opinion he has of those who differ from him. Now, while he is so gentle in all he does, whether it be in this House, or upon the stump, or whether he pursues the same course in church synods—I think they would resent it—I believe it would be just as well, perhaps, if the same were done with the hon. gentleman here. He must not expect that a gentleman whom he attacks in this House, in the most unjustifiable way, should turn the other cheek, in order to enable him to slap there also. It may be a Christian feeling I admit, but as the hon. gentleman is not in the habit of practising it himself, for he rather indulges in the principles of the Old Dispensation rather than the New, let him not growl if he gets a little of it himself. In reference to the affidavit to which I referred, if the hon. gentleman looks at the *Hansard* he will find it. He must not fancy that because there are a large number of new members in this House, that the members who were here when the late member for Dundas (Dr. Hickey) read the whole correspondence and read the affidavit, forget that the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) got up and apologized for it, and said he regretted having made it if he was wrong. I have no more to say on this subject, for it is an unprofitable one. I am quite willing to receive any attacks which the hon. gentleman may make on me in reference to the administration of the affairs of my department. I am quite willing to defend myself on all political matters, but if he indulges in the future in personal attacks he may take it for granted that he will get a Roland for his Oliver. I leave it to the merchants and importers of this country, and to those with whom I have come in contact, to judge

of me and of my imperious character or attempts to lord it over all creation, as suggested by the unveracious member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and take their opinion rather than the truthful, Christian-like statement of that hon. gentleman.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is no doubt that my hon. friend the Minister of Customs is both by practice and precept admirably qualified to instruct my hon. friend beside me in the duties of a Christian; and those who listened to him to-night, will I think agree with me in recognizing his eminent fitness for the position of a moral instructor to this House. But, Mr. Speaker, I rose rather to corroborate the Minister of Customs. I do not know myself what took place in the inner recesses of the Orange Order, I do not know whether or not they applied to the late Sir John Macdonald to balance some of his proclivities or supposed proclivities in the other direction, by the introduction of a real live Grand Master into the Cabinet. It was not removed at all events from the late Sir John Macdonald's custom in balancing different sections and parties, but I am bound to say that I have always understood, for my part, that the Minister of Customs holds his present position, largely to the fact that he was instrumental in obtaining a grand parade of the Orange Order in the city of Montreal in the year 1878, under circumstances which very nearly brought about bloodshed in that city. And, Sir, after the hon. gentleman got into the Cabinet, from that day to this, for twelve years, we have never heard the first breath of his approving of an Orange parade in Montreal, or any other place where it would injure the present Government.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman will allow me, and I must ask the indulgence of this House, even in this matter, because the statement made by the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is for a purpose. Now, I will tell that hon. gentleman that he is just as wrong and as incorrect——

Mr. MULOCK. Be careful.

Mr. BOWELL. I know to whom I am talking. I tell the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) that he is just as wrong and as incorrect as was the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in reference to myself and the Orange Order. I can tell the hon. gentleman that so far from that being the case, that if he refers to the Montreal *Witness* and the Grit organs of that day, he will find the vilest condemnations of myself because I refused to justify the procession or to go to Montreal.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But you instructed other people to parade.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Were you afraid to go?

Mr. BOWELL. I do not think, so far as my courage is concerned, that the hon. gentleman will put it to the test. More than that, so far from the statement of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) being true, I opposed the action of the Montreal brethern from the beginning, in the lodges and among the brethern in the County of Hastings. It was that action which brought down the condemnation of those who are now supporting the hon. gentleman, and who have been from that time to this trying to stir up sectional animosities and hatreds, which I have been trying to assuage and keep down during the whole of my life. It is unworthy of a gentleman occupying his position to make a statement here to-day, that he has no warrant for making, a statement in which there is not one scintilla of truth.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. After the hon. gentleman got into office I know he tried to assuage animosity.

Mr. BOWELL. And before I got into office too. He may be very facetious, but the whole character of the party to which the hon. gentleman belongs, and of which he is such a weak leader and instructor, is made up and is kept together just by such means as he is making use of to-day. The hon. gentleman says that the late Sir John A. Macdonald desired to bring a live Grand Master into the Cabinet. That is about as truthful as all the rest of the statements he has made.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are you not a live Grand Master?

Mr. BOWELL. I did not happen to be a Grand Master at the time, nor have I since, but I could have been had I desired. The whole statements of both gentlemen are of the same character, incorrect.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to have the same indulgence as the Minister of Customs had for a personal explanation. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) said—I am told he said it, but I did not catch his words—that I had made application to join the Orange Order and had been rejected.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No; he did not say that.

Mr. CHARLTON. I believe, Sir, from what I have heard of the rules of the Orange Order, that if the hon. gentleman had made that statement, and had made that statement out of the lodge, that he would be guilty of the violations of the rules of his own order. I wish to say that the statement is utterly false. I wish to say that I did not apply to join the Orange Order, that I never dreamt of doing such a thing, and probably never will; and from what I know of some of the chief officers of that order I do not think I want to.

Mr. BOWELL. What were you doing the last 5th of November and 12th of July?

Mr. WALLACE. I think it will be in the memory of the hon. members of this House that the remarks I made a few moments ago were not what the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) stated them to be.

Mr. CHARLTON. I accept the statement of the hon. gentleman. I did not hear his remarks, but I was informed by some of my friends that he did say so.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman did say so.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no. He did not say so.

Mr. WALLACE. What I did say was this: that I did not think that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is justified in continually bringing the action of the Orange Order before this House, more particularly as not many months ago, he expressed an ardent desire to become a

member of the Orange Order. I repeat that statement and I can give my authority if the hon. gentleman wishes.

Mr. CHARLTON. Will the hon. gentleman repeat what he has just said? I was occupied and did not hear it.

Mr. WALLACE. I repeated it twice before, and I will repeat it again for the hon. gentleman. I said that the hon. gentleman had not many months ago expressed an ardent desire to become a member of the Orange Order.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. WALLACE. I have good authority for the statement, and I can give it to the hon. gentleman and the House if he chooses; and I am sure that if I give the name of the gentleman it will be accepted by this House and by the people outside of this House as a good authority.

Mr. CHARLTON. Give it.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. James L. Hughes, of Toronto. He states that Mr. Charlton expressed his intention of asking for admission into the Orange Order.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have to state, Sir, that that information is incorrect. The last time that I met Mr. Hughes, he informed me that he never met me without feeling like swearing. I told him he had better swear, then, to relieve his feelings.

Mr. BOWELL. That was after the hon. gentleman had deserted the Equal Righters.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. Minister of Customs has given to my hon. friend from South Oxford rather a hard reputation, and he says it is a perfectly appropriate one, because it is a characteristic of the whole party to which the hon. gentleman belongs—the whole Liberal party, not merely as represented in this House, but the party in the country.

Mr. BOWELL. Not in that respect. If I was understood to apply to the whole party a characteristic of the hon. gentleman to whom I was referring, I certainly withdraw the remark and apologize.

Motion to adjourn withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER. Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I should like to call the attention of the House to what has just occurred on a motion to adjourn the House, and to state that whilst I have no desire to restrict the privileges of hon. members in any way, yet I think the business of the House would be greatly facilitated if such motions were not made for the purpose of precipitating a discussion.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). But, Mr. Speaker, just see what we would have lost.

PREVENTION OF FRAUDS.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 42) to prevent frauds in the sale of certain articles.—(Mr. Burdett.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. SPEAKER. Though it is somewhat unusual for the Speaker to say anything with reference to a Bill, I must say that this Bill is of such a character that I am obliged to enter my protest against some of its provisions. The proposition is that:

"Whosoever, either for his own benefit, or as the agent of any person, obtains from any other person any property or anything of value, or procures the signature of any such other person as maker, endorser, guarantor or surety thereon to any order, bond, bill, receipt, promissory note, draft, cheque, or any other evidence of indebtedness, as the whole or part consideration of the sale or transfer to such other person of any grain, seed, cereal, musical instrument, or farming implement, which sale or transfer is at a fictitious price, or a price equal to double or more than double the market price of such grain, seed, cereal, musical instrument or farming implement * * * shall be guilty of a misdemeanour and shall be liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years, or to a fine not exceeding five hundred dollars, or to both such fine and imprisonment, with or without costs, in the discretion of the court."

Let me point out to this House what will be the position of affairs under this Bill, It must be known to everybody, to the farming community at all events, that there are farmers who retain their seed—a good quality of grain—during the whole of the winter for the purpose of selling it for seed in the spring, and, in many instances, people are quite willing to pay double the market value of oats, wheat or any other kind of grain for the sake of obtaining a good article of seed. But under the provisions of this Bill, the person who sells, say, oats, which are worth twenty-five cents a bushel on the market, at fifty cents per bushel for seed, obtaining the higher price on account of their extra good quality, will be guilty of a misdemeanour and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years, or to the penalty of a fine not exceeding $500. I quite appreciate and approve of the motive my hon. friend had in view when he proposed this Bill to Parliament, that is the prevention of frauds, if they can be prevented, which have been perpetrated by selling seed grain or other articles to farmers at enormous and fictitious prices and upon improper representations; but it seems to me this Bill goes altogether too far, because it provides that a man will render himself liable to imprisonment for five years or a fine of $500, if he happens to sell a bushel of oats at 50 cents when the market price is only 25 cents. I cannot allow the Bill to pass the Committee without entering my protest against that kind of legislation.

Mr. BURDETT. This Bill was brought before the House last session and there was then no serious objection made. It was under consideration of the hon. Minister of Justice, but did not become law owing to my absence. I again introduced the Bill this session, and I did so with a knowledge of the law, and a knowledge of the evil, and a knowledge of the remedy required. The Bill is a transcript of the law of the State of Ohio, with changes made enlarging its scope so as to reach other articles besides those mentioned in that law, and these changes were made at the suggestions of hon. members of this House, in the sub-committee to which the Bill was referred. I think the Hon. Mr. Speaker is mistaken in his reading of the Act. If a man has a special kind of seed, which he has

saved over winter, that seed grain, by reason of its quality and by reason of many of the farmers having sold nearly all their crop in the fall, through necessity or otherwise, becomes more valuable on the market, it cannot be said that the farmer who buys it is paying double the market value. No man is going to pay double the market value of grain, when he can go on the market and get it for half the price he is asked for it elsewhere. Therefore, the objection on that score has entirely failed. A number of cases were cited in the Court of Appeal, in a case between parties who had entered into a transaction of the kind this Bill is intended to prevent; and in one of the last numbers of the Ontario Law Reports this whole question is fully discussed. In the case to which I refer, the laws of the different states of the union on this point were brought under the notice of the judges, the decisions upon those laws were brought to their attention, and they held that the notes were void between the original parties who had knowledge of the nature of the transaction. They came to this conclusion on the ground of public policy; and I am informed by the counsel who argued the case on behalf of the maker of the note, that some of the judges suggested it was time some law was passed to meet cases of this kind. I, therefore, speak with some degree of knowledge and assurance that I am on safe ground in advocating the present measure, and in stating that no judge in this land will convict a man, when it is found that he has sold his neighbour honest seed grain for an honest purpose and at an honest price, whether that price be a little more or less than the market value. I am quite willing to reduce the punishment to meet the views of any hon. gentleman. I have put it in larger than I care to have it. I may say that the men engaged in these transactions in the County of Hastings and many other counties, were the same rascals who were engaged in similar transactions in the United States, and were driven out of that country by this very law. They migrated to this country, and like locusts eat up every green thing they could find in the land. I argued when I introduced this Bill last year, and I argue now, that though there may not be very much sympathy felt for a man who goes into a transaction of this kind with his eyes open, and who was criticized by the court as being either a knave, a dupe; or a fool, still I say now, as I did then, that, when a farmer's necessities compel him, or he is in trouble, or is induced by the deception exercised by these agents, he is induced to sign notes and take grain of this character in order to help him out of his difficulties, and though very little or no sympathy be given to him, there are others who are entitled to sympathy and those are the members of his family, his wife and his children, who have probably done more than he has to get together what little property they possess, and which it is desirable they should retain rather than that it should be dissipated and go into the hands of men of this description. Another reason why this Bill should pass is, that there seemed to be a perfect consensus of opinion in this House that this Bill should include other articles and should be made to apply to such dealers as lightning-rod vendors and patent right men and others of that class, and as we all know that the Minister of Justice will, next session, introduce a Bill which he intended to introduce this session, to amend and consolidate the criminal law of the Dominion, therefore, if this measure becomes law now, and it is found to be not workable, or if any hardship should arise from it, it can be amended next session so as to meet the views of hon. gentlemen. I am satisfied that the Bill will work no injustice. It has not done so in the United States in those states where it has been tried, and when this Bill passes we will hear no more of this class of criminals. For these reasons I submit that the Bill should be passed. If it is wrong, any gentleman can go before the Senate and have it emasculated as much as he likes if he has the strength to do so. I think the Speaker, when he apprehends the full scope and object and the true intention of the Bill, will see that it will not operate against any honest farmer who desires to save his seed grain in order to get a better price for it in the spring time, to which no one objects.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) When this Bill was read a second time, it struck me that its provisions were exceedingly objectionable, but the Bill was referred to a special committee, and as far as I can understand the special committee have returned the Bill to the House in the same state as it was sent to them, excepting that they have extended its provisions to all articles in addition to those mentioned in the section as originally introduced. The Bill, therefore, now provides for all kinds of articles, including grains, seeds, musical instruments and articles of every kind and description. No one doubts for a moment that the motives of my hon. friend (Mr. Burdett) who is promoting this Bill are unexceptional. He is endeavouring to strike at a grievous wrong which he has found to exist in Ontario and also in the other provinces, but the question is if he is really remedying the evil or intensifying it. This Bill does not strike, and does not purport to strike at the fraudulent sale of an article. If it did, I will not say that I would not be inclined to support it. But the word "fraudulent" is left out of the Bill. I think the Bill has been fairly summarized by his Honour the Speaker. If a man sells any article whatever and charges double the market price for it, and takes the note of the buyer, he is liable to go to the penitentiary for five years. Of course, Parliament may say that, no matter what the conditions of sale may be, the vendor shall be liable to be sent to the penitentiary for five years if he charges more than the market price, but my opinion is that this is very injudicious and very objectionable legislation, and that with regard to a certain class of people in this country it may be made to operate very harshly indeed. Take the poorer class of farmer who may not be able to carry over his grain till spring, while the thrifty farmer is able to carry over his, have a surplus for sale and charges 50 cents for it. The market price may be only 30 cents. The poor farmer says: "I cannot carry over my grain," and perhaps 60 cents may be charged him for seed grain, but, if you adopt this principle and pass this Bill, the farmer who charges more than the market price will have to consider first of all, whether he is prepared to go to the penitentiary or not. My hon. friend says he does not intend to deal with that class of cases. Then, why does he not put some phraseology in the Bill expressing the view

which he has in his eye? I think this legislation strikes at some very important branches of industry, and I join in the protest which the Speaker has made against it.

Mr. TISDALE. I must say that this is a most extraordinary Bill, and it was so as it was first drawn, but the Special Committee seem to have considered that their duty was to intensify the evil because they have made it apply to every kind of sale. Take the case of an auction sale. A man buys an implement for $10 that may have cost $100, and sells it for over $20, and by this Bill he will be liable to go to the penitentiary. The idea that any legislature could even contemplate legislation of this kind is very extraordinary, but to add to it that any bargain or sale of any article for a fictitious value, or double its market price, is to be punished, is still more extraordinary. There is no market price for many articles, and there is no tribunal of law, or equity, or common sense, to establish the market value of many articles. The result must be that any transaction which is unsatisfactory to the party who bought may drag the vendor or the purchaser before some court. Looking at the amendments which have been made, I must say that they somewhat startled me. The proposition that in this age of legislation we should be asked to solemnly adopt any such proposition as this surprises me. I quite agree with my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) that the hon. member who has introduced this Bill (Mr. Burdett) is actuated by good motives, knowing probably the sufferings that have been inflicted on certain families by some frauds that have been committed, but if anything would induce me to vote against the Bill, the three arguments which the hon. gentleman used to-night in favour of it would have that effect. First, he says there is no trouble about a man proving himself innocent before the court. I always understood that the first principle of criminal law was just the other way, that you must be careful to take no man before the court unless you have an offence for which he ought to be punished. Secondly, he puts before this House a new proposition, that if we are dissatisfied we can go to the Senate and get the Bill rectified. If I understand our duty here, it is to see that we send nothing there to be rectified. Let us decide these things for ourselves. Third, he says that next year the Minister of Justice will consolidate the criminal law, and if this Act does not work we can repeal it. I think those propositions would rather bring me to the conclusion that we had better stop the Bill here. No one could put the real point better than my hon. friend from Queen's P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), when he said that we should be very careful how we make any precedent for anything criminal unless it is fraud. But this is a matter of bargain and sale, that any man buying or selling any article, whatever it may be, shall be put to the peril of a criminal trial, on what terms? A fictitious value, or double the market price, when, as I have already said, there is no market for many of those articles we buy, or no tribunal to which, or by which, you can judge of what that term means. I think we should not only pause in dealing with this Bill, but we should reject it promptly. I move that the Committee rise.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not agree with all the observations that have been made against the Bill. I thought when the Bill was up before that it was probably rather severe, and had been offered to the House without a very strong case in support of it, and at any rate, that it was desirable that it should stand over until next year, when we propose to enact extensive criminal legislation. But I sat in the House for a couple of hours, and I heard on both sides, members, lay and professional, presenting a very strong case indeed in support of the Bill, and I was perfectly willing, for my part, that it should pass that night, or that it should go to the investigation of a Select Committee to consider the whole subject. The Bill has had the benefit of that consideration, and whatever can be said against the Bill, I have yet to hear arguments to convince me that it is open to the criticisms that have been made against it to-night. My hon. friend from South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), for instance, referred to the fact that many times an article is bought at far less than its value, or half its value. He said that an individual who goes to an auction and buys for $10 an article which is worth $20, under this Bill may go to the penitentiary for five years. There is not a word in the Bill that would lead to any such conclusion. There is no penalty whatever on the purchaser, it is on the vendor who sells at double the value. My hon. friend says another strong objection to the Bill is that there is no means of fixing the market price; then there is no means of convicting under the Bill. It has to be shown that the article has been sold at twice the market price before there can be a conviction under the Bill. My hon. friend from Queen's (P.E.I.) says that in the spring the poor farmer is out of grain, and his neighbour, who is better off near by, sells it on credit at a price perhaps double the price for which the article could be bought for cash. There is nothing in the Bill to show that he can be punished for selling for twice the market value for cash.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) On time.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Not at all. Before you can fix the crime upon anybody, and before you can ascertain the market value, you have to consider the market value at the place and under the circumstances under which the sale takes place. You are not to consider the price at the next market town, as the hon. gentleman seems to think, you are not to consider what a man would be charged for the goods anywhere else. The fact of credit, the fact of distance from the market town, the fact of scarcity in the neighbourhood—all go to fix the market price. I do not think the Bill is open to these objections, but I should be sorry even to assist in forcing it upon the Committee. The other night when the Bill was up for the second reading, it was warmly supported on both sides, and if my hon. friends who were not here then will read the *Hansard* of that day, they will find urgent reasons given in support of the Bill. But as this evening it seems to me there is a strong current of opinion against the Bill, I think the better plan would be not to reject it hastily, any more than to press it hastily, but to allow the debate of the previous evening to be examined by my hon. friends who were not here then, and in the meantime to rise and report progress, and ask leave to

sit again. Then we can come to the subject better informed, and possibly with suggestions that will make it less likely to be abused. I would, therefore, feel disposed to move that the Committee now rise and report progress.

Mr. TISDALE. Possibly I did not make myself understood. I did not so much object to what would be necessary to convict, as I did to the chance that it would render any one liable under these circumstances to be dragged before the tribunals. That was the danger I particularly pointed out. In my experience of a somewhat extended nature, I have seen these broad provisions that are put upon the Statute-book, lead to very dangerous, annoying and burdensome prosecutions when people did not pay the obligations that they had made, or were objecting to pay them. That was the great point of my argument, though I may not have made it plain. In my experience these circumstances that the Minister of Justice points out do not always arise before the tribunals. It is affording a dangerous instrument for designing parties to use, and there is no case that I have ever heard of where they do not go the length of fraud. I think to use an old adage, that to pass this Bill would be jumping from the frying pan into the fire. Undoubtedly we will be putting instruments into the hands of parties to use to the detriment of trade, and affording unscrupulous people an opportunity of causing honest men a great deal of trouble. I beg to withdraw the motion, that the committee rise, with the consent of the seconder.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I was very glad to hear the Minister of Justice speak on this Bill. I remember when the Bill was before the House some weeks ago, that it was received with a good deal of commendation by gentlemen on both sides. If I remember rightly, there was very little objection to the Bill at that time. Now, I myself am disposed to sanction the Bill, because I believe it is making an attempt to repress the frauds that have been committed too frequently upon the farmers of this country. We all know that such frauds have been committed over and over again, that unscrupulous persons go through the country and perpetrate frauds upon the farmers on various pretexts. This Bill is making an attempt to prevent such frauds as that. It may be, as some gentlemen contend, that the provisions of the Bill are too severe—there may be an objection on that ground. I would be inclined to modify the penalty clause somewhat. But I do think it is hardly fair, because there are one or two clauses of the Bill that may be open to objection, that hon. gentlemen should at once get up and say that we should stop the Bill now and make no attempt at all to prevent the gross frauds that are being committed all over the country. I think my hon. friend deserves great credit for bringing the Bill forward, and if we can by any means punish those men who travel through the country perpetrating frauds, it is the bounden duty of Parliament to do so. It may be said that if a man signs a note for some specious article at a large price, he must suffer the consequences. But we know the men who perpetrate those frauds are specially skilled for the purpose and bring all kinds of arguments to bear upon the farmer, inducing him in a weak moment to sign a paper which he should not sign. Not only does he, but his family, and those who are innocent suffer. It is the duty of the House to remedy this evil if possible. I do not think the objection raised by his Honour the Speaker of this House was a very forcible one. He pointed out that in the spring farmers sold seed grain at twice the price for which ordinary grain was selling. We know that if men save their best grain and clean it, it is worth probably twice as much in the market as ordinary grain. It does not, however, appear that such cases will come under the provisions of this Bill, simply because the farmer obtained twice the price for seed grain as compared with the price of ordinary grain. The Bill should become law, and while some of the provisions may be too severe, they could be amended in committee, but the House should not strangle a Bill of this character in its first stage.

Mr. BERGIN. I disagree entirely with the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) and the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) as to the effect of the provisions of the Bill. I also strongly dissent from the opinion expressed by the hon. Speaker of this House. His Honour argued that if seed grain were sold at double the ordinary price, the seller would come within the provisions of this Bill. I think he is entirely mistaken. Seed grain is very often sold by farmers to his neighbours who have no seed. We all know that in every township in Ontario and throughout the Dominion, the strong-handed farmer keeps his grain during the winter in the best possible condition and cleans it, and subsequently sells it to his neighbour for even more than double the market price of grain for other purposes. The market price for seed grain is thus fixed at which the farmers sell, and every farmer throughout the country knows the market price of seed grain at that time in his section of the country, and it would be impossible to convict under this law before any magistrate a man who sold seed grain at those prices and at those times. If the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) seriously desires this Bill to become law, if he believes that the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Burdett) deserves credit for bringing this Bill before Parliament, and if he seeks to prevent frauds being perpetrated upon farmers, why does he not devote his great mind to amending the Bill? The introduction of a single word would meet his objection, so that the farmers may escape from the clutches of those vampires who go about robbing them, telling them that they will get an extraordinary quality of grain, a new variety, something that will produce three or four-fold more than ordinary grain, thereby obtaining, under the pretence of giving him credit and time to reap a crop, notes or securities which are afterwards transferred to a third party, so that these parties can escape conviction for fraud. This Bill is not confined to grain, and it is one that should meet with the support of every member of this House. We know that people go about selling lightning rods and different kinds of machines, we have apple tree peddlers, and sewing machine, and organ peddlers, many of whom make such representations to innocent farmers as to induce them to give their notes and written obligations for an article that is hardly worth the paper on which that obligation is written, and by transferring these securities to a third party they evade the law and rob the men to whom

they have sold their useless and worthless property. For these reasons I think this Bill should commend itself to the House. I know it is one that is called for, and if the hon. gentlemen who would ruthlessly strangle it would give a little assistance towards perfecting it, and removing the objections to it, they would be doing much more service to the country than by endeavouring to throw it out.

Mr. MASSON. I thought when the Minister of Justice moved that the Committee rise and report progress, the discussion for to-night would be ended. It appears, however, that such is not the case. I think that suggestion should be acted upon. I would, however, take this opportunity of expressing my view as being favourable to the Bill and its object. The objections taken by hon. members could be removed by the introduction, not of one word, but of four small words. The great objection is, that it makes the doing of the act, without fraudulent intent being distinctly alleged, a misdemeanour. If in the operative part of the Bill the words "with intent to defraud" were inserted, every objection I have heard to the Bill would be removed.

Mr. BURDETT. I am quite willing to add the words "with intent to defraud."

Mr. TISDALE. I am quite willing, as far as I am concerned, to accept that.

Mr. BURDETT. If you put the words "intent to defraud" in the first line, I think according to the Interpretation Act it will apply to the whole Act and not to a particular clause.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I may point out to my hon. friend that if the Committee rises now, the Bill will be reached on Monday night as it will stand at the head of the Paper.

Mr. BURDETT. It is possible I may not be here on Monday night, but if I am not here, and if the Minister of Justice will facilitate me in reaching it at an early date, I do not object.

Mr. SKINNER. As one of the Committee to whom that Bill was referred, I wish to say in the first place, that the Committee thought they got the opinion of the House that they wished the Bill to be preserved in its entirety, but they wished it to be amended in such a way as to embrace other articles than those included in the Bill when it was first before the House. Therefore the Committee proceeded along these lines and made the Bill perfect with this object in view. I think if the mover of this Bill allows the words to go in "with intent to defraud" that the Bill will be so emasculated in regard to the principle involved in it, that it would not be worth the paper it is printed on; unless he goes further and says that selling at double the price will be evidence of fraudulent intention. Hon. gentlemen should remember with reference to this class of legislation that there is a continual development of fraud along the debatable line of honesty and dishonesty, and, therefore, any legislation that seems to punish the wrong will at all times seem on one side to be aimed too much against honest transactions. Therefore, under the intrepretation made to-night by the Minister of Justice, I think, having read and considered this Bill, that it is nearly as good as it can be for the purpose of meeting that class of wrong-doing which the hon. promoter of the Bill had in view when he submitted it to this House. It should, therefore, be very carefully considered if these words are to be inserted with reference to these fraudulent intentions.

Mr. TISDALE. I do not wish it to be understood, as it might be from the remarks of the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin), that I am opposed to the principle of this Bill. I am not opposed to the principle of the Bill. I am in favour of any law which is a safe law, and which is consistent with the general form of our criminal or penal legislation, that can protect farmers from these frauds. I am just as anxious to have such a law passed as any gentleman in this House, or in this country. It was only because I thought, and that I still think that the Bill went beyond that, and become dangerous, that I opposed the Bill on the same lines that the hon. the Speaker did. I wish to make that correction, and I was very glad of the suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. Masson), because I understood when I spoke that no other amendment to the Bill was to be considered, and that it must pass in that form; as I gathered from the remarks of the promoter of the Bill that the House had bound the Committee to that proposition or none. I am glad to be able to assist if I can in amending the Bill in such a way as to make it possible to reach this class of frauds, without following much broader principles which I think are dangerous.

Mr. DICKEY. I would like to ask the promoter of the Bill what amendment was made by the Committee to which the Bill was referred?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SPROULE). The words "or in other chattels" were added. It broadened the scope of the Bill.

Mr. REID. I am fully in accord with the provisions of this Bill. I know for a fact that there are men travelling around my county at different times, selling grain at exorbitant prices, taking notes from the farmers, and selling these notes to the bank, or to some moneyed man at a large discount, and I think that some action should be taken to prevent this practice. These men also have blank forms filled in and signed by the farmers, or they go to widows, or to some persons who do not understand business very well, and take these notes with them. I think this Bill should pass just as it is. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) says that the Bill does not strike at fraudulent persons, but the Bill reads:

"Any person who sells, barters, disposes of, or offers to sell, barter, or dispose of for any fictitious price, or at a price equal to double or more than double the market price of such grain, &c."

That shows fraud at once, and I do not think that any judge would decide against any person who would sell at a little advance over the market price. I hope, therefore, that this Bill will become law.

Committee rose and reported progress.

SUB-COLLECTOR, PELEE ISLAND.

House resumed further consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Allan:

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all correspondence, letters and telegrams relating to the removal of F. B. McCormick from the office of Sub-Collector, Pelee Island; and copies of all letters, telegrams and telephone messages relating to the appointment of J. H. C. Atkinson, to take charge of said office; also all copies of correspondence relating to the dismissal of Atkinson, and the reinstatement of McCormick.

Mr. DEVLIN. Mr. Speaker, at the time that you left the Chair when this subject was previously under discussion I was about to reply to remarks made by the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Macdonell). With regard to the matter of the motion itself, I think it has been already placed before the the House in pretty strong terms; and as for the answer of the hon. Minister of Customs, I will not go into it at any length. But I will take issue with him in the statement he made with regard to the interference of employés in the elections. In order that I may not be misunderstood, I will quote some of the remarks made by the hon. member for Algoma. That hon. gentleman said:

"During my recent election I found that I had not only to fight a whole army of Ontario Government officials, but also had to fight an army of officials appointed by the present Administration. I found some of the postmasters appointed under the present Administration were adverse to the interests of the Government, and I found that to the extent that where notices of meetings were sent out in my district to be distributed to the people, they were held back by the postmasters until after the date of the meeting had expired."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I happened to be up in the district of Algoma during the election there, and I had occasion to see a little of what was going on. With regard to the statement that employés of the Ontario Government had interfered actively against the hon. member for Algoma, I am not prepared to dispute it. I did not meet any employés of the Ontario Government working against him or taking part in that election. But when I arrived there I saw a notice posted in a most prominent place—a notice which had been circulated in almost every part of the town of Sudbury—announcing that "Un de nos grands orateurs de la province de Québec va adresser la parole demain." I looked for a moment to find who this great orator of the Province of Quebec was, and when I saw the name upon the poster, I remembered that I had seen that name elsewhere; it was in the report of the Auditor General for the past year. I find in that report: Louis H. Tache, 12 months, $1,250; also, as private secretary, $600; in all, $1,850. This gentleman, who is the private secretary of a more powerful secretary, was up in the district of Algoma. He made no secret of it, because his name was set out on this poster as that of "Un de nos grands orateurs de la province de Québec." He was the only Dominion official whom I met during that campaign, and I attended three meetings. This gentleman did not conceal his mission. He spoke at a public meeting in the town of Sudbury on Friday evening; he spoke again at a public meeting in the town of Sudbury on Saturday evening; on Sunday morning he spoke at another public meeting at Fraser's Siding; on Sunday afternoon he spoke at another public meeting at Chelmsford; so that we find this gentleman, an employé of the Dominion Government, actively interfering in the election then going on in the district of Algoma. More than that, Mr. Speaker. With regard to the statement that postmasters had interfered in this election, during my trip I met but one, and that gentleman spoke and worked on behalf of the candidate who to-day represents the district of Algoma in this House. Let us see, too, the first gentleman's mode of proceeding, which will show that he received instructions from headquarters to act as he did. When I went to Fraser's Siding I was informed that he had made the statement that it was better for the people to support the Government, inasmuch as they would get their due share of the spoils. At that meeting he was told that the people of Fraser's Siding had petitioned regularly and constantly during the entire year for a post office, and he there and then told them that he had received instructions from the Postmaster General to tell them that they would have that post office at once. He went even further than that. He appealed to a gentleman at the meeting, asking him: "Is it not a fact that you already hold your commission?" and the gentleman was obliged to stand up and say that not only had he not received a commission, but he did not know anything about it. More than that, he must have received instructions for this interference from more powerful agents, because I found that he was accustomed to travel in a most luxurious manner. Bear in mind that it was on a Sunday that two or three of the principal meetings of the campaign of which I speak were held. The regular trains on that day were not running. The distance from Sudbury to Chelmsford, where the second meeting was to be held, was some 12 miles on the Canadian Pacific Railway. What happened? Did he go and hire a carriage? Not at all; but he had a special train to convey him from Sudbury to Chelmsford and to Fraser's Siding. Whether the special train was placed at his disposal by the Canadian Pacific Railway, or whether it was placed at his disposal by the order of the Government, I cannot say; but certainly he never got that Canadian Pacific Railway special train at his own expense. However, he had it to convey him to the meeting at ten o'clock in the morning, and he retained it to a late hour in the afternoon. So that we have here evidence that the interference in the district of Algoma was certainly not against the member representing that district, but very strongly in his favour; because the man who worked hardest in that district, who spoke most eloquently at the meetings—for he is an eloquent speaker—who worked with such energy, was no less a person than an employé of the Government, and, added to that, the secretary of the hon. Secretary of State. He made no secret of his action. He did not claim that it was wrong for him to take part in elections. I had the Auditor General's Report with me, and when I asked him before the meeting if he was not the same person whose name appeared there as receiving a salary, he said he was. He even said more than that. He admitted before the meeting that he was in the habit of attending and addressing public meetings throughout the Province of Quebec, and that he was in the habit of doing so with the full knowledge of his superiors. He stated, further, that he intended shortly to leave the service, and was about to enter the Parliament of Canada. He has not done so yet. Now, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman returned, and nothing was said on the subject; but we find the hon. member for Algoma telling us here that the employés of the Ontario Government worked bitterly against him. If the gentleman who had opposed him had obtained the seat, would he not have had reason to charge the hon. gentleman with having received the strong support of the employés of this Government, and especially the strong support of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which was supposed to act in a spirit of impartiality in the election? Many other officials of the Dominion Government may have taken part in this

contest of whom I know nothing, because the district of Algoma is a very large one, and it is quite possible that numbers of them were sent into it. At any rate, at the third meeting which I attended, I have given you, Sir, evidence that the Dominion Government were represented by an employé. Some weeks ago I brought to the attention of the House the fact that Dominion employés were in the habit of actively interfering in elections. I do not personally complain, I am not dissatisfied with the course they took, I am content even with the result of their labours; but next door to the Capital here, what did we behold during the last election? We beheld there not one or two or three, but numbers of employés of the Dominion Government—whether sent I cannot say—actively engaged, for days and even weeks, in the County of Ottawa, in the contest on behalf of the Government. Sir, one hundred miles from here and beyond that, when members of the Civil Service were supposed to be in their departments, they were found at the top of the Gatineau, lauding to the skies the Government of which they were the officials. No doubt they felt disposed to laud the Government because they were drawing their pay at the time, and probably while engaged in this warfare, were also drawing further pay from other sources. More than that, these gentlemen claimed when we disputed their right to stand on the public platform and denounce men in the manner they did, that they were no longer employés of the Government because, said they, they had resigned previously to the election. We heard that story a few months before in the local elections in Quebec, when these same gentlemen went into the County of Ottawa, in large numbers, to work against the present representative of that county in the Local Legislature. They then stated upon the platform that they had resigned; but, strange to say, a week after the campaign was over and after these gentlemen had sufficiently rested from their terrible labours, they were found again in their offices drawing their pay. I asked the Government at the beginning of the session to produce the resignations which these gentlemen were supposed to have handed in. What was the answer I got? The papers were brought down, but no resignation was produced, so that these gentlemen, employés of the Government, made a statement on the platform which was entirely false, when they said they had handed in their resignations and their resignations had been accepted. Their resignations were not handed in. The Government may smile at this course, but the Government must have known perfectly well that these men were away, because they were absent for two and three weeks at a time, and engaged in an active political campaign. They attended public meetings, their speeches were heard by large audiences and reported, and not a word was said against their course; yet, no doubt, we will hear to-night, as we were told the other night, that they did not take a prominent part in the elections. I thought it my duty to bring these facts before the House. As I have said, I do not care, so far as I am personally concerned, that I had not this large army to stand by and defend me in the fight in the County of Ottawa. We had at our door a powerful Government, determined to hold the constituency which had been theirs for twenty-nine or thirty years, and determined to hold it at any cost, and perhaps that accounted for the presence of these gentlemen in such large numbers. But if we had this powerful Government against us, we had an intelligent people there to help us and defend us, and with their aid we secured the victory.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has already spoken, and can only speak again with the consent of the House.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The matter to which the hon. member for Ottawa has referred is directed mainly against a gentleman who met him on the platform, but who has not the honour of a seat in this House, and cannot, therefore, defend himself; and, in order that my hon. friend from Algoma may, in part, make a personal explanation and explain as well the matters to which the hon. member for Ottawa has referred, I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). During the course of the debate the other evening, the discussion turned on the influence exerted in the different constituencies by officials of the different Governments; and in the course of a few remarks that I made I stated, and I repeat the statement now, that the Dominion Government officials in the district of Algoma, instead of supporting me, as they naturally ought to support the Government in power, worked against me. More than that, I have letters in my desk now to prove the truth of my assertion. Throughout the district of Algoma—and it is, undoubtedly, a very large one—the candidate who is running his election cannot have his eye on every part of that vast district. The matter mentioned by the hon. member for Ottawa County I have no knowledge of whatever. I understood that a gentleman was there in my interest who spoke in French. As I was not sufficiently familiar with French to conduct a campaign in that language, a gentleman came there to represent me, and he must have been a very good speaker, because, in spite of the eloquence of the silver-tongued orator from the County of Ottawa, that polling sub-division, and in fact every sub-division in which he spoke, gave me a majority. That gentleman has not a seat in this House and is not able to defend himself, and when the hon. member for Ottawa County singles him out as the one who went to the district of Algoma, and proceeds to discuss his conduct, he is, I think, taking a very unfair advantage of the position he occupies in this House. With regard to the post office to which the hon. gentleman refers, and concerning which he said the gentleman in question declared that the Postmaster General had instructed him to say it would be opened or that it was opened, let me say that there is not one word of truth in that statement, because, before the election took place at all, the hon. Postmaster General had given instructions to open the post office, not where the hon. member speaks of, because there is no post office at that place, but at another place called St. Ossilia, and these orders had been given long ago. I do not know now whether the post office has been opened or not, but I presume it has, so that there can be no reflection on the hon. Postmaster General or on the gentleman in question, if he did make that statement, for which we have only the hon. gentleman's word,

and from my experience in this House I have heard such strong statements made, many of them lacking foundation in truth, that I begin to doubt almost everything I hear. I begin to think we are in one of those old-fashioned debating schools, where license is given to every man to say just whatever comes into his mind, whether it is the truth or not. Now, with regard to the complaint of the hon. gentleman about the special train which was run up to a meeting, I can only say that I am informed on good authority that the roads being very bad, and any gentleman who has travelled over that country knows perfectly well what kind of roads the Ontario Government build there, roads which at some times are practically impassable—the gentleman who spoke in my interest required to get along the Canadian Pacific Railway for about twelve miles. I understand that he asked, not the Government, for the Government had nothing to do with it, but the superintendent of the railway at North Bay to give him an engine and not a train, but a box car, a caboose, in which I am told the hon. gentleman from Ottawa county (Mr. Devlin) took the opportunity to ride up there and address a meeting at the same time. If I am wrong in that I am open to correction. When I spoke of officials of the Ontario Government interfering in the elections, I stated the truth, and I state now that throughout the district of Algoma there is a hungry horde of Ontario Government officials whose principal duty it appears to be to attend to election matters. Further, I am credibly informed that in the Province of Quebec a similar state of affairs exists. I am credibly informed that at the last election in every district in the County of Ottawa there was a Provincial Government official told off to do duty. Let me enumerate the number of officials we have in Algoma and the purposes for which they are kept. In the first place, we have Crown Lands agents, who are very plausible, meek-looking gentlemen all of them. They do not appear at public meetings, but they are still-hunters every one of them. Then we have the Crown Timber agents, and the bushrangers, but the worst of all are the road builders. The road builders are always let loose on that unfortunate district on the eve of an election. They are not at all times residents of the district of Algoma. They are sometimes strangers, and it seems to me that strangers are sometimes necessary to do the most effective work at election times. An amount of money is appropriated by the Government to do certain work in that district, ostensibly to repair the roads. I am credibly informed that one of these gentlemen said: "Unless I get what I expect, there will be a row; there is $500 voted, and $250 of that has to go into my pocket." There is no district or constituency in Canada that is so afflicted in this way as the poor district of Algoma, a district where the people are struggling to make a living, a district where new settlers come in and find schools built, and sometimes a certain kind of roads, but where you would expect that every available dollar it was possible to expend would be expended and not gobbled up by the officials. Our district is the one that suffers. In reference to the statement I made about the Dominion Government officials, I can only say that from all parts of that district, I have had letters from my constituents complaining of the actions of postmasters, not only in not voting for me—I do not complain of that, because I consider that the franchise is sacred, and that every man should vote as his conscience dictates, but I do object to a Dominion Government official going out and working among the people he knows and taking advantage of his opportunities through keeping a post office and using his influence against myself or any other candidate. The principle is wrong, and what relief do we get? When I make a complaint, the Postmaster General tells me that no man can be discharged because of his political views. That may be so, but it does not appear to me to be practical politics. That is not the system adopted by the Provincial Government of Ontario which sits in Toronto. Let a man be recreant, not to his trust, but to what they believe should be his political faith and he will soon find his head cut off.

Mr. DEVLIN. I do not wish to prolong the discussion, but I think the position which I took remains solid. I do not think the gentleman who has spoken (Mr. Macdonell) has disestablished any of the points made. With reference to the majorities he obtained at the different places which have been named, I think he rather weakened than strengthened his case. He admitted that the special train was placed at their disposal. He did not deny that, or that the civil servant who spoke obtained this special train. The three places to which reference has been made are Sudbury, Fraser's Siding and Chelmsford. He did have a small majority at Sudbury, which was due not on account of Dominion issues, but to the proposed policy of the Ontario Government in regard to the mines. At Chelmsford I do not think he had a majority, and it would be interesting to read the returns from that place. Regarding the establishment of a post office at Fraser's Siding, what I said cannot be disputed. Nothing was said about a post office at Chelmsford. I believe a post office existed there. The meeting at which reference was made to this question was held at Fraser's Siding, and there Mr. Taché, who is an employé of the Government, said he had received instructions to state that a post office would be established there, and he even went so far as to ask a gentleman who was present if he had not received his commission. The member from Algoma travelled to the county which I have the honour to represent, and said that a Quebec Government official represented me at every polling sub-division.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). I did not say that you were represented at every polling sub-division by a Quebec Government official. I said that the employés of the Quebec Government had charge of every polling sub-division in the county.

Mr. DEVLIN. The hon. gentleman may not be aware of the fact that there are 76 polling divisions in the County of Ottawa, and thus we would have required to have 76 officials of the Quebec Government there. I am credibly informed that there were not 76 officials of the Quebec Government there. I do not believe even that there was one Quebec official representing me at the poll. As far as I am personally concerned, I deprecate the interference of officials of any Government in these elections. I will be perfectly candid in the matter. I think they have duties to attend to, and that they would be better occupied in attending to those duties. Still the fact remains that we have not to deal with the employés of the Local Governments. I

have noticed that hon. gentlemen opposite take pleasure in constantly dragging the Local Governments into discussions. Perhaps with them it is a case of sour grapes. They are not satisfied in having their hands in the treasury of the Dominion, they would also like to get into the local treasuries. To conclude, I affirm that every point I made in the remarks which I addressed to the House a few moments ago, was perfectly correct. I say that in the portion of the county which I visited, I found employés of the Dominion Government actively interfering in behalf of the hon. gentleman. I found the postmaster, and I found the secretary of the Secretary of State; furthermore I found that a special train, composed of a locomotive and this box car of which the hon. gentleman speaks, was placed at the disposal of the private secretary, and that he had it there during the entire day, at least from an early hour in the morning till a late hour in the evening; so that my position remains correct, that he, at all events, has little reason to complain, because he had the powerful support of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the powerful support of the employés of the Dominion Government.

Motion to adjourn withdrawn, and main motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 9th July, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PRIVATE BILLS REPORTS.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis) moved that that portion of the 49th Rule which limits the time for the presentation of Private Bills, be suspended in so far as it relates to the Bills respecting the London Life Insurance Company and the Inverness Railway and Mining Company, and that the time for posting these Bills be reduced from one week to three days, in accordance with the recommendation contained in the report of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

Motion agreed to.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT.—CONTRACTS.

Mr. GIROUARD moved that the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections have leave to sit during the time the House is in session, in accordance with the recommendation contained in the second report of the said Committee. He said: I may mention in reference to this application, that unless this permission is granted, I do not know when the Committee will be in a position to make a report. We have had already twenty-four sittings of the general Committee, and during twenty-one of those sittings we had evidence taken; three were without a quorum. The sub-Committee had eight meetings, making a total of thirty-two meetings. It is very hard to judge how much longer the Committee will have to sit, but I am afraid that unless we have permission from this House to sit in the afternoon while the House is in session, whenever it may be convenient so to sit, it is almost impossible to tell when the Committee will be able to make a report.

Mr. LAURIER. I think it would be better to reduce the number of the Committee, because if forty-two members of the House were to sit on that Committee during the session of the House, the business of the House might be interfered with.

Mr. GIROUARD. The fact of the matter is that if all the members of the Committee sat upstairs, there might be sometimes no quorum of the House. It will be better to limit the quorum of the Committee.

Mr. CHARLTON. The meetings of the special committee are of more importance than the meetings of the House. If I understand it, the House is practically waiting for a report of the Committee. We are waiting, probably, for the result of the investigation by that Committee on Privileges and Elections in order to finish the work of the House, and we can finish the work of the House soon after that Committee has finished its work.

Mr. BOWELL. It seems to me this is rather an extraordinary procedure, and something that never occurred in this country before. I do not know what the precedents in the Imperial Parliament may be, but it has always been laid down as a rule that no committee should sit during the time the House was in session, and if this Committee is to sit during the time the House is in session, we had better adjourn the House altogether.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not understand that there is any arbitrary rule preventing a Committee sitting at the same time the House sits; it is altogether a matter of convenience to be determined by the House itself. Of course, it is within the province of the House not to grant the request of the Committee, but it must be within the knowledge of every hon. member of the House that the prolongation of the sittings of this Committee means the prolongation of the session of the House itself—there is no doubt about that. Now, as a matter of fact, we find we have six or eight counsel at that Committee, and a very large number of witnesses, and it is essential to the public interests that that Committee be allowed to sit longer than it has been able to sit heretofore. We meet at ten o'clock, and sit up to one; the sub-Committee frequently meets at two, and has frequently sat until four, and it is impossible for us to get along at all unless the hours are lengthened during which the Committee may sit. It does seem to me not essential that forty-two members of the Committee should be present all the time. The evidence is taken in shorthand, and is printed nearly every day, and quite a number of the Committee, finding their engagements do not permit them to attend continuously, do not think it necessary to continue their daily attendance. There are certain hon. members who have attended continuously, or very nearly so, the sittings, and I suppose they will continue to do so. Like all other Committees, it amounts in the long run to this: that a certain portion of the Committee, having other engagements, do not attend regularly, and, there-

fore, I do not suppose if the Committee had permission granted to sit in the afternoon, the whole forty-two members would feel it incumbent to be there all the time, because the evidence is written down and they have the opportunity of reading it afterwards. I think it possible to have the Committee and the House meet concurrently, without detriment to the public business. If it is not so, the House will not grant the request.

Mr. TROW. Would it not be better for the House not to hold afternoon sessions but to meet at eight o'clock in the evening, because many members of the House are on the Committee. The best plan to adopt, in my opinion, would be for the Committee to sit till six o'clock and the House meet at eight o'clock, and to try this plan for a few days.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The effect of that will be that there will be no Committee and no House. It is a mistake to suppose that the business of the House is so far advanced. There is a vast amount of business on the paper, more than I remember at any previous stage during the session, and it is quite necessary that the House go on with its business as well as the Committee. It is desirable to give the Committee this power, although the Committee may not, perhaps, find it convenient to exercise it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the suggestion of the Minister of Justice will meet the case fully. There is very good reason for this power being granted, and if it is found to be practically inconvenient, it is in the power of the House at once to cancel the order. I entirely concur with the Minister of Justice in hoping that the House will see fit to grant the request of the Committee.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not see how the Committee are going to discharge their duties and the House is going to conduct its business at the same time. Supposing some important question comes up in the House on which a difference of opinion prevails, there would be forty-two members who would not have an opportunity of voting. Then the same thing might occur in the Committee. An appeal might be made from a ruling of the Chair on some point regarding some question of importance, and a large number of the Committee might find it absolutely necessary to be here rather than in the Committee. That might mean that the work both of this House and the Committee might be very inefficiently done.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 135) further to amend the Act respecting the London Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Moncrieff.)

Bill (No. 136) to incorporate the Inverness Railway and Mining Company.—(Mr. Wilmot.)

Bill (No. 137) to amend the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act.—(Mr. Foster.)

BILLS FROM THE SENATE.

Mr. TAYLOR moved that Bill (No. 130) to incorporate the Chatsworth, Georgian Bay and Lake Huron Railway Company, be read the second time to-morrow.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. TAYLOR moved that Bill (No. 132) for the relief of Mahala Ellis, be read the second time to-morrow.

Motion agreed to.

ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS.

Mr. SPEAKER communicated to the House the following letter, which he had received from the Governor General's acting Secretary :—

"OFFICE OF THE
"GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SECRETARY,
"OTTAWA, 9th July, 1891.

"SIR,—I have the honour to inform you that the Honourable Sir William Ritchie, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, acting as Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber on Friday afternoon, the 10th instant, at 3.30 o'clock, for the purpose of giving assent to certain Bills which have passed the Senate and House of Commons during the present session.

"I have the honour to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servant.
"C. J. JONES,
"*For the Governor General's Secretary.*

"The Honourable
"The Speaker of the House of Commons,
"&c., &c., &c."

SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURTS ACT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 137) further to amend the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act, chapter 135 of the Revised Statutes of Canada. He said: This Bill contains three features. The object of one is to make provision in the statute for the principle that was adopted in this House last session. The Bill reproduces in almost exact words the terms of the resolution, and I propose that the judges of the Supreme Court shall have power to make rules from time to time for the purpose of facilitating the taking of evidence on questions of fact arising in cases referred for an opinion on constitutional points. Another provision of the Bill is to make the autumn term of the Supreme Court three weeks earlier than now. At present the vacation lasts during the months of July and August, and generally speaking there is a cessation of business after vacation, inasmuch as there is no term of the Supreme Court until October, and no opportunity for the judges to deliver judgments. A wish has been expressed by the bar that the term should be held earlier, and on consultation with the members of the bench, it has been thought best that the time for opening the autumn term should be three weeks earlier than at present. It is also necessary to make a provision on a matter on which there are conflicting decisions, namely, the question as to judgments on writs of prohibition and *certiorari*, and as to whether there is an appeal on these to the Supreme Court of Canada. I understand that conflicting decisions exist as to both those points, and the object of the Bill is to make it plain that an appeal will lie to the Supreme Court.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, Sir, I desire to make a personal explanation. It has relation to the report of my remarks made upon the Budget on Tuesday last; as contained in the *Hansard* distributed to hon. members. When speaking upon the point of discrimination against Great Britain, I read a brief extract, some two lines, from the columns of the Toronto *Globe*. I did not take the extract from the *Globe* itself, but from the columns of a Conservative paper, and with the extract itself were clipped some comments of that paper upon the remarks of the *Globe*. My sheet of notes went as is usual, I understand, to the *Hansard* room. In the *Hansard* report the complete extract as taken from the Conservative paper is attributed to the Toronto *Globe*, which is, of course, quite incorrect. Also I desire to say, Sir, that the figures quoted by me in relation to several matters: the increased value of horses, as when dealing with the contentions of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright); the amount of farm mortgages in several of the States, upon the probable increase in the value of farm lands in Ontario, as contended by the hon. gentleman opposite, and upon several other matters, are not given as I gave them. In some cases the errors in the reporting of such figures are quite apparent. In others the errors are not so apparent. I have made the corrections in the proof, but regarded it as my duty not only to the paper referred to, but to myself, to make the explanation. Although there are some other errors in the report, which I presume are always unavoidable, I desire to find no fault with the reporters, whose powers I presume I taxed as sorely as I did the patience of the House.

RETURNS.

Mr. GERMAN. I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to the fact that an Order of this House was made early in the session, for a return of the number of extra men employed on the Welland Canal during the elections. I would like that this report should be brought down shortly.

Mr. BOWELL. I will make enquiry in the department and see that whatever information I have is brought down at once. It escaped my memory and has not been brought to my notice since.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have to acknowledge from the Minister of Interior the receipt of the list of shareholders in the Hudson Bay Railroad, for which I am much obliged. He has given me the sums total paid, and the sums total subscribed, and I would be glad if he would add to that the amounts subscribed by each person in each case.

Mr. DEWDNEY. If you will kindly return the statement to me, I will try to give the information.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have not got the information I asked for with reference to the subsidies for the contract for the West Indian service for the present year.

Mr. FOSTER. I think I will have the information for the hon. gentleman to-morrow.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. TUPPER moved concurrence in amendment made by the Senate to Bill (No. 95) further to amend the Act 36 Victoria, chapter 61, respecting the Trinity House and Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What was the amendment made by the Senate?

Mr. TUPPER. There was a clause added authorizing the Commissioners to borrow a sum of $1,000,000 for the harbour improvements there, and that is the only change in the Bill.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It does not in any way make us guarantee?

Mr. TUPPER. It simply authorizes the Commissioners to borrow that sum, and to pay the interest at 4 per cent.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What security?

Mr. TUPPER. Out of the revenue from the harbour.

Amendment concurred in.

CARLETON BRANCH RAILWAY.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to authorize the Government to sell to the city of St. John, for the sum of $40,000, the Carleton Branch Railway.

He said: This resolution explains itself, and when the Bill is brought down upon it I will be prepared to give all information that will be asked by the House. I may say briefly that the Government asks for authority to sell to the city of St. John the Carleton Branch Railway. The history of that line will probably be known to the older members of the House. It will be remembered that the old European and North American Railway ended formerly at the town of Fairville, which was on the opposite side of the River St. John, from the city of St. John. At that time there was simply a suspension bridge, not for railway traffic, connecting Fairville with St. John. Fairville was some three miles and a fraction from the floats, where the ferry plied between the city of St. John and Carleton on the west side of the harbour. It was very awkward, transferring passengers and freight from Fairville to the city of St. John, and so a company was organized to build a railway from Fairville, at that time the terminus of the road, down to the deep water in Carleton, opposite the city of St. John, a distance of three miles and a little more. In this company the town of Carleton took a certain amount of stock. In the year 1882, I think, a bridge was built crossing the river from Fairville, and making railway connection with the city of St. John, so that the traffic which had formerly been transferred *via* Carleton and this line of 3½ miles, and then conveyed by ferry, now came by railway into the city of St. John itself. That made that portion of the line extending from Fairville down to the Carleton floats of very little value, and in 1882 or thereabouts, an Act was passed in this Parliament by which the Government relieved the shareholders, the town of Carleton being one of the principal shareholders; and took the road over, with all its appurtenances and franchises, paying therefor the sum of $85,000 or

$86,000; I am not quite certain as to the figure. Since that time the road has belonged to the Dominion Government; but later it was leased to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, which came into possession of the main line, at a nominal rental of $1 a year. The road, however, needed improvements in order to be made available for the transfer of outside freight to the deep water terminus; but the Government did not see its way to make those improvements. From that time it has been an unprofitable road to us. An application was made on behalf of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for a perpetual lease, or a very long lease of the road, at a nominal rate. The Government thought it better not to accept that proposal. Then the city of St. John made a proposal to buy the road outright from the Government; and after certain communications had passed, the papers in regard to which have been laid on the Table, the Government decided to ask Parliament for authority to sell this road out and out to the city of St. John, under certain conditions, for $40,000.

Mr. LAURIER. What are the conditions?

Mr. FOSTER. The conditions are, broadly, that the payment shall be in cash and that the road shall be used for railway purposes, the understanding being that the city of St. John will transfer it to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company under conditions to be approved by the Government, that company binding itself to the city of St. John to execute certain improvements.

Mr. LAURIER. I have no criticisms of this project to offer at this moment. It seems to me rather involved. It is to be a transfer from the Government to the city of St. John, and from the city of St. John to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. It will be interesting, before any further stage is taken on this measure, to have the whole correspondence on the subject laid on the Table.

Mr. FOSTER. It has been.

Mr. LAURIER. I have not seen it.

Mr. FOSTER. I laid it on the Table a fortnight ago.

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

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the hon. Finance Minister can tell us off hand how much this railroad has cost the Government first and last?

Mr. FOSTER. It has cost the Government first and last $85,000 or $86,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is the length of the road?

Mr. FOSTER. About 3½ miles.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do I understand the hon. gentleman that there is to be an actual sum of $40,000 paid to the Government for this railway?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Not expenditure to be made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, but actual cash?

Mr. FOSTER. Actual cash. It is a good bargain for us.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps you could sell a little more for cash.

Mr. FOSTER. We might.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Fifty cents on the dollar.

Mr. FOSTER. It is the interest of $40,000 per year, instead of a dollar per year which we were receiving on the lease.

Resolution reported.

HUDSON BAY RAILWAY.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved second reading of Bill (No. 119) respecting a certain agreement therein mentioned with the Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway Company.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman was kind enough to lay on the Table a list of the shareholders of this company, but it does not contain the number of shares held by each. I think the Bill had better wait until that information is down.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have seen one of the principal promoters of this enterprise since the hon. gentleman brought that matter up, and I find that it will take a week or ten days to get the information, as the books are in Winnipeg. I think it would be a pity to delay the Bill for that reason. I have no doubt, however, that we shall have the information before the third reading. I do not think that was asked for in the case of other companies which were dealt with in the same manner as this one.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). It is very important that we should have this information before this Bill is read the third time, as there are many stories floating about as to how the stock of this company was disposed of. It cannot possibly take ten days to get the information. The hon. gentleman has control of the telegraph, and could communicate with Winnipeg to-night. We have a right to that information, and I trust that the hon. gentleman will give it to us.

Mr. LAURIER. This Bill is not printed.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes, it is.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is not marked printed on the paper, and we thought, therefore, you were not going on with it.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I know that an hon. gentleman who takes a very active interest in this measure is not in the House, because he concluded that as the Bill was not marked printed, it was not coming up to-day.

Mr. LAURIER moved that the debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster: "That the resolutions adopted in Committee of Ways and Means on Tuesday last, the 23rd instant, be read a second time;" and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). If the hon. gentleman who last spoke on the motion now before the Chair did not succeed, in his somewhat laboured and despondent effort, to throw light on the question before the House, he has at least given us a clearer insight into the aspirations of his political leaders. Since this very important debate was opened, we have had the pleasure, not altogether unmitigated, of listening to the utterances of three hon. gentlemen who occupy prominent positions in the ranks of our hon. friends opposite. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was, of course, the first to make a desperate charge against the impregnable position taken by the hon. Finance Minister in his annual financial statement. I am sorry to say the hon. gentleman was more prejudiced, more doctrinarian, more passionate, and, I regret to add, more illogical than ever. But he was gallantly met in his onslaught by the manly and eloquent speech of my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon); and the gallant knight from Oxford had to retreat with broken armour. His friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson) valiantly came to his rescue, in an eloquent, it is true, but thundering effort which must have tried his physical strength to the utmost; but unfortunately for the vanquished knight, even that effort could not give new life to his shattered arguments. Then my hon. friend behind me, the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague), so well trained in many hard-fought and noble battles to face the enemy, took up the cudgels on Tuesday in a brilliant reply which, it was not surprising, completely demoralized the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), when called upon to continue the debate, doomed to end sadly for his party. The discussion so far by hon. gentlemen opposite of the statement of the Finance Minister calls upon us to consider three great questions: the financial question, the trade question and the political question. I do not intend to worry the House by quoting long arrays of figures. I would like really to be very short in that respect, but still I have to go somewhat fully into statistics to answer the remarks of the hon. member for North Norfolk. In reply to the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) who, with great reason, called attention once more to the splendid results of the financial administration of the present and past Governments, since 1878, in consequence of which we have had large surpluses on the one hand and a large reduction of taxation on the other, the hon. member for North Norfolk asked how the hon. member for Haldimand could reproach the Mackenzie Government for not having also reduced taxation? And in support of that contention he quoted the Public Accounts, to show what? To show that the Customs receipts of the Government, which indicate more exactly the amount of taxation paid by the people, had produced in the year 1874-75 a revenue of $15,351,000; and then he quoted the year following, to show that the revenue had decreased in 1875-76 to $12,823,000, and he showed that for the next three years the amount averaged about $12,700,000. I do not mention the hundred dollars in order to shorten the quotations of figures. There, he said, we have a proof of reduction of taxation to the extent of more than $2,000,000 per year. Well, during the course of my short political life I have heard many extraordinary statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite. I have not had the pleasure of often listening to my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), though I have heard him now and again in the House when I had the honour to occupy a seat in the reporters' gallery, but it is, perhaps, the first time that I have heard an hon. gentleman, holding in this House an honourable and a responsible position, making an argument that whatever may be the cause, a reduction of revenue is a reduction of taxation. I join issue with the hon. gentleman on that point. I say that it is very true that in the year 1874-75 the amount of revenue from Customs was $15,351,000, and that there was a reduction of revenue in the three or four years following, but the facts are there to show that, in the year following the advent of hon. gentlemen opposite, and especially of the heaven-born financier, as he is called, to the Treasury benches, there was an increase of $3,000,000 of taxes, as it was calculated by the hon. gentleman himself. In 1874, the legislation was passed to produce that amount and the revenue increased to $15,351,000. The following year, the fiscal laws of the country remained the same, they were just exactly what the hon. gentleman had made them in 1874, but we had the spectacle of a falling revenue, of a reduced revenue, and why? Because the policy of the Government was having its effect in the country and was creating dismay and apprehension, and thus the revenue was decreased though there was no decrease in taxation. If the House allows me, I will carry on the argument a little further, and see the result. In 1879-80, after the hon. gentleman had been driven from power somewhat suddenly, and when a new policy was inaugurated, we had the fiscal laws then existing producing a revenue of $14,071,000. I call the attention of the House to this point that, in the year following, in 1880-81, without any increase whatever in the fiscal laws of the country or in the tariff, the revenue was brought up to over $18,400,000, an increase of over $4,000,000. In that case there was no increase of taxation, but there was an increase of revenue, the result of the prosperity of the country which had followed the policy adopted by the new Government. The hon. gentleman from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has given to the House a comparative statement of the expenditure under the Liberal Government between 1874 and 1878, and that under the present Government. I wonder how it is that, having all the figures before him, being acquainted with all the facts as he must be, such a comparison could have been made. The criticism by hon. gentlemen opposite of the financial administration of the Conservative Government is inspired by party prejudices and fanaticism, I regret to say, and these prejudices and fanaticism often blind hon. gentlemen to a correct view of the facts and lead them to most erroneous and egregious conclusions and figuring. The expenditure of the country as a whole has increased, but we are well acquainted with this most important fact, that the increase of expenditure has been caused almost entirely by the policy under which large public works have been constructed in the country, under which we have built the Intercolonial Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, and under which we have deepened and enlarged the canals, and also by the help which was extended to the Governments of the provinces to enable them to carry on their business in the

administration of their local affairs. I lay down this proposition: that to make a fair and just and, I may say, a reasonable comparison between the expenditure of the two Governments, we must first take into consideration the amounts which were disbursed on these charges. For instance, last year we had a total expenditure of nearly $36,000,000. Of that amount the debt charges and interest and the cost of administration amounted to $9,887,000; we had the sinking fund, $1,887,000; subsidies to provinces, $3,904,000; making an amount of $15,678,000, so that the balance of the expenditure was $20,314,000. Now, of this balance, we have expended for the collection of revenue under the title of railways and canals, $4,362,000; postal service, $3,074,000. For Dominion lands in the North-West, $173,000, making a total amount of $7,610,000. There is an increase of expenditure, but we must look at the other side and see what the receipts of the Government have been from railways and canals, from the post office, and from the sale of Dominion lands, and how those receipts have increased in order to make a fair comparison. If we deduct that amount from the $20,314,000 we have a balance of $12,731,000, which includes the expenditure of nearly $2,000,000 for local public works all over the country. Comparing the figures of 1889-90 with those of 1877-78, which was the last year for which the Liberal Government was fully responsible, we find that, out of a total expenditure of $23,503,000, deducting, as I have just done in the previous case, the expenditure for charges of debt and management, railways and canals, post office and Dominion lands, and local public works, we have an increase from $6,561,000 to $10,731,000, or an increase for what I must call the really administrative service of the country, of about $4,000,000. I think the Government and the friends of the Government in this House and in the country can challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to say what is their criticism of the increase of expenditures under the different heads I am just going to mention. I remember that during the last election campaign we heard none of those hon. gentlemen denouncing the Government for having increased the expenditure for agricultural purposes. The criticism, of course, was with regard to the block sum of the increased expenditure, but they would not go into details, because they knew very well that these new expenditures were just as necessary as it was in the case of the $61,000 for agricultural purposes. Now, let those hon. gentlemen take the responsibility in this House of making a motion to call for a reduction in the expenditure for agricultural purposes, and to do away with the $160,000 paid in bounties to the fishermen. Since those hon. gentlemen left power there has been a pretty large increase for the Indians in the North-West. The policy of the Canadian Government has been to treat the Indians in a humane way. We have settled those great difficulties, and we have prevented other difficulties which we might have expected if we had followed a different policy. It is costing us some money, but it is better to pay it in order to secure peace and order in the North-West and all over the country. I am somewhat surprised to hear hon. gentlemen criticize this expenditure. For instance, we have one item of an increase of $286,000 for subsidies to steamers, and many of those hon. gentlemen in this House have clamoured day after day, and month after month, and year after year, for an increase of subsidies to steamers. What have they not said with regard to the militia expenditure? They say we have not given enough for militia purposes. We have expended for that purpose during 1889-90 $668,000 more than in 1877-78, and there has also been an increase in the Mounted Police service. But, Mr. Speaker, I repeat we can challenge the hon. gentlemen to point out in any particular where there has been an extravagant expenditure, and to define their reasons for criticizing the Government for having increased the expenditure of the country. Now, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), on Tuesday last, made what he considers a very striking comparison between the expenditure of Canada and that of the United States, in order to show that our financial situation is much more serious than that of the United States. Well, I cannot agree with the figures given by the hon. member for North Norfolk. I do not know where he got them, but I have looked up the statistics of the American expenditure, and I have come to quite a different conclusion. For instance, last year I find that in the United States, comprising an amount of $48,000,000 for a sinking fund, there was a total expenditure of $406,000,000. Calculating upon a total population of 65,000,000 of people, I find that the expenditure per head in the United States was $6.25. In Canada, in calculating the expenditure, we must deduct the amounts which we have to pay in subsidies to the provinces, and which the United States Government does not have to pay to the States; and also the charges for collection of the revenue, for Government railways, because the American Government has no Government railways. They have to meet only the current expenses for carrying on the Government. In Canada we have, in round numbers, a total expenditure of $28,000,000 for a total population of 5,250,000, so that we have a total expenditure per head of $5.33, or a difference in favour of Canada of 92 cents per head, or very nearly one dollar. The hon. member for North Norfolk tried to show that a reduction of revenue was under all circumstances a reduction of taxation, and by contradicting himself squarely, he tried to show that the increased revenue collected by the present Government meant an increased taxation all round. He was apparently ignorant of the fact that he was squarely contradicting himself on that point. Mr. Speaker, I shall be able to show that from 1878 up to the present time, there has been no real increase of taxation upon our population. When the hon. gentlemen opposite came into power in 1873, and after the increase of taxation that was adopted in 1874, as I mentioned a while ago, they had a total revenue in 1874-75 of $15,351,000. Now, calculating with as much precision as possible, I find that the total population of the Dominion of Canada, which was in 1871, 3,635,000, had increased in 1874-75, in round numbers, to 3,800,000. Calculating upon the amount of revenue received under the tariff of 1874, $15,351,000, I find there was a taxation of $4.04 per head of the population for Customs duties alone. Now, we know that the tariff in 1879 was adopted by this House in accordance with the will of the people, in order to carry out the National Policy of the Government, and I find that this tariff, in the year 1879-80, only produced a revenue of $14,071,000. I estimate the

population of the whole Dominion in that year at 4,200,000 souls, that being the most precise calculation that can be made, because in the census of 1881 the population was 4,324,810, so I allow for an increase of 124,000 during the interval between 1879-80 and the year 1881 when the census was taken. Then, basing a calculation upon the total receipts, I find that the amount paid in Customs into the Treasury by the people of Canada in 1879-80, was only $3.35 per head, or a decrease per head of the population of 69 cents, compared with the amount paid into the Treasury by the people in the year 1874-75. Now, Sir, if it would not take too much of the time of the House, I could give figures for all the succeeding years. The next year we find that the Customs revenue, as I mentioned a while ago, increased to a little over $18,400,000; in 1881-82, to $21,581,000; in the following year, 1882-83, to $23,009,000. These, Mr. Speaker, were the results produced by what our friends are pleased to call the atrocious protective policy of 1879, when there was year after year a large increase in the revenue and, as in 1882, a reduction of taxation by the abolition of the duties on tea and coffee. But twelve years having elapsed since the advent into power of a protectionist Government, what will be the result for next year? With the abolition of the duties on raw sugar I estimate, and I think the Minister of Finance will support me in the contention, that the Customs revenue for the next year will be $21,500,000, in round figures, and taking our population at 5,350,000, the amount of revenue collected by Customs which will be paid into the Treasury will not exceed $4.02 per head, or 2 cents less than was paid under the regime of hon. gentlemen opposite in 1874-75. The comparison does not end there. There is this great difference, that while hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, under their free trade policy they collected in Customs duties from the people a larger proportionate amount per head than we are collecting under the present protective tariff; and there was, moreover, this great difference, that we were brought face to face with large deficits, while we have now under this protective policy the most pleasant results in the shape of large surpluses. I will pass by many matters connected with this subject in order to draw to a close my calculations on the financial question. As usual, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), always ready to disparage his own country and to make a point in favor of the United States, hurried to the support of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), to show that Canada was overwhelmingly in debt, while the United States had almost no debt whatever and they were paying off the balance of that debt very rapidly. On this point, also, I join issue with the hon. member for North Norfolk. I have taken the trouble to examine the American statistics, and I have come to a very different conclusion from that at which he arrived. The very basis of the calculation of hon. gentlemen opposite with respect to the financial position of the United States is an unfair and unjust one, because the financial systems of the two countries are different from one another, and of course if you want to arrive at a fair conclusion you must take into account the different financial systems of the two countries. We know very well, and the hon. member for North Norfolk and the hon. member for South Oxford know very well, that the Washington Government does not pay one dollar a year to support the different States in the Union. I ask the House if it is fair not to take this into account. Hon. gentlemen have the Public Accounts before them, and they will ascertain that from July 1st, 1867, until June 30th, 1891, the Dominion Government have paid as much as $84,000,000 in subsidies to the provinces. Moreover, in looking into the Public Accounts, I find that, by legislation passed by this House, $31,000,000 of debt were allowed to the different provinces since 1867, and a large amount of interest allowed thereon. I have calculated as closely as possible that if the Dominion Government had not paid to the provinces those $84,000,000 of subsidies since 1867, we would have paid $50,000,000 less for interest during the last twenty-four years. That represents a total expenditure of $165,000,000 for subsidies to provinces, for debts allowed to provinces, and for interest paid as a consequence of the large amount allowed to the provinces in subsidies and debts. On examining the Public Accounts I was surprised to find—what? That the total amount we have paid for the last twenty-four years, for the building and enlargement of the canals, for the Canadian Pacific Railway, for the Intercolonial Railway, foot up in round figures to $138,000,000; that is to say, $27,000,000 less than the amount paid in subsidies to provinces, for debts allowed to provinces, and for interest subsequent thereon. The consequence is this, that if we had not paid those amounts to support the Government of the provinces, if we had not allowed the debts and interest consequent thereon, we should have had since 1867 all the resources necessary to meet a capital expenditure equal to the total amount required for canals, Canadian Pacific Railway, Intercolonial Railway, for the purpose of acquiring the North-West Territories, and all the other capital expenses, which amount in round figures to $150,000,000; that is, as is suggested to me by the Minister of Finance, if we had had here in Canada the same system as in the United States and the same sources of revenue they possessed. Let us take the other side of the account. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and all his friends, together with his leader the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), always try to make a great point on these two facts: the great decrease of the public debt of the United States, and the increase in the public debt of Canada. I have shown that if we had in Canada the system prevailing in the United States we would not have increased the debt of Canada one dollar since 1867. But let us look at what has taken place in the United States and see if the facts sustain the statements of the hon. gentleman opposite. It is true that at the close of the late civil war in the United States they had a large public debt, amounting to about $2,800,000,000. It is true that since then, during the last twenty-four years, they have paid on account of this large liability about $1,900,000,000, or nearly two-thirds the amount, as the hon. member for North Norfolk said the other day. The hon. gentleman omitted, however, to mention this fact, which is necessary in order to make a true comparison, that while we in Canada have not paid one cent of direct taxation for the maintenance of our Local Governments, the people of the United

States have paid $1,500,000,000 for their support. Another point, and it is the stronger of the two, is this: We know very well, and all readers of modern history know, that when the United States were engaged in the fratricidal war between the North and South, the Northern States had to impose on themselves very heavy sacrifices to maintain the Union. At first they expected to be able to meet all the expenditure of the war out of revenue, and they passed fiscal laws, and laws respecting internal revenue, which were perhaps the most burdensome ever enacted in any country of the world. During the period of the war and for the following years we ascertain this: for instance, that in 1866, the year the war closed, the people of the Northern States, amounting to not more than 20,000,000 people, if we exclude the population of the Southern States, actually paid into the Treasury of the United States so much as $519,000,000. This question was discussed in the United States, in the debates that took place in Congress, and all over the country, with regard to the gradual diminution of war taxes; but the people of the United States, after peace was restored, rising in their might, made up their mind to pay off their public debt as fast as they could. I am not here to say that they did wrong in resolving to take this course. They had the resources, they had the impulse of a great people occupying a fertile and rich territory after the war was over, and they did not do as our friends on the other side of the House do in this country; they did not despair of the future of their country. They went to work, and the sacrifices to which they had assented during the war they carried out for many years after peace had been restored. I will take the five years of peace following the war, and what do I find? I find that during these five years the people of the United States consented to pay into the treasury, the enormous and extraordinary sum of $1,900,000,000 in order to redeem a large part of their debt; and if you divide this amount by five years you have got an expenditure of $380,000,000 a year. I calculate that on an average, during the five years from 1867 to 1871, inclusive, the population of the United States which amounted to about 35,000,000 people, paid, to govern their country and reduce their national debt, $11 a head of taxation to the Washington Government, or exactly double the amount paid by the people of Canada during the same five years. I have carried out the calculation a little further, and I have found that during these five years, when the people of the United States were consenting to pay such a large amount into their treasury to reduce their debt, and to start afresh for the future, that if the Canadian people had agreed to do the same, and to pay an equal amount of taxation, we could have paid the whole debt which we assumed at the union of the provinces in 1867, and if we had applied to our public works the amount paid for subsidies to the provinces, there would not be to-day one dollar of public debt left in Canada. The hon, member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) may smile, and I will remember his smile in a moment. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will take another of the arguments of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). When my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Montague), in his eloquent style, charged that the Liberal Government of 1874-78 was also responsible for the increase of the public debt of the country, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said it was nothing of the kind, and that the Liberal Government had been obliged to create the debt on account of the obligations undertaken by their predecessors. Once more I join issue with the hon. gentleman, and I will lay down this proposition to the House; a proposition which is sustained by facts, and by the history of the country. I say that both political parties are equally responsible for the capital expenditure of the country, and the difference is not in the responsibility, but it is in the merit which is deserved by one party or the other. The Conservative party accept their full share of the responsibility for the policy which has been carried out, and for capital expenditures since 1867, and the Liberal party do not accept the responsibility: they shirk the responsibility, and consequently they lose whatever merit they would have, if they assumed their share of the responsibility. But, Mr. Speaker, let us go into the details a little, because the details are very important. The causes of our public debt may be set down under four heads. First, there were the debts of the provinces taken over by the Dominion Government at Confederation. It is not the first time I have had the pleasure of seeing the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I was very young when I first knew him, and I am sorry to say that he has not improved since. I ask that hon. gentleman if he had not a seat in the Legislative Assembly of the old Province of Canada in Quebec in 1865, and if he did not vote for the resolutions to carry that Confederation scheme, under which the debts of the provinces, to the amount of over $65,000,000, were to be charged to the Dominion Government? Did he not vote for the resolutions to carry out Confederation, which also declared that the Intercolonial Railway was to be built to unite the Lower Provinces to Canada? He did vote for these resolutions, and many of his friends around him also approved of the resolutions, and upon these resolutions the British North America Act was passed by the Imperial Parliament; the Intercolonial Railway was built, and the debts of the provinces were assumed by the Dominion Government; and I ask the House, if hon. gentlemen opposite are not as much responsible as the hon. gentlemen occupying the Treasury benches, and as we ourselves are for the public debt incurred in this way. Now, Mr. Speaker, let us go into the details of the very large expenditure for the deepening and enlargening of the canals. I have followed pretty closely what has taken place in this Parliament of Canada for the last twenty four years, and I know that from year to year large amounts of money have been voted to deepen and enlarge the canals of the Dominion, and I have never heard nor read one word from the hon. gentlemen opposite, declaring that it was their policy not to deepen or enlarge the canals, or that they were against that policy. They have voted the amounts; these public works have been carried through with the unanimous assent of Parliament, and also with the unanimous assent of the country at large. Yet these hon. gentlemen charge this Government and its predecessors with extravagance for the money they have expended on such important public works. Now, a large expenditure has taken place on the Canadian Pacific Railway. And be good enough to remember that when the hon. gentleman and his friends were

sitting on the Treasury benches they asked the Parliament of Canada to pass a law authorizing them to pay more than $25,000,000 and to grant more than 50,000,000 acres of land, and also to guarantee 4 per cent. for twenty-five years on a further amount, to secure the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. If the Canadian Pacific Railway had been built under that law, it would have cost a larger amount than has since been paid for the construction of that road. I ask you whether, in view of these facts, hon. gentlemen opposite have any show of reason, I may say any show of decency, to charge extravagance against this Government and their supporters in piling up the debt of the Dominion by capital expenditure. But, Mr. Speaker, as I said awhile ago, both parties are responsible for this expenditure. We accept before the country our full share of responsibility, and we glory in it. Sir, when the union of the provinces took place, there were two alternatives opened to the choice of the Parliament and the people of Canada. True, Sir, we could have dispensed with deepening and enlarging the canals; true, we could have dispensed with building the Intercolonial Railway; true, we could have dispensed with building the Pacific Railway; true, we could have dispensed with subsidizing the provinces; true, we could have dispensed with acquiring the North-West Territories; true, we could have dispensed with subsidizing by millions of dollars local and colonization lines of railway. We might have done all this; but, on the other hand, we would not to-day have had a united Canada from ocean to ocean. We would not to-day have had the best system of waterways in the world; we would not to-day have had the great iron band uniting together all the provinces from Prince Edward Island to British Columbia; we would not to-day have so extended and developed our free institutions as to merit the admiration of all true friends of civil, political and religious liberty; we would not to-day have been a people conscious of their strength, hopeful of the future, and determined to deserve the destiny which will be the reward of their patriotism, their enterprise, their perseverance and their courage. Hon. gentlemen opposite may say what they may. The more I consider the question, the more I am convinced that if to-day we were called upon in this House to make the choice of one or the other of these alternatives, we would select the alternative which has brought about these great results, and we would leave hon. gentlemen opposite to their despondency and despair. Mr. Speaker, I do not think I need add any further figures on the financial question. I think the figures I have given suffice to show how false, how erroneous, how unfair, how unjust and how illogical were the comparisons made the other day by the hon. member for North Norfolk. I will say only a few words with regard to what hon. gentlemen opposite call the situation of the country. They are very despondent, and we know that they have reason to be so, if we look at the question from the standpoint of their own failures. My hon. friend from Haldimand has given to them on that question, as on all others, such a crushing reply that I need not go exhaustively into it. But I was somewhat amazed the other night to hear the hon. member for North Norfolk mustering up courage to try to say seriously what I suppose must have given him internally a hearty laugh—that a comparison of the present condition of the affairs of the country with their condition in 1877-78 is altogether in favour of the time when his friends were on the Treasury benches.

Mr. CURRAN. That was a joke.

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). Really, as the hon. member for Montreal Centre says, it must have been a joke. The hon. member for South Oxford and the hon. member for North Norfolk were not so despondent during the gloomy years when they occupied the Treasury benches; although anyone who knows the history of this country knows very well that that was its darkest period. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask where is the man with eyes to see, with a memory to remember, with an intelligence to think, to recollect and to judge,—where is the man with a responsible head on his shoulders, and with brains not softened by partisan fanaticism, who will not agree that, compared with the situation of the country when the hon. member for South Oxford was playing the inglorious part of a slumbering fly on the halted wheel, then stuck in the thick mud of free trade despondency and ruin, the state of Canadian affairs for the last twelve years has been more advantageous, more prosperous, more satisfactory, more reassuring and more promising for the future. And yet, Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen opposite, who have only cheerful recollections of the years when they were sitting on the Treasury benches, when despondency, discouragement, I may say despair, had crossed the threshold of so many Canadian homes, have only words of disparagement, words of reproach, words of desperation when they speak of the happy years which followed their downfall. It was only when they received their dismissal from the people that they at last rose to a sense of the dangers ahead. I heard the other day the hon. member for South Oxford say, in plaintive tones, how sorry he was that such a great country as Canada was not given the prosperity to which it is entitled, and, he added we have a territory which can support at least a hundred millions of people. I think the hon. gentleman was right in that statement, or rather he underestimated the amount. I here repeat that, considering the varied and great resources of the Dominion, from Prince Edward Island to British Columbia, this extent of fertile territory can support a population even greater than one hundred millions. But let us suppose that is the full number which the country can in reality support, is it not our bounden duty to join hands together in order to work out the splendid future before us? And when I look at what we have accomplished since 1867, when I consider the present state of affairs, and when I think of the possibilities of the future, I cannot help feeling that the despondency exhibited by hon. gentlemen opposite is unworthy of men, unworthy of members of this House, unworthy of politicians, unworthy of statesmen, and unworthy of true Canadians with blood in their veins, brains in their heads, and good Canadian hearts in their breasts. With the permission of the House I will say a few words about the trade question. It is not a new one. It has been so exhaustively discussed in this House for the last sixteen or seventeen years that I really do not see that I

can add very much to what has been said. I have, however, been somewhat of a student of political economy, I will not say in my leisure hours, because I have given many hours to it. The hon. member for South Oxford and his friends have raised again in this House and country the question of free trade and protection. I might quote many authorities, giving on the one side the views of the free traders and on the other the views of the protectionists, but they have been read before in this House many times over for the last sixteen or seventeen years, and I need not refer to them now. But one thing I know. I know that political economy is not an abstract science; it is an experimental science; and the tariff maker who would go to work according to absolute principles of free trade would soon run into absurdities for which the people would have to pay very dearly. To settle that point, if the House will bear with me, I would like to read a few lines written by a very clever man, Mr. Blaine, the Secretary of State of the United States. Last year, there was a discussion between the Hon. Mr. Gladstone and the Hon. Mr. Blaine on this question of free trade and protection. They wrote very interesting articles, which were published in the *North American Review*. I would like to sum up the exposition of protectionist principles, as laid down by Mr. Blaine, the more so as we are to have shortly negotiations opened at Washington with regard to our trade relations with the United States, in which Mr. Blaine will have a great deal to say, and it is important to know what he thinks of the free trade policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. Mr. Blaine says:

"The free trader cannot offset the force of the argument by claiming that the laws regulating revenue and trade are, like municipal laws, silent during the shock of arms, because the five closing years—indeed almost six years—of the decade in which the rebellion occurred were passed in peace, and during those years the ravages of war were in large degree repaired and new wealth rapidly acquired. But I shall not give to Mr. Gladstone or to the American free trader the advantage of seeming to rest the defence of protection upon its marvellous value during the exhaustive period of war. Viewing the country from 1861 to 1889—full twenty-eight years—the longest undisturbed period in which either protection or free trade has been tried in this country—I ask Mr. Gladstone if a parallel can be found to the material advancement of the United States."

Then read what he says about the free trader:

"Perhaps the most remarkable feature in the argument of Mr. Gladstone, as, indeed, of every English free trader, except John Stuart Mill, is the universality of application which he demands for his theory. In urging its adoption he makes no distinction between countries; he takes no account of geographical position—whether a nation be in the eastern or the western hemisphere, whether it be north or south of the equator: he pays no heed to climate, or product, or degree of advancement: none to topography—whether the country be as level as the delta of the Nile, or as mountainous as the Republic of Bolivia; none to pursuits and employments, whether in the agricultural, manufacturing or commercial field; none to the wealth or poverty of a people; none to population, whether it be crowded or sparse; none to area, whether it be as limited as a German principality or as extended as a continental empire. Free trade he believes advantageous for England; therefore, without the allowance of any modifying condition, great or small, the English economist declares it to be advantageous for the United States, for Brazil, for Australia, in short, for all countries with which England can establish trade relations. It would be difficult, if not impossible, for Mr. Gladstone to find any principle of administration or any measure of finance so exactly fitted to the varying needs of all countries as he assumes the policy of free trade to be. Surely it is not unfair to maintain that, deducing his results from observation and experience in his own country, he may fall into error and fail to appreciate the financial workings of other countries geographically remote and of vastly greater area.

"The American protectionist, let it not be discourteous to urge, is broader in his views than the English free trader."

Or, I may say, the Liberal Canadian free trader,—

"No intelligent protectionist in the United States pretends that every country would alike realize advantages from the adoption of the protective system. Human government is not a machine, and even machines cannot be so perfectly adjusted as to work with equal effectiveness at all times and under all conditions. Great Britain and the United States certainly resemble one another in more ways than either can be said to resemble any other nation in the world; yet, when we compare the two on the question at issue, the differences are so marked, that we almost lose sight of the resemblance. One is an insular monarchy, with class government: the other a continental republic, with popular government. One has a large population to the square mile; the other a small population to the square mile. One was old in a rich and complex civilization before the establishment of the other was even foreseen. One had become the wealthiest nation of the world, while the other was yet in the toils and doubts of a frontier life and a primitive civilization. One had extensive manufactures for almost every field of the human need, with the civilized world for its market, while the population of the other was still forced to divide its energies between the hard calling of the sea and the still harder calling of a rude and scantily-remunerative agriculture."

Now a few lines of what Mr. Blaine says as to the result of protection in Great Britain itself:

"During the last thirty years of her protective system, and especially during the twenty years from 1826 to 1846, Great Britain increased her material wealth beyond all precedent in the commercial history of the world. Her development of steam power gave to every British workman the arms of Briareus, and the inventive power of her mechanicians increased the amount, the variety and the value of her fabrics beyond all anticipation. Every year of that period witnessed the addition of millions upon millions of sterling to the revenue capital of the Kingdom; every year witnessed a great addition to the effective machinery whose aggregate power was already the wonder of the world. The onward march of her manufacturing industries, the steady and rapid development of her mercantile marine, absorbed the matchless enterprise and energy of the kingdom. Finally, with a vast capital accumulated, with a low rate of interest established, and with a manufacturing power unequalled, the British merchants were ready to underbid all rivals in seeking for the trade of the world."

And then, a few lines further on—and these are the last I shall quote—he says:

"The traffic of the world seemed prospectively in her control. Could this condition of trade have continued, no estimate of the growth of England's wealth would be possible. Practically it would have had no limit."

Now, I think Mr. Blaine, the hon. gentleman with whom our Canadian free traders expect to negotiate an unrestricted reciprocity treaty, has given very fully his views as to free trade and protection. The question of free trade pure and simple was discussed in this House and in the country from 1876 to 1878. It was discussed all over the country, in the public press and on all the hustings, in every city, town, village and hamlet, and in 1878 the people of Canada in their might decided that henceforward Canada should enjoy the advantages of the protective system, and should no longer be subjected to the danger of free trade and the slaughtering of American goods in our markets. This decision the people of Canada have maintained ever since 1878. Now, the hon. gentlemen opposite with their financial leader, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), once more raise the question of free trade and protection. It is no use taking up the time of the House to discuss

the theoretical question. I have only this to say, that I challenge the hon. member for South Oxford, I challenge the hon. the leader of the Opposition himself and all his friends to bring before this House a square proposition declaring that it is the opinion of the House and the country that free trade pure and simple should be adopted as the financial or tariff policy of Canada. If they were to bring down such a motion, the leader of the Opposition would find that a good third of his supporters would vote against it, because, as we know by their utterances which have been reported in the debates of this House, they are really protectionists and supporters of the National Policy. Now, not having the courage, I might say the manlihood, of proposing a motion which would be the real and sincere exposition of their free trade principles, they fall back on this capital absurdity, as I may call it, of unrestricted reciprocity. I have followed with interest the debates that have taken place in this House and the discussion in the public press on the question of commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity. I do not wish to add to what has been said on this subject. I do not think I could add very much to the reasons which have been given and which must induce this House and the people to deal with this wild proposition. But what I never could understand was this. With regard to the relations of Canada with the United States, Canada having always been ready since the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 to enter into larger trade relations with the United States, Canada having made on several occasions whatever advances could be made consistently with her dignity and independence, I have always wondered how it came to the mind of my hon. friends that they could settle the difficult question of our trade relations with the United States by making the humiliating surrender they have proposed. It is a very simple way to settle a difficulty when you propose to give up all you have. Of course all that the hon. gentlemen have said in this House, all their propositions on the question, all they have said on the hustings, only tend to prove to the United States, unfortunately, that Canada is at their mercy and that they can do what they like with us. I ask you now, Mr. Speaker, if my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition and his good-hearted friend the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) were to go to Washington as the representatives of the Crown of England to negotiate a reciprocity treaty, in what position they would stand as to maintaining the rights of Canada, when beforehand they have proclaimed to the whole world that Canada can do nothing but bow to the United States dictation. As a member of this House representing one of the finest constituencies in the Province of Quebec and in the Dominion—and I do not say this in disparagement of others—as a citizen of Canada, I have tried to study as fully as I could the question of unrestricted reciprocity, and I have come to this conclusion, that hon. gentlemen have not been able to bring to the support of their own policy one argument which is worth serious consideration from this House. I have heard the hon. member for South Oxford, and the hon. member for North Norfolk, on Tuesday, say the same thing, that Canada could not go alone, that it is impossible to expect her to prosper because she is living as a neighbour to the United States. Well, if I look over the world I find the same circumstances existing everywhere, that countries are neighbours to each other. Spain is a neighbour to France; there is only a range of mountains dividing them. Germany is a neighbour to Austria; Belgium is a neighbour to France and to other countries also. The same may be said of Russia. The German Empire is a neighbour to the Russian Empire; the Austrian Empire is a neighbour to the Russian Empire and to the German Empire also; and have you ever heard any statesman in those wealthy and prosperous countries proclaiming to the world that they could not get on without having unrestricted reciprocity with each other? Have you ever heard France say: We must give to Spain the control of our tariff because they are our neighbours? Have you ever heard Prince Bismarck—who had something to do with political affairs in Europe—or any other German statesman, say: We must have unrestricted reciprocity with Austria, or with Russia, because, forsooth, they are our neighbours?—we must have unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union, we must give them control of our own tariff because we are neighbours? Really, if hon. gentlemen could unshackle their minds of party prejudices and fanaticism, they would soon realize the depth of ridicule there is in their position. If I look over the situation of Europe I find all these countries I have mentioned having each their own tariff system; and if you will allow me, I will give you a few more figures, taking, for instance, Austria, Belgium, Germany, France, Great Britain, Portugal and Spain. Great Britain, of course, is separated from the continent by the sea, but all the other countries I have mentioned are neighbours to each other. They have all got their independence, they regulate their own tariff laws, they make and have made commercial treaties with each other, and the Government of each nation has taken care to arrange the duties for their own advantage first, and if they were to the advantage of their neighbours, well and good. The other party to the treaty also took the same care to secure its own advantage. But what is the fact of the case? Those several European countries that I have mentioned, have about one-third of the territory, in extent, of the Dominion of Canada, or, in round numbers, about one million of square miles altogether. Now, those several countries of Europe have every confidence in themselves, they are self-reliant, they are working out their own destinies, and, as I have just mentioned, with a territorial extent only one-third that of the Dominion of Canada, they support a population of two hundred millions, and they have, moreover, been able to develop an external trade of about eight milliards of dollars, and yet they have not sacrificed their own independence, they have not sacrificed the right to control their own tariff. They have discussed trade relations with their neighbours, and they have agreed when they could agree, and when they could not agree they have remained self-supporting enough, self-reliant enough, to work out their own destinies. Now, I do not see why we Canadians cannot follow their example. We must strive, as far as possible, to extend our external trade relations, we must try to develop our trade with all the countries of the world, if possible, and with the United States as well as with the others. But wherever we meet with pretensions with which we cannot agree, whenever we meet with the assertion

that in order to trade without any restriction, we must sacrifice the independence of Canada and the right to control our own tariff, then is the time to stand on our own ground and to assert our determination to work out our own destinies alone. There are three great objections which we have to make to the scheme of unrestricted reciprocity—first, discrimination against Great Britain; second, we would have to resign control of our own tariff; and third, we would have to provide for the necessary revenue to carry on our Government by the only resource that would be left to us, direct taxation. If hon. gentlemen opposite can get over these three difficulties we might, perhaps, take their scheme into consideration. But so far, whenever they have been asked to tell us how they were going to raise a revenue, we have found, as the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) so well said the other night, that they are not able to answer. One of them is ready to discriminate against Great Britain, and another is not. One of them will resign control of our tariff, and another will not. When the hon. member for North Norfolk was asked the plain question the other day by the Finance Minister, how he would provide for the loss of revenue, he at once found himself in the deep sea, and he could not answer. Mr. Speaker, the question about the revenue is a very simple one. We have said that unrestricted reciprocity, if it was ever attempted, would result in a loss of Customs revenue of about $15,000,000 to start with, which would gradually go on increasing if the country was at all able to prosper under such a system. Now, the hon. gentlemen have got to explain to this House how they will provide for this $15,000,000 of revenue, if not by direct taxation. But there is more to be considered. I was sorry that the hon. leader of the Opposition was not in his seat the other day when the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) desired to ask him a very fair question; and as the hon. leader of the Opposition is present to-day, of course he will be only too glad to answer the question. Under unrestricted reciprocity we would have to provide for $15,000,000 of revenue, if the present Government were in power, and if their policy were carried out. But if hon. gentlemen opposite were to cross over to the Treasury benches and carry out their policy, we would have to provide for a very much larger amount. I had to discuss this subject very often in the Local House in Quebec, and frequently during the last election campaign and previously, and as during the last year I have passed through three elections during ten months, I know something of the question. During the late electoral campaign word was received that Mr. Mercier was to make a grand speech in Montreal in support of Mr. Laurier, the leader of the Opposition in this House. The gentleman went there and made a speech. His whole speech was confined to a justification of his interference in the federal elections as Prime Minister in Quebec, and the interference of his colleagues in several elections, and he gave as an explanation of the fact, that Sir John Macdonald would not carry out the resolutions of the interprovincial conference, and that Mr. Laurier was pledged to do so if he attained power. The leader of the Opposition in this House has, so far, been cautious not to say a word about this scheme, but I hold that this House and this country have the right to obtain a fair and square answer from the leader of the Opposition as to whether the assertion made by Mr. Mercier was true or not. On February 9th last Mr. Mercier said:

"Hon. Mr. Laurier has accepted the resolutions of the Interprovincial Conference of 1887, and promised to give them effect if he comes into power."

The same report appeared in the Toronto *Globe*, *La Patrie*, the Liberal organ in Montreal, and *L'Electeur*, in Quebec. I have a right to ask the leader of the Opposition if it is true that he pledged himself to Mr. Mercier to increase the subsidies to the provinces, and to carry out the resolutions of the Interprovincial Conference if called to power?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Answer.

Mr. LAURIER. Does the hon. gentleman want an answer?

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). Yes.

Mr. LAURIER. I am sorry the hon. gentleman, who is so versatile in speech and in everything else, has not done me the honour to read my speeches during the last three or four years. I have spoken on that question in Toronto and in the city of Quebec, and I have always asserted that in consequence of the majority of the people of the provinces of Quebec, Ontario, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, I was in favour of the Quebec Conference resolutions.

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). I am glad to have received the answer. Now we know where hon. gentlemen stand and where we stand. At all events, I will say to the leader of the Opposition that I have calculated the results that would follow by carrying into effect the interprovincial conference resolutions. If these resolutions were adopted by the Parliament of Canada, with the population as shown by the last census, the subsidies of the provinces would be increased by $2,000,000 a year or 50 per cent. Hon. gentlemen opposite talk about extravagance and increased expenditure, and I ask them how they would be able, under a policy of unrestricted reciprocity, which would destroy our Customs revenue, to provide for these $2,000,000 additional. I desire to offer a few words in regard to a remark by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), to which the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) has given a complete answer, and that is, that if we had unrestricted reciprocity, all at once the value of the 1,200,000 horses in Canada would be raised by $37,000,000, and the same with respect to the land. The hon. member for Haldimand said that such a proposition should not have been propounded in this House, and he was perfectly correct. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), in answer to the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague), used rather harsh words when he said that one of his statements was a piece of effrontery. I will not indulge in such language, because, if I were to do so, I would call the proposition of the hon. member for South Oxford a piece of nonsense. I will not do so, because it is my duty to use in this House as elsewhere only gentlemanly and parliamentary language. I will explain my view by saying that the proposition of the hon. member for South Oxford was really the false proposition of a fanatical mind. In endeavouring to explain how he would supply the loss of revenue the hon. member for North Norfolk was somewhat timid, and he said—these are not his words but they embody his statement—there

is one thing we will do, and that is, to reduce the expenditure of the country to what it was several years ago, when it was only $24,000,000. I have the Public Accounts at my hand and I challenge the hon. member for North Norfolk, the leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for South Oxford, the financial authority on that side of the House, to show how they could reduce the public expenditure to $24,000,000 and carry on the Government of the country. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will run over the figures for two or three minutes. For instance, a large item of our expenditure is the interest on the public debt. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to tell me: are they going to run the country into bankruptcy, are they going to repudiate the public debt? Surely they will not do that. Another large item of our expenditure is the subsidies to the provinces, which amounts to $4,000,000, and hon. gentlemen opposite are pledged to increase that expenditure by 50 per cent. Another large item of our expenditure is the sinking fund, which requires nearly $2,000,000 a year, and of course it gradually increases every year according to the proportionate increase of the deposits for that fund. Can they reduce that item of expenditure? Surely no sane man on the other side of the House will say that they can. It is a part of a contract between us and those who lent us their money, and that contract has to be carried out for the credit of the country. Another large item of our expenditure is the collection of revenue. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like hon. gentlemen opposite to show to this House what reduction they can make on this item. I heard during the last election campaign one of the speakers of the party opposite say: We will decrease the cost of collecting the revenue by abolishing the Custom-houses between the two countries. I replied to this: Well and good, my good friend, but if in the future you have to collect $15,000,000 of direct taxation, do you think the angels will come down from Heaven and collect that for you free of cost? I stated then, and I think I was right, that for every dollar of reduction in the cost of collection they would make by the abolition of the Custom-houses on the frontier, they would have to pay at least $3 for the collection of direct taxation. Now, Mr. Speaker, we are limited to this field of operation—outside of the charges for the public debt, outside of the sinking fund, outside of subsidies to provinces, and outside of the collection of revenue—we are limited to the expenditure of about $10,000,000 a year, and the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) wants to reduce the total expenditure by $12,000,000. How will he do it? He will not have a cent left for the expenses of legislation, for the expenses of civil government, for the administration of justice, for penitentiaries, for the Indians, for the Mounted Police, and for all the other services of the country. Do hon. gentlemen opposite think that they will be able to carry on the Government without any money whatever? Really, when we go into this calculation a little exhaustively, we find that the hon. gentlemen who advocate that policy on the other side of the House have not one inch of ground to stand upon. Now, Mr. Speaker, in connection with this trade question, there is a point which I think it is important to consider. We hear hon. gentlemen opposite saying in support of their unrestricted reciprocity scheme, that being free traders, and believing in the impossibility of having free trade with all the world, they will feel satisfied if they have free trade with the United States, and they call it by the glorious name of continental free trade. But we have only to look across the line to find out another state of things over there. The Canadian free trader has a twin brother on the other side of the line, but also on the other side there are some protectionists; and whilst the hon. gentlemen opposite are fighting their best for continental free trade, the American protectionists, the statesmen of the United States, are fighting for continental protection. I would like hon. gentlemen opposite, when they get to Washington, to try and reconcile their aspirations with these facts. The hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) has truly answered to what the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said with regard to the depreciation of the value of land in the Province of Ontario. Speaking for the Province of Quebec generally, I will say that in that province we have not had this pretented depreciation of the value of land, and I think it is only proper, if we want to have a fair comparison, not to do as these hon. gentlemen opposite very cautiously do when calculating the value of land in Ontario and elsewhere, namely, compare the value for the last two or three years with the values in 1881, 1882, and 1883. If you want to make a fair comparison of the result of the protection of the National Policy, compared with their free trade policy, you must compare the value of land now with the value of land during the time the Liberal party were in power from 1874 to 1878. I have enquired around the Province of Quebec from several persons who are by their professional occupation able to know the value of land, and they all agree in telling me that the value of land is now at least, in many districts, twenty-five per cent. greater than it was in the years from 1874 to 1878, when hon. gentlemen opposite ruled the destinies of Canada. It is not to be wondered at that during the very prosperous years from 1880 to 1888 the value of land should have increased largely, as it may have had in some instances somewhat of a boom; but if for the last two or three years crops have been insufficient, and have not been so good as we would have liked them to be, is it the fault of the National Policy? In addition to this we know, as the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) mentioned on Tuesday last, what is the rule all over the world. Land in a general way is like any other commodity, the price will tend to decrease according to the extent of land brought under cultivation, and when you see all over the world railways opening up large areas where there was no civilization before—for instance, whilst in Canada we have opened up millions of land in the North-West, brought that into the market, and opened them for cultivation, it is no wonder at all that for a certain time there must be depreciation in the value of land, but the equilibrium will come again. We extend the area of our cultivated land, and as in Canada, so in every other country in the world, the consequence will be that by giving to the farmers of Canada a large and important market here within our borders, the market of our great cities, the market of our increased industries and

manufactures, we will help the farmers along and ensure their prosperity in the future as we have ensured it for the last twelve years.

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

After Recess.

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair I had concluded the remarks I intended to make on the two first questions which called for discussion in that debate, the financial question and the trade question. I said in commencing those remarks that there was a third question which it was our duty seriously to take into consideration: I mean the political, or more properly the national question. Now, I will speak my mind frankly and openly. I have given to this question of unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union, all the consideration which as a public man and as a citizen of Canada it was my duty to give to it; and I may say that I have been brought face to face with this conclusion, that either of these schemes —either commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity—is only a stepping stone to political union with the United States. I am fully convinced that there can be no other result. The hon. gentlemen opposite will say what they please on the subject; they will try to dissimulate as much as possible the inevitable consequence of their policy; but there is the fact staring them in the face, and staring in the face of all loyal Canadians. For the last three years we have seen the spectacle of the friends and partisans of unrestricted reciprocity in Canada doing their best to explain to this House and to the people of Canada how the country will grow prosperous under their policy; and, in passing, I may mention how I, for one, wondered how it was that during the five years these hon. gentlemen were in power, and during all the years that they have been in public life—responsible public men since the union of the provinces—this project never occurred to them; but that it took them twenty-one years, from 1867 to 1888, to find out that by the very reason of Canada being the neighbour of the United States we could not go on without unrestricted reciprocity. Surely they have not been very far-sighted in that respect; but at all events—and this is their answer to the argument of those loyal Canadians who believe that the ultimate result of this policy will be annexation to the United States—they pretend to say, no; what we want is to make Canada prosperous. As the hon. member for North Norfolk said, the more population we shall have, the more prosperous we shall be; the more wealth we shall have in Canada, the surer we shall be to avoid annexation. But, Mr. Speaker, if we look on the other side of the line, we find just the contrary said there. All those who support the scheme in the United States —the public men, the press, and the men engaged in business pursuits—have all the one idea, that they want unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union precisely to bring about political union. Allow me to quote once more the words of President Lane, in introducing the gallant knight of South Oxford to the Boston banquet some months ago. He said:

"Our Liberal friends—not only Fielding and Longley of Nova Scotia, Davies of Prince Edward Island, Mercier and Laurier of Quebec, Cartwright of Ontario, and a host besides—look to us, the people of the United States, for the sign by which they shall conquer."

Mr. Speaker, amongst the supporters of unrestricted reciprocity in Canada are two men who have, I will not say the courage—for one has not had the courage to speak publicly—but at all events, who say what they really expect for the future. We have Mr. Farrer and the disclosures which were made public with regard to his somewhat notorious correspondence with United States people; and we have another gentleman occupying a more prominent position in Canada, who has been the most eloquent and most clever exponent of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, but who, unlike them, has spoken openly. I mean Mr. Goldwin Smith. Now, that gentleman does not disguise his way of thinking. He says plainly what he is—an annexationist; he wants political union between the United States and Canada to be brought about, and he says so frankly. He says that he wants a union of all the English-speaking people on the continent of North America. He has published a very well written book entitled "Canada and the Canadian question," in which we shall find his views on the subject. Then we have another gentleman who was for many years the talented leader of hon. gentlemen opposite. His words have been quoted before, but I do not want to close my speech without quoting a few lines from his remarkable letter. Here is what the Hon. Mr. Blake says in the letter which hon. gentlemen opposite were so anxious should not see the light of day before the 5th of March last:

"Assuming that absolute free trade with the States, best described as commercial union, may and ought to come, I believe that it can only come as an incident, or at any rate as a well understood precursor of political union, for which, indeed, we should be able to get more better terms before than after the surrender of our commercial independence."

These are sensible words, Mr. Speaker. Then Mr. Blake goes on:

"Then, so believing—believing that the decision of the trade question involves that of the constitutional issue, for which you are unprepared and with which you do not even conceive yourselves to be dealing, how can I properly recommend you now to decide on commercial union? Do not suppose that these are with me questions of yesterday. Long ago, while leader of the Liberal party, it became my duty to examine into a similar design, submitted by a political architect of some reputation."

I wonder if it was the hon. member for South Oxford—

"I thought the foundation insecure, the lines defective and the estimate of cost inadequate. It seemed to me that the proposed structure could be erected only on that different foundation, those other lines, and that larger cost which has been described. For this it was conceded that the people were not then prepared. And I was unable to propose the design for adoption as a party plan. My views remain unchanged to-day."

Now, by this letter—and it is very important that it should be on public record—we see that one of the most important reasons which decided the Hon. Mr. Blake to abandon the leadership of his party and retire from political life was that this scheme of unrestricted reciprocity could not be accepted by him, as a loyal Canadian and a member of the Legislature of Canada. The House will bear with me, I hope, when I return, for a moment only, to this book written by Mr. Goldwin Smith. I will quote but a few lines, which read as follows:—

"The reasoning of Lord Durham with regard to French Canadians holds good in some measure with regard to Canada altogether in its relation to the Anglo-Saxon continent. He thought it best to make the country at once

that which, after the lapse of no long time, it must be. And this reminds us of another reason for not putting off the unification of the English-speaking race, since it is perfectly clear that the forces of Canada alone are not sufficient to assimilate the French element or even to prevent the indefinite consolidation and growth of a French nation. Either the conquest of Quebec was utterly fatuous, or it is to be desired that the American continent should belong to the English tongue and to Anglo-Saxon civilization."

I wish to make a few words of comment on this point. I know I am here treading on very delicate ground, but, in one sense, French Canadians are thankful to Mr. Goldwin Smith. We are thankful to him for having spoken openly and said what he wants. It is an advantage to know with whom we have to deal. I would like to know from the leader of the Opposition and his friends if they support the views of Mr. Goldwin Smith on this point. I would like to say—and my hon. colleagues will allow me these few remarks, I have no doubt—that I am one of the members of Parliament representing here a French constituency; I am one of the members representing the French-speaking element, not that I mean to say I represent absolutely that element, for, in common with all other members, I represent Canada and Canadian interests before all. But, despite what hon. gentlemen opposite and Mr. Goldwin Smith may say, there is one thing certain and history is there to prove it. Providence has decided that on this free soil of Canada, the different nationalities which have sprung up from the European nations, are to mingle together and to live side by side in a brotherly way. The French element is here on the soil of Canada, and all we ask is that, like the English-speaking population of the Dominion, we should be allowed to be loyal to the Crown, that we should be allowed to help in developing the resources of the Dominion and in defending the rights of this Parliament and the independence of Canada. We ask that we should be allowed to develop and work out the free institutions we have received from the British Empire; and when I see that Mr. Smith has written that he favours political union with the United States, purposely for the annihilation of the French element, I think it is my duty as a representative of the French element to resent any such opinion. And I will say publicly, in answer to Mr. Goldwin Smith, that the French Canadians in Canada have done their share in developing the resources of Canada. Have our people not been a loyal people? Has not our French element been a law-abiding element? Have we created any difficulties here in Canada? And whilst we are working hand in hand with you for the development of this Canada of ours and to ensure the glorious destiny which shall be our share in the future, why deny us the privilege of cherishing the names of our ancestors and the glories of our mother nation on the other side of the Atlantic? Once more I would like to know if the leader of the Opposition approves of what Mr. Smith has written upon this point. Now I desire to say a few words about the issues that we fought at the last election, in answer to the question put by the hon. member for North Norfolk, who asked Tuesday why the dissolution had taken place. Hon. gentlemen opposite have a somewhat despondent recollection of that dissolution and its consequences; and we can see that they would have much preferred there had been no dissolution at all. But the political question is very plain, and as one of the citizens of Canada, as one of the public men of Canada, I must say that I entirely approve of the advice given by the advisers of the Governor General to dissolve Parliament. The reason given was one of the best that could be found. A great public question had been discussed for three years all over the length and breadth of the Dominion, and had been the subject of prolonged debates in this House. It had been discussed by the press throughout the country, and when the responsible advisers of the Crown in Canada said that the time had come when the question was to be fairly submitted to the people, whether we should have unrestricted reciprocity and surrender our rights to legislate on fiscal matters and discriminate against the mother country, or whether we should try and negotiate with the United States, in a fair way, a reasonable and just treaty of reciprocity, they did their duty to the people of Canada in advising a dissolution, and the people of Canada responded nobly to the appeal. On the side of the Government of Canada and its supporters the late campaign was fought on the issue put squarely before the people, whilst on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite it was not. I challenged this afternoon the hon. member for South Oxford to bring down a single resolution in favour of absolute free trade, pure and simple. If they had done so before the elections, there would not perhaps have been returned of them to this House even a corporal's guard. But all over the country side issues were introduced in order to deceive public opinion, and in the Province of Quebec, of which I can speak more particularly, —for I fought the battle there, and I am glad to say to-night, that in eight months time I redeemed two constituencies from those gentlemen—all kinds of side issues were introduced in the fight. We have constantly heard in this House hon. gentlemen charging the Government, and on Tuesday we heard this charge from the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), with having granted money for railway subsidies to bribe the constituencies. Strange to say, in the last campaign in the Province of Quebec—and no doubt it was the same in the rest of the Dominion—there was not a county or a township or a parish in the Province of Quebec that could have any interest in the building of a railway where these gentlemen did not try to arouse public feeling because the Government had not subsidized such railways. As the members of this House are well aware, if the great Liberal-Conservative party in the Province of Quebec during the last few years have suffered somewhat and have been reduced in numbers in their representation in this House, it is due to the side issues which were raised against the Government in the two last general elections. I remember very well what I have heard from the leader of the Opposition and his friends, and I remember that when the leader of the Opposition went around the Province of Quebec, he did not visit the constituencies as a free trader *par excellence*. No, Sir, he appealed, I may say, to the national or rather the racial feelings of our French Canadian people, holding in one hand that Saskatchewan rifle ready to charge against the loyal defenders of the sovereign authority of our gracious Queen, and in the other hand the "blood-rusted key to attempt the future's portals." Before resuming my seat, I think it is my duty to ask the

House to express its views on a sub-amendment to the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford. I will read the amendment which I intend to propose clause by clause, with a few words of comment on each clause. I will move, seconded by my friend the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), that all after the word "That" in the amendment be struck out, and the following be added to the main motion :

"And in concurring in these resolutions this House desires to express its approval of the efficient policy of the Liberal-Conservative Government, which, by permitting the free importation of raw materials, and by judicious protection of her natural and manufactured products, has resulted in the marked development of Canadian industries——"

I will place this question fairly and squarely before this House to ascertain whether this House is in favour of a National Policy or of absolute free trade. Secondly, I shall ask the House to express its approval—

—"of the liberal aid which has been granted to important and necessary public works, notably railways, canals and steamship lines, which have proved such important factors in developing our resources and facilitating our commerce——"

I will do this for the very important reason that, since the beginning of the session, as often as the occasion has occurred, we have heard that it was almost criminal, according to the hon. member for North Norfolk particularly, for the Government of Canada to have granted railway subsidies, and yet we have seen in this House not later than yesterday, and we have seen almost every day since the opening of the session, hon. gentlemen opposite rising from their seats one after the other and begging the Government to grant subsidies to this and that railway. Yesterday three hon. gentlemen rose, and I intended to say a few words on the subject then, but I thought I could wait until I had the present occasion. The hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Vaillancourt) proposed that assistance should be given to a proposed railway, the Quebec Oriental, which is to start from a few miles on the south shore of the St. Lawrence and to run between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Intercolonial Railway. I congratulate the hon. gentleman on his having supported the claim of this railway to a subsidy. He did so in very good and appropriate terms. If this railway is built, as I hope it will be, it will pass through my constituency, the County of L'Islet, and I shall be very glad if the Government can see its way to subsidize this road. Afterwards we heard from the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette), asking the Government to subsidize the railway, and the hon. member for Bellechase (Mr. Amyot) spoke in the same strain. I know that this railway is a very important one and will develop a large section of our country, but I know that if the Government see their way to subsidize this railway, it will require the expenditure of several hundred thousand dollars. These hon. gentlemen will find it difficult to agree with the hon. member for North Norfolk when he objected to the granting of railway subsidies. I have taken the trouble to hunt up in a hurry the amount of subsidies that would be required if the Government acceded to the requests of hon. gentlemen on the other side, and I find it would be at least $10,000,000. Yet these hon. gentlemen are charging the Government with extravagance in the policy they have adopted in the past, and which I hope they will continue in the future, of subsidizing railways within the limits of the financial resources of the country. If these hon. gentlemen are sincere in their requests to the Government for this and that subsidy, I hope they will vote for this second clause of my amendment. The third clause to which I will ask the House to give its approval is :

—"of the wise and prudent management of the finances which, while adequately providing for the public service, has maintained and advanced the credit of the country, and while producing substantial surpluses for capital expenditure, has made no appreciable addition to the public debt during the last two years."

I will ask my hon. friends to record their votes in favour of a policy which has produced surpluses and reduced taxation, and, when the hon. member for South Oxford seemed so anxious that we shall declare that we want the taxes on all the necessaries of life abolished, I ask hon. gentlemen to express their approval of the policy which has abolished the duty on sugar. Fourth, the hon. gentlemen opposite are always making a big cry against the extravagance in expenditure. They want to see the public expenditure reduced. Well, I am also in favour of the reduction of the expenditure, but within the limits required and fixed for a good public service. I say it would be a wrong policy, a very bad and stupid policy, in the interest of Canada, if we were to reduce the expenditure at the expense of the public service of Canada, and of the progress and development of the resources of Canada. A few days ago we had the pleasure of hearing from the Minister of Finance, speaking in the name of the Government, this most important declaration, that whilst they are asking the Parliament of Canada to reduce the taxation by $3,500,000, they only want to recoup the loss of revenue by $1,500,000, and they want to make up the difference by economy in the public service. Well, when a Government is courageous enough and understands so well its duty to the people of Canada as to undertake the very difficult task of reducing the expenditure by $2,000,000 out of a total, I will say, of $20,000,000, outside the interest on the public debt, the sinking fund and the subsidies to the provinces, I think such a Government deserves commendation, and I will ask our friends opposite to give us a proof of their sincerity in asking for a reduction in the expenditure, by declaring their satisfaction that the Government is to effect an economy of $2,000,000. Now, the last paragraph is this :

"That this House, while approving of the special efforts made by the Government to increase Canadian trade with the far East, with the West Indies, with Great Britain and with the United States, desires to express its confidence that any negotiations for the extension of commercial relations with the United States will be so conducted that their result will be consistent with that proper control of our own tariff and revenue which every self-respecting people must maintain, and with the continuance of those profitable business and political relations with the mother country which are earnestly desired by all intelligent and loyal Canadians."

I will ask the House to say that the policy of this Parliament of Canada must be expressed in the terms I have just laid down in this amendment ; and if hon. gentlemen are sincere in their expression of opinion that they do not want to discriminate against Great Britain, that they do not want to sacrifice the right of this country to regulate our own fiscal laws, then I ask them to

join with us in voting for this amendment in order to strengthen the Government in the negotiations which are soon to be opened at Washington. Now, in placing this amendment in your hands, Mr. Speaker, and in submitting it to the calm consideration and to the sound judgment of this House, I hope that the representatives of the people will be found equal to their duty. We are passing through a crisis in our history. The discussions of the last three years have disturbed the public mind. They have created in the mind of a large majority of our people a fear that the patriotic efforts of the last twenty-four years to lay deep in the free soil of Canada the foundations of the magnificent structure of a great Canadian nation may yet be of no avail, on account of the disloyal designs and deeds of wild and traitorous schemers. On the other hand, they have created in the mind of the minority extravagant hopes of unlimited prosperity, which can never be realized, and which are doomed to disappointment. I say it is adverse to the public interest that such anxiety on the one hand, and such fond delusions, impossible of realization, on the other, should exist, and, as responsible representatives of the people, we must join together to restore confidence, quiet, security, and self-reliance from one end of the Dominion to the other. Important negotiations will shortly be opened in Washington with our neighbours, with a view to settle all pending difficulties between the two countries. I am one of those who are confident that the statesmen who govern the great republic to the south of us, will receive the accredited representatives of the sovereign authority of the Queen of England and Canada, with an earnest desire to come to a fair, to a just and to an honourable agreement, which will be mutually advantageous, and which will ensure peace, good feelings and harmony between the two nations. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of this great event, I am sure I will voice the unanimous sentiment of the people of Canada when I say that the duty of this Parliament is to support the Government in the diplomatic task they have undertaken. Again I appeal to the leader of the Opposition and his supporters in this House to join with us in this patriotic action. I still hope that they will not allow the history of our times to record against them that in a moment of national emergency they were found unequal to their duty towards their country, towards the British Empire and towards their Sovereign. I hope that they will not be found completely lost to a proper sense of their responsibility as public men, as politicians, and as citizens of Canada. But if my appeal does not meet from those hon. gentlemen with a hearty response, then I will look around me and I will address myself to that patriotic phalanx of men who for years past have fought the noble battles of Canada. I will say to them that for the very reason that we are left single-handed in this national contest we must still more unite together, we must close our ranks and stand shoulder to shoulder. To our appeal I believe that the people of Canada will give a hearty and an enthusiastic response. Throughout the length and breadth of this wide Dominion the rallying cry will be heard and re-echoed over the waves to the foot of the Throne: Loyal to the Crown we have been; loyal to the Crown we shall be. At all times true to Canada we were; true to Canada we shall be. And like the great and loyal statesman, the chivalrous chieftain, the good-hearted friend now forever departed —may God permit that my closing sentence reaches him in the better land—"British subjects we were born, British subjects we will die." I, therefore, move the following amendment to the amendment:—

That all the words after the word "That" in the amendment be struck out and the following be added to the main motion:—"And in concurring in these Resolutions this House desires to express its approval (1) of the fiscal policy of the Liberal-Conservative Government, which, by permitting the free importation of raw materials, and by a judicious protection of our natural and manufactured products, has resulted in the marked development of Canadian industries; (2) of the liberal aid which has been granted to important and necessary public works, notably, railways, canals and steamship lines, which have proved such important factors in developing our resources and facilitating our commerce; (3) of the wise and prudent management of the finances, which, while adequately providing for the public service, has maintained and advanced the credit of the country, and while producing substantial surpluses for capital expenditure, has made no appreciable addition to the public debt during the last two years; (4) of the policy of relieving from duty articles of universal use, such as tea, coffee and sugar (in respect of the latter the consumer being freed from taxation to the extent of three and one-half millions during the present session), and of the mode of meeting the larger portion of the loss of revenue thereby caused by the exercise of economy in expenditure.

"That this House while approving of the special efforts made by the Government to increase Canadian trade with the far East, with the West Indies, with Great Britain and the United States, desires to express its confidence that any negotiations for the extension of commercial relations with the United States will be so conducted that their result will be consistent with that proper control of our own tariff and revenues which every self-respecting people must maintain, and with a continuance of those profitable business and political relations with the mother country which are earnestly desired by all intelligent and loyal Canadians."

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, with the merits of the resolution as moved by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins) I have no fault to find; it may be a proper subject for discussion by this House. But the moving of this amendment at this present moment and under present circumstances is a direct breach of faith by the Government of a solemn covenant entered into with the Opposition. The hon. gentleman is aware that once before I had occasion to complain before this House that hon. gentlemen had not kept their word pledged to the Opposition. On that occasion the hon. gentlemen told me that if there was anything to find fault with by the Opposition it was not the result of any intention on their part, but it was simply the result of a misunderstanding. I had no hesitation on that occasion in accepting the explanation which they offered. But I call upon the hon. gentleman now to say what explanation he has to give of moving this amendment under present circumstances. The hon. gentleman is aware that when on a late occasion he moved the House into Ways and Means, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), in answer to his motion for the House to go into Ways and Means, moved an amendment, to which, as he knows, by the rules of this House, no amendment could be moved. These rules of the House are the result of the wisdom of Parliament. They have been established for the proper carrying out of the business of Parliament, and they are rules so wise in themselves that no party on either side of the House, in power or in Opposition, ever took an exception to them. When the Minister of Finance had moved his resolution to go into Ways and Means, and my hon. friend the

member for South Oxford had moved his amendment, to which no amendment could be moved, the Minister of Finance asked him, for convenience sake and in order to enable the Government to carry on the business of the country, to withdraw his amendment, at the same time pledging himself that at a later stage he should move his amendment, and the matter should stand just in the position it occupied at that time. This is the result of the condescension which was shown by my hon. friend. I will put it in this way to the Minister of Finance: Suppose that upon that occasion the hon. member for South Oxford had refused to accede to the desire of the hon. gentleman; suppose he had said: "No, I will not grant your demand; we will go on with the discussion; I insist on moving my amendment on the motion to go into Committee of Ways and Means," where would the hon. Minister be to-day? He knows, as I know, that this sub-amendment could not have been moved; and because my hon. friend on that occasion thought proper, through the courteous exchange of opinions from one side of the House to the other, to accede to the demand which was made upon him, and to withdraw his motion under the direct pledge and understanding that he could move it at another stage with the same privileges, and the same advantages, and the same restrictions as well, as he could have moved it then, when this amendment could not have been moved, therefore, I now ask the hon. gentleman, I ask it in consequence of an arrangement which was agreed to on that side of the House, I ask it as a right, I ask it not as a matter of favour, or as a matter of privilege, but I ask it as a right, that the hon. gentleman keep his own word, stand by the pledge which he gave to the House, stand by the understanding which was arrived at, and see that this sub-amendment be withdrawn. I ask him to keep his word, and, Mr. Speaker, there are certain courtesies to be extended from one side to the other. I hope the hon. gentleman will not refuse those courtesies.

An hon. MEMBER. It is not a courtesy.

Mr. LAURIER. It is not, perhaps, courtesy; it may be said to be our right, but there are certain courtesies to be extended from one side to the other, and when the hon. gentleman asked my hon. friend to withdraw his motion he asked for the exercise of these courtesies which are extended from one side to the other. If on the present occasion we are not put in the position exactly as we should have been put, on a motion being made on the motion of the hon. gentleman to go into Committee of Ways and Means, then, Sir, we will understand there is no reliance to be placed on their words, and we will act accordingly.

Mr. FOSTER. Probably no one in the House is more surprised than myself at the tone of my hon. friend, at the matter of his remarks, and at the extraordinary conclusions to which he has come. Whatever passed between myself and him, or between myself and my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), passed across the floor of this House, and is a matter of record, and a matter of hearing and of memory to hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House. That there was any private agreement between myself and the leader of the Opposftion, or between myself and the hon. member for South Oxford, I deny, and I do not think either of these gentlemen will say that there was.

An hon. MEMBER. They do not say so.

Mr. FOSTER. What took place was simply this: When the resolutions which I introduced in the course of my Budget speech, on the motion to go into the Committee of Ways and Means, when that motion came before the House, after I had finished my remarks and after they had been replied to by my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), he moved his amendment. I immediately stated, and my hon. friend the Minister of Customs bore me out in that, that it had always been the custom in the House that the resolutions should be read in Committee and should be passed by the Committee in order that they might become operative at once, and that if the hon. gentleman persisted in his motion it would be impossible that this should be done. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition protested that my hon. friend from South Oxford should not withdraw his motion, but my hon. friend from South Oxford pointed out to him, in a very few words, what perhaps he did not know before, what would be the business result of such a proceeding as that, and I stated from my place here—I stated nothing else publicly and nothing else privately—that if the hon. gentleman would withdraw his motion in amendment at that time, that he could move it upon going into concurrence, or upon the second reading, and that there would be the very same privileges of discussion, just as wide and just as broad, as there would have been if it had been in Committee. That was all that passed. If the record states anything else, or if any gentleman from his memory can state anything else, and have it substantiated, let it be done. But what is my hon. friend trying to do to-night? He, without any warrant whatever, rises in his place in this House and tries to fasten upon me and upon this side of the House a breach of contract with himself. He cannot establish it, and he knows that he cannot establish it, and when he attempts to fasten that upon me before the House, he is engaged in an operation in which he will be unsuccessful, just as much so as he was when he tried to persuade the House upon a former occasion that I broke faith with him—holding up his boyish threat that if such a thing as that shall be done they will teach us manners and they will have no dealings with us. We can get along on the Rules of the House if necessary, but we propose to be just as courteous, and just as honourable in carrying out our contracts across the House as we have ever been. What is the gravamen of the charge? What has my hon. friend, and the members on that side of the House, lost; have they lost any freedom of discussion or any freedom of vote? No; they can discuss their own resolution for hours, for days, for weeks, and with all the freedom that they could have had in any other stage of proceedings. It is freedom of discussion that they ask, but they are afraid that perhaps a new light will be thrown upon this resolution of theirs by the amendments which have been moved, not by me, but by my hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins), and they think that they will be placed in the position of disadvantage in conducting the discussion and having a vote upon these two parallel amendments. But they will have

the same freedom of discussion, they will have the same chance to make their ideas felt, they will have the same opportunity to present the truth to the people, as well as to this House, as they would have had under any other circumstances. What does my hon. friend want? Does he want to snatch a verdict in any way, as by the moving of the previous question, so as to shut out amendments? He surely is not afraid of any amendment that may emanate from this side of the House. My hon. friend is showing the weakness of his position in two ways: first as to alleging there was a violation of a contract which never took place; and second by objecting to an amendment to his resolution which he thinks would put his resolution in a bad light.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I extremely regret that we should find the sharp practice of a pettifogging attorney introduced into the proceedings of this House. The hon. the Minister of Finance is literally correct in saying, that as we thought we were dealing with gentlemen, we did not deem it necessary to draw up a formal legal bond to compel him to observe what he knew perfectly well, and what every man in this House knew perfectly well, was the implied contract between us, which was, that for the convenience of the public service, and as a matter of courtesy from this side of the House to the other, we agreed to withdraw the amendment—which it was utterly out of his power, be it remembered, to amend at the time that I moved it—and we agreed to withdraw it on the understanding that we should be left in precisely the same position we were then in. Sir, I do not pretend to say that we thought at that time so poorly and so meanly of the hon. Minister and his associates as to suppose that they would condescend to so petty and so trifling a trick as this. Let them do it if they please. If, after what my hon. friend has stated, they choose to go on, I would not advise any of my hon. friends to waste any more time upon them. But, Sir, from this time out, as my hon. friend has stated, they may depend upon it, no warning will be given of any motions on going into Supply, or anything of that kind, and I will venture to tell them that they will find the result will be decidedly more unpleasant than it would be to adhere to the understanding which did most undoubtedly exist on this side of the House, and without which, most assuredly, I would not have consented, nor would any man on this side of the House have consented, to the withdrawal of my motion in amendment, when the discussion took place.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the House allow me to read exactly what did occur?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no. We know all about it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. When the House is told that a petty trick is being resorted to, that the members on this side of the House are acting as pettifogging attorneys, that they are not acting as gentlemen, and that hon. gentlemen on the other side are wasting their time in negotiating with them, one would have expected at least that in reply to the hon. Minister of Finance some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House would have at least alleged that some understanding had taken place other than that which is shown on the records of the House; because if no other understanding can be alleged—and none has been alleged—these aspersions are doubly disgraceful to the men who have made them. What does the record show, Sir? It shows that on the 23rd June, 1891, and on page 1252 of *Hansard*, an understanding was arrived at with which the motion made to-day by my hon. friend from L'Islet is perfectly consistent.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear. Oh; yes.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I shall not only make that assertion, but I shall prove it to the House and to the satisfaction of the gentlemen who are disposed to interrupt me at this moment; and I shall show that the complaint they make this evening in such disgraceful language is a complaint that we are following out very carefully and fully the ample discussion which they pledged us should be had. The complaint now is, not that we are limiting discussion, but that we are widening it; not that we are attempting to catch any particular vote of the House, but that we are attempting to prevent hon. gentlemen opposite taking a catch vote of the House. On page 1252 is set forth the resolution moved by the hon. member for South Oxford; and in reading to the House what took place immediately afterwards I will ask the House to remember that it is not pretended now, after the challenge given to the Minister of Finance, that anything else was whispered across the floor except what appears here upon the record. Now, what appears upon the record is this: that when that resolution was read, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance said:

"I propose that we should follow the same course that we have done on other occasions, and go into Committee and pass them with what debate will be necessary, which I hope will not be very much at this time. Then we can concur in the resolutions in some future time.

"Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And then we can proceed with the debate afterwards?

"Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

"Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course it is well understood that the fullest possible discussion will go on in future stages in the Committee."

Hon. gentlemen opposite did not seek to reserve any right, any privilege, any technical advantage which they may have had in moving the resolution at that time. All they asked was to have it distinctly understood that the discussion should be as full at the subsequent stage as it could have been then. But the matter did not rest there. They were still more explicit as to what they wanted reserved—

"Mr. FOSTER. Your motion will have to be withdrawn for the moment to allow us to go into Committee.

"Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course, this discussion cannot be possibly closed to-night, and, as my hon. friend suggests, it is of importance to the public service that these resolutions should be passed, so that under these circumstances I do not object to withdraw the motion for the present.

"Mr. FOSTER. Very well; the resolution can be withdrawn for the moment, and we can go into Committee."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Hon. gentlemen may not only cheer that, but they may cheer when the rest of the record is read, and when they find that it gives an absolute falsification to the insinuations of breach of faith which have been made—

"Mr. SPEAKER. Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. gentleman shall have leave to withdraw the amendment?

"Amendment withdrawn.

"House resolved itself into Committee on Ways and Means.

"(In the Committee.)

"On resolution 1,

"Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Probably as these resolutions are long, it had better be understood that their adoption now is purely *pro formâ* on our part, and is intended not in the slightest degree to imply our concurrence in them, but is merely for the purpose of giving the Government an opportunity of putting them in force at once and preventing any fraud on the revenue.

"Mr. FOSTER. That is the understanding."

And in order that there might be no possible mistake about it, the hon. member for South Brant got the House to understand distinctly that the agreement arrived at was precisely what the hon. Minister of Finance has stated to-night.

"Mr. PATERSON (Brant). And that there will be perfect liberty to discuss or to object to any item hereafter?

"Mr. FOSTER. Certainly."

If anything else transpired between the hon. Minister of Finance and the other side of the House, we will carry it out not only in the letter but in the spirit. But when it is not pretended that anything else took place and that we are committing a breach of faith, I say that the insinuation recoils upon the men who make it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think, Sir, that even the scanty record of what took place that is given here, if carefully examined will be found to sustain what my hon. friend has contended for. I beg to say that the resolution proposed by my hon. friend from South Oxford would never have been withdrawn upon any other understanding than this, that when the debate was to be resumed it should be exactly in the position in which it had been. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman knows that. The hon. gentlemen upon the Treasury benches know the understanding just as well as hon. gentlemen on this side, and the hon. Minister of Finance knows that what is here recorded is not a full account of what transpired at the time. The hon. Minister has referred to the fact that the hon. leader of the Opposition objected to the withdrawal of the resolution. Is that recorded here? Is there any allusion to it? Is there a single word of it? He knows that the discussion went on informally for some time, and when he refers to this as a full record of what transpired he is referring to a record which he himself, by his allusion to that debate, shows is not a full record of what actually took place. Then, Sir, what did my hon. friend from South Oxford say when the hon. Minister of Finance asked him to withdraw the resolution? It was:

"We can proceed with the debate afterwards."

What debate? What was the subject of debate? Was it the resolution moved this evening by the hon. member for L'Islet? Not at all. The subject of debate was the resolutions of Ways and Means which the hon. Minister of Finance proposed to the House, and the amendment thereto proposed by my hon. friend from South Oxford. These were the subjects for discussion, and nothing else; and it was well understood that when this amendment which had been withdrawn was moved again the original resolution and the amendment should be open for discussion, and that the parties on that side of the House and on this would stand exactly in the position in which they had stood before. Is that the position in which the hon. gentleman has placed us this evening? Is that what the hon. gentleman calls keeping faith with the Opposition? Sir, on one occasion there was a distinguished general who, when he accepted the surrender of the army of his opponent, was told that the arrangement made at the Caudine Forks could not be carried out. Well, said the hon. gentleman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes; he was an hon. gentleman. It may be that he was a pagan, but he was nevertheless an hon. gentleman; and when he was told that the arrangement could not be carried out he said: Place your army back in the position in which it stood before. And we say to the hon. gentleman, place us in the position in which we were when you asked us that that resolution be withdrawn, and then we will be prepared to consider any addition the Rules of Parliament will permit you to make to that resolution. That you have not done; and it is trifling with the understanding and with the judgment of this House when the hon. Minister of Justice gets up here and tells us that allowing us to move the resolution and then proposing any sort of amendment the hon. gentleman may choose to propose, and which, if he has a majority in the House, he will carry, and thus prevent us ever reaching the resolution proposed by my hon. friend from South Oxford, is putting us in the position in which we stood before. We were in the position to take the opinion of the House and to submit it to the judgment of the country upon the subject of unrestricted reciprocity or a large measure of reciprocity with the people of the United States.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Which?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Do we stand in that position now? Why, the hon. gentleman on the Treasury benches have put into the hands of the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins) an amendment to our amendment which they hope to carry, and which will supersede our resolution; and I say that until we are given the opportunity of voting for our resolution, and until hon. gentlemen opposite are given the opportunity of taking the responsibility of voting against it, if they dare, they are not keeping faith with us and are paltering with their word. The hon. Minister of Finance will learn that that sort of trick is one which cannot be played a second time on this side of the House. The hon. gentleman may consider that a proper parliamentary proceeding——

Mr. FOSTER. I object, Mr. Speaker, to the word "trick" being used.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Before you rule, Sir, I would like to say this, that the hon. gentleman has not charge of my vocabulary. The hon. gentleman thinks the expression is improper——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, chair.

Mr. SPEAKER. It seems to me the hon. gentleman used the word in quite an unparliamentary sense.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If you say, Sir, that the word is out of order, I shall withdraw it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Substitute "trickster."

Mr. SPEAKER. In the sense in which the hon. gentleman used the word, it is out of order.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then I will withdraw it, and say that the hon. gentleman, in another

moment of weakness, has failed to keep faith with us. The hon. gentleman may think that we are outside the pale on this side of the House, but, nevertheless, he will find that it is a matter of very great convenience to the Administration to keep faith with us. We have not violated our word or our promise in spirit, any more than in fact; and I tell the hon. Finance Minister that everybody in this House will understand that that moral cowardice which prevented him from voting according to his convictions on the subject of prohibition has prevented him and his colleagues now from keeping faith with us and from voting in accordance with what he dare not say are his convictions on the subject of reciprocity.

Mr. BOWELL. This is certainly a tempest in a teapot. The language of the leader and of the lieutenant of the Opposition seems to have taken root in the minds and actions of his followers, because the latter certainly do not betray that gentlemanly conduct which the hon. leader of the Opposition desires should characterize members on this side of the House. Their conduct, if not of pettifogging lawyers, certainly savours of the ordinary barroom. Now, it is clear to me, and it must be clear to every member of this House, who has any recollection of what took place between the leader of the Opposition, or rather the hon. member for South Oxford and the Finance Minister, that the only agreement made and the only deduction that can be drawn from the language then used is, that there should be the fullest possible discussion, with the Speaker in the Chair, of every item embraced in those resolutions.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BOWELL. Hon. gentlemen may say "Oh, oh," but let them read the report, and then say what it means. The fact is simply this: either the hon. member for South Oxford has forgotten the Rules of the House, or he never knew them. No one was more astonished than I when I heard him rise and move an amendment to the motion of my hon. colleague, the Minister of Finance, to concur in the resolution, because, every one who has paid any attention to the Rules of the House knows that on a motion of that kind any amendment can be made to the amendment proposed; and if the hon. gentleman had looked up the authorities—either May, or Todd, or Bourinot—he would have learned that an amendment on a motion to go into Supply or an amendment on a motion to go into a Committee of Ways and Means could not be amended by another amendment; but he ought to have known, as the veriest tyro in the House knows, that on an amendment to a motion to concur anyone could move an amendment to the amendment. The fact is, that having made a blunder with regard to the time of moving the amendment he now assumes an air of superiority over all the rest of the world. Really, anyone, looking at him when he uttered the language which he addressed to the House, when he said he was not treating with gentlemen, anyone who saw the angelic smile which characterized his face, as it always does when he gives utterance to the sentiments of the nature he then expressed, and which added glory to that imperial moustache so carefully and so well waxed in order to add effect to his bearing, would fail to recognize that superiority he claims. He is, I am sorry to say, not a very good specimen of the aristocracy of England to which he belongs, for he scarcely ever rises in this House without giving utterance to sentiments that are insulting to others who think proper to differ from him on any subject that may be under discussion. Had he on this occasion used different language, had he and his friends adopted a different tone, I do not know but that my hon. friend and colleague might have taken a different course, could he have been convinced that there had been any misunderstanding. I will say this, however, for the hon. member for South Oxford, that in my long experience in the House, particularly in discussing the Estimates—and I desire to do him every credit—in the Committees of the Whole, he has never been obstructive, when it was necessary to carry resolutions of this House, or in the passage of certain items after an explanation has been given. I have said that before, and I repeat it now; but I say that the language he used to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House is unworthy of him as a man, more particularly from the position he occupies, not only in this House, but in the country at large. I repeat distinctly that no such understanding as that to which the leader of the Opposition refers was arrived at. I will not say that the hon. gentleman does not believe the truth of every word he utters; I would be very sorry even to insinuate such a thing; but I say that, when the arrangement was made that the motion should be withdrawn, it was to my mind with the distinct understanding that the hon. gentleman would take the first opportunity on going into Committee of Supply or Committee of Ways and Means to present that motion or any other motion he thought proper to present to the House. With his long parliamentary experience, the hon. gentleman should know the proper time at which to make a motion of that kind, and if he seized an improper time, upon his shoulders alone must rest the responsibility. I have read this discussion as it is recorded in the *Hansard* once or twice, and I repeat again what I stated when I commenced my remarks, that there is not a word in it that can lead to any other conclusion than that there was to be every possible freedom of discussion allowed, even with the Speaker in the Chair as well as in Committee. If you want any evidence of that fact you have only to read the question put by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson), when he said it was to be distinctly understood that there should be no limitation of the discussion and that every item should be considered. Certainly that could not refer to the proposition containing a great principle which had been moved by the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), so that the present objection is nothing but an attempt to create a feeling based upon false premises, because the Opposition have found themselves in a position where they are called upon to vote against a resolution containing principles which many of their followers would not like to vote against. Thus, being caught—I was going to say—being placed in that position, they now raise this question in order to mislead the people. Having been caught in their own trap they are now trying to wriggle out of it. I for one care very little for the threats of the leader of the Opposition or of his lieutenant. This side of the House has never, as far as I know, received any consideration from those hon. gentlemen in the past, neither do we expect it in the

future. We expect to fight our battles fairly and squarely, not only in this House but before the people, and when the people record their votes against the principles advocated for twelve or thirteen years past by the late Government and proposed to be carried out by the present Government, and I hope by the future Government, whatever it may be, it will be time enough for us to succumb; but I assure the hon. gentlemen that it will not be under any threats which they may throw out. We are prepared to accept their threats, we are prepared to accept their courtesies, and to extend as much courtesy from this side of the House as they extend or as they are capable of extending from that side of the House. If they fancy that by making threats they will keep the House sitting till the fall, they will obstruct public business, upon them rests the responsibility. We are quite prepared to accept it in the future as we have in the past.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The speeches of the three hon. gentlemen who have attempted to defend the action of the Government in this matter have shown that they are painfully aware of the untenable ground on which they stand. The last hon. gentlemen who spoke (Mr. Bowell) rose evidently in a passion, and attempted to turn this debate into a personal scolding matter, and though he attempted to argue somewhat afterwards, he did not succeed very well. Let us see where we are in this matter, and I believe there are some fair-minded men on the other side of the House who are open to argument and willing to give fair play. When the hon. gentleman from Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved his amendment, he did so in the exercise of the undoubted right which the Opposition possess to formulate their policy in a resolution which must be voted upon by the House. That is the inherent right of the Opposition on a motion to go into Committee of Supply or a Committee of Ways and Means. We exercised that right, and submitted the policy on which we appealed to the country and upon which we were desirous of testing the opinions of hon. gentlemen opposite. But we have been—I will not say tricked, because that has been ruled out of order—but we have been deluded, we have been dragged away from the attempt to obtain the views of hon. gentlemen opposite on the subject of unrestricted reciprocity, and we have been deprived of the right to challenge the opinion of the House upon the fiscal policy upon which we went to the country and upon which we now desire to challenge the opinions of hon. members of the House. The Minister of Justice attempted to defend this breach of faith on the ground that the letter of the contract justified it. I am quite prepared to argue it out on the letter of the contract, meagre as is the report in the *Hansard*. The first proposition is that, at the suggestion and for the convenience of the Finance Minister, this course was taken. The suggestion did not emanate from us. We did not require any change in procedure, but, as a matter of favour, the hon. gentleman asked and received that courtesy which the Opposition are always willing to give, with a view to the proper management of the public business, and without which, notwithstanding the high-sounding terms which the Minister of Finance has ventured to use to-night, I assert that the business of the country cannot be satisfactorily carried on. What does the Finance Minister say? He said that he proposed that we should follow the same course we had followed on similar occasions before. I appeal to the hon. gentleman and ask him to carry his memory back one or two years, to the time when Sir Charles Tupper first introduced this new plan, and I ask him whether, on either of the two occcasions I refer to, an amendment to the amendment was moved. The hon. member knows that, taking the letter of his contract, he has violated it. I am not now arguing whether the spirit of the contract has been broken or not. That has been argued so well by my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Mills), that it is not necessary for me to enter into it; but the whining appeal of the hon. gentleman was to the effect that he was prepared to rely on the letter of the contract, though the spirit of the contract might have been violated. Has the hon. gentleman kept his pledge, that if the amendment was withdrawn the same conditions should be followed as were followed on previous occasions? We find that Mr. Foster said:

"Very well; the resolution can be withdrawn for the moment, and we can go into Committee."

And now the Minister of Customs says that the Minister of Finance did not mean the withdrawal of the motion for a moment, but the withdrawal for some future day when the House was asked again to go into Committee. Was there ever such an absurd construction, or forced construction, attempted to be put upon an act? Further than that, my hon. friend from South Oxford, who moved the resolution, followed up the matter immediately and said:

"Probably, as these resolutions are long, it had better be understood that their adoption now is purely *pro formâ* on our part, and is intended not in the slightest degree to imply our concurrence in them, but is merely for the purpose of giving the Government an opportunity of putting them in force at once, and preventing any fraud on the revenue."

Sir, there was no other object in view, there was no object in the mind of the Minister of Finance at that time, or in the mind of any member of the House, of taking away from the Opposition the rights or the privileges which they possessed of forcing a vote upon the policy they formulated in the amendment. There was only one object—to allow the resolutions then to be passed *pro formâ*, and the debate was to be resumed, each side reserving to itself the rights it had before, one of those rights being our right to challenge a decision upon the amendment as we tendered it. The moment we yielded and the hon. gentleman attained what he asked for, then the House was to be relegated, and the different parties in the House were to be relegated, to the exact position and to the relative rights that they held before. Sir, look where the hon. gentleman is placed. The hon. gentleman knows well that on the second reading of a resolution reported from Committee of Ways and Means, such a resolution as was then before the House cannot be put at all. The hon. gentleman knows that on the second reading of a resolution from Committee on Ways and Means no amendment can be proposed except one which is relevant to the main motion; therefore, this motion of my hon. friend from South Oxford cannot be put from the Chair except in pursuance and in consequence of the solemn compact come to across the House, and that being the case, this amendment only being put from the Chair pursuant to the contract agreed to by both parties, the hon. gentleman now comes in

and says: We will carry out the compact so far as to enable you to put the resolution, and we will break the compact and propose an amendment to it. Sir, if the hon. gentleman turns to Bourinot, page 491, he will find the law laid down clearly that:

"In putting the question for concurrence on each resolution, both the amendment and the debate must be relevant to the same, in accordance with English practice, and nothing can be introduced which is irrelevant by way of amendment or by way of discussion."

What have we been doing for the past week? Have we been discussing a matter relevant to the resolution, the second reading of which is proposed? Not at all. We have been travelling all over the record, all over the history of Canada, discussing—what? Discussing the amendment which my hon. friend from South Oxford moved in pursuance of the solemn compact come to across the House. And, Sir, that being true, and the House occupying this position, we find these gentlemen—these gentlemen across the House—who say they are prepared to keep their word, keeping it to the extent of allowing an irrelevant debate to go on and an irrelevant amendment to be moved, and saying: We will stop you from taking the opinion of the House upon your amendment. Sir, we cannot characterize this conduct in the House as disgraceful, but if it was outside the House, or in a *nisi prius* court, hon. gentlemen would be told by the judge pretty much as they were told by my hon. friend from South Oxford, that it was a contemptible trick.

Mr. EDGAR. I think that there are gentlemen on both sides of this House who will be most anxious and desirous to act in good faith, as they understand it, in the matters before the House. Now, I would like to ask any hon. gentleman here, who in this House could understand what were the intentions and the wishes and the consent of the hon. member for South Oxford when he withdrew that resolution? There is no person in this House but the member for South Oxford himself who can stand up and tell the House as a gentleman, as an hon. member of this House, what was his understanding when he withdrew that resolution. The hon. member for South Oxford has declared to this House what was his understanding when, at the request of the Minister of Finance, he withdrew the resolution. Sir, I consider that all the members of this House should in that matter accept the statement of the hon. member who withdrew that resolution. It was absolutely and entirely in his own hands whether he went on with that resolution or whether he withdrew it, and therefore his statement should be accepted. Then, let us look at it in another light. Supposing that the Minister of Finance had given warning to the member for South Oxford when he asked him to withdraw that amendment, intimating to him that he proposed to put up some member following to move an amendment to his amendment—does anybody in this House believe for a moment that the member for South Oxford would have given his consent as he did on that occasion? Now, Sir, we have two tests which hon. gentlemen, either on the Treasury benches or off the Treasury benches, must regard as tests of the proper way to consider this question. Sir, I should be very sorry indeed if the good sense of some hon. gentlemen on that side of the House does not cause them to protest against the proceedings that it is proposed to be taken to-day, yet sanctioned by the Minister of Finance, and, I am sorry to say, by the Minister of Justice also. It was agreed, as we find by the *Hansard*, that the debate was to proceed afterwards. What debate? Could the hon. member for South Oxford have meant a debate on some other resolution which he never heard of, and which was only proposed to the House to-day? Could he, on the 23rd of June, talk of proceeding with a debate on the resolution of the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins) which he never heard of, which was not drawn and which nobody knew anything about then? No, Sir, he meant that we should be called upon to proceed with the debate, of course, which he had begun upon the resolution, which had to be voted upon by this House, under the orders of this House. Now, Sir, under the circumstances, I do sincerely hope that the good sense of the House will not allow this matter to go any further.

Mr. CURRAN. The hon. member who has just addressed the House has taken the wind completely out of the sails of all his friends who have spoken. He opened his remarks by saying that nobody but the member for South Oxford could know what was in his own mind at the time he gave his consent.

Mr. EDGAR. At the time he withdrew his motion.

Mr. CURRAN. Therefore all this indignation, all this abuse, all this insinuation that no gentlemen were to be found anywhere in this House except on the other side of it, is entirely unjustifiable, and certainly is the very worst possible means that could be adopted of inducing the withdrawal of this or any other motion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CURRAN. Well, I am satisfied that these gentlemen who are now interrupting me are not giving any very great evidence of their gentlemanly conduct.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CURRAN. Hon. gentlemen opposite are gentlemen in their own estimation, but they are not acting like gentlemen when they apparently object to my saying a few words, although we have listened to members of the Government being called pettifoggers and declared unfit to enter into any compact, and while declarations have been made by hon. gentlemen opposite that for the future no compact will be entered into with us. No one could misunderstand what was understood here the other night; no one could misunderstand what was agreed to on a former occasion. It was said then, as was said on a former occasion when an agreement had been arrived at by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright):

"Of course that has been the practice, and no objection will be taken to it on this side. The hon. gentleman knows, however, that we do not in the least waive our right to the fullest possible discussion in the most conversational manner, of the various items, when the discussion takes place in Committee."

So this arrangement has been arrived at, a distinct, positive and emphatic arrangement, that there should be a most full and ample discussion, that the fullest opportunity should be given to discuss the resolution, and for that matter no objection was to be thrown in the way of the most ample discussion of the whole history of Canada, if necessary. What has taken place here? Has there been any interruption to the discussion? Has not every man who desired to address the

House had the most ample opportunity of taking part in the discussion; and certainly when this evening an amendment to the amendment was proposed, and the leader of the Opposition rose and accused the Government and their followers of a breach of faith, when members of the Government were subsequently told by the member for South Oxford that they were pettifoggers, and when he hurled at them every epithet he could call to mind, I think it is high time for this House to show, if they are men, their determination to stand by the Government. We are not to be bullied. We are not afraid to meet hon. gentlemen opposite, either here, or out of the House, on the platforms of the country. We have met them before and we will meet them again, and I trust the Government will stand by the decision at which they arrived to-night.

Mr. MULOCK. I am sure we are all disposed on certain occasions to stand by our respective parties, but there are occasions when we are bound to stand by the honour of the Crown it may be, and I hope on this occasion we will be able to arrive at a sound conclusion, even if it may involve some members supporting a party which they do not generally support. Looking at the situation when the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford was moved, what was it? If we look at the *Hansard* report on that occasion we find on page 1252-3 the gist of the bargain arrived at. The Government motion to go into Committee of Ways and Means had just been moved, and the hon. member for South Oxford moved an amendment at that stage, to which no possible amendment could have been proposed. The Minister of Finance, in his desire to promote public business, asked that that motion might be withdrawn. Withdrawn substantially? No. What was the reason for the withdrawal that took place, for it all turns on that? Was the withdrawal merely a formal withdrawal? If it was a merely formal withdrawal, then, when the amendment was restored, it was entitled to the same position, and the parties entitled to the same right, and no greater, than if the motion had never been withdrawn. The report in *Hansard* is as follows:—

"Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course it is well understood that the fullest possible discussion will go on in future stages in the Committee.

"Mr. FOSTER. Your motion will have to be withdrawn for the moment to allow us to go into Committee.

"Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course this discussion cannot be possibly closed to-night, and, as my hon. friend suggests, it is of importance to the public service that these resolutions should be passed, so that under these circumstances I do not object to withdraw the motion for the present.

"Mr. FOSTER. Very well; the resolution can be withdrawn for the moment and we can go into Committee.

"Mr. SPEAKER. Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. gentleman shall have leave to withdraw the amendment?

"Amendment withdrawn.

"House resolved itself into Committee on Ways and Means."

I appeal to the Minister of Finance and to every member on each side of the House whether in view of that temporary arrangement, that formal withdrawal in the interests of the public, for that must at all times prevail and should at all times govern our conduct, even in the course of our party warfare—I appeal to hon. members whether the true spirit of that compact was not this, that there was to be no change in the rights of parties. That commends itself to my mind as the only conclusion to draw from what took place. If there was to have been another arrangement it would have been the subject of discussion; but as the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) said, the precedents which are to govern us are all in one way. Under these circumstances—I did not happen to hear the animated discussion that took place at the commencement of this debate—as the Minister of Finance will not give me his ear at this moment, I appeal to other hon. members, and I ask whether in view of the statements made by this side it may not be that the withdrawal of the amendment was but a formal withdrawal for the promotion of the public business, and not a real withdrawal, and whether it is not the duty of the Minister of Finance, as temporary custodian of the honour of the Government and the Crown on this occasion and in this matter, whatever his own views may be, to err on the right side and accept the statements made by the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for South Oxford as to the course that was adopted, for the hon. gentleman is bound to take them at their word, and restore them to the position which they occupied before the amendment was withdrawn. No other course will redeem the honour of the Government. Let them do what they are bound to do now, and it will not be a sacrifice. Hon. gentlemen will simply be doing their duty, and it is never too late to do their duty. If a mistake has been made, it should be remedied as early as possible. The proper despatch of public business and the interests of the country demand that there should be such relations between both sides of the House that hon. members can trust each other, that there should be some confidence between parties, even if opponents. I, therefore, hold it would be discreditable to this House as a tribunal, it would be discreditable, I say it in no offensive terms, and it would reflect on the Administration if they allow strained relations like the present to exist for a moment between the two parties, and I appeal to the Government, and I cast the responsibility on them if they are deaf to the appeal, to take the right course even at this late hour, and withdraw the amendment, and let the proceedings go on as they did before the amendment to the amendment was moved.

Mr. TISDALE. As a member of Parliament unskilled to a great extent in the Rules of the House, I must say I feel that this whole occurrence, and especially the spirit in which it has been conducted, is very regrettable. There will be disagreements on different questions between the two parties, particulary between two parties which are so strong as we are in this country. But surely when serious disagreements arise members who take part in the discussion should be listened to, and, being somewhat warm in temperament myself, I think every allowance should be made for hon. members on both sides who, in the early part of it, certainly discussed the subject in somewhat warm terms. It is regrettable that a misunderstanding should arise, and as I understand it, and I wish to get to understand it, when this motion was first made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) no amendment could then have been moved. On the other hand, I did not understand it entirely as a matter of favour that he withdrew it at the time

to allow public business to proceed, because while he need not do it, he would have taken the responsibility from the Government and put it on the Opposition if these resolutions should not have come into force ; and therefore such action would have seriously affected the business of the country. He had the undoubted right if he saw fit to take that responsibility. The first proposition which comes to my mind is, as to whether there is any breach of faith, because I am one of those who think that if there has been any unintentional breach of faith it should not be taken advantage of. The question here seems to me, if I am correctly informed, as open to two or three interpretations. Now, having that position, is it not fair to consider that when the hon. gentleman was asked under these circumstances to withdraw his amendment—he being a gentleman of great experience, and understanding fully from his great experience in these matters the position he would be placed in—he would have protected himself by such safeguards as he thought necessary. Certainly, as it strikes my mind from the discussion, the desire, and the very proper desire, and the only desire that was prevalent then, was for the fullest discussion, and that was all that was asked to be reserved. Surely, from what is in the *Hansard* there can be no dispute that that was the reservation that was spoken of, whether anything more was implied or not. What was the next step? And here comes the position which I think is fairly and properly discussable without charging any of these extreme things that I regret have been charged across the House to-night. The hon. member for South Oxford took the next step, and as I understand it he moved his resolution at a time when he need not have moved it, and at a time which put him in the position that according to parliamentary practice, as I am informed, this amendment could have been moved. The hon. gentleman need not have moved his amendment then ; he might have moved it on going into Supply, and then he could maintain his position. Now, as the reservation was entirely one for the fullest discussion, the hon. gentleman taking the responsibility of making his motion when he was not called upon, and he might have made it when there would have been no chance of his being in any different position, is it not arguable, even from the standpoint of the other side, and is it not allowable from our side, to think that we considered it a challenge for that fullest discussion which has followed, and which has been enlarged undoubtedly. It seems to me that is a full statement of the matter.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No ; no.

Mr. TISDALE. Allow me ; I do not often address the House, and I must say this, and I wish to say it to both sides of the House : there can be nothing more deplorable—and I say it individually and I wish other members would act on their individuality—there can be nothing more deplorable than this system of objecting by hon. gentlemen on either side of the House. I may say here to-night, and I hope it will not be considered that I am lecturing the House, for I do not wish to, but what has occurred in the chamber of this House to-night is such that we ought to consider on both sides whether we cannot get a better state of things, and conduct the fights which we must have in a party sense, more in the lines of argument and discussion, than to exhibit so much feeling about it. Do let us get down to business and get through. The hon. gentleman who interrupted me somewhat put me out, but I do not believe he intended it. I say then, that in this way the remarks of the hon. gentleman looked like a challenge for discussion. Now, there is the dilemma. Ought we on our side of the House to be fairly blamed for an advantage, if you call it such? Is it not a legitimate and proper one, when in the inception of the arrangement the only reservation was for the broadest and fullest discussion? It is true, as it seems to me, that by the motion of the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins) the discussion has been enlarged. Now, a gentleman of the well known knowledge of parliamentary practice of the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright)—and on both sides of the House it is conceded there is none better skilled, so far as I heard, in this Parliament or in few other Parliaments—when that hon. gentleman deliberately takes his choice of the time of moving his motion, ought he be so harsh in considering it a breach of faith. But is it a breach of faith? Could it, and ought it not be fairly treated, as if he of his own choice took the position to challenge the discussion, and to leave it open fairly for us to accept the challenge. It seems to me that is the difficulty of the position. If he had not done so, if he had not voluntarily and of his own will done so, then, undoubtedly, I should say that we should not have taken any advantage, if it is an advantage. Now, is it an advantage after all? Are the Opposition prepared to say that they will not allow us to move any amendment we please that will broaden the discussion? This, it seems to me, is a fair statement of the difficulties. How are we to solve them? Let me say once more, and lastly, for I do not wish to detain the House, that it was very unfortunate indeed that the hon. gentlemen upon that side of the House should have used these threats which they did. It made a bad impresssion upon my temper and upon my feelings as a man. I want to say that I do not like to hear such threats. The Government side of the House control it, and they have the majority and they must take the responsibility. It is commendable that we should be patient, but it is beyond human nature to be patient if all the time threats of this kind are to be made. I will mention a notable instance of this. The other day the majority declined to adjourn over Dominion Day, and I see in a large portion of the Liberal press, especially in my part of the Province of Ontario, where we are accused of being ultra-loyal, that we are held responsible for it, although it was a majority of the other side of the House which voted that we should sit on Dominion Day. Now, here in the same way, when this unfortunate occurrence arose, some one immediately got angry about it, and they dared us on this side of the House, and we are forced into such a position by the temper of the discussion in the House that we cannot very well back down, even if we felt like it. We have to appeal to the Rules of the House now, and I see that according to the Rules of the House the fault is on the part of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright).

Some hon. MEMBERS. No ; no.

Mr. TISDALE. It so appears to our side of the House, because he took the wrong time to move his motion. Is it driving the argument too far to say that, when the hon. gentleman had his own choice, and of his own volition took the position which caused this discussion to arise? He moved his amendment in the manner in which he did, of his own choice, and if he choose to make his motion at that time, the Rules of the House say that this amendment is in order.

Mr. CASEY. I think the hon. Minister o Finance might properly say: "Save me from some of my apologists." The hon. gentleman who has just sat down began with the apparent intention of pouring oil upon the troubled waters; he had no doubt an honest intention to do so, but he has said more unkind things about his own friends than were said even on this side of the House. He has put them in a very much worse position than they were in before. Even my excitable friend, the worthy Boanerges from Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), with his loud challenges inside and outside of the House and his violent muscular exercise, though he might have appeared a more disturbing element in the debate than my smooth-voiced friend from Norfolk, did not contribute so much to the unpleasantness of the debate as the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. He says that my hon. friend from South Oxford, though an old parliamentarian, withdrew his motion at a time when he was assured by the hon. Minister of Finance that to go on with it would be injurious to the public interest. My hon. friend from South Norfolk says that as old a parliamentarian as my hon. friend from South Oxford ought to have known better than that; he ought to have known better than to withdraw his motion without getting something positively binding upon the hon. Minister of Finance from which he could not subsequently back out. That is a very rough thing for him to say about his own leader, the hon. Minister of Finance—a very unkind thing. I hope his having said it will not cause any breach of the pleasant relations which I suppose have heretofore existed between the two hon. gentlemen. But I am sure nothing so unkind has been said on this side of the House as that an old parliamentarian like my hon. friend from South Oxford should have known the hon. Minister of Finance better than to make any such loose arrangement with him. I think he will know better than to make any such loose arrangement with him. in future. But the hon. gentleman says that my hon. friend from South Oxford had his choice of making his motion now or on some other occasion when it could not be amended, and he asks why he choose this occasion. According to the Rules of the House, he says, my hon. friend from South Oxford is to blame for the unpleasantness which has arisen, because he chose a time to put his motion when that motion could be amended. Why did he choose that time, Mr. Speaker? Because he had the word, the positive undertaking of the hon. Minister of Finance, that if he chose to postpone that motion to this time he should be put back just in the same position he would have been in if he had gone on with it at the time it was first proposed. It is absurd to say, as my hon. friend from Montreal Centre did, as the hon. member for South Norfolk did, and as the hon. Minister of Finance himself did, that the only question was one of free discussion. Why, Sir, without any promise on their part at all we could have had as free discussion as is necessary on this motion, whether it were moved now or on going into Committee on Ways and Means. The essence of the thing promised was, that my hon. friend from South Oxford should be in the same position in every respect as he would be in if the House were going into Committee on Ways and Means, and that his amendment should not be amended, even if it were put at a stage of the proceedings when, according to the Rules of the House, an amendment was possible. My hon. friend from South Oxford is undoubtedly an old parliamentarian, and he is such an old parliamentarian that the hon. Minister of Finance cannot for one moment believe, whatever he may profess to believe, that my hon. friend would have withdrawn his motion on that occasion if he had suspected that it would be amended upon his moving it at a subsequent stage. That was one of the vital conditions on which the motion was withdrawn. That vital condition has been violated. My. hon. friend from South Norfolk states that it was not known to that side of the House that my hon. friend from South Oxford would move his amendment at this stage—that he had his choice to move it now or some other time, and had to take his chances. But, Sir, the elaborate motion in amendment to the amendment which has been laid before the House bears signs of deliberate and long preparation, of boiling down, of careful construction to frame the most plausible motion that could possibly be put from that side of the House. It was known that the amendment of my hon. friend from South Oxford was going to be moved, and it was known that my hon. friend did not expect any amendment to his motion. But the mine was laid, and in due course it has been sprung; and it was evidently intended for some time to be sprung, because the motion bears evident traces of having been prepared for the hon. gentleman who moved it. Now, the hon. member for South Norfolk asks if it is an advantage to us not to have an amendment to the amendment? He cannot doubt it being an advantage. Of course it is an advantage to the Opposition to be able to take a vote upon an issue put in their own words. That is the reason why the privilege of moving an amendment, which cannot be amended, on going into Ways and Means or Supply, has been given. That is the advantage which was intended to be given to the Opposition, but which, by a subterfuge, has been taken from them. The hon. gentleman says this amendment to the amendment may be an advantage. If so, is it a legitimate advantage? Of course it would be a legitimate advantage if my hon. friend had now moved his amendment for the first time. But, after that amendment has been withdrawn—or rather, virtually postponed, for it was never withdrawn, except as a matter of form—on a distinct understanding between the two sides of the House, I say it is not a legitimate advantage. It is an advantage obtained by means which cannot be characterised in parliamentary language. I do not like to use unnecessarily strong language in Parliament; but, unfortunately, some things are done in Parliament which cannot be characterised in parliamentary language, and I think this is one of them. But perhaps we may be unduly blaming the hon. Minister of Finance in this respect after all. There is a disease which affects the memory—I forget its medical name, but it is called loss, or slipperiness, or laxity, or feebleness of the

memory—and I am afraid, from our long experience of the hon. Finance Minister in this House, that he must be afflicted with that disease, for this is not by any means the first time that we have found his recollection of what has passed within a few days previous different from that of some other members—different even from the records in *Hansard*. I have had occasion, more than once, to correct this defect of his memory from the pages of *Hansard*, and it may be that it is a constitutional disease which affects the hon. Minister, and that we should not blame him for that which he cannot help. It may be that his memory has its moments of weakness, as well as his volition. It may have hours of weakness, for all we can tell, and we may not be right in blaming the poor man for a constitutional defect which it is beyond his power to cure. There is a gentleman under examination before a certain tribunal in this city at the present time who seems to be afflicted with the same disease. It is not quite parliamentary, I suppose, to refer to proceedings in Committee before they are reported to this House, although the proceedings in that Committee are fully reported in the press, and for that reason I will not further carry out the comparison between the memory of the hon. Minister of Finance and that of Nick Connolly, which I would like otherwise to institute. I hope, however, that by a judicious course of treatment the hon. Minister of Finance may be enabled to recall his memory, and those sentiments in matters of agreement and honour between gentlemen which generally accompany a good memory. My hon. friend from Centre Montreal has tried to raise the ire of members who do not form part of the Cabinet by endeavouring to make them believe that we said there were no gentlemen on that side of the House. That was never said, by word or implication. We have attaked the conduct of the Government and its mouthpiece, on this occasion the Minister of Finance, but we have made no attack on hon. members on that side who do not belong to the Cabinet, for the simple reason that we do not believe they were privy to this thing. We believe that this was done solely by the Minister of Finance and his associates, who did not take the members on the back benches into their confidence. Probably if they had done so they would not have taken the course they have.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I do not think that the hon. gentleman who spoke last mended matters very much, and I think that in the beginning of his remarks he entirely misrepresented what was said by the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale). However, that is a matter of comparativly little importance. I was not present at the beginning of the discussion, and did not hear the angry language which, I am told, was used on both sides, and therefere, perhaps, I am in a better position to offer an opinion as to what should be done than if I had had my feelings aroused by a discussion, which I think I am justified in saying those who took part in it will, to a great extent, or at least to some extent, on cooler consideration, regret. I was not present either when the discussion took place upon the motion to go into Committee of Ways and Means, out of which all this trouble has arisen. Now, I must say, for my part, I should be very sorry if, by the course now taken, the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford is not to be voted upon, because I, for one, am very anxious to record my vote against it. It is just the one motion against which I desire to record my opinion. But apart from that, viewing the matter calmly and coolly as I can, not having had my feelings aroused by any angry words used in the course of the discussion, I do think, if there is a practicable way by which the hon. member for South Oxford can be replaced as nearly as possible in the same position as that in which he stood when he agreed to withdraw his resolution, that course should be adopted. I think that that can be done by a withdrawal of both resolutions, so that on a future occasion the hon. member for South Oxford will not be precluded putting the motion, against which I am anxious to have an opportunity of recording my vote. This discussion is one we must regret. It is one which certainly will not give the young members of this House any very exalted idea of the dignity of our proceedings. I do not remember in my experience of ever having heard a discussion, so far as I did hear it, in which so violent accusations, couched in so virulent language, were hurled across the House. Hitherto we have carried on our debates, I must say, in a manner creditable to us as a deliberative body, and in a manner which I have always regarded with great satisfaction. I am as firmly convinced as ever in my opinion with regard to the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite on this trade question, but that does not prevent me saying on this occasion this much, that it is but fair to the hon. member for South Oxford that, under a fair carrying out of the arrangement arrived at, he should not be precluded from putting his motion to the House in the way he proposed.

Mr. STAIRS. I agree to a very considerable extent with what has been said by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, but I wish to point out to the House that, even if there were anything in the contention urged by hon. gentlemen opposite this evening, which I do not admit, they have put it altogether out of the power of the Government to make any concession whatever.

Mr. LANDERKIN. They have a string around your neck.

Mr. STAIRS. I am entited to my opinion, and I hold that hon. gentlemen opposite have adopted such a tone in bringing this matter to the attention of the House that it is utterly impossible for hon. members on this side, even if there were anything in the contention of hon. gentlemen opposite, to allow themselves to be bullied by those hon. gentlemen. As it does not seem likely that to continue the discussion of this question will result in any good, I propose to continue the debate on the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford and the sub-amendment thereto.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There has been a point of order taken, and the hon. gentleman cannot proceed until that point is decided.

Mr. BOWELL. What is the point of order?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). It is that the amendment proposed is proposed in breach of the agreement which had been come to across the House.

Mr. STAIRS. As I understand, there was no formal point of order raised on this question by the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. BOWELL. Nor informal either.

Mr. STAIRS. If you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, say I am not out of order, I propose to go on with my remarks.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not understand that there was any point of order raised. The only question raised was that raised by the leader of the Opposition as to the understanding arrived at; and there being no point of order raised, the debate can go on.

Mr. STAIRS. I was saying when I was interrupted, that I proposed to continue the discussion and refer to one or two important subjects that have already been referred to by hon. gentlemen opposite in this debate. Some remarks were made by the hon. member for South Oxford respecting the Intercolonial Railway which require consideration, and I will also refer to a question which will, I hope, have a good effect on the debate, as it deals with that sweet subject, sugar. I also propose to make some remarks on the subject of unrestricted reciprocity. With the permission of the House, I will deal first with the question of sugar. I have to refer to some of the assertions which have been made, not only by hon. gentlemen opposite during the course of the debate, but also respecting the encouragement of the sugar refining industry in this country since 1879. It has been asserted by many speakers on the Opposition side that the refiners of the Dominion have made very large sums of money in consequence of the policy introduced by hon. gentlemen on this side in 1879, and I desire to point out that the way in which this question has been treated by hon. gentlemen opposite and their newspapers is very much exaggerated and is devoid of truth. A paper published in the city of Halifax and supporting hon. gentlemen opposite states that the shareholders in a certain sugar refinery there, which commenced with a share capital of $350,000, paid only one dividend, and that the whole of that capital was lost, and as, since that work was reorganized and put on a sound basis, it has not been remarkably profitable, it proves refining has not been the bonanza hon. gentlemen opposite have endeavoured to make out. The late tariff was introduced in 1886, when the polariscopic test was adopted, in order that the duty on sugar might be arranged in the most satisfactory way, not only to the country generally but to the importers who were engaged in bringing sugar into this country, and as far as I have heard there has not been any complaint as to the working of this tariff since it was introduced and was put in operation by my hon. friend the Minister of Customs. I was very much interested in the introduction of the polariscopic test, as it affected the grading of the sugar duties. There was considerable difficulty before on the *ad valorem* basis, which it was plain was injurious to the importers in Halifax and the Maritime Provinces generally, and had a tendency to injure the West Indian trade. That difficulty has passed away, and the business has been worked satisfactorily to all concerned since the polariscopic test was introduced. It is not correct to state that the duty on raw sugar under the late tariff was of advantage to the refiners. It was not of the slightest benefit to the sugar refining industry, and I am very much pleased that the duty has been taken off this session. A charge has been made by some of the newspapers supporting some of the hon. gentlemen opposite that the Conservatives have changed their base and the policy they adopted in 1879 by taking off the duty on sugar, which is a raw material. It is not so; the change is entirely in accord with the policy which was adopted in 1879. It has been said that the Conservatives are weakening on their protective policy. This I deny, and I say that taking off the duty on raw sugar no more shows a tendency to let-up on that policy than taking off the duty on tea and coffee, or any other article which is not produced in this country, and on which the duty was levied for revenue purposes altogether. I shall have to refer to some statements made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and afterwards to some of the statements made by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), and I think, when doing so, I shall reply to almost everything said by hon. gentlemen on the other side about sugar. I am certain that I shall be able to put the case of the Government and of the Liberal Conservative party in such a position that hon. gentlemen opposite will not dare to attack the figures I will put before the House or the conclusions I draw from them. Before going into my argument, it is right to explain that, when I use the words "the late tariff" I apply that to the polariscopic tariff which was in force from 1886 to the 23rd June last, and when I speak of "the new tariff" I mean the resolutions introduced by the Minister of Finance on the 23rd June. As I have already hinted, the Liberal Conservative party have to complain of the unfair and unjust criticisms which have been made upon the late tariff since it has been in operation. Two questions have been invariably mixed up. The public have been led to believe that the increased price of sugar under the late tariff, which was due to the tax which was placed upon sugar for revenue purposes only, was due to the protective policy of the Government. That is not the case. Anyone who is at all conversant with the sugar interest knows that the cost of granulated sugar was advanced under the late tariff, by the revenue collected from the raw sugar, about 2 cents a pound. Was that of any benefit to the refiners, or were they to blame for it? Suppose a duty were to be placed for revenue purposes on raw cotton, if the finances of the country were in such a condition as to require it, of 3 cents a pound, and possibly the duty on manufactured cotton increased in proportion, would the manufacturers of cotton be blamable for the increased price? It would be just as fair, in that case, for the Opposition newspapers to charge the manufacturers of cotton with being responsible for the increased price, because a revenue tax had been put on the raw material, as for them to charge, as they have done, the sugar refiners for the increase in the price of sugar in the past. When the duty was taken off raw sugar it would have been imagined that the Opposition speakers would not have attempted these tricks again. Perhaps I must withdraw that expression, and I will say that they would not have attempted this criticism again. I was astonished, however, to find that the hon. member for South Oxford, in his speech a few nights ago, made a most astounding statement, and, that there may be no doubt about it, I will read it to the House. Perhaps I should explain first that the Minister of Finance claimed

that the reduction in the duties on raw sugar would amount to $3,500,000—in other words, this sum which had been previously taken from the consumers of sugar in Canada was, under the resolution which he proposed, to be left in the pockets of those consumers. Now, with reference to that, the member for South Oxford said:

"The Government propose to present $2,000,000 of this $3,500,000 taken off the duty on raw sugar to their friends, Drummond & Co."

I am sorry the member for South Oxford is not present, because he made in this instance such an astounding statement that I really do not know whether to believe that he was mistaken or not. I cannot understand that a gentleman of his knowledge of finance and of political economy, could have had the assurance to make such a statement to an intelligent body like the House of Commons of Canada. The hon. gentleman admits that the people of Canada are going to save $3,500,000 in the duty on raw sugar. I am not considering the duties which are being substituted, to a certain extent, to make this up. I am considering at the present time the question of the saving of the duty on sugar. He admits that the people of Canada are going to save $3,500,000, owing to the duties having been taken off raw sugar, and I want every hon. gentleman present to notice that of that $3,500,000 he says that the Government propose to present $2,000,000 to their friends, Drummond & Co. Sir, I repeat such a statement is not worthy of that hon. gentleman. His intimate knowledge of political economy and of finance obliges me to feel that he could not have been mistaken, and as every statement of his will naturally be accepted by his party organs and supporters without hesitation, it should make him especially careful not to make such statements to the House and to the country, and it is my duty this evening to contradict him most emphatically. Now, I want the House to understand that I am not referring now, as the member for South Oxford was not referring when he made that statement, to the increased price owing to the $\frac{8}{10}$ of a cent per pound of protection which the Minister of Finance proposed to make in his resolution, but to the $2,000,000 out of $3,500,000 which he distinctly stated were to be presented to Drummond & Co. I think I would be justified, and this House would be justified, in taking an expression of opinion upon such an important question from that hon. gentleman, as being the opinion of his party. He speaks as the authorised exponent of his party on an important question and in a debate like this on the Budget, and I shall consider it so, unless any of his supporters in the course of this debate disclaims it as being the statement and the opinion of his party. I point out now that protection existed under the old tariff; as great a protection, in fact a greater, existed under the old tariff than exists under the new tariff, as I will show more clearly later on. But not to complicate the argument upon the direct point that I am now trying to explain to the House, I want the statement of the member for South Oxford about the $2,000,000 to be so clear that there can be no question on the subject, and I want it to be shown in its proper light before the country. I am not going to complicate this particular argument with the argument as to whether the relative protection that exists under the new tariff is greater than under the late tariff, or whether the protection that does exist under the present tariff increases the cost of sugar to the consumer, as I propose dealing with these two points later on. Let us see now just how the question stands in relation to this $2,000,000 out of the $3,500,000. Now, then, under the late tariff it cannot be disputed that the $3,500,000 which was paid into the public treasury by the consumers of sugar will not be paid into it under the tariff proposed a few nights ago; in other words, that $3,500,000 remains in the pockets of the consumers of sugar in Canada. Under the late tariff neither the consumers of sugar nor the refiners had that $3,500,000, but the public treasury had it; under the new tariff neither the refiners nor the public treasury have it, but the consumers have it, and no power on earth under the new tariff can take one cent of it from them. The consumers have it and they will keep it. To illustrate the absurdity of the hon. gentleman's contention in another way: I may say, it is in effect now said, that a certain $2,000,000 out of the $3,500,000, which it is admitted the refiners could not take when collected for the public treasury under a heavy revenue tax on sugar, is going to be grabbed by them, when the entire tax under which it was collected has been removed and every cent of it remains in the pockets of the consumers. If we are to understand the hon. member for South Oxford according to what his language clearly implies, he means that somehow or other that $2,000,000 is going to be stolen out of the pockets of the consumers of sugar in Canada by Drummond & Co. I would like to ask how that can be. No matter what opinion hon. members opposite may entertain of the refiners of Canada, I am confident they will not claim they are either robbers or pickpockets. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he knows—not to mention the Hon. Mr. Drummond, who is a wicked Tory—that among his political friends in Halifax is the Hon. Robert Boak, President of the Legislative Council in Nova Scotia, a life-long Liberal, both in Dominion and local politics, who is president of the Nova Scotia refinery, and does he consider that this gentleman is going about in the future to pick the pockets of the consumers of sugar in Canada? Such a statement is so absurd that it hardly needs refutation. And just at this point it is not amiss to ask the hon. gentleman—I only wish he were here—whether he will say that the hon. gentleman whom I have referred to is a very heavy contributor to the election fund of the Conservative party. Surely, the hon member did not mean this; and if he did not mean that the money was positively to be taken out of the pockets of the people, and as there is no other way these desperate refiners could get hold of this $2,000,000, the hon. member must admit now that he was mistaken in the way he made his charge, and in the way in which the country understood it, and if he does not so admit it he stands convicted of intentionally misleading the House and the public. The statement of the hon. gentleman is so absurd that it hardly needed refutation, but it runs parallel with so many other statements made by the hon. gentlemen opposite and their friends on the platform that I thought it better to make a distinct contradiction of it, so that there could be no question about it in the future; and I declare now that not one cent of this duty which has been remitted by the resolution of the Minister of Finance on the 23rd of June

can be taken from the consumers of sugar in Canada. Now, Sir, I shall have something to say of the charge which the hon. gentleman made very distinctly, if my recollection serves me aright, that the refiners of Canada were going to take the whole of the $\frac{5}{100}$ of a cent per pound of the duty on refined sugar away from the consumers of sugar in Canada, a little later on in connection with the remarks of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson). Now, the hon. member for Brant had a good deal to say upon the question of sugar. He knows a good deal about it. I remember that in previous years I had the pleasure of discussing this subject in the House. I am only sorry the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) is not in his seat to-night, because the statements he made were so absurd, and the conclusions at which he arrived so monstrous, that I am confident when he gets the real facts of the case—and he will do it if he takes the trouble to read what I say—he will freely admit that in discussing this question he came to the House without any knowledge of the subject he was going to discuss. The hon. member for Brant criticised pretty freely the statement of the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) respecting sugar under No. 14 Dutch standard. He overlooked the fact—it is a little matter, but I will mention it in passing—that under this tariff, and under the late tariff, that it is not sugar under No. 14 that is coming in free, but No. 14 and under, which makes a little difference. The hon. gentleman had a good deal to say about the statement that had been made by the hon. member for Albert in connection with the possibility of sugars of 14 Dutch standard being used in ordinary consumption, and he criticised very closely his argument, and stated that the hon. member for Albert had claimed that the great proportion of sugar to be used by the people is sugar of this class, under No. 14 Dutch standard. I desire to point out that I am convinced that sugars of No. 14 Dutch standard and under can be had at very reasonable prices, and that these pure and wholesome sugars may come into Canada and enter into consumption without paying any duty whatever. I am speaking now of what I know. But the hon. member for Albert did not say the people of Canada would use a very large proportion of this sugar. What that hon. gentleman said was, that the price at which these sugars could be imported, and the possibility of bringing them in duty free, would prevent the refiners ever advancing the prices of refined sugar beyond a fair rate. Or, in other words, that if the refiners ever became extortionate in asking high prices for refined sugars, sugars of the class referred to would come in and prices would have to come down. That was the argument, and that alone, which the hon. member for Albert based on these facts in connection with sugars of No. 14 Dutch standard and under. The hon. member for Brant also said that the Minister of Finance cannot claim much credit if he is going to force the people to use sugar under No. 14. The hon. member must know that the Minister of Finance never said, and never claimed, anything of the kind. It never entered into his head, I dare say. The only argument the Minister could have thought of on the subject, and I do not remember whether he said anything at all, would simply be the argument presented to the House by the hon. member for Albert, namely, that the possibility of the sugars referred to coming in free would prevent the price of refined sugar being put up too high. The next statement made by the hon. member for Brant to which I wish to refer is one that proved most clearly that he had no knowledge whatever of the subject on which he spoke. He not only did not know the facts, but he did not know where to go for his knowledge, which I dare say is just as bad. He entered into a very elaborate calculation to show what was the difference in the price of raw sugar and refined sugar for the twelve months from July 1, 1889, to June 30, 1890. He told the House where he got his figures. He told the House, if I remember rightly, that he got the prices of refined sugar from the price-list published in the Montreal *Journal of Commerce*, and that he got his prices of raw sugar from the tables presented to this House by the Minister of Finance. The hon. gentleman did not go to the right place to get his facts. I can show that his facts were wrong, and will point out some of the things the hon. member for Brant left out of the calculation altogether, when he gave the figures of the Minister of Finance as the cost of the raw sugar used by the refiners during that period. I want the House to bear in mind the hon. gentleman presumed to give the cost of raw sugar, and yet he gave figures which he must have known did not take into consideration at all the freight paid on sugar landed in Canada, and the insurance which was paid on the sugar as well—two very important items. I can hardly understand how an hon. gentleman with the commercial knowledge which the hon. member for South Brant possesses should have made such a slip when he came down to the House and omitted these items. Some hon. gentleman may say that the freights are not very high. If the House will bear in mind that a considerable quantity of the sugar brought into Canada comes from the East, from the Phillipine Islands, on which very high freight is paid, from $6 to $8 a ton, and the insurance often runs as high as 5 per cent., hon. members will find that these are very important elements in the calculation when added together; but no matter whether the amounts for freight or insurance are small or great, they should be added to the cost of sugar to the refiner. Then the hon. gentleman—and this is a point with which the hon. member might not be expected to be so intimate—was mistaken in his view of making up the average selling price of refined sugar in Canada at that time, and in the proportion he took of granulated and yellow sugars. My recollection is, that he said the consumption of sugar in Canada was half granulated and half yellow. The proportion is more like one-third granulated and two-thirds yellow, and even that, if anything, overestimates the quantity of granulated sugar. The selling price he arrived at was absurd. To show its fallacy, I will first give the figures of the hon. gentleman, and next I will give figures, not estimated, but the real results of my own knowledge. The hon. gentleman estimated that the refiners received, in the twelve months to which I have referred, an average price of $6.64 per 100 lbs. for their sugars, and the hon. gentleman took the average cost of raw sugars to the refiners during that period as $4.40 per 100 lbs., a difference of $2.24, which he said went into the pockets of the refiners of Canada. I have said I will give the exact figures. I have not the figures for one year, but I have them for a period of two years which

include the twelve months to which the hon. gentleman referred, and as the average is spread over a longer time it will be a more correct one. The absolute cost of the raw sugars which were used in a certain refinery of Canada, in the two years from 1st January, 1889, to 1st January, 1891, was $5.14 per 100 lbs., and the average net price which the refiners received in that time for these sugars was $5.74 per 100 lbs., being a difference of 60 cents per 100 lbs., instead of a difference of $2.24, as was asserted by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) a few nights ago. That 60 cents per 100 lbs. covered all the expenses of refining, the loss in weight, all the interest on the plant, and included the profit which was made by the refiners; and if it is looked at by any reasonable man, even without any knowledge of refining, he can see there could not have been any such large profit in refining during the two years commencing the 1st January, 1889, and ending 1st January, 1891. Let us see how this difference works out, as applied to the quantity of sugar consumed in Canada. The hon. gentleman took the cost of the sugar in the time specified as $4.40 per 100 lbs., but it should have been $5.14 per 100 lbs., a difference of 74 cents per 100 lbs. by which he under-estimated the cost of the raw sugar, or upon the quantity which was consumed in Canada that year of 200,000,000 lbs., a sum of $1,484,000. In that calculation of raw sugar he was only out $1,484,000, therefore. Now let us see how much he is out in the returns the refiners got. He estimated that the refiners received, and that the people had to pay $6.64 per 100 lbs., but the real price was $5.74 per 100 lbs., or a difference of 90 cents; so that he only over-estimated the price that the refiners got by 90 cents per 100 lbs.; or upon the 200,000,000 lbs. consumed in Canada he over-estimated to the extent of $1,800,000; or to put it in another way, the hon. gentleman claimed that the difference between the cost of the raw sugar and the price of the refined sugar was $2.24, instead of 60 cents per 100 lbs., which is the correct figure. The hon. gentleman was $1.64 per 100 lbs. out, only 350 per cent. in that calculation, and on the weight of sugar consumed in Canada, alluded to before, he was only $3,280,000 out, which he said the refiners of Canada took more than really they did. A little later on I will show the effects these figures which I have given have upon the argument, whether the refiners of Canada during the past two years took any advantage of the protective tariff, as far as advancing the price of sugar is concerned—in other words, whether the price of refined sugar in Canada during the past few years had been increased by the protective tariff. Not only was the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) out in these figures which he gave, but he was also very much out when he came to discuss the relative protection under the late and under the new tariff. The Minister of Finance stated that he estimated the protection given by the old tariff at 1 cent per pound —meaning the protection that existed under the tariff in force down to the afternoon the resolutions were moved in this House—and that the new tariff gave a duty of $\frac{8}{10}$ of a cent per pound, or a protection of 80 cents per 100 lbs. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) stated that in comparing the relative protection which existed in these tariffs he took the *ad valorem* protection, and not the specific. I think his basis of calculation was wrong. I consider that in calculating the rate of protection which the tariff gives, as far as it affects the interest of the refiner, the specific protection is more fair than the *ad valorem*. The hon. gentleman repeats the Minister of Finance's statement, that the protection under the old tariff was $1 per 100 lbs., but he cannot see how a dollar per 100 lbs. is more than 80 cents per 100 lbs. Now, whether you take this specific protection, or whether you take the *ad valorem* protection, I claim that a dollar must be more than 80 cents. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) said that the hon. Minister of Finance stated that the protection under the old tariff was 1 cent per pound. He then went on and told that the prices in the United States have fallen from 6 cents to 4 cents for granulated sugar, and the refiner therefore had a protection of 1 cent as against 6 cents. I can show that the hon. gentleman's premises are wrong here. When the hon. Minister of Finance said the protection was 1 cent per pound he spoke of the protection which existed from the date the United States duties were taken off, namely, from 1st April, 1891, to the afternoon the resolutions were proposed. He did not speak of the protection on American granulated sugar that existed before the United States duty was taken off. This cannot be disputed, and the figures he gave were as nearly correct as possible. He put it at 1 cent per pound, or a dollar per 100 lbs., and the calculations of the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) made it 96 cents per 100 lbs. The House will see that these figures are practically the same. As I said before, I believe the specific duty is the more correct way, but whichever be the correct way, the hon. member for Brant, and any other hon. member in this House to-night, must admit that the premises must be correct or the calculations will be worthless. The figures upon which the calculations are based must be correct or the conclusions arrived at are worthless; and the premises of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) were altogether incorrect. I will now take the *ad valorem* basis to see how the figures work out. That is the basis which the hon. gentleman took himself. I will prove the hon. gentleman is all wrong, and that his calculations are misleading and his premises absurd. To find the *ad valorem* protection, a specific or combined specific and *ad valorem* duty would give the protection calculated on the cost of the sugar to the purchaser, and the correct duty taken. That is an axiom that cannot be denied. The hon. member for Brant was out in his calculation in two ways. He was out first in regard to the cost of sugar to the Canadian buyer at the time the United States tariff was in force. He said it was 6 cents per pound, and he based his *ad valorem* calculation of the protection on that. He forgot altogether to tell the House that when the home price of sugar in the United States was 6 cents per pound the Canadian buyer would only pay a fraction under $3\frac{6}{10}$ cents per pound, owing to the American drawback. The difference is $2\frac{4}{10}$ cents per pound, the Canadian buyer only paying $3\frac{6}{10}$ cents per pound, and not 6 cents. The hon. member should have calculated the percentage on $3\frac{6}{10}$ cents per pound, and not 6 cents, as he did. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member was also astray in assuming that the protection would have been 1 cent per pound when the home price of granulated was 6 cents in the

United States. I trust I am making myself clear to the House. The question is a little involved, I am afraid, and is not interesting; but I crave the indulgence of the House, because I believe that the change which has been made in the duties on sugar by these resolutions is very important to the country, and it is well that the facts should be clearly and definitely stated to the House and the country. I will just say, then, that the hon. member for South Brant was astray in arguing as if the protection would have been 1 cent a pound when the home price of granulated sugar in the United States was 6 cents a pound under the late American tariff. He knew that at that price the Canadian duty would have been $3\frac{6}{10}$ cents a pound on granulated, and that the protection, instead of being 1 cent a pound, was about $1\frac{6}{10}$ cents a pound. And that when he calculated the *ad valorem* protection which the late tariff gave on the price of 6 cents a pound, he should have taken the specific protection at $1\frac{6}{10}$ cents and not at 1 cent a pound, which was given by the hon. Minister of Finance as applying to the time when the American duties on sugar had been repealed. I repeat, then, that he is mistaken on two things: first, on the price of the sugar which he took to calculate the *ad valorem* protection, and second, on the protection which existed under the circumstances he mentioned. Now, I want to make myself quite clear on this point. The hon. gentleman was wrong to have reduced the protection to an *ad valorem* basis; but if this was to be done when he showed the comparative rates of *ad valorem* protection, given specific and *ad valorem* duties would give, he should have done so on prices of sugar ruling at the same time. Either the protection under the late tariff must be brought down to the present time and calculated on the price of sugar ruling now, or the protection under the new tariff must be put back to the previous time and calculated on the price of sugar then prevailing. Can anyone deny that this is the case? To make it clearer, I wish to point out that the issue between the hon. member for South Brant and myself is not the *ad valorem* protection which existed some months ago under the conditions then prevailing compared with the *ad valorem* protection now existing; that has no bearing on the question whatever; but the question now is what the *ad valorem* protection to the refiners would be to-day if the tariff had not been changed, compared with that existing under the new tariff. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for South Brant did not proceed on this principle, and therefore the figures he gave to the House are absurd. He must acknowledge this. There is no other basis on which you can make a comparison, and the hon. gentleman's basis was calculated to deceive the House and the country. I assert, and I defy contradiction, that on this principle of comparison which I lay down, and it is the only correct one, $\frac{6}{10}$ of a cent cannot be more than 1 cent.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I will. Just take your seat and I will prove it.

Mr. STAIRS. The hon. gentleman, in making the assertion, is equally absurd, and he can no more prove it than he can prove that white is black. I have now laid down the principles upon which the hon. member for South Brant should draw these comparisons. I will work out the details of the comparisons to show how much the hon. gentleman was out in his percentages. He took the protection under the new tariff as $\frac{6}{10}$ of a cent a pound on sugar costing 4 cents as being equal to 20 per cent., and that is right enough: but under the late tariff he took the protection to be $16\frac{2}{3}$ per cent. on 6 cents a pound. On the principle I lay down, his argument was all wrong, because the sugar did not cost 6 cents a pound; it only costs $3\frac{6}{10}$ cents a pound; and the protection, instead of being $16\frac{2}{3}$ per cent. on 6 cents a pound, should be $27\frac{7}{11}$ per cent. on $3\frac{6}{10}$ cents a pound. Therefore, the hon. gentleman was out only to the extent of $7\frac{7}{11}$ per cent. If any hon. member chooses to work out the calculation to find out what the percentage would be upon granulated sugar costing 6 cents a pound, he will find that the protection would be 44 per cent. instead of $16\frac{2}{3}$ per cent. But I do not give these comparisons as having a great deal of bearing on the case. I only put them out to show that the hon. member for South Brant was entirely mistaken in the calculations he presented to this House a few nights ago. From what I have said every hon. gentleman can see that the *ad valorem* protection under the new tariff is not as great as it was under the old tariff, and, of course, all can see that the specific protection under the new tariff is not as great as it was under the old, because $\frac{6}{10}$ of a cent cannot be as much as one cent. But hon. members may say that this is not a practical question; the practical question they will say is, to what extent have the refiners taken advantage of the late tariff to add to the price of sugar? Now, this is a practical proposition; and if hon. gentlemen opposite can prove that under the protective policy manufactured sugar is increased in price by the duty, it is an argument against the policy; but if I can show in this case that it is not so, I shall be able to prove that the protective policy is advantageous: that the country had the cheap sugar and the benefit of manufacturing it in the country. In starting out, I may say I am going to prove beyond question from the prices of sugar existing in Canada to-day that the refiners are not taking advantage to the extent of 1 cent per 100 lbs. of that protection of 80 cents per 100 lbs. But before I go into the question of how the present tariff applies, I think it may not be amiss that I should show what was the state of affairs previous to the introduction of these resolutions. Now, I have stated as a fact, and it is well known, that the difference between the price of raw and refined sugar, in the period of two years to which I have referred, is only 60 cents per 100 lbs., and I point out that if the refiners took advantage of all the protection which existed under the late tariff, they must have sold refined sugar at least 1 cent per pound more than the raw cost. I repeat that if the refiners did take advantage of the whole protection which existed under the late tariff of 1 cent per pound, they must have sold refined sugar 1 cent per pound more than the raw cost. The hon. member for South Oxford claims that, under the new tariff, they would take advantage of the whole $\frac{6}{10}$ of a cent, and I presume it would be said on the other side that they would have taken advantage of the whole of the cent that then existed. To have taken advantage of the protection of 1 cent per pound, they must have sold the sugar at an advance of at least 1 cent per pound on the cost of the raw, if they were not to have had any profit.

The actual figures prove that the difference between the cost of raw and refined sugar during the two years of 1889-91 is only 60 cents per 100 lbs., proving clearly that at least they did not take advantage of any of the 1 cent per pound, for if it be claimed the $\frac{6}{10}$ advance was due to the protection, they made and sold the sugar for nothing. When I come to deal with the question of the tax that exists at present, I will show they did not take advantage of the protection existing under the new tariff at all. The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), in the course of his remarks, said that the calculations of the hon. member for Albert, with respect to the protection which exists under the new tariff, were very much involved. I deny that most emphatically, and am quite willing to leave to the House, if the calculations of the hon. member for Albert were involved, what must be said of the calculations of the hon. member for Brant. Now, the hon. member for Brant set out to prove that the refiners of Canada to-day were charging a great deal more for the sugar they refined than was being charged by the New York refiners at the same time. He stated that the New York and Boston prices about the date he spoke of, which is near enough for our calculation——

Mr. LANDERKIN. How much did they charge for rope?

Mr. STAIRS. I am not talking about rope, but no doubt hon. gentlemen opposite will be given rope enough to hang themselves. In the New York and Boston markets the price was $4.19 against the price in Canada of $4.50 per 100 lbs., or, in other words, our prices are, under the new tariff, 31 cents per 100 lbs. higher than they are in the markets of the United States. The hon. member for Brant admits they have not taken the whole 80 cents per 100 lbs., but he declared that what the hon. member for South Oxford stated was that the Minister of Finance has given them the power, if they agree among themselves, to take the whole of the 80 cents. I am a little in doubt whether the hon. member for Oxford qualified it in that way, he may have; but I will show that they have not taken anything, and the only way to prove that is to take the facts. In the first place, the net price of Canadian granulated sugar, at the time the hon. gentleman mentioned, was not $4.50. In the second place he took the prices of articles of different qualities in different places. Granulated sugar in the United States is not exactly the same thing as granulated sugar in Canada; and in making his calculations he made no allowance whatever for the difference. The price of granulated sugar was 4·50 cents in Montreal, less 2½ discount. That discount, it may be said, is not a great deal, but on a leading article like refined sugar it is a very large item, amounting to ⅛ of a cent per pound, and reduces the prices of Canadian granulated, about the date he mentioned, to 4⅜ cents net instead of 4½; and at that time the price on American granulated was 4¼, less the discount of 1 per cent., or 4·20 per 100 lbs. The hon. gentleman also compared sugars in different markets, and if he had taken that into account, he would have added 20 cents per 100 lbs. to the price of sugar in Montreal for the difference of carriage from New York to Montreal; and there was also a difference in quality, which he did not take into account, but for that I do not blame him, as he was not likely aware of the fact. The relative difference in values of granulated sugars made in New York and Montreal is 12½ cents per 100 lbs. If these items be taken into the calculation, it will be found that, instead of comparing 4·19 per 100 lbs. in New York with 4·50 per 100 lbs. in Montreal, as he said, 4·38 in Montreal compares with 4·52½ in New York, showing a difference in favour of Montreal of 14½ cents per 100 lbs. The hon. member for Brant stated that the increased prices which the refiners in Montreal were taking, as compared with the refiners in New York, was 30 cents per 100 lbs., which on 200,000,000 lbs. would make a difference of $600,000 more charged in Canada than in the United States for granulated sugar. Instead of that being the case, the real facts are that the difference in Montreal at that time was 14½ cents per 100 lbs. less than in New York, which, on 200,000,000 lbs., makes a saving of $290,000 by refining the sugar in Canada, besides which the people of Canada have the value of these industries. With reference to the great importance of these industries, I would refer hon. gentlemen opposite to the speech made by Hon. Mr. Jones in the session of 1876, referred to a few nights ago by the hon. member for Haldimand. I might give the House a comparison of the prices in Halifax and New York, and the comparison is a perfectly legitimate one. Take the New York price of 4·20 per 100 lbs. net and the difference in quality of 12½ cents per 100 lbs., and you have 4·32 as what New York sugar would be worth, if the quality were the same as the Canadian sugar, against a net price in Halifax of 4·25 at the date the hon. gentleman spoke of; a difference of 7½ cents per 100 lbs. in favour of Halifax, and in this calculation I have not taken into account the freight. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said the other night that yellow sugar was selling in Canada at 3⅝ per pound and 3$\frac{7}{16}$ in the United States. On June 26th, the price of yellow sugar in Halifax was 3⅜ to 3½ cents, as compared with 3$\frac{7}{16}$ in the United States. I do not propose to use the price of yellow sugars because they are an indefinite quantity, and you cannot say exactly what they are. There is another interesting calculation which might be made as to the relative cost of sugar to the Canadian consumer previous to 1879, and that which exists at present, and I think the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) made some slight comparison of this kind. Granulated sugar is selling in Halifax now at 20 lbs. for one dollar, and I am sure it will be admitted that that is a very low price, and I am told that in Hamilton it is selling at 22 lbs. for a dollar. In 1878, I am advised that the wholesale price of granulated sugar in Montreal was about 10 cents a pound, while on June 26th, 1891, it was only 4⅜ cents. The hon. member for North Norfolk stated that Cuba crystals in New York were worth 5 cents a pound, and compared that with the price in New York to-day of 3⅜ cents a pound. It would be dishonest for me to say that the figures I have given would be an entirely fair comparison, because I must deduct the duty on the granulated which was paid in 1878. The price of granulated sugar in Montreal, in 1878, was about 10 cents, and the duty, as near as I can estimate it, would be about 2½ cents, so that, if there were no duty on granulated sugar in

1878, it could have sold at about 7½ cents a pound. To-day, without any duty on the raw, it is selling at 4⅞ cents. But I will be told that the raw sugar was a good deal higher. According to the statement of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) Cuba crystals were worth about 5 cents a pound, in 1878, in New York, and that left a difference between Cuba crystals, which are a standard article, and the refined sugar of 2½ cents a pound, so that the granulated sugar could have been sold in Canada, if there had been no duty at that time, at an advance of 2½ cents on the price of Cuba crystals in New York. To-day Cuba crystals in New York are quoted at 3⅜ cents, while the granulated sugar is being sold in Montreal for 4⅝ cents, or only an advance of 1 cent a pound, as compared with 2½ cents in 1878, which I contend is a very favourable showing for the National Policy. There is another comparison which it may be interesting to give to the House. When the United States' duty was removed on the 1st April last, the Cuba crystals were worth in New York 3 cents a pound, and the price of granulated sugar was fixed by the New York refiners at 4¼ cents, and millions of pounds were sold at that price, making a difference of 1¼ cents a pound. When the duty was removed in Canada a few days ago, Cuba crystals were worth in Halifax 3¼ cents a pound, and granulated sugar was fixed by the refiners at 4¼ cents, or only a difference of ¾ cent per pound, so that there is a difference of ½ of a cent in favour of the Canadian refiners. I think I have taken up sufficient time in wearying the House on this sugar question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. STAIRS. I dare say it is a little wearisome to hon. gentlemen opposite, but I have always found that in any question facts are the best things to present to influence people, whether it be the public or the House, and I am sure that the facts I have given to the House to-night will have considerable influence with hon. members in enabling them to form a proper judgment on this question. I will now turn to another important question, and that is in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. In the remarks made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) he referred to the deficit in the working of the Intercolonial Railway and the Prince Edward Island Railway of $640,000 a year, and he claimed that this deficit was altogether a loss to the country. I wish to point out that a loss of this nature to the public treasury may not be a loss to the country. Before I go into that argument, it is but right for me to claim that I consider the whole of the Dominion is equally interested in the maintenance of the Intercolonial Railway. In the Maritime Provinces we sometimes hear that our friends in the west claim that the Intercolonial Railway was constructed and is run entirely in the interest of the Maritime Provinces. That is not the case. I claim that Ontario and Quebec derive as much benefit, and probably more, than the Maritime Provinces from the Intercolonial Railway. I was struck by some of the language used by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). He said, speaking of the deficit :

"I do not believe this dead loss we sustain is the cost of the maintenance of public works properly administered, but I believe it is the cost of maintaining a radically corrupt Government in power."

Now, this is pretty strong language, and I want to point out to the House the position in which the hon. member places himself when you take into account what he himself has said on this subject when he was in power. But before going into this I must say that to whatever extent the deficit in this road is caused by extravagance or corruption, to such an extent and to that extent only is such a deficit a loss to the country. On this side of the House we deny that the deficit in the receipts of the Intercolonial Railway is due to these causes. I hold that the experience of the hon. member for South Oxford when in power proves this to be the case. I wish to remind the House that the Mackenzie Government, of which the hon. member for South Oxford was a member, made every possible effort to make both ends meet in the management of the Intercolonial Railway. I need not go into the history of it. The very attempt which the Government then made to make both ends meet really resulted in the loss being greater than it was before. They drove business away from the road and it was years before it was got back again. Now, I desire to make quotations from the speeches of the hon. member for South Oxford in the years 1877 and 1878, as recorded in the *Hansard* of those years. In 1877, on page 139, I find the following remarks made by Mr. Tupper, now Sir Chas. Tupper, and the answers of Mr. Cartwright, the then Finance Minister when the Budget speech was being delivered :—

"Mr. TUPPER. What do you estimate the cost of working the railways above receipts?

"Mr. CARTWRIGHT. The present dead loss to us is, as near as I can recollect, about $550,000, including the cost of running the Prince Edward Island Railway, which will amount to above $100,000.

"Mr. TUPPER. You expect to reduce that by $250,000?

"Mr. CARTWRIGHT. By about that."

Then again, in 1878, the Minister of Finance, in the course of his Budget speech, said:

"For the purpose of working our Railway Department a sum of $750,000 will be required.

"Mr. MITCHELL. For railways?

"Mr. CARTWRIGHT. The probable loss on the working of railways is, as near as can be ascertained, $600,000 a year."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have read the context very carefully and I am convinced that when the member for South Oxford stated that the probable loss of working the railroad, as near as could be ascertained, would be $600,000 a year, he meant that would be the probable cost for many years to come. Now, we may be told that we had at that time a smaller railway system existing than at present. Let us admit that and let us see where that would lead the hon. gentleman. The only argument we can draw from the remarks of the hon. member for South Oxford a few nights ago, is that this present deficit is caused by corruption and nothing else. It means that or nothing at all. Now, I repeat that this deficit is not caused by corruption, but if it is caused by corruption, we may naturally conclude that it was also caused by corruption during the time the hon. member himself was in power. If it is not caused by corruption it is caused probably by other reasons, partly, say, by low rates, and, if so, the deficit is not in any sense a loss to the country, that

is in the broadest sense. I desire to submit to the House that if we were to put the rates up, it would entail a very much heavier loss to the country. The hon. gentlemen opposite put the rates up and it made things worse than they were before. Take the hon. gentleman's own experience. The business then carried on over the Intercolonial Railway was of such a nature that the raising of the rates had the effect of driving a large amount of the business from the road. I desire to submit to the House that not only has the loss which is incurred by maintenance to be taken into account, but the interest which the country has to bear on the capital employed in the construction of the Intercolonial Railway has also to be taken into account. You might adopt a policy which would be very detrimental to the interests of the country, you might drive traffic from the Intercolonial Railway and therefore not get the indirect advantages which now accrue to the country, and at the same time you would have to bear the whole cost of the interest. These are things which are worthy of consideration by hon. members on both sides of the House. Nova Scotia is able to claim that she was the first of the provinces now constituting the Dominion, to commence the construction of Government railways, and at that time it was never expected that these railways would pay fully the cost of maintenance. It was expected, though, that the indirect advantages would more than make up to the country any little loss that was sustained, and I believe this principle applies to the Intercolonial Railway as it is worked to-day. Now, I put this another way, and I will just ask, who is it that pays at present the deficit that is incurred in working the Intercolonial Railway? Is it not the people of Ontario, of Quebec, of Nova Scotia, of New Brunswick and of Prince Edward Island? Now suppose you adopt a policy of putting up the rates, to make matters square. Who would pay the deficit then? Exactly the same people. I am sure I am willing to consider any effort that will wipe out this deficit and make both ends meet; I would encourage to the fullest extent in the management anything that would tend to improve the condition of the Intercolonial Railway, while not affecting the business interest of the whole Dominion. If the contention of the hon. member for South Oxford is right, that corruption is at the bottom of this deficit, I claim that it was at the bottom of the deficit that occurred when his friends controlled the road; and if corruption is the cause, it must have been worse in his time than it is now, because the deficit on the road was as great then as it is to-day. But the language he employed the other night in reference to this deficit, I am sorry to say, approaches very nearly to other language which he is in the habit of employing, and is not worthy the position of the hon. gentleman in this House and in the country; it approaches very nearly to other language of the same character which has been heard in this House lately, language which is quoted throughout the length and breadth of the country—it approaches so nearly to it that it will not have any weight whatever, either with his own supporters or with the members on this side of the House. I would be quite as well justified in applying the same language to the deficits he referred to in the speeches of 1877 and 1878 from which I have quoted, and of charging against the Government of which he was a member that the loss then sustained was not caused by the maintenance of public works properly administered, but was caused by maintaining a radically corrupt Government in power, as he had of making such a charge against the present Government. We will give hon. gentlemen opposite the same treatment which they give us. I had intended to go into the question of unrestricted reciprocity, but I think the hour is so late I should defer my remarks to another opportunity.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. STAIRS. I was a little amused to hear the hon. member for Brant, in replying to the hon. member for Albert, dwell so fully and so strongly on the statement which he said the hon. member for Albert had made, that if we had reciprocity with the United States the Americans would take possession of our markets and destroy our manufactures, for from the beginning to the end of the speech of the hon. member for Albert there is not a reference to that matter. I was very much struck, indeed, also with a remark that fell from the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) during his speech, and it is well worth hearing coming from that hon. gentleman. An humble hon. member on the Government side of the House like myself might have fallen into that mistake, but it is surprising that the hon. member for South Oxford should have done so. The hon. member said: "I have never denied, and I do not deny it now, that the American consumer pays the duty likewise; but what the American consumer pays the Canadian producer loses." I think that opinion should go down for all time in some work on political economy. The hon. gentleman, in his speech, referred to the three leading objections which have been taken on this side of the House against the policy of the Opposition in regard to reciprocity. The first was discrimination against England; the second was that we would give up control of our own tariff; and the third was that under such a policy we never could produce sufficient revenue. It has been asserted on the other side of the House that the National Policy is a policy of discrimination against England. If it be a policy of discrimination against England, the present fiscal policy against England is one discriminating against Canada and her colonies. The position I take is, that Canada treats England as she does other countries, and we do it because England treats Canada in exactly the same way as she treats other countries. England cannot expect to be treated in any other way. My opinion is that it is in the interests of Canada, whenever it is possible, to give English manufacturers an advantage in our markets, it is only my own opinion as a manufacturer. This is a question which is a very broad question, and it is one on which a great deal may be said on both sides, but we totally deny the contention put forward by hon. gentlemen opposite that the National Policy discriminates against England. The policy that is propounded on the other side of the House, a policy of unrestricted reciprocity, no matter what form it may take, must discriminate most decidedly and unjustly against English manufactures. What is proposed? Take it in its mildest form, that each country is to control its own tariff, if unrestricted reciprocity is entered upon Canada is to

make its tariff and the United States is to make its tariff, and just so long as we impose any duty, even 5 per cent., against English goods, and allow American goods to come in free, to that extent do we discriminate against England. Hon. gentlemen cannot get over it, and they have never tried to get over it. They may be willing to take the bull by the horns, and be willing to discriminate and do it. We are perfectly willing to meet them on that issue. We hold that this would not only be unfair to England, but not in the interests of Canada. I am not going fully into these objections, but am only going to mention them very briefly. The second objection was that to-day it is claimed by the Liberal-Conservative party that the policy of the Opposition would give up control of our own tariff. If you follow out what unrestricted reciprocity means you can come to no other conclusion than that, and hon. gentlemen opposite have never attempted to show that we can obtain unrestricted reciprocity and still retain control of our own tariff. It is utterly impossible. There are two ways at which we can arrive at this conclusion. First, we have a perfect right to take the opinions of friends of hon. gentlemen opposite in the United States, to whom they will have to go when they endeavour to arrange unrestricted reciprocity, for two parties are required to enter into such an agreement. If hon. gentlemen opposite get into power, which I do not believe they will do, they will have to go to their friends on the other side, and they will have to take what the others are willing to give, and it must be remembered that their friends in the United States have stated most emphatically that they would not accept unrestricted reciprocity which would allow Canada to control its own tariff. We do not need, however, to go to the opinions of gentlemen on the other side of the line. Every hon. gentleman, and every intelligent man throughout Canada, who uses his own common sense, can tell the proposition of hon. gentlemen opposite that a policy of unrestricted reciprocity under which we will control our own tariff can never be worked out. The moment it is attempted they will find themselves getting into such difficulties that the details can never be worked out, and they will have to go a little further, to what is called commercial union. There is no other conclusion to be arrived at. Then we come to the revenue question. Hon. gentlemen opposite have never attempted to answer the questions of Conservative speakers on the platform or in this House, or the arguments in the newspapers on this question. The only answer they have made here in this House is: Let us over to your side of the House. That may be all right enough if they had to argue the question out with us here: but, unfortunately, or perhaps fortunately, we on this side are not the arbiters to say whether they are to come over here or not, but it is the people of Canada who have to decide that issue. Hon. gentlemen opposite must go to the people when they want to have that question settled. I maintain that when they go to the people and say: We propose a certain policy which we believe to be in your interest, the reply will come: "How are you going to meet the deficit which must arise in the revenue?" The Opposition leaders will have to answer that question. The people will demand an answer to that question although hon. gentlemen will not give it to us here, but can throw our inquiry back and say: Let us over to the Treasury benches and we will show. The people settled this question on 5th March last, and before they let hon. gentlemen opposite cross to this side of the House they will have another reckoning with them. The revenue question is therefore one which they must meet. They cannot get to the Government benches on that policy until they clearly and distinctly explain to the people what they are going to do on the question respecting the revenue, on the question of retaining control of our tariff, and on the question regarding discrimination against England. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no question about it but that the unrestricted reciprocity policy of hon. gentlemen opposite was the main cause, I believe, in the Maritime Provinces, why they sustained such an overwhelming defeat. The people of the Maritime Provinces got it thoroughly into their head that unrestricted reciprocity was not in the interest of the country. They voted upon that question and the decided to allow the very large number of candidates supporting the party opposite to stay at home. I do not suppose there was anything that had more weight and more effect on the people of the Maritime Provinces than some of the speeches made at that celebrated banquet at Boston, which has been referred to from time to time in this House. When we heard what the leaders of the party opposite said their policy meant we could not be surprised that the men who were engaged in carrying on the business and trade of this country were very jealous about the way in which they earn their living, and about how their business was going to be affected. The people of the Maritime Provinces, taking the speeches which were made in Boston, clearly understood that the policy which these gentlemen announced would remove all the business of the cities of the Maritime Provinces to the city of Boston. It was their reading upon that question which, to a greater extent than any other, secured the overwhelming defeat of the friends of the gentlemen opposite. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to think that on this side of the House we are afraid to vote on the unrestricted reciprocity question. I may say that my colleague and myself, and every member who supports the Conservative party from the Maritime Provinces, were elected to oppose unrestricted reciprocity tooth and nail. It is absurd for the hon. gentlemen opposite to attempt to make out to the country that any Conservative member of this House is afraid to face this vote. Let us see further how did the friends in the United States, of hon. gentlemen opposite take these speeches made in Boston. They took what was said there, in the only sense it could be taken in, namely, that it would lead to the transfer of a large amount of the wholesale business in the Maritime Provinces to the city of Boston. So clearly did they understand that, so clearly did they understand that the Liberal leaders who were present at that dinner in great force, were willing to give everything of value in connection with Canadian trade and manufactures into the hands of the Americans, that it was distinctly stated there that these hon. gentlemen looked to the American people for the sign by which they were to conquer. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me recapitulate very briefly, indeed, some of the points which I have discussed. I have shown, Mr. Speaker, that the deficit in the maintenance and the management of the Intercolo-

nial Railway may not after all be lost to the country. I have shown that the Government lead by Mr. Alexander Mackenzie were unable to prevent that loss. I have shown that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) himself, looked forward for many years to a loss in working this railway, of about $800,000 a year. I have shown, Sir, that in view of that, these hon. gentlemen at that time were open to the very charge which they are now making against the Government. Then, in regard to sugar, I have shown that the refiners, since the National Policy went into force, have not made any excessive profits. I have pointed out that it is not against the protective policy to remove the duties on raw material. I have pointed out that the Opposition criticism as respects the duty on sugar, is, and always has been, unfair and misleading, and I have shown clearly that the statement of the hon. member for South Oxford that of the $3,500,000 saved to the people of this country by the new sugar tariff, $2,000,000 would be taken by the sugar refiners, is untrue and absurd. I have proved clearly and distinctly that not one cent of the $1,800,000 which he said would be taken by the refiners owing to the duty on refined sugar of eight-tenths of a cent per pound, would be taken, and that it is impossible for the refiners under the new tariff to overcharge, as there are incidents in that tariff which would compel them to keep their price within reasonable figures. I have shown I think to hon. gentlemen opposite, that their whole position on the sugar question is absurd. I see the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) in his place now, and I regret that he was not present while I was speaking. I say, Sir, that I have shown that the position of that hon. gentleman on the sugar question was absurd, and that it was based on false premises, and wrong calculations arrived at. I would repeat to the hon. gentleman what I said were it not that it would detain the House.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Spare us.

Mr. STAIRS. I have very often listened to my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) with a great deal of pleasure, and I am quite confident that he will listen to me for a little time without interruption.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Hear, hear.

Mr. STAIRS. I have shown that the statement of the hon. member for Brant, that a difference of $2.24 existed in a certain twelve months, between the cost of raw sugar and the price at which the refined sugar sold, was absurd, and that figures taken from the books of one of the refineries in Canada show that instead of it being $2.24 per 100 lbs., it was only 60 cents per 100 lbs. for an average of two years. I have shown that the percentages of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) were all wrong, that the cost on which he based the calculations were wrong, and that the premises which he took in some cases were incorrect.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I rise to a point of order. The gentleman is reading his speech, and has been reading it.

Mr. STAIRS. I am quite willing to submit to the hon. gentleman if I am reading. The hon. member's point of order——

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. member is reading his speech, of course he knows that is not allowed.

Mr. STAIRS. It is just a recapitulation of the points I have brought before the House.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I rise to another point of order. He read that before.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must suggest to hon. gentlemen that this debate ought not to be made a farce of.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think the Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, chair.

Mr. STAIRS. I judge from some remarks of hon. gentlemen opposite a minute ago that they wish to get through. I can assure them that the easiest way to get through is to allow me to recapitulate the points I made in my speech. I am quite confident that the hon. member for South Brant wishes to hear me, and I am going to give him the pleasure. Now, I have shown that the *ad valorem* protection of sugar under the new tariff is not as much as it was under the old tariff, and that the specific protection is not as much as it was under the old tariff. In answer to the practical question, is refined sugar in Canada——

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I insist on my point of order. The hon. member is reading his speech, and I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to rule if he is allowed to do so.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have already ruled. A member cannot read his speech; but I believe that according to the practices and rules of Parliament notes may be used.

Mr. STAIRS. In answer to the hon. gentleman I beg to say that I am not reading my speech. I am simply referring to my notes in order to recapitulate the points I made in my speech. I have shown that the prices of all the sugars taken into consideration instead of being 31 cents per 100 lbs. higher in Montreal than in New York, as stated by the hon. member for Brant, are 14¼ cents lower; and instead of the people of Canada paying $600,000 a year more for their sugar they really have, under the present tariff, an advantage of $290,000. I assert, and I defy contradiction, that the duty on refined sugar has not increased, and does not at the present time increase the price of refined sugar to the Canadian consumer; and in view of all this, I submit that the tariff as it now exists is eminently in the interest of the people of Canada. I thank the hon. members on both sides of the House for listening to me through these rather tedious remarks. I cannot claim that a speech which goes so much into facts and figures is a very pleasant one to listen to; but it had to be given, and hon. gentlemen opposite have to thank themselves for it. I will not, however, take my seat, without referring to the very courteous and good-natured manner in which the hon. member for South Brant addressed the House the other night. I assure hon. gentlemen opposite that we all on this side of the House had pleasure in listening to him; I know that I did; and I joined with a great deal of pleasure in the meed of applause which the hon. gentleman got from this side of the House when he took his seat.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I have something to say on this question of the ad-

journment of the debate. I would be sorry to contribute in any way to a heated discussion. Complaint seems to have been made on the other side of the House that on this side there has been animosity shown, at the same time it is complained, and the hon. member from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) complained and regretted that animosity is shown on both sides. The position is not the same. On this side we complain that a formal agreement, that a contract has been openly violated. There was made an agreement in this House—and I was present when the thing happened. And what was this agreement? It was that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) should have all the benefit of his motion at a later phase of the debate. The question of discussion was not made a special point, but it was understood that he would have all the advantages resulting to him from his motion. Would any of the hon. members on the other side of the House arise here and say that if it had been proposed to the hon. member for South Oxford to abandon his undeniable right of having requested a direct vote taken on his motion, in amendment, would anyone dare say—and I appeal to the hon. French Ministers in this House—would any one of them dare say that the hon. member for South Oxford would have consented? Is there a member in this House who would dare say so? And now, Mr. Speaker, by a roundabout way, by contrivance which I need not qualify, but the effect of which I only wish to consider, it is wanted to deprive the hon. member for South Oxford of the direct vote which it is his right as well as his interest to ask from this House. And now, what would be the position? The hon. member for South Oxford could not have a direct vote on his motion, not only now but at no time during the rest of the session. Such is the subterfuge—I can use the term in parliamentary language—such is the subterfuge which the Government have, perhaps not premeditated, but which they are now resorting to. After having given many days and many nights to discussion, what do they come with now, what strength of argument do they offer the country? They come and say: We are going to use the rules of the House to prevent a vote, to stifle an expression of opinion. Mr. Speaker, I believe that this position is not to be countenanced, and I expect from you a ruling that the amendment is out of order. Mr. Speaker, the Orders of the House are invoked. I ask this House and I ask the country, which has more force, which is most binding? Is it not a solemn contract made before the House and unanimously agreed to, a contract saying that at any time the hon. member shall have all the advantages attaching to his motion? Shall such a solemn contract be defeated by a Standing Order of the House? Which can have more force? If the Orders of the House are written and printed on paper, the order so recently adopted by the House must be written on the soul of the hon. members, and must dictate their course from honour's standpoint. I think that they should not entrench themselves behind pure technicalities and formalities to deprive the hon. member for South Oxford of the advantages of his motion by a subterfuge. The Government will perhaps——

Mr. OUIMET. Interrupting the hon. gentleman, I would like to say that I think good understanding, tolerance, and even good-will should exist between the two parties in this House, in the interest of the prompt dispatch of business; and I am convinced that all this difficulty has arisen from a misunderstanding on the part of the hon. member for South Oxford of his right of moving an amendment without that amendment being subject to a sub-amendment on the second reading of the resolutions. I understand that, strictly speaking, the Government are right in asserting that the sub-amendment is in order; but they may be insisting too strictly on their right. Although it may be said that they have been a little put to defiance by some of the members of the Opposition, I think it would be in the interest of public business and of that good understanding that ought to exist in the House between the two parties, that this should cease, and that a mode should be found to put the hon. member for South Oxford in the same position that he was in when he waived his right to move the amendment. My experience as Speaker of this House has led me to feel that anything that may prevent a good understanding between the two parties is injurious to the prompt and efficient expedition of business; and though I am sure that the amendment of the hon. member for L'Islet was moved in good faith, yet I would ask him to withdraw it, and I would call upon the hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. leader of the Government to give way and put an end to this discussion which has, after all, no practical effect except to prevent for the future that good understanding between the parties to which I have referred. I know that this matter has created already a good deal of bad blood and bad temper on both sides, and I do not think it is in the interest of this House to foster or encourage anything of that kind. Therefore, I would beg the Government to withdraw the amendment and leave the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford in the same position it would have been in if it had been moved at the time he had a right to move it, when the motion was made that the House go into Committee of Ways and Means. I would add this, that while I am sure everyone in the House would be pleased to see an understanding of that kind arrived at, I was sorry to hear the hon. leader of the Opposition threaten that in future no pairing and no understanding of any kind would be entertained by him. I see no reason, Mr. Speaker, why the two parties should not understand each other, and why we should be carrying the war to the knife in this House. The great questions now before this House and before the country should be discussed fairly, without any undue advantage being taken by one party of the other, by some practice which the other party might call sharp practice. In this case I do not think there was any intention of resorting to any unfair tactics to gain any undue advantage. After all, I may say this, that those who are in favour of the policy of the Government will vote against the motion of my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and those who are against it will vote the other way, so that the result will be the same, and the country will judge what the vote really means. It is, in fact, a vote for or against the policy of the Government. There is nothing to be gained by either side, by pressing that strict right which the Government have now of insisting on their sub-amendment being voted

upon, but it will result in a bad understanding in the future, and prove detrimental to carrying on the business of the House. I would, therefore, ask the Government to recede from their position, and the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins) to withdraw his amendment and allow us to go on with the discussion as before.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I may be allowed to say a few words by way of intervening in the discussion, as the hon. gentleman has just done. I may do so all the more appropriately, because I was not in the House at the beginning of the discussion, and therefore did not hear the opening remarks. There can be no two opinions in the House as to the advantage that must result to public business from a cordial understanding between the two parties. That is not only in the interests of our convenience as gentlemen, but will be very much to the advantage of the public; and I am sure we recognized the other night, when the hon. member for South Oxford withdrew his resolution, that he was acting in the public interest, and that he was assisting us in expediting public business by allowing us to carry the Ways and Means resolutions without amendment. My own belief as to the way in which this difficulty has arisen is this: that there has been a misunderstanding or a want of explicit understanding, which resulted in very different impressions altogether being formed in the minds of the parties who undertook to enter into the agreement which was arrived at when the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford was withdrawn. It seems, from the observations that have been made in the debate to-night, that he had in his mind the impression that he was to reserve all his rights when he withdrew his resolution; that he believed he was not only reserving to himself and party the right to discuss in detail the resolutions, as he has the right to discuss them in committee at this stage, but that he also reserved to himself further the right which he had waived in withdrawing his resolution of having his amendment put to the House, on concurrence, without its being subject to a sub-amendment. But there is not the slightest doubt, on the other hand, that my hon. colleague, the Minister of Finance, received no such impression from the conversation which took place. I am sure he had in his mind the idea that the hon. member for South Oxford simply desired that the matter should stand over for full and minute discussion on concurrence on these resolutions, as we frequently agree that there should be the most ample discussion in concurring upon any vote taken in Supply. And I am sure that when the resolution was brought forward this evening, the way in which it was received by hon. gentlemen opposite must have struck every one on this side with surprise. My object in intervening now is not only to express our concurrence in the desire that harmony should be maintained between the two sides in the transaction of public business, but to call attention, at this stage of the discussion, to the manner in which the sub-amendment was received by hon. gentlemen on the other side. Assuming, and I think a little reflection will surely convince them, that what I have said is correct as regards the good faith of both the gentlemen connected with the understanding, I think hon. gentlemen will admit that the way in which that resolution was received, the expressions used conveying the charge that there were no gentlemen on this side, and the suggestion that there were no gentlemen sitting on the Treasury benches, that they ought not to be called gentlemen, that they were acting like pettifogging attorneys, and that this amendment was a piece of sharp practice, were reflections out of place altogether as applied to what was a pure misunderstanding and to a proceeding which was proposed in good faith. If, instead of the subject being discussed in this manner, the simple statement was made that the resolution was not in accordance with the agreement arrived at by hon. gentlemen opposite, I am convinced there would have been every desire on this side to carry out the agreement, not as we, but as hon. gentlemen opposite, understood it. That is the way in which we desire to carry on business. We desire that the good understanding which has hitherto existed shall still be respected, feeling, as I do, the certainty that there was good faith on both sides, though a misunderstanding evidently existed; and while the discussion to-night was unusually spirited, as it might well have been, on account of the surprise with which I must believe the amendment was received, still I am of opinion that many of the remarks made were not made in the spirit in which we all desire the discussion on this subject should proceed now.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman has not said anything with regard to the suggestion of the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet).

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have suggested to my hon. friends opposite whether they do not agree with me that the language used on this subject should not under all the circumstances, be withdrawn.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman, it seems to me, ought not to be at all surprised if there was warmth of feeling expressed on this side, when the amendment of the hon. member for L'Islet was moved. It would strike anybody, and strike the hon. gentleman I am sure, that if he asks a favour from this side of the House, in order to accommodate public business, this side would expect that, on returning to the subject, they would be placed exactly where they were; and, certainly, when we found we were not placed in that position, our surprise must not have been a cause of surprise to the other side. Of course expressions showing warmth of feeling, if at all avoidable, should always be avoided. If we could always control our temper everything would be pleasant, and though the circumstances may not have altogether justified, they certainly excused the warmth of feeling displayed; and I submit to the hon. gentleman himself, if, under such circumstances, when we were met by an amendment we had no reason to expect, and which, when adhered to, we persisted was not a fair carrying out of the understanding arrived at the other day, whether the hon. gentleman himself will not agree that, under such circumstances, our feeling was not at all without cause.

Mr. OUIMET. If I may be allowed to say another word, I would ask the hon. member for L'Islet to withdraw his sub-amendment. I have consulted all the precedents, and I find that every time we have gone into Ways and Means the resolutions have passed through Committee without amendment, with the understanding that the amendment should be moved on the second reading

of these resolutions when reported. I have consulted the Journals of the House during those years when changes were made to the tariff, and I find that on every occasion an amendment was moved on concurrence, as on the present occasion, without sub-amendment. That is another reason why I think the hon. member for South Oxford never dreamed his amendment would be met by a sub-amendment, and, under the circumstances, I would, of course with all due respect and regard, insist on my suggestion that the sub-amendment should be withdrawn.

Mr. FOSTER. We have to take cognizance of the circumstances as they are; we have to take into consideration that a certain set of circumstances have surrounded us, that this has come to a point to-night and that certain things have been asserted and said. The Minister of Justice has, to my mind, made a very fair statement of the circumstances, and has suggested, as plainly as language could suggest, how we might get over the difficulty. I stated in reply to the somewhat warm attack of the leader of the Opposition that there was not on my part, and certainly not on the part of the Government, any attempt to violate any understanding, expressed or implied. I believe that on the part of the Government, I know it on my own part, and I state it again. Under these circumstances, feeling as I do, and as the Government does on this side of the House, I think there ought to be some consideration for our position. The leader of the Opposition and the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) had an entirely different idea in their minds when this amendment was put before the House. They thought that their idea of the understanding had not been carried out, and they made certain assertions, not as to their idea but as to the spirit and motive of myself and other members of the Government. Now, I think the circumstances of the case and the position of affairs are plain to every member of this House, and I do not see why any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House should in plain words say that a man had violated his faith, had violated his pledge, had done it designedly, that he was no gentleman, that he was a pettifogger, that he was a trickster, and the like of that; and yet, when informed on the word of a man—and I gave it myself to-night—that the idea of the Government was not to take any advantage of them or to violate any agreement at all, the plain way to a reconciliation, if any reconciliation is desirable, as it most certainly is, that the business of the House may go on with cordiality and evenness, is open and it should not be asked for one side of the House to do all the giving way. That is plain English, and I do not, for one, propose to do it. I will go as far as any other gentleman or any other man, and I think the way is plain to arrive at an arrangement.

Mr. AMYOT. If this discussion is exhausted, I will resume the few remarks I have to make. I am very sorry that we cannot come to an understanding. I think it would be very easy to declare that, under the circumstances, the amendment be withdrawn, and then the words which have been uttered would no further apply.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They have not been withdrawn.

Mr. AMYOT. The amendment has not been withdrawn.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I might urge again upon the leader of the Opposition whether he ought not to accept the assurance of the Minister of Finance that he was free from the motives which have been attributed to him. I think he ought to accept that statement that he did not understand that any agreement with gentlemen opposite precluded some amendment being moved. If it is put in that form, we are perfectly willing to adopt that solution of the difficulty.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not object to the proposition of the hon. the Minister of Justice, and, in order to carry out the harmony that should prevail in this House, I have simply this to say, and it is my last word on this subject: we complain of a certain act of the Government, and they complain of certain language of ours. Let them withdraw the act and we will withdraw the language.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman has hardly done what he would ordinarily consider generous. We have been asked to withdraw the amendment, but we have been asked in terms—and he will pardon me for saying so—that are insulting, inasmuch as they imputed dishonourable, ungentlemanly and unworthy motives to the gentlemen on this side of the House. All we ask is that request shall be expressed in a different form, and that the hon. gentleman shall accept as a justification for expressing it in different form, our assurance that there was no such motive actuating any member of the Government. I think, inasmuch as the discussion arose in the way in which the request was made to us to withdraw, that the hon. gentleman has a clear way of accepting our assurance on this subject, and saying that he accepts our assurance, if he asks for the withdrawal, we will grant it.

Mr. LAURIER, If the hon. gentleman thinks that in the language which I used there was anything insulting, I am ready to withdraw any expression of that kind. I had no intention of using insulting language.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I was referring to the remarks in which the discussion began after the amendment was moved.

Mr. LAURIER. I am not prepared to admit that I said anything insulting to hon. gentlemen. If the hon. gentleman will point out to me one word of mine which was insulting I am quite willing to withdraw it, but I am not prepared to admit that I did use such words.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am not referring to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. LAURIER. I thought the hon. gentleman said a moment ago that he was not in the House when I addressed it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I was not referring to the hon. gentleman in particular. The discussion was taken up by his friends, and remarks were made that I thought very strongly offensive. I am not referring to the hon. gentleman himself.

Mr. LAURIER. I am not conscious that I used any expressions which were derogatory to the honour and dignity of this Parliament, and if I did I will withdraw them. But if I understand the hon. gentleman to say that they intended nothing offensive, and that the whole thing was a

misunderstanding, that there was no deliberate intention of breaking faith with us, I am willing to accept his disclaimer with the understanding that the sub-amendment be withdrawn.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In referring a moment ago to insulting language, I am sorry the hon. gentleman supposed that I applied that observation to him, because I did not; I was referring to the general course of the debate, from which I will not select the expressions now, because they were offensive; but I think the hon. gentleman, in accepting my disclaimer, ought to say that the gentlemen on his side of the House will withdraw their offensive expressions towards the Minister of Finance, and will accept his statement that the matter arose out of a pure misunderstanding.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think I used the words "a trick," but you ruled it was scarcely parliamentary and I withdrew it at the time. If that is the word to which the Minister of Justice refers, it has been withdrawn. I did not use the word "trickster." I will put this to the Minister of Justice: Let him assume for one moment our standpoint, let him suppose for one moment that the Opposition were sincere in the position we took, does he think our language too strong from that point of view?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If you will allow me to say so, I do. I do, because you were not only taken by surprise, which justified the warmth of the discussion, but the discussion imputed, from beginning to end, very improper motives to this side, and a desire to commit a breach of faith. I think the good feeling that has prevailed throughout the session might have justified hon. gentlemen on that side in assuming that there was no such desire.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). All I can say in reply to the hon. Minister is, that assuming that the understanding was such as we believed it to be, and as we still believe it to be, we could not think otherwise at the time than that there was a breach of faith. I think that a breach of faith in the House between parties on opposite sides is an act that cannot, within the rules of parliamentary discussion, be too strongly characterised. But the statement of the Minister of Justice just now offering to withdraw the amendment to the amendment, and that of the Minister of Finance, satisfy me, at all events, that those hon. gentlemen did not understand the matter from our standpoint, and under those circumstances I have no doubt whatever that my language, although perfectly sincere, was not such as was warranted by the position of the hon. gentlemen as explained and stated by themselves.

Mr. FOSTER. That is exactly the point to which I wished this matter to come. If matters had been as my hon. friend thought they were, this language was none too strong; but when I rose, and when the Minister of Justice rose, and stated that these were not the motives impelling us, then I thought that we might have expected from my hon. friend just exactly what he has now stated. As he has now made this statement I think we may all smile and be pleasant, and we will withdraw this amendment if my hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins) is of the same opinion as myself.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Under the circumstances I will ask permission to withdraw the motion I made to adjourn the debate.

Motion to adjourn debate withdrawn.

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). I do not want any misunderstanding about this point. I have got my word to say about it, too. I will give the answer which the House expects from me under the circumstances.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). If you want conciliation, you must show it towards me also. Now, I want it to be well understood that while I thought it was my duty, under the circumstances, to move the sub-amendment, of course I knew that it would meet with opposition, and at the same time I was satisfied that the opinions expressed in the amendment would meet with the assent of the Government and their supporters. Now, I was present in the House some days ago when the resolutions amending the tariff were submitted to the Committee of the Whole; I do not exactly remember if I was here all the time——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Don't make a two-hours speech.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend, as mover of the sub-amendment, certainly has a right to a respectful and patient hearing.

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). I was saying that I do not remember if I was present all the time when this pretended agreement that is now mentioned was made. The hon. gentlemen opposite say that such an agreement was made some days ago. At all events, I have read over the report of this debate, and I never came to the conclusion that under the circumstances the supporters of the Government had abdicated whatever rights they have here as members of this Parliament to move a sub-amendment. At all events, I see that my sub-amendment has somewhat ruffled the waters and has raised angry passions. For my part I am willing to meet my hon. friends opposite in an effort towards conciliation. But I want this to be well understood—it happens that I know something of parliamentary procedure.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). I shall say what I like, Mr. Speaker. Hon. gentlemen have had their own way, they have stated what they pleased, and I have a right to make an explanation. I think I am speaking very politely towards every one. I say this, that I know something about parliamentary procedure.

An hon. MEMBER. What is the question, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER. The amendment to the amendment is the question now before this House.

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). I wish to say that I have an undoubted right to move a sub-amendment. Any member of this House has an undoubted right, according to parliamentary procedure, to move, at this stage of the proceedings, a sub-amendment, and if the question were raised, I have no doubt what the decision of the Speaker would be, and I have no doubt of the teaching of parliamentary authorities on the point. The right is undisputed. Now, it seems to me we have to face this little difficulty of an agreement that hon. gentlemen opposite say was made some days ago, by which it was understood that on the second reading of the resolutions, the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford was to be exactly in the

same position as it was when he moved it. So far as I understand it myself, his amendment remains in that position. A motion has been made by the Minister of Finance for the second reading of the resolutions, and the amendment moved by the hon. member for South Oxford is exactly in the same position as it was then, with the right of this House to debate the amendment and the main motion as long as they please. Then, exercising my undoubted right as a member of this House, I moved a sub-amendment. Under the circumstances, in order to conciliate the House and to smooth over the difficulties that have arisen, hon. gentlemen opposite having taken back what was said awhile ago——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh ; order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would like to say that the practice of interrupting speakers is entirely contrary to the Rules and ought, in my opinion, to be abandoned.

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). I will remind the House of this, that when an amendment is before the Chair, it cannot be withdrawn except upon the unanimous consent of the House. Now, Mr. Speaker, I see that hon. gentlemen opposite are not very anxious to vote upon the principle enunciated in my amendment, although we on our side of the House are ready to vote squarely on the amendment of the member for South Oxford. I am ready to withdraw the sub-amendment if the House unanimously consents ; but I declare that I will take the next opportunity that occurs of asking the House to vote upon my sub-amendment.

Amendment (Mr. Desjardins, L'Islet) to amendment withdrawn.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 1.1 a.m. (Friday).

INDEX.

FIRST SESSION—SEVENTH PARLIAMENT, 1891.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following:—1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist; *, without remark or debate; Acts., Accounts; Adj., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned; Amt., Amendment; Amts., Amendments; Amalg., Amalgamation; Ans., Answer; Ass., Assurance; B., Bill; B. C., British Columbia; Can., Canada or Canadian; C. P. R., Canadian Pacific Railway; Com., Committee; Co., Company; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence; Consd., Consider; Consdn., Consideration; Cor., Correspondence; Deb., Debate; Dept., Department; Depts., Departments; Div., Division; Dom., Dominion; Govt., Government; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General; Hse., House; H. of C., House of Commons; Incorp., Incorporation; Ins., Insurance; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway; Man., Manitoba; Mess., Message; M., Motion; m., moved; Neg., Negatived; N.B., New Brunswick; N.W.T., North-West Territories; N.S., Nova Scotia; O.C., Order in Council; Ont., Ontario; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island; P.O., Post Office; Par., Paragraph; Prop., Proposed; Q., Quebec; Ques., Question; Recom., Recommit; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference; Rep., Report, Reported; Reps., Reports; Res., Resolution; Ret., Return; Ry., Railway; Rys., Railways; Sel., Select; Sen., Senate; Sp., Special; Stmnt., Statement; Sup., Supply; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary; Wthdn., Withdrawn; Withdrl., Withdrawal; Y. N., Yeas and Nays; Names in Italic and parentheses are those of the mover.

Adams, Mr. M., *Northumberland, N.B.*

Pelee Island Sub-Collector (M. for Cor., &c.) 1600.

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2743 (ii).

Allan, Mr. H. W., *South Essex.*

Amherstburg Dry Dock (Ques.) 3259 (ii).

——— (M. for Ret.*) 3287 (ii).

Pelee Island Sub-Collector (M. for Cor., &c.) 1580 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4590 (iii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2981 (ii).

Allison, Mr. D. W., *Lennox.*

Elliott, G. M., Inspector of Gas (Ques.) 5576 (iii).

Napanee Public Buildings, Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 1272 (i), 2154 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (Two-rowed Barley) 1566 (i).

Canals—Income (Rideau) 5222 (iii).

Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 4224 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 4319; (Ont.) 6242; (Ottawa) 4486 (iii). Dredging (New Plant) 1690 (i), 4602 (iii); (remarks) 4800. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4575 (iii).

Veterans, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 2925.

Volunteers of 1837-38, Land Grant (Ques.) 961 (i).

Amyot, Mr. G., *Bellechasse.*

Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. for Com., 1763 (i).

——— Subsidies (Ques.) 5075 (iii).

Bancroft Tender *re* Kingston Graving Dock (prop. Res.) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4158; neg. (Y. 82, N. 99) 4212 (ii).

Bellechasse Election, Gazetting Member (Ques.) 112 (i).

——— (M. for Ret.) 187 (i).

Census Returns, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4929 (iii).

Chicago Exhibition, Canada's Invitation (Ques.) 1577 (i).

Compulsory Voting (B. 53, 1°*) 266; 2° m., 1030, 1039 (i).

Controverted Elections Act Amt. (B. 45, 1°) 218 (i).

——— B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 2366; in Com., 3651 (ii), 5355, 5604 (iii).

Election Returns, Date of Declaration, &c., on M. for Ret., 134 (i).

Elections, uniform Time to Controvert (Ques.) 112 (i).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 792 (i).

Amyot, Mr. G.—*Continued.*
Franchise Act Repeal B. 8 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 314 (i).
Giguere, Capt. Claude, employment by Govt. (Ques.) 1266 (i).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1166 (i).
Herchmer, Commsr., Enquiry into Conduct, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 2922 (ii).
——— Cor. in Macleod *Gazette* (Ques.) 4293 (iii).
High Commissioner, on M. to adjn. Deb., 706 (i).
Immigrants into Canada, Number (Ques.) 5075 (iii)
Imperial Federation and High Commissioner (Ques.) 2153 (ii).
I. C. R., Accident at St. Joseph de Lévis (Ques.) 2145 (ii).
——— Claims for Damages (Ques.) 1770 (i).
Intoxicating Liquors, Prohibition of Sale (Ques.) 961 (i).
Isle Verte P. O., Rep. of Enquiry (M. for copies*) 544 (i).
Kingston Dry Dock, original Plan (M. for copies*) 1579 (i).
——— Contract, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3653 (ii).
——— Papers (Ques.) 1764 (i); (remarks) 3960 (ii).
——— P. O., Lessee of Box 524 (Ques.) 962 (i).
——— Lease of Boxes (Ques.) 1266 (i).
——— Postmaster's Rep. (M. for copies) 1578 (i).
——— on M. for copies, 2545 (ii).
Landslide at Quebec, O. C.'s, &c., on M. for copies, 3634 (ii).
Military Camp No. 7 (Ques.) 3264 (ii).
Military College Cadets, Diplomas, &c. (Ques.) 4297 (iii).
——— (Ques.) 3957 (ii).
New Carlisle Wharf, Cost of Construction, &c., on M. for Ret., 966 (i).
North Shore Ry. Debentures, on M. for copies of O.C.'s, &c., 1020 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Bowell*) for Com. on Res., 4753 (iii).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 3914 (ii).
Pelletier, H. H., emplymnt. by Militia Dept. (Ques.) 3258 (ii).
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Jamieson*) 285 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., Papers (remarks) 1851 (i).
——— CONTRACTS, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 5999 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Deb., 6026 (iii).
Quebec and Lake St. John Ry., Subsidy (Ques.) 2145 (ii).
Quebec Eastern Ry., Subsidy, on M. for Ret., 1934 (i).
Quebec, West, Vacancy, on objection (Mr. *Laurier*) 4082 (ii).
Sick and Distressed Mariners (Ques.) 2145 (ii).

Amyot, Mr. G.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Printing and Stationery) 246 (i).
Dominion Police, 1557 (i).
Justice, Administration of (L. A. Audette) 1557 (i).
Militia (Armouries, &c.) 3722; (Maintenance, &c.) 3736; (Drill Pay, &c.) 4224 (ii); (Kilted Battalion, Toronto) 6182 (iii).
Pensions (Mounted Police, &c., Rebellion, 1885) 3662 (ii).
Public Works—Capital (Kingston Graving Dock) 1673, 1678 (i). *Income*: Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 4552 (iii).
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 3857 (ii).
Three Rivers Piers, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 5776 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on M. to adjn. Deb., 2060 (i).

Armstrong, Mr. J., *South Middlesex.*
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty B. 168 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 3971 (ii).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1807 (i).
Camilla and Whittington Mail Service (Ques.) 2151 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5207 (iii).
Gov. General's Warrants, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4549 (iii).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 5518 (iii).
Lobo P.O., Change of Postmaster (M. for Pets., &c.*) 1579 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2949 (ii).
Montreal Customs, Defaulting Clerks (Ques.) 4675 (iii).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 3912 (ii).
Priv. and Elec. Com., distribution of Evidence (remarks) 5351 (iii).
Red Deer Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 3144 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Haras Co.) 6180 (iii).
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3537 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, 5169. Minor Revenues (Ordnance Lands) 5176 (iii).
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 5240 (iii).
Penitentiaries (Dorchester) 912 (i).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4573 (iii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 1368, 2238 (ii).

Bain, Mr. T., *North Wentworth.*
Amber Deposits in N. W. T., Applicants (Ques.) 2518 (ii).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1790 (i).
Brampton Postmaster, Filling Vacancy (Ques.) 3259 (ii).

Bain, Mr. T.—*Continued.*
Dundas and Waterloo Macadamized Road (Ques.) 223 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3085 (ii).
Rideau Canal, Claims for Land Damages (Ques.) 3618 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Agriculture (Dairy Industry) 6177 (iii).
Legislation: Senate (salaries, &c.) 941 (i).
Miscellaneous (Banff Hot Springs) 5120; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 5095; (Parliamentary Documents, distribution) 5083 (iii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 4338 (iii).
Quarantine (Tracadie Lazaretto) 3576 (ii).
Walker, Dr., Claim *re* Dundas, &c., Macadamized Road (M. for O.C.) 1058 (i).

Baker, Mr G. B., *Missisquoi.*
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 6201 (iii).

Barron, Mr. J. A., *North Victoria, Ont.*
Administration of Justice B. 14 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 892 (i).
Barry P. O., Tenders, &c. (M. for copies*) 2935 (ii).
——— Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 3255 (ii).
Beaverton Harbour Works, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 226 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 2367 (ii); in Com., 5602, 5734, 6224 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) on M. for 2°, 997 (i).
——— B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3248 (ii), 5142; on M. for 3°, 5556 (iii).
Elections Act Amt. (B. 54, 1°) 266; 2° m., 1040.
Fenelon Falls, Lockmaster's Office (Ques.) 4673.
Fitzgerald, W., Fishery Officer (Ques.) 5405 (iii).
Franchise Act Amt. (B. 98, 1°) 738 (i).
——— B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3086.
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) on M. for 2°, 1007 (i).
Galt P.O., Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 225.
Galway, Establishment of P. O. (M. for Ret.*) 736 (i).
Graham, J. R., Dismissal (M. for Ret.) 210 (i).
——— Ret. *re* Dismissal (Ques.) 3201 (ii).
Indian Reserve No. 6, Timber Cut (Ques.) 111 (i).
I.C.R., Rates for Clergymen, &c. (Ques.) 3261 (ii).
Kingston P.O., Rep. of Postmaster, on M. for copies, 2546 (ii).
Lindsay P.O., Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 225 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2949 (ii).
Mail Clerk, Lindsay and Haliburton, Resignation (Ques.) 4671 (iii).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 4464 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com., 5644 (iii).

Barron, Mr. J. A.—*Continued.*
Pub. Accts. Com., on presentation of 21st Rep (remarks) 4608 (iii).
P. O. Dept. (M.) to ref. Accts., &c., 2517 (ii).
Peterborough P.O., Name of Contractor (Ques.) 225 (i).
Railway Act Amt. (B. 103, 1°*) 891 (i); 2° m., 3303 (ii).
Reporters, Official, Accommodation (remarks) 1012 (i).
Saw Logs Cut in Disputed Territory (M. for Ret.*) 128 (i).
Scotch Granite, Increased Duty (Ques.) 335 (i).
Shawanakiskic's Indian Reserve (Ques.) 269 (i).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. for Com. on Res., 6135; in Com., 6141; on M. for 1° of B., 6143 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Capital (St. Lawrence River and Canals 4124; (Trent) 4126 (ii). *Income* (Miscellaneous) 1668; (Trent Valley, Bridge at Hastings) 1665 (i).
Civil Government (Public Works) 409 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Rys. (I.C.R., &c.) 4080 (ii).
Fisheries (Behring Sea) 6268 (iii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists, Revision) 948, 1560 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Maintenance) 3511 (ii); (salaries, &c.) 6266 (iii).
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) conc., 4289 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Litigation Expenses) 1709; (Printing Bureau) 1706 (i); (Strong, W. O., Gratuity to Widow) 6265 (iii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 4363, 6243; (B.C.) 6252; (Ottawa) 4509; (Que.) 4344 (iii). Dredging (New Plant) 1691 (i). Harbours and Rivers (Generally) 4601; (Kaministiquia River) 4529; (Ont.) 4575 (iii).
Territorial Accounts. (Surgeon General's salary) 6282 (iii).
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3439 (ii).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2560 (ii).
——— on M. to adjn. Hse., 2569 (ii).
Trent Valley Canal Works, Total Cost &c. 1929 (i).
——— Commissioners' Rep. (Ques.) 194, 197 (i).
——— (remarks) 214, 550, 993 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4467, 4773 (iii).
Wiarton Harbour Works, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 226 (i).

Beausoleil, Mr. C., *Berthier.*
Beet-Root Sugar, Cultivation, &c. (M. for Cor.* 545 (i).
——— Bounty B. 168 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 4466 (ii).
Connell, J., emplymnt. by Sorel Harbour Commissioners (Ques.) 5076 (iii).
Dom. Electoral Lists, Revision (Ques.) 143 (i).
Electoral Divisions, N. W. T., Re-arrangement (Ques.) 221 (i).

Beausoliel, Mr. C.—*Continued.*
Fishing Licenses in Quebec Counties (M. for Stmnt.*) 145 (i).
——— System of Issuing (Ques.) 143 (i).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1195 (i).
Jockes & Delorimier, Messrs., Stone Contractors (Ques.) 5076 (iii).
Lake St. Peter, Fishery Districts (Ques.) 2148 (ii).
Lavallée, Fishery Overseer (Ques.) 2145, 2148 (ii).
Montreal P.O. Service (Ques.) 5077 (iii).
North Shore Ry. Debentures, on M. for copies of O.C.'s, &c., 1026 (i).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3945 (ii).
Ottawa Mail Service, Advertising (Ques.) 963 (i).
——— Advertising in *Le Canada* (M. for Ret.) 2540 (ii).
Personal Explanation, par. in *Empire* Newspaper (remarks) 3427 (ii).
Sorel Harbour Works, Employés (Ques.) 5077 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (Que., salaries, &c.) 3514 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2680 (ii).

Béchard, Mr. F., *Iberville.*
Richelieu River Floods, H. F. Perley's Rep. (M. for copy*) 128 (i).
——— (Ques.) 336 (i).
St. John's, Que., Medical Officer (Ques.) 527 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2792 (ii).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., *Beauharnois.*
[*See* SPEAKER, Mr. Deputy.]
Montreal and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s (B. 65, 1°*) 387 (i).
Private Bills, Presentation, Extension of Time (M.) 156 (i).
South-Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 46, 1°*) 238 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital (St. Lawrence River and Canals) 4107 (ii).

Bergin, Mr. D., *Cornwall and Stormont.*
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) on M. for 2°, 1005; in Com., 1978 (i).
SUPPLY:
Legislation: Senate (salaries, &c.) 932 (i).

Borden, Mr. F. W., *King's, N.S.*
Edgett's Landing, Ballast Wharf (Ques.) 3956 (ii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3083 (ii).
Inverness and Richmond Ry. Co., on M. for Cor., 2538 (ii).
Kentville Postmaster, Suspension (Ques.) 221 (i).
Port George Pier, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 2910 (ii).
Sawdust in LaHave River, on M. for Ret., 1951 (i).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Post Office (Mail Service) 4706, 4718; (salaries, &c.) 4721 (iii).

Borden, Mr. F. W.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Indians (N.B.) 4734 (iii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Liverpool or London and St. John or Halifax) 4679 (iii).
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 4235 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 4331. Harbours and Rivers (Generally) 4596 (iii).
U. S. Treaty with Cuba, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4008 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2290 (ii).
West Indies Steamship Subsidies, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies*, P.E.I.) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4423 (iii).

Bowell, Hon. M., *North Hastings.*
Admiral, Str., Services and Ownership, on M for Ret., 2157 (ii).
Advertising and Printing, in Com. of Sup., 500.
American Cheese shipped through Can. Ports (Ans.) 114 (i).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1811 (i).
Bonding Foreign Fish (Ans.) 1265 (i).
C.P.R., North Shore Ry. Bonds (Ans.) 2522 (ii).
Canal Contracts, Tenders, &c., on M. for copies, 1940 (i).
——— Statistics (presented) 738 (i).
Coal Monopoly, B.C., in Com. of Sup., 924 (i).
Caraquet Ry., Receipts and Expenditures (Ans.) 3614 (ii).
Cattle Quarantine Regulations (remarks) 806 (i).
Chambly Canal, Contract for spreading Stone (Ans.) 3959 (ii).
Cornwallis Valley Ry. Co., Subsidy (Ans.) 2153.
Cotton Sail Duck, Imports (Ans.) 142 (i).
Customs Collector, Annapolis Royal (Ans.) 270.
——— Seizures at Walkerton (Ans.) 3266 (ii).
——— Illegal Seizures (Ans.) 2521 (ii).
Debates, Official Rep. (Ms.) for Sel. Com., 7, 109 (i).
Dom. Aid to Rys., on M. for Ret., 1055 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3254 (ii); on M. for 3°, 5583 (iii).
Doucet, Louis, Dismissal (Ans.) 741 (i).
Govt. Rys., Expenditure on Capital Account (explanation) 4092 (ii).
——— Payments for Printing (Ans.) 3614 (ii).
Great North-West Central Ry., Engineer's Certificate (Ans.) 2145 (ii).
Guysborough Customs Collector, Superannuation (Ans.) 2520 (ii).
High Commissioner, on M. to adjn. Deb., 706 (i).
I. C. R. (B. 105, 1°) 959; 2° m., 1256; in Com., 1260 (i).
——— Accident at St. Joseph de Lévis (Ans.) 2145 (ii).
——— Employés, Enquiry into Conduct, on M. for Ret., 1937 (i).
——— emplyt. of Walter Hogg (Ans.) 5407 (iii).
——— Labourers, Reduction of Pay (Ans.) 3266.

Bowell, Hon. M.—*Continued.*
I.C.R., McCully, S.W., Dismissal (Ans.) 3613 (ii).
——— Rates for Clergymen, &c. (Ans.) 3261 (ii).
——— Refreshment Contract (Ans.) 3617 (ii).
——— Stone for Langevin Block (Ans.) 1575 (i).
Kingston Graving Dock, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3659 (ii).
Langevin Block, Haulage of Stone (Ans.) 1768.
Liquor Seizures in Montmagny (Ans.) 209, 741 (i), 2148 (ii).
Lachine Canal, Côte St. Paul Drain, Tenders, on M. for Ret., 2158 (ii).
McNamara, N., Share Customs Seizures (Ans.) 3959 (ii).
Marie Eliza, Seizure and Sale (Ans.) 710 (i).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1071 (i).
Mining Machinery, Free Entry into B.C., on M. for Cor., 965 (i).
——— Importation of, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4099 (ii).
Montreal and Sorel Ry., Subsidy (Ans.) 3615 (ii).
Montreal Custom House Employés, on M. for Ret., 3277 (ii).
——— Superannuation (Ans.) 3616 (ii).
——— Night Watchman (Ans.) 5406 (iii).
——— Irregularities (Ans.) 3953 (ii).
Munroe, Hugh, Claim for Damages, on M. for Ret., 2546 (ii).
New Carlisle Wharf, Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 971 (i).
North Shore Ry. Debentures (Ans.) 2522; (prop. Res.) 3577 (ii); M. for Com. on Res., 4748 (iii).
N. S. Central Ry., Subsidy (Ans.) 3960 (ii).
Napierville and St. Rémi Ry., Subsidy, on M. for Ret., 2544 (ii).
Orange Influence, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1965 (i).
Pairing of Members (remarks) 805 (i).
——— on M. for adjnmt., 3826 (ii).
Pelee Island Sub-collector, on M. for Cor., &c., 1589 (i).
P. E. I. Ry., Dismissals (remarks) 4000 (ii).
——— Employés, Dismissal, on enquiry for Ret., 5088 (iii).
——— Messrs. Saunders and Muttart, Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 2164 (ii).
——— Train Service (Ans.) 1274 (i).
Polson Mfg. Co., Steel Plates, Imports (Ans.) 270.
Priv. and Elec. Com., Afternoon Sittings, on M., 1988 (1).
Public Accts. Com., on M. to ref. Accts. *re* Bourcier, 3950 (ii).
Quebec and Lake St. John Ry., Subsidy (Ans.) 2145 (ii).
Quebec Eastern Ry., Subsidy, on M. for Ret., 1936 (i).
Ry. Act. Amt. (B. 175) 1° m., 6142; 1°, 6286 (iii).
Returns, on enquiry (remarks) 1991 (i), 2581 (ii).
Rideau Canal, Claims for Land Damages (Ans.) 3618 (ii).

Bowell, Hon. M.—*Continued.*
St. John Ry. Station, additional Property (Ans.) 739 (i).
St. Lawrence River Canals, Deepening (Ans.) 1927 (i).
Scotch Granite, Increased Duty (Ans.) 335 (i).
Short Line Ry., New Route (Ans.) 3266 (ii).
Soucy, Eugene, Dismissal from I.C.R. (Ans.) 1274, 1927 (i).
Standing Committees (M.) to change names, 237.
——— Names substituted (M.) 1651 (i).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. (B. 175) prop. Res., 6032; in Com., 6136, 6185; 1° of B., m., 6142; (M.) to re-com., 6217; 1° 6286 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Two-rowed Barley) 1566 (i).
Canals—Capital (Galops) 4107; (Grenville) 4141 (ii), 6198, 6298 (iii); (Lachine) 4102; (Murray) 4125; (Sault Ste. Marie) 4102 (ii), 5210 (iii); (St. Lawrence River and Canals) 4121; (Rapide Plat) 4107; (Tay) 4143 (ii), 5221 (iii); (Trent) 4128. *Income* (Carillon) 4150 (ii); (Carillon and Grenville) 5222 (iii); (Chambly) 4146 (ii), 6200 (iii); (Miscellaneous) 1667 (i); (Rideau) 5222, 6304 (iii); (St. Ours Lock) 4148; (St. Ann's Lock) 4149 (ii); (St. Peter's) 5223 (iii); (Trent River) 4151; (Welland) 4145 (ii); (Welland, Pond at St. Catharines) 1666 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Canals (Murray) 1728 (i). Customs (B.C.) 5051 (iii); (Board of Customs, &c.) 5053, conc., 5419; (Chinese Immigration) 5056, conc., 5419; (Inspectors of Ports) 5052; (Laboratory) 5054; (N.S. and N.B.) 5023 (iii); (O'Meara, Mr., additional salary) 1714 (i); (Ont.) 5042; (P.E.I.) 5025, conc., 5418; (Que.) 5030; (Revenue Cruiser) 6277; (Travelling Inspectors) conc., 5418 (iii); (Vacuum Oil Co., refund) 1721 (i). Rys. (I.C.R., &c.) 1736 (i), 4057 (ii).
Fisheries (N.S., salaries) conc., 4255 (iii)
Militia (Care and Maintenance) 3736 (ii); (Drill Pay, &c.) conc., 4287 (iii).
Penitentiaries (B.C) 924 (i).
Public Works — Income: Buildings (B. C.) 6252 (Ont.) 6240; (N. W. T.) conc., 5387. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 6257 (iii).
Railways—Capital: Annapolis and Digby (construction) 1661. Cape Breton (construction) 1656 (i), 3898 (ii); (Grand Narrows Bridge) 1658 (i); (Train Ferry) 3898 (ii). C. P. R. (construction) 1652 (i), conc., 4278 (iii). I.C.R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 3854; (Halifax, warehouse) 3894 (ii). (Moncton, increased accommodation) 1653 (i); (New Glasgow, increased accommodation, 3882 (ii), 6197 (iii); (Rolling Stock) 1654 (i), 3882 (ii); (St. Charles Branch) 1655 (i), 3884 (ii); (St. John, additional accommodation) 1655 (i); ("Y" at Truro) 1655 (i). Oxford and New Glasgow (construction) 1658 (i), 6197 (iii). P.E.I. (Summerside Station, removal) 3898 (ii), conc., 4278; (Payment for expropriation) 6198 (iii). Short Line Ry. (Judgment of Court) 1658 (i).
Quarantine, conc., 5437 (iii).
Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B.C. 3682 (ii).
Territorial Accounts (Surgeon General's salary) conc., 6306 (iii).

Bowell, Hon. M. —*Continued.*
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. (prop. Res.) 6032 ; in Com. on Res., 6136 (iii).
Sugar (Raw) Imports (Ans.) 602 (i).
——— Quantity in Bond (Ans.) 740 (i).
Summerside Ry. Station (Ans.) 3263 (ii).
Tay Canal, Contracts for Extension (Ans.) 3262.
——— Expenditure, on M. for Ret., 3267 (ii).
——— Locks and Employés (Ans.) 3617 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3745 (ii).
——— Passage, Tonnage, &c., of Vessels (Ans.) 3260 (ii).
——— Tenders for Construction (Ans.) 3953 (ii).
——— Tenders for Extension (Ans.) 3956 (ii).
Telegrams, in Com. of Sup., 500 (i).
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3501 (ii).
Trade and Navigation Returns (presented) 104 (i).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2556 (ii).
Transcontinental Mail Service (Ans.) 6216 (iii).
Trent Valley Canal, Total Cost (Ans.) 1930 (i).
Walkerton, Seizure of Iron Bridge, &c. (Ans.) 3619 (ii).
——— Sub-Collector, Resignation (Ans.) 3266 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2027 (i).
——— on M. to conc. in Res., 3205, 3233 (ii).
Welland Canal, on enquiry for Rets. (remarks) 3200 (ii).
Wild Fowl, Prohibition of Export (Ans.) 1769.
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry., on Order for Com. on prop. Res., 1254 (i).

Bowers, Mr. E. C., *Digby.*
Bay of Fundy Fisheries (M. for Ret.) 715 (i).
Centreville Breakwater, Repairs (Ques.) 962 (i).
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 97 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 568 (i).
Corn Meal, Abolition of Duty (Ques.) 143 (i).
Digby Postal Accommodation, insufficient (Ques.) 1264 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3183 (ii).
Meteghan Wharf, Digby Co. (Ques.) 530 (i).
New Carlisle Wharf, Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 974 (i).
Raquette Pier, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 1575 (i).
Sissiboo River, Dredging (Ques.) 1574 (i).
SUPPLY :
Fisheries (Fish-breeding) 3529 (ii), conc., 4268 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction, &c.) 3512; (maintenance) 3510 ; (salaries, &c.) 3509.
Public Works—Income : Buildings (N.S.) 4330. Dredging (Man.) 4648 (iii) ; (New Plant) 1693 (i) ; (repairs) 4646 (iii).
Railways—Capital : Annapolis and Digby (construction) 1659 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2781 (ii).

Brodeur, Mr. L. P., *Rouville.*
Census Returns, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4983 (iii).
Employés in Elections (Ques.) 221 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 791 (i).
Guévremont, Senator, Land purchased from (Ques.) 4671 (iii).
Helbronner, Mr. Jules, Amount paid (Ques.) 5407 (iii).
Isle Bizard Bridge (remarks) 5195 (iii).
Jacques Cartier Co., Public Works (Ques.) 4674 ; (remarks) 5014 (iii).
Pairing of Members (remarks) 745, 802 (i).
Ste. Angèle Postmaster, Dismissal (Ques.) 5407 (iii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6233 (iii).
Statutes, Distribution of (Ques.) 2522 (ii).
Voters' Lists, Extension of Time for Revision (Ques.) 2912 (ii).

Brown, Mr. J. P., *Chateauguay.*
Chambly Canal, Contract for spreading Stone (Ques.) 3959 (ii).
St. Lawrence Dredge (Ques.) 3952 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2880 (ii).

Brown, Mr. J., *Monck.*
Fishing Licenses in Grand River (Ques.) 709 (i).

Burnham, Mr. J., *East Peterborough.*
Military Districts Nos. 3 and 4, Brigade Major (M. for Cor.) 733 (i).
Trent Valley Canal, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4792 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Capital (Trent) 4134 (ii).

Burdett, Mr. S. B., *East Hastings.*
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) on M. for 2°, 997 (i).
Frauds on Farmers Prevention (B. 42, 1°*) 206 ; 2° m., 1003 ; M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 1041 ; in Com., 1972 (i).
Hastings Co. Mail Service (M. for Ret.) 212 (i).
——— Public Works, Improvements (Ques.) 208.
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 2° and in Com., 1067 (i).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Income : Dredging (New Plant) 1690.
Trent Valley Canal, Commissioners' Rep. (Ques.) 194 (i).
——— on adjnmt. (remarks) 217 (i).

Cameron, Mr. H., *Inverness.*
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1842 (i).
I. C. R. B. 105 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. for 2°, 1257 ; in Com., 1262 (i).
Inverness and Richmond Ry. Co. (M. for Cor.) 2522 (ii).

Cameron, Mr. H.—*Continued.*
Inverness Ry. and Mining Co.'s B. 136 (Mr. *Wilmot*) on M. for 2°, 2858 (ii).
Macdonald, Sir John A., Erection of Monument (Ques.) 2148 (ii).
P.E.I. Ry., Messrs. Saunders and Muttart, Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 2171 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2896 (ii).

Cameron, Mr. M. C., *West Huron.*
Administration of Justice B. 14 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 893, 1090 (i).
Bancroft Tender *re* Kingston Graving Dock, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Amyot*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup, 4177 (ii).
Bills, delay in Printing (remarks) 238 (i).
Calgary and Edmonton Mail Service, Contractor (Ques.) 3255 (ii).
——— and Fort Macleod Mail Service (Ques.) 3256 (ii).
Census Returns, prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4885. (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5354, 5596, 5731 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5197, 5547 (iii).
Elections Act Amt. (B. 9, 1°) 107; 2° m., 1029.
Evidence in Criminal Cases (B. 11, 1°*) 129 (i); 2° m., 2955 (ii).
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) on M. for 2°, 1005; on Order for Com. (remarks) 1014.
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3089 (ii).
——— Act Repeal (B. 8, 1°) 106; Order for 2°, 206; 2° m., 295; Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., 302; agreed to (Y. 113, N. 84) 332 (i).
Goderich, St. Helen's, &c., Mail Service (Ques.) 3262 (ii).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 636 (i).
Indian Affairs, Management, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1484 (i).
Indian Reservation, Sea Bird Island, B.C. (Ques.) 709 (i).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 3580 (ii).
Kingston Penitentiary, Coal Supply (Ques.) 3260.
Langevin Block, Payments on acct. of Contract (Ques.) 5776 (iii).
McPherson, Addison, Claims for Losses (Ques.) 3257 (ii).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1076 (i).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member (prop. Res.) 4152 (ii).
——— on M. to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com. (Amt.) 5612; neg. (Y. 74, N. 99) 5724 (iii).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 4463 (iii).
Orange Influence, on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Charlton*) 1966 (i).

Cameron, Mr. M. C.—*Continued.*
P. E. I. Ry., Messrs. Saunders and Muttart, Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 2161 (ii).
Privilege (Ques. of) Member for East Northumberland, 4085 (ii).
Public Works Dept., Contracts, on M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 5824 (iii).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Acts Amt. B. 138 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3589 (ii).
Supply:
Canals—Capital (Tay) 4143 (ii), 5221 (iii).
Civil Government (Public Works) 257 (i).
Fisheries (B.C., salaries, &c.) 3527 (ii).
Govt. of N. W. T. (contingencies) 1709 (i), 5067.
Indians (B.C.) 4802; (Man. and N.W.T.) 4731, 4810.
Legislation: Senate (salaries, &c.) 930 (i).
Miscellaneous (Litigation Expenses) 1707 (i).
Mounted Police, 1698 (i).
Public Works—Income: Dredging (repairs) 4641 (iii). Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 1688 (i).
Tay Canal (prop. Res.) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3738; neg. (Y. 82, N. 100) 3779 (ii).
——— Contracts for Extension (Ques.) 3261 (ii).
——— Locks and Employés (Ques.) 3617 (ii).
——— Passage, Tonnage, &c., of Vessels (Ques.) 3259 (ii).
——— Tenders for Construction (Ques.) 3953 (ii).
——— Tenders for Extension (Ques.) 3956 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 1994 (i); in Com., 2206 (ii).

Campbell, Mr. A., *Kent, Ont.*
Battell, William, Employé Cobourg P.O. (Ques.) 3952 (ii).
Chatham P.O., Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 3951 (ii).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5736 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5548 (iii).
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) in Com., 1977 (i).
I. C. R. B. 105 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 1263 (i).
Kaministiquia River, Dredging (M. for Ret.*) 146 (i).
——— (Ques.) 129, 1267 (i).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4637 (iii).
River Thames, Bar at Mouth (Ques.) 1268 (i).
Supply:
Agriculture (Experimental Farms) 1567 (i).
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3544 (ii).
Civil Government (High Commissioner) 424 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Chinese Immigration) 5058 (iii); (O'Meara, Mr., additional salary) 1717 (i); (Que.) 5039 (iii). Public Works (Telegraphs, P.E.I. and Mainland) 4668 (iii). Rys. (I.C.R., &c.) 4076 (ii).
Indians (N.B.) 4735; (Man. and N. W. T.) 4815; (N.S.) 4631; (P.E.I.) 4735 (iii).
Justice, Administration of (Judges' salaries) 517 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists, Revision) 949. (i).

Campbell, Mr. A—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Liverpool or London and St. John or Halifax) 4679 (i).
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Kaministiquia River) 4523. *Income:* Buildings (Ottawa) 4513. Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 4592; (Ont.) 4582, 6255. (Miscellaneous) 4661; (N.W.T.) 4445; (Surveys) 4662 (iii).
Railways—Capital: Cape Breton (construction) 3898. I.C.R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 3873 (ii).
Tay Canal, Basin at Perth, Contract (Ques.) 4672 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3773 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2425 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 2255 (ii).

Carpenter, Mr. F. M., *South Wentworth.*
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3091 (ii).
St. Catharines and Niagara Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 61, 1°*) 387 (i).

Caron, Hon. Sir A. P., K.C.M.G., *Rimouski.*
Armaments, Victoria Point (remarks) 6308 (iii).
Beaudry, Lieut.-Col., Commission (Ans.) 1766 (i).
Bridge at Quebec, O.C.'s, on M. for copies, 1046.
Cavalry School in Toronto (Ans.) 223 (i).
Commissions, Military Colleges, Permanent Corps (Ans.) 3960 (ii).
Garrison Club, Que., Lease of Lands (Ans.) 527 (i).
Hearn, J. G., emplymnt. by Militia Dept. (Ans.) 5078 (iii).
Infantry School, St. John's, Surgeon (Ans.) 3620.
Land Grants to Volunteers (B. 159) in Com. on Res., 3106; Res. conc. in and 1°* of B., 3582 (ii).
Landslide at Quebec, O. C.'s, &c., on M. for copies, 3628 (ii).
Lundy's Lane Battle, Monument (Ans.) 3618 (ii).
McPherson, Addison, Claims for Losses (Ans.) 3257 (ii).
Military College, Kingston (Ans.) 3957 (ii).
——— Cadets, Diplomas, &c. (Ans.) 4297 (iii).
Military Camp No. 7 (Ans.) 3264 (ii).
——— Dist. No. 1, Location of Camp, on M. for Cor., 231 (i).
——— Nos. 3 and 4, Brigade Major, on M. for Cor., 733 (i).
——— Nos. 5 and 6, Paymaster (Ans.) 707 (i).
Militia Act Amt. (B. 174, 1°) 6126 (iii).
Militia and Defence, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 135.
Militia Battalion (69th) No. 5 Co. (Ans.) 268 (i).
Pelletier, H. H., emplymnt. by Militia Dept. (Ans.) 3258 (ii).
Pensions for Permanent Corps (Ans.) 2908 (ii).
Prorogation (remarks) 6327 (iii).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 6034 (iii).

Caron, Hon. Sir A. P.—*Continued.*
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Deb., 6025 (iii).
Rebellion, N.W.T., Scrip for Militia (prop. Res.) 634 (i).
Saddlery, 1st Reg. of Cavalry (Ans.) 198 (i).
Strike in Ottawa, &c., calling out Militia (remarks) 5555 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (High Commissioner) contingencies, 499 (i).
Militia (Armouries, &c.) 3720; (Brigade Majors, salaries, &c.) 3700; (Care and Maintenance, &c.) 3734; (Clothing, &c.) 3700; (Drill Pay, &c.) 3730, 4225, 4233 (ii), conc., 4282 (iii); (Drill Instruction) 3729 (ii); (Kilted Battalion, Toronto) 6182 (iii); (Military College) 4237 (ii), conc., 4289 (iii); (Military Stores, &c.) 3717 (ii); (Monuments, Battlefields, Can.) conc., 4277 (iii); (Permanent Forces, Pay, &c.) 3738 (ii); (St. John's Gate, repairs) 1574 (i).
Miscellaneous (Commutations of Duties) 5084; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 5086 (iii).
Pensions (Fenian Raid) 4660; (Mounted Police, &c.) 3667; (Rebellion, 1885) 3661; (Veterans, 1812) 3661 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Rys. (I.C.R.) 1743 (i).
Territorial Accounts, 1729 (i); (Surgeon General's salary) 6280, 6284 (iii).
Telegrams, in Com. of Sup., 499 (i).
Volunteers' Services in Nanaimo, in Com. of Sup., 1558 (i).
Volunteers of 1837-38, Land Grant (Ans.) 961 (i).
Wellington, B.C., Services of Militia (Ans.) 2147.

Carroll, Mr. H. G., *Kamouraska.*
Cacouna, Purchase of Timber for Wharf (Ques.) 158 (i).
I.C.R., Accident at St. Joseph de Lévis (M. for Ret.) 177 (i).

Cartwright, Sir R., K.C.M.G., *South Oxford.*
Address, on the, 35 (i).
Adjnmnt, Dom. Day (remarks) 1537 (i).
American Cattle slaughtered in Canada, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5210 (iii).
Armaments, Victoria Point (remarks) 6308 (iii).
Auditor General's Powers (remarks) 391 (i).
Bourgeois, G. A., payment to, on M. to ref. to Pub. Accts. Com., 2361 (iii).
BUDGET, The (Ques.) 738, 953 (i).
——— (reply) 1232; (Amt.) 1252 (i); neg. (Y. 88, N. 114) 3082 (ii).
C. P. R., Arbitrators Award (remarks) 6129 (iii).
——— Section "B," Charges against P. M. G., on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 5971 (iii).
Carleton Branch Ry. Sale B. 106 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 1992 (i).; in Com. on B., 3899.
Cattle Trade, Shipping of Live Stock B. (remarks) 957 (i).
Census Returns (Ques.) 130 (i).
——— Printing (remarks) 4465, 4534 (iii).

Cartwright, Sir R.—*Continued.*
Census (prop. Res.) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup. 4829; neg. (Y. 81, N. 103) 5010 (iii).
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 97 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for Com. on Res., 551; in Com., 558; on M. for 3°, 1253 (i).
Coal Monopoly, B.C., in Com. of Sup., 923 (i).
Compulsory Voting B. 53 (Mr. *Amyot*) on M. for 2°, 1033 (i).
Consolidated Audit Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3237 (ii).
Consolidated Fund, Receipts and Expenditures (M. for Ret.*) 135 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 2369 (ii); in Com., 5355, 5735 (iii).
Copyright, Legislation respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5020 (iii).
Criminal Law Codification B. 32 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 156 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 4829; on M. for Com., 5139 (iii).
Debates, Official Rep., on M. (Mr. *Bowell*) for Sel. Com., 109 (i).
Documents mentioned in Speech from Throne (Ques.) 157 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on on M. for 1°, 105 (i).
——— B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5208; on M. for 3°, 5575.
Estimates, The (enquiry) 214 (i).
——— Suppl., delay (remarks) 5555 (iii).
Exports and Imports (M. for Ret.*) 135 (i).
Fishing Bounties, Claims, &c., on M. for Stmnt., 542 (i).
Gov. Gen.'s Warrants, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1544 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4467 (iii).
——— (prop. Res.) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4537; neg. (Y. 82, N. 97) 4551 (iii).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1120 (i).
——— Business, on M. to take in Mondays, 2668 (ii).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 579 (i).
——— on M. to adjn. Deb., 705 (i).
Indemnity to Senators and Members, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) 6291 (iii).
Indian Agent Chisholm, Charges against (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 6148 (iii).
Iron Bounties Ret. (enquiry) 2580, 2668 (ii).
Kingston Graving Dock, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3659 (ii).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4614 (iii).
——— B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 5487 (iii).
Live Stock Shipment B. 154 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 1°, 3135 (ii).
London and Canadian Loan and Agency Co.'s B. 27 (Mr. *Cockburn*) on M. for 2°, 190 (i).

Cartwright, Sir R.—*Continued.*
N.W.T., Representation of Act Amt. B. 112 (Mr. *Davin*) on M. for 1°, 1102 (i).
Orange Influence, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1969 (i).
Order, Ques. of (remarks) 5330 (iii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 4659 (iii).
Pairing of Members, on M. to adjn., 3823 (ii).
Pictou Bank Winding-up B. 76 (Mr. *McDougald, Pictou*) on M. for 1°, 388; on M. for 2°, 547 (i).
P. O. and Dom. Savings Banks Deposits, on M. for Ret., 203 (i).
Priv. and Elec., Afternoon Sittings, on M., 1989 (i).
Provincial Accounts Settlement B. 99 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1065 (i).
Pub. Accts. Com., on M. for Com. of Sup. (Amt.) 4089 (ii).
——— Sittings of Com. (remarks) 5014 (iii).
Public Works Dept., Papers (remarks) 991 (i).
Quarantine (U.S.) Regulations for Sheep, on ruling of Mr. Speaker, 744 (i).
Receipts and Expenditures (M. for Stmnt.) 213 (i)
Reciprocity Papers (remarks) 600 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 3150 (ii).
Returns, on enquiry (remarks) 1991 (i).
Standing Committees, organization (enquiry) 199.
Standing Orders Com., Rep. *re* Rathbun Co. (remarks) 5012 (iii).
Sugar, Free List, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1931 (i).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Experimental Farms) 3571 (ii).
Arts, &c. (Adam Brown, honorarium) 6174 (iii); (Census) 1569 (i); (Census and Statistics) 3534 (ii); (Jamaica Exhibition) 1568 (i).
Canals—Capital (Galops) 4108; (Lachine) 4102; (Murray) 4125 (ii); (Sault Ste. Marie) 5210; (Tay) 5219 (iii). *Income* (Carillon) 4150 (ii); (Miscellaneous) 1667 (i); (Ste. Anne's Lock) 4149; (Welland) 4145 (ii); (Pond at St. Catharines) 1666 (i).
Charges of Management (Dom. Notes) 1755; (Public Debt, Commissions) 1748 (i).
Civil Government (Auditor General's Office) 1544; (High Commissioner) 411, contingencies, 431, 491, 1555; (Indian Affairs) contingencies, 435; (Interior) 247; (Geological Survey) 410; (Justice) 242, (contingencies) 423; (Privy Council) contingencies, 433; (Public Works) 398, 408; (Railways and Canals) 408; (Sec. of State) 242.
Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, 5167. Customs (Chinese Immigration) 5056 (iii); (O'Meara, Mr., additional salary) 1714; (Yacht *Cruiser*) 1721 (i). Dom. Lands (salaries) 5189 (iii) Excise, 1724 (i). Minor Revenues (Ordnance Lands) 5171. Post Office (Mail Service) 4712, 6279. Public Works (Agency, B.C.) 4669; (Harbours, &c., repairs) 4665; (Slides and Booms, Dues) 4663 (iii). Rys. (I.C.R.) 1736 (i), 3853, 4057 (ii). Post Offices, 1744. Weights and Measures, 1726.
Fisheries (Fish-breeding) conc., 4268; (N. S., salaries) conc., 4245 (iii).
Government of N. W. T., 5066 (iii).
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 3575 (ii), 5224 (iii).

Cartwright, Sir R.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

Indians (B.C.) 4800; (Man. and N.W.T.) 4736; (N. B.) 4732, 5059; (Ont., Que., &c.) 4727 (iii).

Justice, Administration of (Miscellaneous) 6170; conc., 6203 (iii).

Legislation: House of Common (Debates) 942 (i); (Indemnity) 6172 (iii); (Leather Trunks) 1562 (i).

Marine Hospitals, &c., conc., 4243 (iii).

Militia (Armouries, &c.) 3720; (Brigade Majors, salaries, &c.) 3699; (Drill Pay, &c.) 3730, 4214 (ii), conc., 4280 (iii); (Military College) 4236 (ii), conc., 4289 (iii); (Military Stores, &c.) 3717 (ii); (Monuments, Battlefields of Can.) conc., 4277 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Burrard Inlet Survey) 1705 (i); Old Records) 5124; (Printing Bureau, Plant) 5346.

Ocean and River Service (Que. Water Police) 3508 (ii).

Penitentiaries (B.C.) 919; (Kingston) 882; (Man.) 913 (i).

Pensions (Fenian Raid) 3660; (Rebellion, 1885) 3661; (Veterans, 1812) 3661 (ii).

Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Kaministiquia River) 4523 (ii); (Kingston Graving Dock) 1675 (i). *Income:* Buildings (B.C.) conc.) 6304; (Man.) 4441; (N.W.T.) 4445; (Ont.) 4331, 4362, 6244; (Ottawa) 4470, 4475; (P. E. I.) conc., 6305; (Que.) 4332. Slides and Booms, 4650, 6261. Dredging (New Plant) 4602. Experimental Farms, &c., 4655. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4572. Roads and Bridges (N.W.T.) 4607 (iii).

Quarantine (Tracadie Lazaretto) conc., 4277, 6304.

Railways — Capital: Annapolis and Digby (construction) 1664. Cape Breton (construction) 1656. C. P. R. (construction) 1652; conc., 4278 (iii). I.C.R. (Moncton, accommodation at) 1653, conc., 1758; (St. Charles Branch) 1655 (i).

Steamboat Inspection, conc., 4243 (iii).

Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B.C.) 3675 (ii).

Territorial Accounts. (Surgeon General's salary) conc., 6306 (iii).

Unprovided Items, 1745 (i).

Tay Canal, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to for M. Com. of Sup., 3763 (ii).

Telegrams, &c., in Com. of Sup., 499 (i).

Testimonials to Ministers (prop. Res.) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3827 (ii).

——— (personal explanation) 3947 (ii).

Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3497 (ii).

Trade Relations with U. S., Papers (remarks) 2289 (ii).

Treaty Papers, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 238, 906 (i).

Trent Valley Canal, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4468 (iii).

Tunnel, P. E. I. and Mainland, on M. for Cor., 1605 (i).

U. S. Fishing Vessels B. 10 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 206 (i).

U. S. Treaty with Cuba, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4012 (ii).

Washington Treaty, Papers (enquiry) 192 (i).

Cartwright, Sir R.—*Continued.*

Ways and Means—The Tariff (Amt.) to M. for Com. on Res., 1252 (i); neg. (Y. 88, N. 114) 3082 (ii).

——— in Com. on Res., 1253 (i), 4006 (ii).

——— on M. to conc. in Res., 3201, 3232 (ii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to Amt., 2023, 2037 (i).

——— on 2° of Res., 1853 (i).

Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 1994 (i); in Com., 2205, 2229, 2237 (ii).

——— (remarks) 1852 (i).

——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 549 (i).

Casey, Mr. G. E., *West Elgin.*

Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1779 (i).

Divisions, Members' Votes, on Procedure (remarks) 4461 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5141, 5200, 5549 (iii).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3092 (ii).

C. P. R., Section "B," Charges against P.M.G., on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 5975 (iii).

Census Returns (remarks) 3999, 4156 (ii), 4239 (iii).

Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5362, 5374, 5602, 5747 (iii).

Customs Acts Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Foster*) on Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) to M. for 3°, 5324 (iii).

Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4631 (iii).

Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2946 (ii).

Order (Ques. of) unparliamentary language, 5330 (iii).

Privilege, Ques. of, par. in Toronto *Globe*, 4242 (iii).

——— *re* Cor. in London *Times*, 4249 (iii).

Quebec, West, Vacancy, on Issue of Writ (remarks) 6309 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3531 (ii).

Civil Government (High Commissioner) contingencies, 494 (i).

Collection of Revenues: Customs (Mr. O'Meara's salary) 1720 (i). Dom. Lands (salaries) 5189. Excise (Distilleries, Extra Duty-pay) 5137; (salaries, &c.) 5128 (iii).

Indians (Ont., Que., &c.) conc., 5412 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (maintenance, &c.) 3510 (ii).

Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 4228 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Can. Temp. Act) conc., 5426; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 5092, 5101; (Commercial Agencies) conc., 5429 (iii).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N. S.) 4316; (Ont.) 4363; (Ottawa) 4471; (Que.) 4358. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4569 (iii).

Territorial Accounts. (Surgeon General's salary) 6280 (iii).

Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3446 (ii).

Casey, Mr. G. E.—*Continued.*
Trade Policy of the Govt.,on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3413 (ii).
Trade Relations with Foreign Countries, Address from Sen., on conc., 6322 (iii).
Veterans of 1837-38, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 2934 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com. on Res., 4003 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 2209, 2245, 2252 (ii).

Chapleau, Hon. J. A., *Terrebonne.*
Barber's, Mr., Claim (Ans.) 269, 270 (i).
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 3966 (ii).
Bellechasse Election, Gazetting Member (Ans.) 111 (i).
——— on M. for Ret., 188 (i).
Bills, delay in Printing (remarks) 238 (1).
Brandon *Mail* in Public Departments, Number (Ans.) 3258 (ii).
Chicoutimi Election Return (Ans.) 142 (i).
Civil Service Examiners' Rep. (presented) 103 (i).
——— List of Can. (presented) 103 (i).
Debates, Official Rep., on M. to conc. in 1st Rep. of Com., 632 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5548; on M. for 3°, 5573
Dom. Electoral Lists, Revisibn (Ans.) 143 (i).
Election, last General, Recounts (Ans.) 142, 177.
Elections, uniform Time to Controvert (Ans.) 112 (i).
Fisheries Deptl. Rep. (presented) 738 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3089 (ii).
Helbronner, Mr. Jules, Amount paid (Ans.) 5407 (iii).
Langevin Block, Priv. and Elec. Com., Printing Evidence (remarks) 4000 (ii).
McLean, Roger & Co.'s Claim (Ans.) 269 (i).
Napierville and St. Rémi Ry. Subsidy, on M. for Ret., 2544 (ii).
North Shore Ry. Debentures, on M. (Mr. *Bowell*) for Com. on Res., 4759 (iii).
Order (Ques. of) unparliamentary Language, 5329.
Printing and Stationery Rep. (presented) 738 (i).
Printing Bureau, absence of Superintendent (remarks) 2437 (ii).
——— Type purchased (Ans.) 3620 (ii).
——— Regulations *re* Employés (Ans.) 3618 (ii).
——— Paper Contracts (Ans.) 529 (i).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Tarte*) *re* Cor. in London *Times*, 4240 (iii).
Regina *Leader*, Printing and Advertising (Ans.) 4295, 4465 (iii).
Royal Commissions since Confederation (Ans.) 4297 (iii).
Ste. Angèle Postmaster, Dismissal, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6237 (iii).
Secretary of State's Rep. (presented) 103 (i).

Chapleau, Hon. J. A.—*Continued.*
Smith & Ripley and Hon. J. A. Chapleau (remarks) 5404 (iii).
Soulanges Canal, Expenditure, on M. for Stmnt., 534 (i).
Speaker, Election of Deputy (remarks) 388 (i).
Statutes, Distribution of (Ans.) 2522 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Civil Government (Civil Service Examiners) contingencies, 481; (Printing Bureau) contingencies, 479, 484; (Printing and Stationery) 243; (Sec. of State) 242 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Printing Bureau) 6253 (iii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Expenses of Committees) 61 73 (iii).
Miscellaneous (*Canada Gazette*) conc.,5418; Printing Bureau, Plant) 5246; (Printing, &c.) conc., 5418 (iii).
Testimonials to Ministers, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3846 (ii).
Type-setting Machines, Cost (Ans.) 271 (i).
Voters in Quebec District, Number (Ans.) 2910.
Voters' List, Cost of Revision (Ans.) 268 (i).
Votes and Proceedings, Translation (remarks) 389 (i).

Charlton, Mr. J., *North Norfolk.*
Address, on the, 77 (i).
Adjnmnt., Ascension Day (remarks) 111 (i).
——— Dom. Day (remarks) 1276 (i).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1818 (i).
Calgary and Fort Macleod Mail Service (Ques.) 3256 (ii).
Calgary and Edmonton Mail Service, Contractor (Ques.) 3255 (ii).
Census Returns, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4858 (iii).
Customs Acts Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Foster*) on Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) to M. for 3°, 5303 (iii).
Customs Seizures, Illegal (Ques.) 2520 (ii).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 2364; on M. to adjn. Hse., 2372 (ii); in Com., 5354, 5374 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 3, 1°) 104 (i).
——— B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. to recom., 5546 (iii).
——— B. 5 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) on M. for 2°, 998 (i).
Election Returns, Date of Declaration, &c., on M. for Ret., 133 (i).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 8 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 327 (i).
——— (B. 31, 1°*) 156; 2° m., 999, 1003 (i).
Goderich, St. Helen's, &c., Mail Service (Ques.) 3261 (ii).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4301 (iii).
High Commissioner (M. to adjn. Deb.) 705 (i).

Charlton, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier* in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup. 808 (i).
Kingston Penitentiary, Coal Supply (Ques.) 3260 (ii).
Land Grants to Rys., B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. to conc. in Res., 4308; in Com., 4628 (iii).
——— B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 5489, 5494 (iii).
Liquor License Permits, N.W.T. (M. for Reps., &c.*) 545 (i).
Lord's Day Observance (B. 2, 1°) 104; 2° m., 747 (i); 1st Rep. of Com. (presented) 2360; in Com., 2936; on Order for Com., 3287 (ii).
McPherson, Addison, Claims for Losses (Ques.) 3257 (ii).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1072 (i).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4298 (iii)
Order (Ques. of) *re* par. in Toronto *Mail*, 2962 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 4659 (ii).
——— unparliamentary Language, 324 (i).
Printing Bureau, absence of Superintendent (remarks) 2438 (ii).
Priv. and Elec. Com., Afternoon Sittings, on M., 1988 (i).
Privilege (Ques.) par. in Toronto *Mail*, 2069 (i).
——— Orange Influence, 1964 (i).
Prohibition, on adjnmt. (remarks) 546 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 3149 (ii).
Ships' Inspection B. 149 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3607 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3551 (ii).
Charges of Management (Dom. Notes) 1754 (i).
Civil Government (High Commissioner) contingencies, 465, 491; (Interior) 249; (Printing Bureau) contingencies 442 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Chinese Immigration) 5057, conc., 5419; (Ont.) 5043. Public Works (Harbours, &c., repairs) 4666. Post Office (Mail Service) 4709 (iii).
Geological Survey, 4725; conc., 5411 (iii).
Government of N. W. T. (Well-boring Machines) conc., 5424 (iii).
Indians (B.C.) conc., 5415; (N.B.) 5060, conc., 5423; (N.W.T.) conc., 5415; (Ont., Que., &c.) 4729 (iii).
Legislation: Senate (salaries, &c.) 936 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Campbellton and Gaspé) 5350; (Grand Manan, N.B., and Mainland) 4678: (San Francisco and Victoria) 4703 (iii).
Militia (Clothing, &c.) 3711 (ii).
Miscellaneous (*Canada Gazette*) conc., 5417; (Commercial Agencies) conc., 5433 (iii).
Mounted Police, conc., 5415 (iii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Man.) 4430; (N.W.T.) conc. (Amt.) 5387; (N.S.) 4314; (Ont.) 5348; (Ottawa) 4473, 4475, conc., 5401; (Repairs, &c.) 4469. Dredging (B.C.) 4650; (Que. and Ont.) 4647. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4559. Slides and Booms, 4652 (iii).

Charlton, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Quarantine, 5336 (iii).
Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B.C.) 3672
Tay Canal, Contracts for Extension (Ques.) 3261.
——— Expenditure (M. for Ret.) 3267 (ii).
——— Passage, Tonnage &c., of Vessels (Ques.) 3259 (ii).
Testimonials to Ministers, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3848 (ii).
Timber Licenses, &c. (prop. Res.) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3428; neg. (Y. 81, N. 100) 3507 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1892 (i).
——— on M. to conc. in Res., 3203 (ii).

Choquette, Mr. P. A., *Montmagny.*
Alert, Str., Captain's Name, &c. (Ques.) 1769 (i).
——— Examination of Commander (Ques.) 2913.
American Cattle for slaughter (Ques.) 5776 (iii).
Animals from U.S., Free Entry (Ques.) 129 (i).
Bernier, Capt., Examination (Ques.) 3621 (ii).
Bourgeois, G. A., Dr., P.O. Inspector, Retirement (M. for Ret.*) 2935 (ii).
——— Payment to (M.) to ref. to Pub. Accts. Com., 2361 (ii).
Chicoutimi Election Return (Ques.) 142 (i).
Doucet, Louis, Dismissal (Ques.) 741 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5551 (iii).
Eel Fishery at Rimouski (Ques.) 2907, 2913 (ii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m.h., to M. for 2°, 785.
Fraserville P.O. Building, Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 3255 (ii).
I.C.R., Claim of Miss Lea Caron (Ques.) 209 (i).
——— Employés, Enquiry into Conduct (M. for Ret.) 1937 (i).
——— emplymnt. of Walter Hogg (Ques.) 5407.
——— Refreshment Contract (Ques.) 3617 (ii).
La Rivière du Sud, Dyke (Ques.) 601 (i).
Liquor Seizures in Montmagny (Ques.) 208, 741 (i), 2148 (ii).
New Carlisle Wharf, Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 967 (i).
Printing Bureau, Regulations *re* Employés (Ques.) 3618 (ii).
Quebec Eastern Ry., Subsidy, on M. for Ret., 1935 (i).
Rouleau, F. F., Fishing Rights at Rimouski (M. for Ret.*) 2936 (ii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Leather Supplies (Ques.) 2912 (ii).
Sheppard, W. A., emplymnt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1266 (i).
Soucy, Eugène, Dismissal from I.C.R. (Ques.) 1274, 1927 (i).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (Que., salaries, &c.) 3518 (ii).

Choquette, Mr. P. A.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 4559 (iii).
Railways—Capital: Annapolis and Digby (construction) 1660 (i).
Tunnel, P.E.I. and Mainland, on M. for Cor. 1632 (i).
Voters in Quebec Province, Number (Ques.) 2910.

Christie, Mr. T., *Argenteuil.*
Customs Act. Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Foster*) on Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) to M. for 3°, 5321 (iii).
Hartley, H. E., Dismissal (M. for Cor.) 144 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2945 (ii).
P. O. Savings Banks, Interest (Ques.) 1577 (i).
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Amt. to prop. Res., 375 (i).

Coatsworth, Mr. E., jun., *East Toronto.*
Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 34 (Mr. *Flint*) in Com., 3296 (ii).
Canadian Order of Home Circles incorp. (B. 81, 1°*) 524 (i).
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Jamieson*) 286, 336 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 5853.
St. Lawrence River Canals, Deepening (Ques.) 1927 (i).
Septennial Benevolent Society's incorp. (B. 83, 1°*) 524 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) conc., 5439 (iii).
Temperance Colonization Society (Ans.) 606 (i).

Cochrane, Mr. E., *East Northumberland.*
Brighton, Warkworth and Norwood Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 71, 1°*) 387 (i).
——— (B. 86, 1°*) 548 (i).
Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 90, 1°*) 549 (i).
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) on M. for 2°, 1009 (i).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 4152 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Dairy Industry) 6177 (iii).

Cockburn, Mr G. R. R., *Centre Toronto.*
Adjnmt., St. Peter and St. Paul, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1410 (i).
Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1957 (i).
Compulsory Voting B. 53 (Mr. *Amyot*) on M. for 2°, 1036 (i).
Empire Printing Co.'s (B. 28, 1°*) 156; 2° m., 191 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 777.

Cockburn, Mr. G. R. R.—*Continued.*
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1142 (i).
London and Canadian Loan and Agency Co.'s (B. 27, 1°*) 156; 2° m., 190 (i).
Privilege (Ques. of) par. in P.E.I. *Daily Examiner*, 1604 (i).
SUPPLY:
Legislation: House of Commons (Expenses of Committees) 6173.
Militia (Armouries, &c.) 3727 (ii): (Kilted Battalion, Toronto) 6183 (iii).
Toronto Drill Shed, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 963 (i).
Tunnel, P.E.I. and Mainland, on M. for Cor., &c., 1291, 1645 (i).
Western Life Assurance Co.'s B. 48 (Mr. *Macdonald, Winnipeg*) on M. for 2°, 295 (i).

Colter, Mr. N. R., *Carleton, N.B.*
Privilege (Ques. of) par. in Ottawa *Citizen*, 3578.

Corbould, Mr. G. E., *New Westminster.*
Address in answer to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 17 (i).
Burrard Inlet and Westminster Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 107, 1°*) 1011 (i).
Coal Monopoly, B.C., in Com. of Sup., 925 (i).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (B.C., salaries, &c.) 3528 (ii).
Penitentiaries (B.C.) 925 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (B. C.) 4451. Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 4594 (iii).

Corby, Mr. H., *West Hastings.*
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) on M. for 2°, 1007 (i).
Pairing of Members (remarks) 746 (i).
Trent Valley Canal, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4797 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2421 (ii).

Costigan, Hon. John, *Victoria, N.B.*
Compounders License Fees (prop. Res.) 1064 (i); in Com., 3243, 3579 (ii).
Duguay, Jos., Exciseman, Suspension (Ans) 3254.
Fort Erie and Buffalo Ferry (Ans.) 1768 (i).
Excise Collector at Stratford (Ans.) 5078 (iii).
Fraudulent Marking (B. 140, 1°*) 2144 (i); in Com., 3583 (ii).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 103, in Com., 4300 (iii).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1176 (i).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. (prop. Res.) 1064 (i); in Com., 3243, 3579; B. 116, 1°*, 1345; 2° and in Com., 3242; Res. conc. in and in Com., 3579 (ii).
——— Regulations *re* Tobacco (Ans.) 194 (i).
——— Rep. (presented) 103 (i).
Intoxicating Liquors, Analysis, on M. for Ret., 205 (i).
Lease of Building on Sparks St. (Ans.) 2518 (ii).
Petroleum Inspection Act Amt. (B. 157, 1°) 3426; in Com., 3648 (ii).

Costigan, Hon. John—*Continued.*
Subsidies (Money) to Railways B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com. on Res., 6140 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Civil Government (Inland Revenue) 253 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, 5166. Culling Timber, 5159. Customs (P.E.I.) 5030. (Excise) Customs Collectors' Allowance) 5138 ; (Methylated Spirits) 5138 ; (Officers of Distilleries, &c.) 5136 ; (salaries, &c.) 5125. Inspection of Staples, 5165. Weights and Measures, &c., 5162 (iii).
Public Works-Income: Buildings (Ottawa) 4475 (iii).
Testimonials to Ministers, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3842 (ii).
——— on adjnnt. (remarks) 3948 (ii).
Weighers of Grain (B. 164) in Com., 4307 (iii).
Weights and Measures Rep. (presented) 103 (i).

Craig, Mr. T. D., *East Durham.*
Census Returns, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4979 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2617 (ii).

Curran, Mr. J. J., *Centre Montreal.*
Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s Acts Amt. (B. 16, 1°*) 155 (ii).
Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s (B. 82, 1°*) 524 ; M. for Com., 1761 ; 3° m., 1957 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3084 (ii).
Fraudulent Marking Prevention B. 140 (Mr *Costigan*) in Com., 3583 (ii).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1183 (i).
Intoxicating Liquors, Analysis (M. for Ret.) 203 (i).
Montreal Custom House Employés, on M. for Ret., 3279 (ii).
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Amt. to prop. Res., 380 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to Amt. to M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 6086 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Capital (Lachine) 4103 (ii). *Income :* (Miscellaneous) 1667 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Rys. (I. C. R. &c.) 4065 (ii).
Public Works : Buildings (Que.) 4345. Dredging (New Plant) 4604 (iii).
Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B. C.) 3677 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2032 (i).

Daly, Mr. T. M., *Selkirk.*
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1808 (i).
C. P. R., Souris Branch, O. C.'s, &c. (M. for copies*) 1938 (i).

Daly, Mr. T. M.—*Continued.*
Franchise Act Repeal B. 8 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 316 (i).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1192 (i).
Great North-West Central Ry., Engineer's Certificate (Ques.) 2144 (ii).
Homesteads (Second) N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 621 (i).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4625, 5539 (iii).
Medicine Hat Ry. and Coal Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 25, 1°*) 155 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 3142 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Agriculture (Experimental Farms) 3560 (ii).
Mounted Police, 4822 (iii).
Penitentiaries (Man.) 916 (i).
Public Works—Income : Buildings (Man.) 4431 ; (N.W.T.) 5398 (iii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co's. B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on Order for Com. on Res., 1254 ; in Com. on Res., 1279, 1363 (i).

Davies, Mr. L. H., *Queen's, P.E.I.*
Admiralty Jurisdiction B. 13 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1093 ; in Com., 1414 (i) ; in Com. on Res., 3101 (ii).
Administration of Justice B. 14 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1090 (i).
Adjnmt., Ascension Day (remarks) 110 (i).
——— Holidays (remarks) 1275 (i).
——— Dom. Day (remarks) 1541 (i).
——— St. Peter and St. Paul, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1411 (i).
Albion Mines Savings Bank B., on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to introd., 1103 (i).
——— B. 113 (Mr. *McDougald, Pictou*) in Com., 1297 (i).
Arnoldi, J. R., Govtl. action (remarks) 3130 (ii)
Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. *Curran*) on Amt. (Mr. *Cockburn*) to M. for 3°, 1958 (i).
Bills of Exchange Act Amt. B. 104 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1100 (i).
Bridge at Quebec and North Shore Ry. Debentures (Ques.) 525 (i).
Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 34 (Mr. *Flint*) in Com., 3298 (ii).
Canadian, West Indian and South American SS. Co., Subsidies (M. for Cor.*) 544 (i).
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 97 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for Com. on Res., 553 ; in Com., 559 ; on M. to conc. in Res., 636 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3651 (ii), 5597, 5727 (iii).
Criminal Law Codification B. 32 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 157 (i).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 1408 (i).

Davies, Mr. L. H.—*Continued.*
Divorce, Thomas Bristow Relief B. 133 (Mr. *O'Brien*) on M. for Com., 2551 (ii).
Divisions, Members' Votes, on Procedure (remarks) 4459 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 1°, 105 (i).
——— B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3244 (ii); on M. for 3°, 5578, 5586 (iii).
Esquimalt, Settlers' Grievances, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4049 (ii).
Female Offenders in N.S. B. 143 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3596 (ii).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3157, 3163; on M. for 3°, 3239 (ii).
Fishermen's Safety (B. 114, 1°*) 1406 (i).
Fishery Bounty, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Tupper*) 1098 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2°, 776 (i).
——— B. 31 (Mr. *Charlton*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2°, 1002 (i).
——— B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3083.
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) on M. for 2°, 1005; in Com., 1974 (i).
Govt. Harbours, Piers, &c., B. 115 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3104 (ii).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1136 (i).
Halifax County Court Judges Salaries, on M. for Ret., 2547 (ii).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 698 (i).
I. C. R., additional Property accommodation, St. John (M. for Cor.*) 1578 (i).
——— Management, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., 3799 (ii).
——— McCully, S. W., Dismissal (Ques.) 3613 (ii).
——— B. 105 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. for 2°, 1257; in Com., 1261 (i).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res.. 5494 (iii).
New Carlisle Wharf, Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 972 (i).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 4155 (ii).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 4464 (iii).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 3922; in Com., 3928 (ii).
Order (Ques. of) unparliamentary Language, 4973 (iii).
Oyster Beds, Leases (Ques.) 3958, 5157 (ii).
Preventive Officer, Pownal Bay, Dismissal (Ques.) 4672 (iii).
Pictou Harbour Commissioners B. 150 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3594, 3900 (ii).
P.E.I. Ry., Road-bed and Rails (M. for Ret.) 228.
——— Dismissals (remarks) 4000 (ii).
Priv. and Elec., 1st Rep. of Com. (remarks) 800.

Davies, Mr. L. H.—*Continued.*
Priv. and Elec., Meetings of Com. (remarks) 983.
——— Afternoon Sittings (M.) 1988 (i).
——— 6th Rep. of Com. *re* Controverted Elections, on conc., 4827 (iii).
——— 7th Rep. of Com. (remarks) 5553 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Amt, 375 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Amt., 1339 (i).
Provincial Govt's Property Transfer B. 11 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 3988 (ii); in Com., 5751 (iii).
Public Accts. Com., on M. to rescind Order of Hse., 1926 (i).
Public Works. Dept., Papers (remarks) 395 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 5881; (Amt.) 5919; neg. (Y. 83, N. 104) 6124 (iii).
Quebec, West, Vacancy, on Issue of Writ (remarks) 4084 (ii).
——— Ques. of Procedure, 4088 (ii).
St. John Ry. Station, additional Property (Ques.) 601, 739 (i).
Ships' Inspection B. 149 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 1°, 2666; in Com., 3600 (ii); on M. to conc. in Amts., 4466 (iii).
Ships' Safety, Legislation respecting (remarks) 218 (i).
——— B. 44 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1088, (i).
Stanley, Str., Trips between Mainland and P. E. I., on M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 164 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 85 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1095 (i).
Strike in Ottawa, &c., calling out Militia (remarks) 5555 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Agriculture) 254; (Finance and Treasury Board) 250; (High Commissioner) 446, 453; (Inland Revenue) 253; (Indian Affairs) 1550, contingencies, 436; (Marine) contingencies, 441; (Public Works) 258, 262 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (P.E.I.) 5024, conc., 5418 (iii). Rys. (I. C. R., &c.) 4058 (ii). Post Office (Mail Service) 4707 (iii).
Fisheries (Fish-breeding) conc., 4259; (P. E. I., salaries) conc., 4256 (iii).
Indians (N.B.) conc., 5421; (Ont., Que., &c.) conc., 5414 (iii).
Justice, Administration of (Sullivan, Hon. W. W., salary) 1556 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Campbellton and Gaspé) 4700; (Liverpool or London and St. John or Halifax) 4689; (P.E.I. and Mainland) 4701; (St. John, Halifax and West Indies, &c.) conc., 5467, 5486 (ii).
Militia (Armouries, &c.) 3724; (Drill Pay) 3733 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Commercial Agencies) conc., 5429; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 5088 (iii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ottawa) 4470; Dredging (repairs) 4642 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Maintenance) 3513 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 3854, 3895; (St. John, additional accommodation) 3885; (St. Charles

Davies, Mr. L. H.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Branch) 3884. P.E.I. (Summerside station, removal) 3898 (ii), conc., 4278 (iii).
Steamboat Inspection conc., 4245 (iii).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 138 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Sen. Amts., 5080, 5591 (iii).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2562; in Com., 2577 (ii).
Trade Policy of the Govt. on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3358 (ii).
Tunnel between P. E. I. and Mainland (Ques.) 208 (i).
——— (M. for Cor. &c.) 1277 (i).
——— Sir Douglas Fox's Rep. (Ques.) 4294 (iii).
U. S. Fishing Vessels B. 10 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 3°, 232 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2029 (i).
West Indies Steamship Service (Ques.) 195 (i).
——— Manifest of Cargoes (M. for Ret.*) 205 (i).
——— Subsidies (prop. Res.) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4373; neg. (Y. 82, N. 107) 4427 (iii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119, (Mr. *Dewdney*) on Order for prop. Res., 1255; in Com., 2232 (ii).

Davis, Mr. D. W., *Alberta.*
British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 56, 1°*) 334 (i).
Macleod Irrigation Co.'s incorp. (B. 52, 1°*) 266.
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 3921; in Com., 3938 (ii).
Red Deer Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com on Res., 3146 (ii).

Dawson, Mr. G. W., *Addington.*
Rideau Canal, Claims for Land Damages (Ques.) 3618 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Income (Rideau) 5223 (iii).
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 4249 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2485 (ii).

Delisle, Mr. A., *Portneuf.*
Beaudry, Lieut.-Col., Commission (Ques.) 1766 (i).
Bernier, Capt. J. E., Reps. of L. Langevin *re* (M. for copies*) 2935 (ii).
Cacouna, Purchase of Timber for Wharf, (Ques.) 158 (i).
Infantry School, St. John's, Surgeon (Ques.) 3620 (ii).
Intoxicating Liquors Smuggled into Quebec, Suits resulting (M. for Stmnt.*) 1062 (i).
Judges in Quebec, appointments (Ques.) 5076 (iii).
Langevin, Mr. Laforce, emplymnt. on Quebec Harbour Works (Ques.) 1769 (i).

Delisle, Mr. A.—*Continued.*
Montreal Pilots, article in Montreal *Herald*, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6144 (iii).
North Shore Ry. Debentures, on M. for copies of O. C.'s, 1019 (i).
Pairing of Members (remarks) 804 (i).
Printing Paper Contracts (Ques.) 528 (i).
Quebec Graving Dock, Management (Ques.) 2149.
Queen's Counsel, conferring Titles (Ques.) 3263.
Revising Officers and late Elections (Ques.) 207.
St. Lawrence River, Deepening (Ques.) 207 (i).

Davidson, Mr. J. I., *South Ontario.*
SUPPLY:
Quarantine, 5342 (iii).

Davin, Mr. N. F., *West Assiniboia.*
Adjnmt., St. Peter and St. Paul, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1412 (i).
American Cattle slaughtered in Canada (remarks) 4537 (iii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5209 (iii).
Bancroft Tender *re* Kingston Graving Dock, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Amyot*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4208 (ii).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1821 (i).
Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 34 (Mr. *Flint*) in Com., 3297 (ii).
Commissions, Military College, Permanent Corps (Ques.) 3960 (ii).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 1408 (i).
Divisions, Members' Votes, on Procedure (remarks) 4459 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. (B. 108, 1°) 1010 (i).
——— B. 165 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 1°, 3996 (ii); on M. for 2°, 5764; in Com., 5770, 6227.
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 783.
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4302 (iii).
Grant, J. J., case of, *re* Settlement (M. for Ret.) 3635 (ii).
Herchmer, Commissioner (Amt.) to M. on Order Paper, 711 (i).
——— Comptroller's Rep. (Ques.) 1274 (i), 2669 (ii).
——— Enquiry into Conduct (prop. Res.) 2913; wthdn., 2923 (ii).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 646 (i).
Homesteads (Second) N.W.T. (prop. Res.) 606 (i).
Immigration into N.W.T. (Ques.) 1269 (i).
Indian Act Amt. B. 144 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3591 (ii).
Indian Dept., Regina, Estimates (M. for Ret.*) 2935 (ii).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4633 (iii).
——— B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 5506 (iii).

Davin, Mr. N. F.—*Continued.*
Land Grants to Volunteers B. 159 (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) in Com. on Res., 3108; on M. to conc. in Res., 3582 (ii).
Macdonald, Sir John, decease of (remarks) 887 (i).
Man. and Assiniboia Grand Junction Ry. Co.'s incorp (B. 129, 1°*) 1964 (i).
Mounted Police, N.W.T., Management (Ques.) 267 (i).
——— Newspaper article on Reform (Ques.) 1269.
Nelson, B.C., Postmaster's salary (Ques.) 2518.
N.W.T. Representation Act Amt. (B. 112, 1°) 1102 (i).
——— B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 3902; in Com., 3930 (ii), 4298; on Sen. Amts., 6228.
Privilege (Ques.) par. in Toronto *Globe*, 4241.
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to Amt. to M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 6160 (iii).
Ry. Act Amt. (B. 110, 1°) 1062 (i); 2° m., 3307 (ii).
Regina and South-Western Ry., Pet. *re* (M.) 799 (i).
Second Homesteads in N.W.T. (prop. Res.) wthdn., 3302 (ii).
Settlement of the N.W.T. (prop. Res.) wthdn., 2913 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, 5168. Dom. Lands (salaries) 5183 (iii). Customs (O'Meara, Mr., additional salary) 1718 (i).
Government of N.W.T. (Library) 6277 (iii); (Translating *Gazette*) 1710 (i); (Well-boring Machines) conc., 5424 (iii).
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 5224 (iii).
Justice, Administration of (Judges' salaries) 514 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.W.T.) 4448; conc., 5395, 6250 (iii); (Printing Bureau) 6254 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 5097; (Medicine Hat Hospital) 6275; (Prohibition Commission) 6276 (iii).
Mounted Police, 1701 (i).
Testimonials to Ministers, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for to Com. of Sup., 3851 (ii).
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3455 (ii).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2568 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2719 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1386 (i).

Denison, Mr. F. C., C.M.G., *West Toronto.*
Adjmnt., Dom. Day (remarks) 1542 (i).
——— (M.) to adjn. Hse., neg. (Y. 50, N. 72) 1579.
Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. *Curran*) on Amt. (Mr. *Cockburn*) to M. for 3°, 1960 (i).
Cavalry School in Toronto (Ques.) 222 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 in Com., 5358 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3249 (ii).

Denison, Mr. F. C.—*Continued.*
Empire Printing and Publishing Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 28, 1°*) 156 (i).
Female Offenders in N. S. B. 143 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3596 (ii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 781 (i).
Imperial Postal Union, Two Cent Rate (Ques.) 131 (i).
Lake Erie, Essex and Detroit River Ry. Co.'s (B. 60, 1°*) 387 (i).
Land Grants to Volunteers, in Com. on Res., 3111 (ii).
London and Canadian Loan and Agency Co.'s (B. 27, 1°*) 156 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3537 (ii).
Justice, Administration of (Judges' salaries) 520.
Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists) 1561. Senate (salaries, &c.) 939 (i).
Militia (Armouries, &c.) 3727; (Care and Maintenance, &c.) 3736; (Drill Instruction) 3730 (ii); (Drill Pay, &c.) conc., 4281; (Kilted Battalion, Toronto) 6183 (iii).
Penitentiaries (Man.) 6171 (iii).
Pensions (Mounted Police, &c., Rebellion, 1885) 3666 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Ont) conc., 5444 (iii).
Veterans of 1837-38, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 2930 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1381 (i).

Desjardins, Mr. A., *Hochelaga.*
Citizens Insurance Co.'s (B. 118, 1°*) 1403 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. to adjn. Hse., 2372 (ii).
Debates, Official Rep., 2nd Rep. of Com. (presented) 548, 1200 (ii).
——— 2nd Rep. of Com. (M.) to conc., 1407 (i).
——— 3rd Rep. of Com. (presented) 2289 (ii).
——— 4th Rep. of Com. (Ms.) to conc., 5941, 6286 (iii).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 8 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 309 (i).
Montreal Bridge Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 121, 1°*) 1483 (i).
Pairing of Members (remarks) 805 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Buildings (Que.) 4352 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2773 (ii).

Desjardins, Mr. L. G., *L'Islet.*
Quebec Ry. and Bridge Co.'s (B. 87, 1°*) 548 (i).
Trade Policy of the Govt., on M. for Com. of Sup. (Amt.) 3309; agreed to (Y. 99, N. 77) 3425 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1995; (Amt. to Amt.) 2020 (i); wthdn., 2668 (ii).

Dewdney, Hon. E., *East Assiniboia.*
Amber Deposits in N.W.T., Applicants (Ans.) 2518 (ii).
Banff Springs Park and Reserve (Ans.) 3957 (ii).
B. C. Better Terms, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4098 (ii).
Cockburn Islands, Location Tickets (Ans.) 1271 (i)
Dingman, Indian Inspector and Agent Allen (Ans.) 1766 (i).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. (B. 165, 1°) 3995 (ii); on M. for 2°, 5762; in Com., 5770, 6226 (iii).
Fort du Coteau du Lac, Lease (Ans.) 605 (i).
Electoral Divisions, N.W.T., Re-arrangement (Ans.) 221 (i).
Esquimalt, Settlers' Grievances, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4022 (ii).
Georgian Bay Islands, Timber Cut (Ans.) 603 (i).
Geological Maps, Counties of N.S. (Ans.) 1011 (i).
—— Survey, Eastern Townships (Ans.) 198 (i).
Grant, J. J., Case of *re* Settlement, on M. for Ret., 3639 (ii).
Homesteads (Second) N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 612 (i).
Indian Act Amt. (B. 144, 1°) 2203; in Com., 3591 (ii).
Indian Affairs, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 103 (i).
—— Management (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1505 (i).
Indian Agent Allen, Traffic in Liquor (Ans.) 1264 (i).
—— Charges against (Ans.) 1928 (i), 3265 (ii).
—— Jones, Charges against (Ans.) 4674 (iii).
—— North Bruce, List of Charges (Ans.) 1273
—— Sutton West (Ans.) 961 (i).
—— Wiarton (Ans.) 603 (i).
Indian Reservation Sea Bird Island, B.C. (Ans.) 709 (i).
—— No. 6, Timber Cut (Ans.) 111 (i).
Indians in Antigonish, Medical Services, &c. (Ans.) 225 (i).
Intoxicating Liquors, Sale to Indians (Ans.) 271.
Interior, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 103 (i).
Jockes & Delorimier, Messrs., Stone Contractors (Ans.) 5677 (iii).
Keewatin, Str., Police Patrol Boat (Ans.) 4294.
Laidlow, Wm., Resignation, on M. for Ret., 1050 (i).
Land Grants to Rys. (B. 169) Res. conc. in and 1°* of B., 4307; M. for Com., 4609; in Com., 4611; 2° m. 5434 (iii).
—— (B. 173) in Com. on Res., 5487, 5593; 1°* of B., 5727; 2° m., 6130 (iii).
Legal Services, Payments by Govt. (Ans.) 2907.
Liquor Sales to Indians in Bruce Co. (Ans.) 530 (i).
Man. School Act, Papers (remarks) 807 (i).
—— School Lands, Sale (Ans.) 1766 (i).
Mennonite Reserve, Man. (Ans.) 198 (i).
Mounted Police, Newspaper article on Reform (Ans.) 1270 (i).

Dewdney, Hon. E.—*Continued.*
N.W.T. Act Amt. (B. 126, 1°) 1760 (i); 2° m., 3902; in Com., 3931 (ii), 4298; on Sen. Amts., 6228 (iii).
—— Representation Act Amt. (B. 178, 1°) 6307; 2° m., 6325 (iii).
Ordnance Lands, Leases, Montreal (Ans.) 5409.
Papashase Indian Reserve, on M. for adjnmt. (remarks) 1404 (i).
Paspasckase Indian Reserve (Ans.) 3265 (ii).
Petroleum at Crow's Nest Pass (Ans.) 6285 (iii).
Quebec Skating Club, Transfer of Land (prop. Res.) 981 (i); in Com., 3584 (ii).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 68 (prop. Res.) 1200 (i); in Com. on Res., 3138 (ii).
Rideau Canal Reserve Lots (Ans.) 4296, 5408 (iii).
Settlers on Ry. Reserve, Vancouver, on M. for Ret., 1051 (i).
Shawanakiskic's Indian Reserve (Ans.) 269 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Indian Affairs) 249, 1547, contingencies, 435 (i); (Geological Survey) 410; (Interior) 248 (i), 6169 (iii); contingencies, 434 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Chinese Immigration) 5058. Dom. Lands (salaries) 5180; conc., 5435. Minor Revenues (Ordnance Lands) 5171. Public Works (Telegraphs, N. W. T.) 4668 (iii).
Geological Survey, 4725; conc., 5411 (iii).
Government of N. W. T. (Elections) 5066; (Library) 6276 (iii); (Schools) 1711; (Translating *Gazette*) 1710 (i); (Well-boring Machines) conc., 5425 (iii).
Indians (B.C.) 4801; (Caughnawaga School Teacher) 6273 (iii); (Green, T. D., salary) 1552; (Man. and N.W.T.) 4736, 4812; (N.B.) 4732, 5059, conc., 5419 (iii); (N.S., Medical Services) 1696 (i), (salaries) 4730, 6294 (iii); (Ont., Que., &c.) 1694 (i), 4727, conc., 5412 (iii); (N.W.T., late Mr. Payne) 1695; (Treaties) 1695 (i), conc., 5415; (P.E.I.) 4735 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Banff Hot Springs) 5109 (iii); (Dufresne, J. I., D.L.S.) 1706 (i); (Govt. of Keewatin) 5084; (Lunatics, support of) 1709 (i), 5085; (Mounted Police, compensation) 5086 (iii).
Mounted Police, 1697 (i) 4817, 6274, 5415, conc., 5415 (iii).
Open Account (Seed Grain) 1729 (i).
Pensions (Harpur, G. H.) 1572 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (B.C.) 6251; (N.W.T.) conc., 5391, 6249 (iii); (Regina School) 1687 (i).
Unprovided Items, 1730 (i).
Temperance Colonization Society (Ans.) 606 (i).
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3438 (ii).
Walrond Ranche and Settlers, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6158 (iii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (prop. Res.) 549; Order for Com. on Res. (read) 1253; in Com. on Res., 1347, 1398; Res. conc. in and 1°* of B., 1414; 2° m., 1994 (i); in Com., 2205, 2236, 2249 (ii).

Devlin, Mr. C. R., *Ottawa County.*
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 3967, 3983 (ii).
Bright, J. B., emplymnt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3263.
Commercial Treaty, England and France (Ques.) 3950 (ii).
Experimental Farm, Distribution of Bulletins (M. for Ret.*) 1579 (i).
Gatineau Point Wharf, Expenditure (Ques.) 604 (i).
Genest, S., Cosgrove, J., and Leduc, C., Resignations, &c. (M. for Cor.) 145 (i).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1174 (i).
Hull Post Office, Tower Clock (Ques.) 222 (i).
Le Liévre and Ottawa Rivers, Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 2522 (ii).
Man. School Acts (M. for Ret.) 116 (i).
——— Papers (enquiry) 807 (i).
——— Separate Schools, Papers (Ques.) 741 (i).
North Nation River Wharf, Construction (Ques.) 222 (i).
Ottawa Co. Postal Service (M. for Ret.) 229 (i).
Pelee Island Sub-Collector, on M. for Cor., 1981; on M. to adjn. Hse., 1986 (i).
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Amt. to prop. Res., 383 (i).
Sawdust in La Have River, on M. for Ret., 1948 (i).
Stratford Boys' Home, Govtl. Control (Ques.) 604 (i).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Dairying Industry) 3575 (ii); (Experimental Farm) 1567 (i).
Civil Government (High Commissioner) contingencies, 491; (Indian Affairs) contingencies, 439; Post Office) contingencies, 440; (Public Works) 397 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (O'Meara, Mr., additional salary) 1717 (i).
Fisheries (Fish-breeding) conc., 4276 (iii).
Justice, Administration of (Judges' salaries) 514 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists Revision) 948 (i).
Penitentiaries (Dorchester) 912 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Hull P. O.) 1685 (ii); (Man.) 4437. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4571 (iii).
Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B.C.) 3682 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2763 (ii).
——— par. in *La Patrie* (remarks) 2965 (ii).

Dickey, Mr. A. R., *Cumberland.*
Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 34 (Mr. *Flint*) in Com., 3295 (ii).
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 97 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 563 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5357, 5380, 5603, 5727, 5739 (iii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3098 (ii).

Dickey, Mr. A. R.—*Continued.*
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) in Com., 1920 (i).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 690 (i).
I. C. R. Management, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3807 (ii).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4632 (iii).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 4153.
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 5919 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Rys. (I.C.R., &c.) 4068 (ii).
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) conc., 4283 (iii).

Dupont, Mr. F., *Bagot.*
Census Returns, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4953.
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m.h., to M. for 2°, 788.
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 876 (i).

Dyer, Mr. E. A., *Brome.*
Newport Harbour Improvements, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6196 (iii).
Pairing of Members (remarks) 804 (i).

Earle, Mr. T., *Victoria, B.C.*
Victoria and North American Ry. Co.'s Ferry (B. 62, 1°*) 387 (i).

Edgar, Mr. J. D., *West Ontario.*
Adjnmt., St. Peter and St. Paul, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1411 (i).
Administration of Justice B. 14 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1092 (i).
Admiralty Jurisdiction B. 13 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1421 (i).
Admiral, Str., Services and Ownership (M. for Rets.) 2157 (ii).
Albion Mines Savings Bank B. 113, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to introd., 1103; in Com., 1297 (i).
Allisonville Postmaster, Charges against (Ques.) 2152 (ii).
Berne Copyright Convention (Ques.) 1264 (i).
C. P. R., Section "B," Charges against P. M. G., on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 5989 (iii).
Copyright Act, 1889 (Ques.) 335 (i).
——— Amt. B. 141 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 2144 (i).
——— Imp. Legislation (Ques.) 4674 (iii).
——— Laws of Canada (M. for Cor.) 726 (i).
——— Legislation respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5014 (iii).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 1409 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) on M. for 2°, 994 (i).

Edgar, Mr. J. D.—*Continued.*
Dom. Elections Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5198 (iii).
Esquimalt Graving Dock, Lengthening (Ques.) 530 (i).
Fishery Laws, Enforcement, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks), 1525 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. (B. 4, 1°) 105; 2° m., 767, 795 (i).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn Hse., 1145 (i).
Indian Lands Provincial Settlement B. 100 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1087 (i).
Lily, H. M. S., Rescue of Crew (M. for Papers, &c.) 1059 (i).
Priv. and Elec., 1st Rep. of Com. (remarks) 800 (i).
Provincial Accounts Settlement B. 99 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2° and in Com., 1066 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to Amt. to M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 6100 (iii).
——— Papers, &c. (enquiry) 219, 393.
——— on Ques. of Priv. (M.) to ref. Charges to Com. on Priv. and Elec., 155 (i).
Revising Officers' Instructions *re* Revision (Ques.) 5078 (iii).
Ships' Safety B. 44 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1088.
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 85 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1093 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Public Works) 255, 261, 406 (i).
Penitentiaries (B.C.) 926 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2031 (i).

Edwards, Mr. W. C., *Russell.*
Member's Vote challenged, 3780 (ii).
Pairing of Members, on M. for adjmnt., 3823 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Dairy Industry) 6175; (Haras Co.) 6180 (iii).
Collection of Revenues: Public Works (Slide and Boom Dues) 4663 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2813 (ii).

Fairbairn, Mr. C., *South Victoria.*
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1799 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 3°, 5577 (iii).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. for 1°, 6144 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Generally) 4601 (iii).

Fauvel, Mr. W. Le B., *Bonaventure.*
Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. for Com., 1764 (i).
Bonaventure Pier, Construction (Ques.) 335 (i).

Fauvel, Mr. W. Le B.—*Continued.*
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3185 (ii).
Fishing Licenses, Restigouche River (M. for Ret.) 3283 (ii).
New Carlisle Wharf, Cost of Construction (M. for Ret.) 966 (i).
Salmon Net-Fishing, Licenses (Ques.) 2152 (ii).
——— Restigouche River (Ques.) 1268 (i).

Featherston, Mr. J., *Peel.*
Brampton Postmaster, Vacancy (Ques.) 3259 (ii).
Cattle on European Steamers (Ques.) 603 (i),
Live Stock Shipment B. 154 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 1°, 3135; in Com., 3993 (ii).
——— (remarks), 957 (i).
SUPPLY:
Quarantine, 5337 (iii).

Ferguson, Mr. C. F., *Leeds and Grenville.*
Adjmnt., St. Peter and St. Paul, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1411 (i).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1805 (i).
Pembroke Lumber Co.'s incorp. (B. 26, 1°*) 15t
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (High Commissioner) contingencies, 457 (i).
Territorial Accounts (Surgeon General's salary) 6282. (iii).

Ferguson, Mr. J., *South Renfrew.*
Kingston and Pontiac Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 89, 1°*) 548 (i).

Flint, Mr. T. B., *Yarmouth.*
Adjnmt., Queen's Birthday (Ques.) 157 (i).
Blizzard, Schooner, Rescue of Crew (M. for Cor.) 735 (i).
Can. Temp. Act Amt. (B. 34, 1°) 193 (i); 2° m., 3288; in Com., 3293 (ii).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3650 (ii).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3186 (ii).
Fishery Bounty Cheques, Cost, &c., *re* (M. for Ret.) 180 (i).
——— (Ques.) 129 (i).
——— Claims, &c. (M. for Stmnt.) 537 (i).
——— Payments (M. for Stmnt.) 211 (i).
——— Inspector, Dist. No. 3, Resignation (Ques.) 130 (i).
Foreshores of Dom., Ownership (M. for Cor.) 178.
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 867 (i).
Indian Agent Chisholm, Charges against, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6147 (iii).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member (prop. Res.) 4462; (M.) to ref. to Sel. Com., 4533 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com., 5687 (iii).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3934 (ii).

Flint, Mr. T. B.—*Continued*
Pictou Harbour Commissioners B. 150 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3595 (ii).
P.O. Building Strathroy, Tenders (M. for copies*) 2935 (ii).
Privilege (Ques. of) on Division, June 22, 1484 (i).
——— East Northumberland, Charges against Member (prop. Res.) 4462 (iii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Amt., 1326 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Jamieson*) 336 (i).
Returning Officer, Victoria, N.S. (M. for Cor.*) 2935 (ii).
Sawdust in La Have River, on M. for Ret., 1946, 2189 (i).
Seigfreid, Schr., Reward to Captain (Ques.) 224 (i).
Ships' Inspection B. 149 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3601 (ii).
Stoney Island Breakwater (Ques.) 5408 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (High Commissioner) contingencies 460; (Indian Affairs) contingencies, 438 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, 5168. Customs (Que.) 5040. Excise (salaries, &c.) 5127; (Methylated Spirits) 5138. Post Office (Mail Service) 4717; (salaries, &c.) 4722 (iii). Rys. (I.C.R., &c.) 4064 (ii). Weights, Measures, &c., 5163 (iii).
Government of N.W.T., 5067 (iii).
Indians (N.B.) 4733; (N.S.) 6273; (P.E.I.) 4735 (iii); (T. D. Green, salary) 1552 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists, Revision) 947 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Maintenance) 3512
Mail Subsidies, &c. (St. John and Halifax and West Indies, &c.) conc., 5479 (ii).
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) conc., 4285; (Monuments, Battlefields of Can.) 4277 (iii); (Permanent Forces, Pay, &c.) 3737 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Printing Bureau Plant) 1706 (i), 5346 (iii).
Mounted Police, 4824 (iii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (B.C.) 4451 (ii); (Miscellaneous) 4662; (N. W. T.) conc., 5389; (Ont.) 4371; (Ottawa) 4475. Harbours and Rivers (N.S.) 4532, 6254 (iii).
Railways—Capital: Annapolis and Digby (construction) 1659 (i). I. C. R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 3875 (ii).
Walrond Ranche and Settlers, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6148 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2626 (ii).
West Indies Steamship Subsidies, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4405 (iii.)

Forbes, Mr. F. G., *Queen's, N.S.*
Bay of Fundy Fisheries, on M. for Ret., 721 (i).
Cement Purchases by Govt. (Ques.) 4674 (iii).
Cornwallis Valley Ry. Co., Subsidy (Ques.) 2153.
Dorchester Penitentiary, Supplies (Ques.) 1928 (i).
Fishing Bounties paid in Queen's, N.S. (M. for Ret.) 734 (i).
——— on M. for Stmnt., 211 (i).

Forbes, Mr. F. G.—*Continued.*
Inverness and Richmond Ry. Co., on M. for Cor., 2538 (ii).
Liverpool and Annapolis Ry. Co., Subsidy (Ques.) 143, 601 (i).
Liverpool Postal Accommodation (Ques.) 1768 (i).
Pairing of Members, on M. for adjnmt., 3825 (ii).
Plate presented to Min. of Public Works, Duty paid (Ques.) 2912 (ii).
Quebec Colonization Lottery (Ques.) 2154 (ii).
Sawdust in La Have River, on M. for Ret., 1950 (i).
Smith & Ripley and Hon. J. A. Chapleau (Ques.) 5403 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (Fish-breeding) conc., 4266 (iii).
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 5283 (iii).
Indians (N.B.) 5063 (iii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Liverpool, &c. or St. John, &c.) 4688 (iii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 4326; (Ont.) 4364 (iii). Dredging (New Plant) 1691 (i). Harbours and Rivers (Generally) 4594 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 3864 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2884 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1384 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E., *King's, N.B.*
Address, on The, 56 (i).
Adjnmt. St. Peter and St. Paul, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin* 1410 (i).
Albion Mines Savings Bank B. (M.) 1103 (i).
Atlantic Mail Service, on M. for Cor., 126 (i).
Auditor Gen.'s Rep. (presented) 103 (i).
Baie des Chaleurs Ry., Subsidies (Ans.) 5075 (iii).
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty provision B. 168 (prop. Res.) 3427, 3961; in Com., 3963, 3983 (ii); Res. conc. in and 1°* of B., 4300 (iii).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1828 (i).
BUDGET, THE (remarks) 738, 953, 959 (i).
——— (Annual Stmnt.) 1200 (i).
Cape Breton Ry., Station Masters' Duties (Ans.) 4677 (iii).
Carleton Branch Ry. Sale B. 158 (prop. Res.) 1992 (i); Res. conc. in and 1°* of B., 3579 (ii).
——— Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 550 (i).
Census Returns, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4845.
Cement Purchases by Govt. (Ans.) 4675 (iii).
Civil Service Employés, Payments (Ans.) 2906.
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry Co.'s B. 97 (prop. Res.) 441, 550; M. for Com. on Res., 550; Res. conc. in and 1°* of B., 636 (i).
Commercial Treaty, England and France (Ans.) 3951 (ii), 4670 (iii).
Consolidated Rev. and Audit Act Amt. (B. 137, 1°*) 1989; in Com., 3236 (ii).
Corn Meal, Abolition of Duty (Ans.) 143 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Continued.*
Customs Act Amt. (B. 156, 1°) 3254 (ii); 2° m., 4829; M. for Com. on Res., 5139 (iii).
Debates, Official, on M. to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 1407 (i).
Deptl. Files, Destruction (Ans.) 4157 (ii).
——— Pay Sheets (Ans.) 2520 (ii).
Elliott, G. M., Appmnt. as Gas Inspector (Ans.) 5076 (iii).
ESTIMATES, THE (remarks) 214 (i).
——— (presented) 227 (i).
——— Suppl., 1891 (presented) 799 (i).
——— Suppl., 1892 (presented) 5589 (iii).
——— further Suppl., 1892 (presented) 6289 (iii).
Fenelon Falls Lockmaster (Ans.) 4672 (iii).
——— Lockmaster's Office (Ans.) 4673 (iii).
Gov. Gen's. Warrants (presented) 103 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 1545 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4542 (iii).
Govt. Policy, on adjnmt. (remarks) 1101 (i).
Heney, John, Payment of Canal Tolls (Ans.) 4676 (iii).
High Commissioner, Sums Paid (Ans.) 224 (i).
——— Fiscal Year 1890 (Ans.) 176 (i).
Indemnity to Senators and Members (M.) 6290.
Iron Bounties, on enquiry for Ret., 2580, 2668.
Maple Sugar, Bounty for Production (Ans.) 1576.
Montreal Customs, defaulting Clerks (Ans.) 4675.
Murray Canal, Officials employed (Ans.) 4675.
Mercantile Agencies, Legislation Regulating (Ans.) 144 (i).
Newfoundland Bait Act, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6194 (iii).
Newspaper paragraphs, personal explanation objected to, 3427 (ii).
North Shore Ry. Debentures (prop. Res.) 3577.
Order (Ques. of) in Com. of Sup., 4658 (iii).
——— Superannuation, in Com. of Sup., 3671 (ii).
——— Unparliamentary Expressions, 1341 (i).
Pictou Bank Winding-up B. 76 (Mr. *McDougald, Pictou*) on M. for 2°, 548 (i).
Porter, David, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6231 (iii).
P. O. Savings Banks, Interest (Ans.) 1577 (i).
Preventive Officer, Pownal Bay, Dismissal (Ans.) 4672 (iii).
Private Bills Reps., Extension of Time (M.) 3738.
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors (Amt.) to Amt., 1313; agreed to (Y. 107, N. 88) 1344 (i).
——— Mr. Scriver's Speech (remarks) 2204.
——— on adjnmt. (remarks) 545 (1).
Public Accts. Com., Meetings, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1713 (i).
——— on M. to refer Accts. of Bourcier, 3948 (ii).
——— Sittings of Com., on M., 5014 (iii).
Public Accounts (presented) 103 (i).
Public Debt, Sinking Fund (Ans.) 2152 (ii).
Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (Ans.) 4675.
Quebec Harbour Commissioner's, Interest Acct. (Ans.) 270 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Continued.*
Reciprocity, Canada and Spain (Ans.) 3619 (ii).
Rideau Canal, Tolls Collected (Ans.) 4676 (iii).
——— Tolls Refunded (Ans.) 4676 (iii).
Robitaille, C. N., Payment to (Ans.) 4673 (iii).
Subsidies (Ry.) to Provinces (Ans.) 603 (i).
Supplies for Public Service, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4101 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Dairy Industry) 6174 (iii).
Arts, &c. (Census) 1569 (i); (Census and Statistics) 3533 (ii); (Health Statistics) 6173 (iii); (Seldon's Claim) 1569 (i).
Canals—Income (Miscellaneous) 1667 (i).
Charges of Management (Dom. Notes) 1754; (Printing, Advertising, &c.) 1756; (Public Debt, Commissions) 1749; (Savings Banks) 1748 (i).
Civil Government (Agriculture) 254; (Auditor Gen.'s Office) 1545 (i), 6167 (iii); (Customs) 254; (Finance and Treasury Board) 250; (Fisheries) 255; (Geological Survey) 410; (Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office) 240, contingencies, 433; (High Commissioner) 411, 1732 (i), 6167 (iii), contingencies, 442, 451; (Indian Affairs) 249, 1548, contingencies, 438; (Inland Revenue) 253; (Interior) 247; (Justice) 241; (Marine) 255; (Post Office) 254; (Printing and Stationery) 243, contingencies, 442, 484; (Privy Council Office) 241, contingencies, 433, 1556 (i), 6168 (iii); (Public Works) 397; (Sec. of State) 242 (i), 6167 (iii).
Collection of Revenues: Excise, 1724 (i). Rys. (I.C. R.) 3853 (ii), conc., 1758 (i). Public Work (Agency, B.C.) 4669. Harbours, &c. (Repairs) 4665. Land and Cable Telegraphs, 4668. Slide and Boom Dues, 4663. Telegraphs (B.C.) 4669; (N.W.T.) 4668; (P.E.I. and Mainland) 4668 (iii). Weights and Measures, 1725 (i).
Fisheries (Fish-breeding) conc., 4274 (iii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Debates) 943; (Voters' Lists) 1560, 1734. Library (salaries) 945. Senate (salaries, &c.) 930 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Campbellton and Gaspé) 4700, 5349; (Canso, Arichat, &c.) 4702; (Grand Manan, N.B. and Mainland) 4678; (Liverpool or London and St. John or Halifax) 4679; (Magdalen Islands) 4678; (San Francisco and Victoria) 4703; (St. John and Halifax and West Indies, &c.) conc., 5458 (iii).
Militia (Armouries, &c.) 3727 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Can. Temp. Act) 5086, conc., 5426; (C.A.R., Hon. Thos. White's Funeral) 6276; (Chief Justice Palmer, allowance) 6276; (Commercial Agencies) 5108, conc., 5428; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 5086, 5103; (Historical, &c., Map of Can.) 6261; (Old Records) 5084, 512; (Prohibition Commission) 6276; (Returns, preparation) 5107; (Royal Society's Proceedings) 5123; (Strong, W. O., Gratuity to Widow) 6264; (Govt. of Keewatin) 5084 (iii); (Gliddon, Wm., payment) 1706 (i).
Penitentiaries (B.C.) 926 (i).
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Kingston Graving Dock) 1678 (i). (Cape Tormentine) 4522. *Income:* Buildings (B.C.) 4451, 6251; (Man.) 4429, 5348; (N.W.T.) 4441, 6248; (N.S.) 4514; (Ont.) 4331, 4362, 6239; (Ottawa) 4470, 4474, 4522, 4663, conc., 5401; (P. E. I.) conc., 6305; (Printing Bureau) 6253: (Que.) 4332, 6201, 6210, conc., 5385; (Repairs, &c.) 4469. Dredging (B.C.) 4649: (Man.)

Foster, Hon G. E.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
4647; (Ont. and Que.) 4646; (New Plant) 4602; (Repairs) 4640. Experimental Farms, &c., 4653. Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 4593; (Generally) 4595, conc., 5402; (Man.) 4591; (N.S.) 4530; (Ont.) 4559, 5265, conc., 5438; (P.E.I.) 4532; (Que.) 4552; (Miscellaneous) 4657. Roads and Bridges (Ont.) 4607; Slides and Booms, 4650, 6261. Surveys, &c., 4662 (iii).
Quarantine, conc., 6304 (iii).
Railways—Capital: C.P.R. (construction) conc., 4278 (iii); (remarks) 1651 (i).
Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B.C.) 3672, 3695 (ii).
Territorial Accounts (Surgeon General's salary) 6280 (iii).
Unprovided Items, 1745 (i).
Supply (B. 127) 1°*, 2°* and 3°*, 1853 (i).
——— (B. 167, 1°*) 4297 (iii).
——— (B. 177) Res. in Com., 1°*, 2°* and 3°*, 6307 (iii).
Tay Canal, Basin at Perth, Contract (Ans.) 4672 (iii).
Telegrams, in Com. of Sup., 500 (i).
Trade Policy of the Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3376 (ii).
Trade Relations with Empire, Mess. from Sen. (M.) 6216 (iii).
——— Foreign Countries, Address from Sen. M. to conc., 6309 (iii).
——— U. S., Papers (remarks) 2289 (ii).
——— West Indies (remarks) 4608 (iii).
Treaty, Commercial, England and France (Ans.) 3951 (ii), 4670 (iii).
Tunnel, P. E. I. and Mainland, on M. for Cor., 1647 (i).
——— (Ans.) 208, 227 (i).
——— Sir Douglas Fox's Rep. (Ans.) 4294 (iii).
U. S. Treaty with Cuba, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4011 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2021 (i).
——— on M. to adjn. Deb., 2065 (i).
——— M. to conc. in Res., 1434 (i); 3201, 3232.
——— in Com. on Res., 1252, 1853 (i); 4001 (ii); 4297, 6307 (iii).
——— (prop. Res.) for Com., 102 (i).
West Indies Steamship Service (Ans.) 195 (i).
——— Subsidies, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4394.
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on Order for Com. on Res., 1254 (i); in Com., 2229; M. to conc. in Amts., 2290 (ii).

Fraser, Mr. D. C., *Guysborough.*
Adjnmt., Dom. Day (remarks) 1539 (i).
Albion Mines Savings Bank B. 113 (Mr. *Mc Dougald, Pictou*) in Com., 1297 (i).
Breakwaters in Guysborough County (Ques.) 1012.
Cape Breton and N.S. Ry. accommodation (M. for Cor.) 177 (i).

Fraser, Mr. D. C.—*Continued.*
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 97 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 560 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 2369 (ii); in Com., 5744 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) on M. for 2°, 998 (i).
East River, Deepening (Ques.) 1011 (i).
Female Offenders in N.S. B. 143 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3599 (ii).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3171 (ii).
Fishery Laws, Fines for Violating, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 189 (i).
——— Overseer, Guysborough, Salary (Ques.) 5403.
Fishing Bounty paid in Guyborough Co. (M. for Ret.*) 232 (i).
Geological Maps, Counties of N.S. (Ques.) 1011.
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1159 (i).
Guysborough Customs Collector, Superannuation (Ques.) 2520 (ii).
Halifax City Market Property (Ques.) 1770 (i).
——— County Court, Judges' Salary (M. for Cor.) 2547 (ii).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 838 (i).
Indians in Antigonish, &c., Medical Services (Ques.) 224 (i).
——— Guysborough, &c., Supplies (M. for List*) 232 (i).
Inverness and Richmond Ry. Co., on M. for Cor., 2536 (ii).
——— County Rys., Subsidies (Ques.) 2911 (ii).
I. C. R. Management, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3811 (ii).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1072 (i).
McLeod, Mr., of Port Mulgrave (remarks) 2289.
Mermerly, Barque, Rescue of Crew (M. for Cor.) 712 (i).
Munroe, Hugh, Claim for Damages (M. for Ret.) 2546 (ii).
Oxford and Pictou Mail Service (Ques.) 1768 (i).
Pictou Harbour Commissioners B. 150 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3594 (ii).
P. E. I. Ry., Messrs. Saunders and Muttart, Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 2167 (ii).
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Jamieson*) 277; on adjnmt. (remarks) 545, 1343 (i).
Sawdust in La Have River, on M. for Ret., 1952.
Ships' Inspection B. 149 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3602 (ii).
Short Line Ry., New Route (Ques.) 3266 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3548 (ii).
Agriculture (Two-rowed Barley) 1564 (i).
Civil Government (Public Works) 265 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, 5166. Customs (Chinese Immigration) 5066 (iii);

Fraser, Mr. D. C.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
(Douglas, Mr., additional salary) 1724 (i); (Ont.) 5049. Dom. Lands (salaries) 5181 (iii). Rys. (I.C.R.) 1737 (i), 4062 (ii). Post Office (Mail Service) 4715 (iii).
Fisheries (N.S., salaries) conc., 4245 (iii).
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 5229 (iii).
Indians (N.B.) 5061; (N.S.) 4729 (iii).
Justice, Administration of (Exchequer Court) 508; (L. A. Audette) 1557 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists) 949, 1560, 1735.
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Canso, Arichat, &c.) 4702; (San Francisco and Victoria) 4704 (iii).
Militia (Armouries, &c.) 3721; (Clothing, &c.) 3711 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Banff Hot Springs) 5116; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 5089 (iii).
Railways.—Capital: Cape Breton (Train Ferry) 3898. I.C.R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 3862; (New Glasgow, increased accommodation) 3882 (ii).
Public Works—Income Buildings (B.C.) 4451; (Que.) 4335. Harbours and Rivers (N.S.) 4530.
Tay Canal, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3756 (ii).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2573 (ii).
U. S. Treaty with Cuba, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4014 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2842 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1390 (i).

Fréchette, Mr. L. J. Côté (*alias*), *Megantic.*
Geological Survey, Eastern Townships (Ques.) 198 (i).
Pairing of Members (remarks) 745 (i).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. to conc. in Res., 6142 (iii).
Voters' Lists, Extension of Time for Revision (Ques.) 2908 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3070 (ii).

Frémont, Mr. J. J. T., *Quebec County.*
Admiralty Courts, Colonial (Ques.) 5777 (iii).
Bridge at Quebec, Construction (Ques.) 2912 (ii).
C. P. R., North Shore Ry. Bonds (Ques.) 2521.
Criminal Law B., Fees *re* Drafting (Ques.) 3260.
Divisions, Members' Votes, on Procedure (remarks) 4462 (iii).
I. C. R., Accident at St. Joseph de Lévis (Ques.) 2145 (ii).
Landslide at Quebec, O. C.'s, &c. (M. for copies) 3621 (ii).
North Shore Ry. Debentures (Ques.) 527 (i).
——— on M. for copies of O. C.'s, &c., 1018 (i).
Quebec and Lake St. John Ry., Subsidy (Ques.) 2145 (ii).
Sick and Distressed Mariners, 2145 (ii).
Sillery Seigniory and Huron Indians of Lorette (Ques.) 604 (i).

Gauthier, Mr. J., *L'Assomption.*
Hurteau, Mr. Hilaire, employment by Govt. (Ques.) 529 (i).
Inland Revenue Regulations *re* Tobacco (Ques.) 194 (i).

German, Mr. W. M., *Welland*
Bancroft Tender *re* Kingston Graving Dock, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Amyot*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4205 (ii).
Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 70, 1°*) 387 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 in Com., 5372, 5737 (ii).
Crystal Beach and Point Abino Customs Officers (M. for Cor.*) 1579 (i).
Fort Erie and Buffalo Ferry (Ques.) 1768 (i).
Homesteads (Second) N. W. T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 628 (i).
Johnston, Samuel, Dismissal as Preventive Officer (M. for Ret.*) 2935 (ii).
Kingston P. O., Rep. of Postmaster (M. for copies) 2545 (ii).
Lundy's Lane Battle, Monument (Ques.) 3618 (ii).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com., 5664 (iii).
Postmasters' Salaries, Niagara Falls, &c. (Ques.) 1275, 1767 (i).
Returns (enquiry) 1991 (i), 2581 (ii).
Toronto Harbour Works, Contractors, &c. (Ques.) 2518 (ii).
Welland Canal, Extra Employés (M. for Cor., &c.) 229 (i).
——— Rets. (enquiry) 3200 (ii).
Whirlpool Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 58, 1°*) 334 (i).

Gibson, Mr. W., *Lincoln and Niagara.*
Bancroft Tender *re* Kingston Graving Dock, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Amyot*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4196 (ii).
Privilege (Ques. of) par. in *Empire*, 3200 (ii).
St. Catharines and Merriton Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 88, 1°*) 548 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital (Carillon) 4150 (ii); (Sault Ste. Marie) 5211 (iii); (St. Lawrence River and Canals) 4112 (ii). *Income:* (Carillon and Grenville) 5222 (iii).
Public Works—Capital: Kingston Graving Dock, 1670 (i). *Income:* Buildings (Ottawa) 4497 (iii).
Quarantine, 5337 (iii).
Tay Canal, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3750 (ii).
Testimonials to Ministers, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3844 (ii).
Welland Canal, Surplus Water (M. for Ret.) 963 (i).
——— Turning Basin (Ques.) 270 (i).

Gillies, Mr. J. A., *Richmond, N.S.*
Admiralty Jurisdiction B. 13 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1422 (i).

Gillies, Mr. J. A.—*Continued.*
Fisheries Protection Service, Cape Breton (Ques.) 527 (i).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 842 (i).
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic (M.) to adjn. Deb., agreed to (Y. 98, N. 90) 385 (i).

Gillmor, Mr. A H., *Charlotte.*
Bay of Fundy Fisheries, on M. for Ret., 723 (i).
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 3973 (ii).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1801 (i).
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 97 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 566 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com.. 3174 (ii).
I. C. R. Management, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3813 (ii).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2561 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie Wharf, Purchase of Property (Ques.) 1268 (i).
SUPPLY :
Fisheries (Fish-breeding) conc., 4270 (iii).
Indians (N.B.) 5063 (iii).
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 5265 (iii).
Weldford P. O., Conduct of Business (Ques.) 2151 (ii).

Girouard, Mr. D., *Jacques Cartier.*
C. P. R., Section "B," Charges against P. M. G., on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 5984 (iii).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member (M.) to Print Evidence, 4835 (iii).
Priv. and Elec., 1st Rep. of Com. (presented) 799.
——— Afternoon Sittings (M.) 197, 1987 (i).
——— 2nd Rep. of Com. conc. in, 2360 (ii).
——— 6th Rep. of Com. *re* Controverted Elections (M.) to conc., 4825 (iii).
——— 7th Rep. of Com. (presented) 5553 (iii).
——— 4th Rep. of Com. *re* Thomas McGreevy, &c. (presented) 3738 (ii).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS (M.) to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 5778; agreed to (Y. 101, N. 86) 6126 (iii).
——— Papers (remarks) 988 (i).
Quebec, West, Rep. of sub-Com. on Priv. and Elec., (presented) 4747 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Public Works: Buildings (Que.) 4334 (ii).
Justice—Administration of (Judges' salaries) 515.

Godbout, Mr. J., *Beauce.*
Maple Sugar, Bounty for Production (Ques.) 1576 (i).
Quebec Central Ry. Co., Subsidy (Ques.) 4675 (iii).

Gordon, Mr. D. W., *Vancouver Island.*
Behring Sea Seal Fisheries, Imp. Legislation (Ques.) 959 (i).
Chinese Immigrants into Can. (M. for Ret.*) 1578 (i).

Gordon, Mr. D. W.—*Continued.*
Esquimalt Settlers' Grievances, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4046 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Income: Buildings (B.C.) 4452. Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 4594 (iii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (San Francisco and Victoria) 4703 (iii).
Wellington, Cost, &c., of Militia (M. for Cor., &c.) 145 (i).
——— Services of Militia (Ques.) 2146 (ii).

Grieve, Mr. J. N., *North Perth.*
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1774 (i).
Listowell P. O. and Custom House (Ques.) 601 (i).

Guay, Mr. P. M., *Lévis.*
Revising Officer, Rimouski (Ques.) 741 (i).
Sheppard, W. A., emplymnt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1266 (i).
Sillery Seigniory and Huron Indians of Lorette (Ques.) 604 (i).
Soucy, Eugène, Dismissal from I. C. R. (Ques.) 1274 (i).
Statutes, Distribution (Ques.) 2522 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 4346. Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 4556 (iii).

Haggart, Hon. J. G., *South Lanark.*
Advertising Ottawa Mail Service (Ans.) 963 (i).
—— on M. for Ret., 2541 (ii).
Agriculture, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 103 (i).
Allisonville Postmaster, Charges against (Ans.) 2152 (ii).
American Cattle for Slaughter (Ans.) 5776 (iii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5210 (iii).
——— (remarks) 4536 (iii).
Atlantic Mail Service (Ans.) 1765 (i).
Bancroft Tender *re* Kingston Graving Dock, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Amyot*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4200 (ii).
Brampton Postmaster, Filling Vacancy (Ans.) 3259 (ii).
Calgary and Edmonton Mail Service, Contractor (Ans.) 3255 (ii).
——— and Fort Macleod Mail Service (Ans.) 3257.
C. P. R., Section "B," on prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 5943 (iii).
——— Statutory Declaration (read) 6127 (iii).
Camilla and Whittington Mail Service (Ques.) 2151 (ii).
Cattle on European Steamers (Ans.) 604 (i).
Census Commissioner Jones (Ans.) 1274 (i).
——— Receipt of Returns (Ans.) 130 (i).
——— (presented) 4608 (iii).
——— Corrected copy (presented) 4705 (iii).
——— on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4992 (iii).
——— (remarks) 3999, 4156 (ii), 4239 (iii).
Chicago Exhibition, Canada's Invitation (Ans.) 1577 (i).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Continued.*
Coaticook P. O., Coal Contract (Ans.) 6216 (iii).
Copyright, Legislation respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5022 (iii).
Cross Point and Gaspé Basin Mail Service (Ans.) 114 (i).
——— and Paspebiac Mail Service (Ans.) 113 (i).
Digby, Insufficient Postal Accommodation (Ans). 1264 (i).
Esquimalt Settlers' Grievances, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt to M. for Com. of Sup., 4054 (ii).
Experimental Farm, Central, Expenditure (Ans). 1576 (i).
——— Horses (Ans.) 739 (i).
——— on enquiry for Ret., 3200 (ii).
——— Rep. of Director (presented) 104 (i).
Galt Postmaster, Resignation, &c. (Ans.) 1264 (i).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1172 (i).
Goderich, St. Helen's, &c., Mail Service (Ans.) 3262 (ii).
Hastings Co. Mail Service, on M. for Ret., 213 (i).
High Commissioner for Can., Rep., &c. (presented) 104 (i).
Holstein Postmaster, Resignation, &c. (Ans.) 1766, 1929 (i).
Hurteau, Mr. Hilaire, emplymnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 530 (i).
Immigrants into Canada, Number (Ans.) 5075.
Immigration to N.W.T. (Ans.) 1269 (i).
Imperial Postal Union, Two cent Rate (Ques.) 131.
Indian Agent Chisholm, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6148 (ii).
International Abattoir Co. (Ans.) 3615 (ii).
Inverness Co. Ry., Subsidies (Ans.) 2911 (ii).
Kentville Postmaster, Suspension (Ans.) 221 (i).
Kingston P. O., Lessee of Box 524 (Ans.) 962 (i).
——— Lease of Boxes (Ans.) 1266 (i).
——— Rep. of Postmaster, on M. for copies, 2545 (ii).
Laberge, Mr., emplymnt. by P. O. Dept., Que. Div. (Ans.) 3955 (ii).
Labour Statistics, Bureau (Ans.) 3615 (ii).
——— Establishment of Bureau, on M. for Cor., 202 (i).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 5522, 5610 (iii).
Letter Postage, Reduction (Ans.) 129 (i).
Lyster Postmaster, Resignation (Ans.) 3958 (ii).
Mail Clerk, Lindsay and Haliburton, Resignation (Ans.) 4672 (iii).
Mail Service, B.C. (Ans.) 4294 (iii).
Medical Inspection, Trans-Atlantic Steamers (Ans.) 2906 (ii).
Montreal Letter Box Service Contract (Ans.) 3615, 3954 (ii).
——— P. O. Service (Ans.) 5077 (iii).
Nelson, B.C., Postmaster's Salary (Ans.) 2518 (ii).
Ottawa Co. Postal Service, on M. for Ret., 230.

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Continued.*
Ottawa Mail Service Advertising (Ans.) 963 (i).
——— in *Le Canada*, on M. for Ret., 2541 (ii).
Oxford and Pictou Mail Service (Ans.) 1768 (i).
Plate presented to Min. of Pub. Works, Duty paid (Ans.) 2912 (ii).
Postmaster General's Rep. (presented) 103 (i).
Postmasters' Salaries, Niagara Falls, &c. (Ans.) 1275, 1767 (i).
P. O. and Dom. Savings Banks Deposits, on M. for Ret., 202, 210 (i).
P. O.'s, Rural, Opening and Closing (Ans.) 2912.
Quarantine Officer at Rimouski (Ans.) 3616 (ii).
Quarantine (U.S.) Regulations for Sheep, &c. (Ans.) 605; (remarks) 744, 961 (i).
Quebec P. O., Sunday Closing (Ans.) 1765 (i).
Registered Letter Fee, Reduction (Ans.) 143 (i).
Registration Stamps, Revenue (Ans.) 158 (i).
Ste. Angèle Postmaster, Dismissal (Ans.) 5407.
Stallions at Experimental Farm (Ans.) 739 (i).
——— on enquiry for Ret., 3200 (ii).
Stanley, Str., Trips between Mainland and P.E.I., on M. for Ret., 171 (i).
Stratford Home for Boys, Govtl. Control (Ans.) 604 (i).
Steam Fans on Cattle Ships (Ans.) 1275 (i).
Summerside Postmaster, Dismissal (Ans.) 3955.
SUPPLY:
Arts, &c. (Census) 1569 (i); (Census and Statistics) 3531 (ii); (Jamaica Exhibition) 1568 (i).
Agriculture (Dairy Industry) 1562 (i), 3574 (ii); (Experimental Farms) 1567 (i), 3555 (ii); (Two-rowed Barley) 1564 (i).
Canals—Capital (Tay) 4144 (ii), 5220 (iii).
Civil Government (Agriculture) 254; (Post Office) 254 (i), 6166 (iii), contingencies, 440 (i); (P.O. and Finance) contingencies, 432 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 1744 (i), 6279; (Mail Service) 4705; (Miscellaneous) 4725; (salaries, &c.) 4720 (iii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (P. E. I. and Mainland) 4702; (San Francisco and Victoria) 4703 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Banff Hot Springs) 5119 (iii).
Public Works—Capital: Kingston Graving Dock, 1674 (i). *Income:* Buildings (B.C.) 6252; (Man.) 4429; (Que.) 4336. Experimental Farms, &c., 4654 (iii).
Quarantine, 5336, conc., 5437; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 3576, conc., 4277, (iii); (Vaccination) 1570 (i).
Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B.C.) 3672 (ii).
Tay Canal, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3759 (ii).
Trent Valley Canal, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4798 (iii).
Tunnel, P.E.I. and Mainland, on M. for Cor., &c., 1290 (i).
Weldford P. O., Conduct of Business (Ans.) 2151.
Yamaska, East, Post Office, Closing (Ans.) 2153.

Hargraft, Mr. J., *West Northumberland.*
Battell, William, Employé Cobourg P. O. (Ques.) 3952 (ii).

Hargraft, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 3°, 5561 (iii).
Lakeport Harbour of Refuge, Construction (Ques.) 207 (i).
——— (M. for Ret.*) 232 (i).
Murray Canal, Officials employed (Ques.) 4675.
Cobourg Harbour Works, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5335 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4574 (iii).

Harwood, Mr. H. S., *Vaudreuil.*
Vaudreuil, Construction of Wharf (Ques.) 335 (i).

Hazen, Mr. J. D., *St. John, N.B., City and Co.*
Address in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (moved) 8 (i).
Bay of Fundy Fisheries, on M. for Ret., 718 (i).
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 97 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 564 (i).
Compulsory Voting B. 53 (Mr. *Amyot*) on M. for 2°, 1038 (i).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1150 (i).
I. C. R. Labourers, Reduction of Pay (Ques.) 3266 (ii).
——— Management, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., 3795 (ii).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2953 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 5271 (iii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Liverpool or London and St. John or Halifax) 4692 (iii).
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 4221 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Halifax, warehouse) 3894; (St. John, additional accommodation) 3887.

Henderson, Mr. D., *Halton.*
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 3°, 5564 (iii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3092 (ii).
Guelph Junction Ry. Co. and C.P.R. Co.'s (B 66, 1°*) 387 (i).
SUPPLY :
Miscellaneous (Parliamentary Documents, distribution) 5083 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3013 (ii).

Hyman, Mr. C. S., *London.*
Adjmnt., St. Peter and St. Paul, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1413 (ii).
London and Port Stanley Ry. Co.'s (B. 63, 1°*) 387 (i).
Military District No. 1, Location of Camp (M. for Cor.) 231 (i).
Saddlery, 1st Reg., Cavalry (Ques.) 198 (i).
Steam Boiler and Plate Glass Ins. Co. of Can. incorp. (B. 50, 1°*) 266 (i).
Strathroy P.O., Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 3262 (ii).

Hyman, Mr. C. S.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY :
Civil Government (High Commissioner) contingencies, 445, 458 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Post Office (Mail Service) 4716; (salaries, &c.) 4719 (iii).
Justice, Administration of (Judges' salaries) 516.
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 3732; (Military Stores, &c.) 3718 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (B.C.) 4454; (Man.) 4439; (N.W.T.) 4444; (Que.) 4359 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2581 (ii).

Ingram, Mr. A. B., *East Elgin.*
Car-Coupling Accidents (prop. Res.) 3643 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5551 (iii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3095 (ii).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2950 (ii).
Pelee Island Sub-Collector, on M. for Cor., &c., 1597 (i).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. *Barron*) on M. for 2°, 3305 (ii).
Returning Officer, East Elgin, Accounts (M. for Cor.*) 1579 (i).
Ships' Inspection B. 149 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3609 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 5264 (iii).
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (St. John, increased accommodation) 3888 (ii).

Innes, Mr. J., *South Wellington.*
Canadians Abroad, Distressed (Ques.) 2149 (ii).
Letter Postage, Reduction (Ques.) 129 (i).
Maclean, Roger & Co.'s Claim (Ques.) 269 (i).
SUPPLY :
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Chinese Immigration) 5056; (P.E.I.) 5029 (iii).

Ives, Mr. W. B., *Sherbrooke.*
Adjnmt. for Holidays (remarks) 1275 (i).
Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. *Curran*) on Amt. (Mr. *Cockburn*) to M. for 3°, 1958 (i).
Division, Members' Votes, on Procedure (remarks) 4462 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 1°, 104 (i).
Montreal and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 29, 1°*) 156 (i).
Public Works Dept., Papers (remarks) 989 (i).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com. on Res., 6135, 6141 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Civil Government (Printing and Stationery) 245; (Public Works) 264 (i).
Militia (Kilted Battalion, Toronto) 6183 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2375 (ii).

Jamieson, Mr. J., *North Lanark.*
Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 34 (Mr. *Flint*) in Com., 3293 (ii).
Ottawa and Parry Sound Ry. Co., &c. (B. 96, 1°*) 600 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3092 (ii)
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic (prop. Res.) 271 (i).
——— on adjnmt. (remarks) 545 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Amt., 1312 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Amt., 1298 (i).

Joncas, Mr. L. Z., *Gaspé.*
Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. for Com., 1763; on Amt. (Mr. *Cockburn*) to M. for 3°, 1959 (i).
Cross Point and Gaspé Basin Mail Service (Ques.) 113 (i).
——— and Paspebiac Mail Service (Ques.) 113 (i).
Govt. Rys., Payments for Printing (Ques.) 3614.
Pairing of Members, 4213 (ii).
Privilege (Ques. of) par. in *Le Monde*, 1346 (i).
Sessional Clerks in H. of C. (M.for Stmnt.*) 544.

Kaulbach, Mr. C. E., *Lunenburg.*
Adjnmt., Dom. Day (remarks) 1536 (i).
Bay of Fundy Fisheries, on M. for Ret., 725 (i).
Blizzard, Schooner, Rescue of Crew, on M. for Cor., 735 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Foster*) on Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) to M. for 3°, 5319 (iii).
Fisheries Act Amt. B 122 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3174 (ii).
Fishery Bounty, in Com. on prop. Res. (Mr. *Tupper*) 1097 (i).
Newfoundland Bait Act (M. for Cor.) 3267 (ii).
——— Suspension (Ques.) 113 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6188.
Sawdust in La Have River (M. for Ret.) 1942, 2201 (i).
SUPPLY :
Indians (N.B.) 5065 (iii).
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) conc., 4284 (iii).
Public Works: Buildings (Que.) 4336 (iii).

Kenny, Mr. T. E., *Halifax.*
Adjnmt., Dom. Day (remarks) 1540 (i).
Atlantic Mail Service, on M. for Cor., 125 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Foster*) on Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) to M. for 3°, 5322 (iii).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1162 (i).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 817 (i).
I.C. Ry. B. 105 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. for 2°, 1259.
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1080 (i).
Sawdust in La Have River, on M. for Ret., 2199.
SUPPLY :
Agriculture (Dairy Industry) 6179 (iii).
Indians (N.B.) 5062 (iii).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Laboratory) 5054 (iii). Railways (I.C.R., &c.) 4076 (ii).

Kenny, Mr. T. E.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Mail Subsidies (Liverpool or London and St. John or Halifax) 4680 (iii).
Tunnel, P. E. I. and Mainland, on M. for Cor., 1629 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2822 (ii).
West Indies Steamship Subsidies, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4417(iii).

King, Mr. G. G., *Queen's, N.B.*
Edgett's Landing, Ballast Wharf (Ques.) 3956.
SUPPLY :
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 5277 (iii).
Collection of Revenues: Railways (I.C.R., &c.) 4063 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2122 (ii).

Kirkpatrick, Hon. G. A., *Frontenac.*
Administration of Justice B. 14 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 892 (i).
Bancroft Tender *re* Kingston Graving Dock, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Amyot*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4190 (ii).
C. P. R. Co.'s Act (1889) Amt. (B. 74, 1°) 387 (i).
——— (B. 75, 1°*) 387 (1).
——— Telegraph Lines (B. 21, 1°*) 155; 2° m., 189 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5731 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5152 (iii).
Kingston Graving Dock, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3657 (ii).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1071 (i).
New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 37, 1°*) 206 (i).
New Brunswick Ry. Co. and C.P.R. Co.'s (B. 69, 1°*) 387 (i).
Ontario and New York Bridge Co., M. to suspend Rule, 286 (i).
——— incorp. (B. 93, 1°*) 549 (i).
Order (Ques. of) Newspaper Reps., 2963 (ii).
Quebec, West, Vacany, on Issue of Writ (remarks) 4084 (ii).
Rathbun Co.'s (B. 171, 1°*) 5013 (iii).
Rideau Canal, High Water (M. for Ret.) 711 (i).
St. Lawrence and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s (B. 20) 2° m., 189 (i).
Standard Time (M. for Ret.) 209 (i).
Standing Orders Com., on Rep. *re* Rathbun Co. (remarks) 5012 (ii).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 6221 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Militia (Armouries, &c.) 3721; (Drill Pay, &c.) 4225 (ii).
Penitentiaries (St. Vincent de Paul) 909 (i).
Veterans of 1837-38 (prop. Res.) 2923 (ii).

Landerkin, Mr. G., *South Grey.*
Adjnmt., Ascension Day (remarks) 110 (i).
Ballot Boxes, J. R. Arnoldi's Rep. (M. for copy) 201 (i).
Beaverton Dock, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 708 (i).
Cablegrams per Reuter's Agency (Ques.) 4296.
Chippewa Indians, Charge against Agent (Ques.) 3264 (ii).
Civil Servants in Elections (Ques.) 1765 (i).
Coal Monopoly, B.C., in Com. of Sup., 926 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 2366; on M. to adjn. Hse., 2370 (ii); in Com., 5378 (iii).
Dingman, Indian Inspector, and Agent Allen, (Ques.) 1766 (i).
Dom. Aid to Rys., on M. for Ret., 1056 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 1°, 105 (i).
——— B. 5 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) on M. for 1°, 106; on M. for 2°, 999 (i).
——— B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5145, 5207; on M. for 3°, 5585 (iii).
Election, last General, Recounts (Ques.) 142, 177 (i).
——— Senators as Candidates (Ques.) 1577 (i).
Election Returns, Date of Declaration, &c. (M. for Ret.) 131 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 781.
——— B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3090.
——— Year of Passing, &c. (Ques.) 961, 1267 (i).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4306 (iii).
Heney, John, Payment of Canal Tolls (Ques.) 4676 (iii).
High Commissioner, Sums Paid, Fiscal Year 1890 (Ques.) 176, 223 (i).
Holstein, Postmaster, Resignation, &c. (Ques.) 1766, 1929 (i).
Indian Affairs, Management (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1512 (i).
Indian Agent Allen, Traffic in Liquor (Ques.) 1264 (i).
——— North Bruce, List of Charges (Ques.) 530, 1272 (i).
——— Jones, Charges against (Ques.) 4673 (iii).
Intoxicating Liquors, Sale to Indians (Ques.) 270 (i).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 1°, 4209 (iii).
——— B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 5505 (iii).
Lease of Building on Sparks St. (Ques.) 2518 (ii).
Liquor Sales to Indians in Bruce Co. (Ques.) 530.
New England Paper Co. (Ques.) 1767 (i).
Pairing of Members, on M. for adjmnt., 3827 (ii).
Port Arthur Breakwater, Contract (Ques.) 602 (i).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Amt., 1331 (i).
Public Accts. Com., Functions (remarks) 4240 (iii).
Public Expenditure, Rets. (enquiry) 4158 (ii).

Landerkin, Mr. G.—*Continued.*
Public Works in Electoral Dists., Expenditure (M. for Ret.) 1061 (i).
Registered Letter Fee, Reduction (Ques.) 143 (i).
Registration Stamps, Revenue (Ques.) 158 (i).
Returns (enquiry) 2581, 4158 (ii).
Rideau Canal Reserve Lots (Ques.) 4296 (iii).
——— Tolls Collected and Refunded (Ques.) 4676 (iii).
Royal Commissions since Confederation (Ques.) 4297 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Dairy Industry) 1563; (Experimental Farms) 1568 (i).
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3537 (ii).
Civil Government (High Commissioner) 411, contingencies, 443, 471, 495 (i); (Rys. and Canals) 6169 (iii).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Douglas, Mr., additional salary) 1723; (O'Meara, Mr., additional salary) 1717 (i); (Ont.) 5044. Excise (salaries, &c.) 5130 (iii). Weights and Measures, &c., 1726 (i), 5165 (iii).
Dominion Police, 1557 (i).
Indians (B.C.) 4802 (iii); (N.S., Medical Services) 1696; (T. D. Green, salary) 1554 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Printing, &c.) 946; (Voters' Lists) 946, 1562 (i).
Miscellaneous (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 5106 (iii); (Litigation Expenses) 1708 (i); (Parliamentary Documents, distribution) 5084 (iii); (Printing Bureau) 1706 (i); (Returns, preparation) 5107.
Mounted Police, 4818 (iii).
Penitentiaries (B.C.) 919, 925; (Man.) 918 (i).
Public Works: Buildings (N.S.) 4322; (Ont.) 4366, 4370; (Ottawa) 4474; (Printing Bureau) 6253; (Que.) 4338, 6203 (iii); (Walkerton P.O.) 1686 (i). Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4564, 4566 (iii).
Quarantine, 1570 (i).
Votes polled, last General Election (M. for Ret.*) 128 (i).
Walkerton Public Buildings, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 267 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2461 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 2235 (ii).
Wood Supply, Ottawa Public Buildings, Contractor (Ques.) 4295 (iii).

Langelier, Mr. F., *Quebec Centre.*
Admiralty Jurisdiction B. 13 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1731 (i).
Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. *Curran*) on Amt. (Mr. *Cockburn*) to M. for 3°, 1961 (i).
Bridge at Quebec (Ques.) 525 (i).
——— O. C.'s (M. for copies) 1041 (i).
——— Rep. of Engineers *re* Survey, on M. for copy, 1053 (i).
Debates, Official Rep., on M. to conc. in 1st Rep. of Com., 633 (i).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 848 (i).
Laberge, Mr., emplymnt. by P. O. Dept., Que. Div. (Ques.) 3954 (ii).

Langelier, Mr. F.—*Continued.*
Marie Eliza, Schr., Seizure and Sale (Ques.) 710.
——— (M. for Cor., &c.*) 1478 (i).
Medical Inspection, Trans-Atlantic Steamers (Ques.) 2906 (ii).
Montreal Custom House Employés, on M. for Ret., 3282 (ii).
North Shore Ry. Debentures (Ques.) 525 (i).
——— (M. for O.C.'s) 974, 1022 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Bowell*) for Com. on Res., 4767 (iii).
Pairing of Members (remarks) 744, 802 (i).
Provincial Accounts Settlement B. 99 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1065 (i).
Quarantine Officer at Rimouski (Ques.) 3616 (ii).
Quebec Eastern Ry., Subsidy, on M. for Ret., 1937 (i).
——— P. O., Sunday Closing (Ques.) 1765 (i).
Queen's Bench, Que., Appmnt. of Chief Justice (remarks) 5195 (iii).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Acts Amt. B. 138 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Sen. Amts., 5591.
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Public Works) 258 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Que.) 5033 (iii); Rys. (I.C.R.) 1742 (i).
Indians (Ont., Que., &c.) 1694.
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 4553 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on M. to conc. in Res., 3208.

Langevin, Hon. Sir H. L., K.C.M.G., *Richelieu and Three Rivers.*
Adjnmt., Corpus Christie (M.) 523 (i).
——— Dom. Day (remarks) 1537 (i).
——— Holidays (remarks) 1275 (i).
——— Queen's Birthday (M.) 386 (i).
——— St. Peter and St. Paul (M.) 1409 (i).
——— Sir John Macdonald's Funeral (M.) 888 (i).
Amhertsburg Dry Dock (Ans.) 3259 (ii).
Annapolis Public Buildings (Ans.) 529 (i).
Arnoldi, J. R., Govtl. Action (remarks) 3130 (ii).
Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. *Curran*) (Amt.) to Amt. to M. for 3°, 1963 (i).
Beaverton Dock, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 708 (i).
——— Harbour Works, Name of Contractor (Ans.) 226 (i).
Belle Creek Breakwater, P.E.I. (Ans.) 1271 (i).
Barry P.O. Building, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 3255.
Big Bay Wharf, Expenditure, &c., on Work (Ans.) 1929 (i).
Black River Improvements (Ans.) 739, 740 (i).
Bonaventure Pier, Construction (Ans.) 335 (i).
Boucherville Wharf, Contractor (Ans.) 1265 (i).
Brae Harbour Breakwater, Completion (Ans.) 1274 (i).
——— Tenders (Ans.) 208 (i).
Breakwaters in Guysborough County (Ans.) 1012.
Bridge at Quebec (Ans.) 525 (i).
——— Construction (Ans.) 2912 (ii).

Langevin, Hon. Sir H. L.—*Continued.*
Bridge at Quebec, Bright, J. B., emplymnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3264 (ii).
Cacouna, Purchase of Timber for Wharf (Ans.) 158 (i).
C. P. R., L'Avenir Branch (remarks) 198 (i).
Cascumpec Harbour Improvements (Ans.) 1765 (i), 2151 (ii).
Cement Purchases by Govt. (Ans.) 2521 (ii).
Centreville Breakwater, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 962.
Civil Service, Regulations *re* Meals, &c. (Ans.) 3258 (ii).
Coteau Landing Wharf, Monopoly (Ans.) 222 (i).
Documents promised in Speech from Throne (Ans.) 157 (i).
Dredging, &c., Black River (Ans.) 739, 740 (i).
Dundas and Waterloo Macadamized Road (Ans.) 223 (i).
East River, N.S., Deepening (Ans.) 1011 (i).
Elections in 1891, Senators as Candidates (Ans.) 1577 (i).
Esquimalt Graving Dock, Advts. for Tenders, &c., on M. for copies, 1933 (i).
——— Amount paid Larkin & Co. (Ans.) 270.
——— Lengthening (Ans.) 530 (i).
Finance Dept., New Safe, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 130 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) on Order for 2°, 206 (i).
Fraserville P. O. Building, Contractor, &c. (Ans.) 3255 (ii).
Galt P. O., Name of Contractor, &c. (Ans.) 226.
Gatineau Point Wharf, Expenditure (Ans.) 604.
Giguère, Capt. Claude, emplymnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1266 (i).
Govt. Business, precedence on Mondays (M.) 2668, 3576 (ii).
——— Wednesdays (M.) 1730 (i).
——— Thursdays (M.) 1004 (i).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1126 (i).
Halifax City Market Property (Ans.) 1770 (i).
Hastings Co. Public Works, Improvements (Ans.) 208 (i).
High Commissioner, on M. to adjn. Deb., 705 (i).
Homesteads (Second) N.W.T., on prop. Res. (M.) to adjn. Deb., agreed to (Y. 87, N. 73) 629 (i).
Hull Post Office, Tower Clock (Ans.) 222 (i).
Imperial Federation and High Commissioner (Ans.) 2154 (ii).
I. C. R., Accident at St. Joseph de Lévis, on M. for Ret., 177 (i).
Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 2144 (ii).
Jennings, Mr., Engineer, Appmnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 2522 (ii).
Kaministiquia River, Dredging (Ans) 129, 1267.
Kingston Graving Dock, Papers (Ans.) 1765 (i)
Knowlton's Landing, Wharf (Ans.) 1770 (i).
Lakeport Harbour of Refuge, Construction (Ans.) 207 (i).
Langevin Block, Construction (Ans.) 1575 (i).

Langevin, Hon. Sir H. L.—*Continued.*
Langevin Block, Papers (remarks) 992 (i).
——— Total Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 1267 (i).
Langevin, Mr. Laforce, emplymnt. on Quebec Harbour Works (Ans.) 1769 (i).
La Rivière du Sud, Dyke (Ans.) 601 (i).
Le Liévre and Ottawa Rivers, Dredging (Ans.) 2522 (ii).
Library of Parliament, Joint Com. (M.) 156 (i).
Lindsay P. O., Name of Contractor, &c. (Ans.) 225 (i).
——— Public Buildings (Ans.) 268 (i).
Listowell P. O. and Custom House (Ans.) 602 (i).
Liverpool and Annapolis Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (Ans.) 601 (i).
——— Postal Accommodation (Ans.) 1768 (i)
Macdonald, Sir John, Decease (remarks) 883 (i).
——— Adjmnt. for Funeral (M.) 888 (i).
——— Public Funeral (M.) 884 (i).
——— Erection of Monument (Ans.) 2148 (ii).
——— Illness (announced) 599 ; (remarks) 631, 707 (i).
Major's Hill Park, Tenders (Ans.) 605 (i).
Man. Separate Schools, Papers, &c. (Ans.)741 (i).
Meteghan Wharf, Digby Co. (Ans.) 531 (i).
Miminegash Breakwater, Tenders for new Works (Ans.) 130 (i).
Ministerial Changes, Stmnt. by Hon. Mr. Abbott (read) 891 (i).
——— (remarks) 1013 (i).
Napanee Public Buildings (Ans.) 2154 (ii).
——— Contractor, &c. (Ans.) 1271 (i).
New Carlisle Wharf, Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 966 (i).
North Nation River Wharf, Construction (Ans.) 222 (i).
North Saskatchewan River Improvements (Ans.) 1576 (i).
North Shore Ry. Debentures (Ans.) 526 (i).
——— on M. for copies of O. C.'s, &c., 1017 (i).
Ottawa Co. P. O. at Buckingham, on M. for Ret., 230 (i).
Parliament Buildings, Metal Pillars (Ans.) 1273.
Peterborough P. O., Name of Contractor (Ans.) 225 (i).
Pinet Harbour Improvements (Ans.) 226 (i).
Port Arthur Breakwater, Contract (Ans.) 602 (i).
Port George Pier, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 2911 (ii).
Prince Edward, Dredge (Ans.) 1765 (i).
Printing, Joint Com. (M.) 156 (i).
Private Bills, Extension of Time (M.) 828, 1483 (i).
——— Pets. (M.) 128 (i).
——— Reps., 2203, 3308 (ii).
Prohibition, on adjnmt. (remarks) 545 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Tarte) 153 (i).
—— Papers (remarks) 219, 394, 746, 988, 1850 (i).
Public Works, Deptl. Employés, on enquiry for Ret., 3200 (ii).
Public Works in Electoral Dists., Expenditures, on M. for Ret., 1062 (i).

Langevin, Hon. Sir H. L.—*Continued.*
Quebec Eastern Ry. Subsidy, on M. for Ret., 1936 (i).
Quebec Graving Dock, Management (Ans.) 2150.
Quebec Harbour Commission, Chief Engineer (Ans.) 527, 602 (i).
Raquette Pier, N.S., Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 1575.
Red Point Pier, P.E.I. (Ans.) 1271 (i).
Red River Surveys, Reps. (Ans.) 1012 (i).
Reporters, Official, better Accommodation (remarks) 1013 (i).
Returns, on enquiry (remarks) 1062 (ii), 2581 (iii).
Revising Officers and late Elections (Ans.) 208 (i).
Richelieu River Floods (Ans.) 336 (i).
River Thames, Bar at Mouth (Ans.) 1268 (i).
St. Jean Deschaillons Shoals, on M. for Cor., 1053 (i).
St. John Ry. Station, additional Property (Ans.) 601 (i).
St. Lawrence River, Canal on North Shore (Ans.) 176 (i).
——— Deepening (Ans.) 207 (i).
St. Pierre, Pierre, emplymnt. as Slide-Master (Ans.) 603 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Wharf, Purchase of Property (Ans.) 1268 (i).
Sissiboo River, Dredging (Ans.) 1574 (i).
Speaker, Election of Deputy (M.) 388 (i).
Strathroy P. O., Contractor, &c. (Ans.) 3263 (ii).
Summerside Harbour, Dredging (Ans.) 3258 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Income (Miscellaneous) 1668 (i).
Civil Government (Public Works) 255, 397 (i).
Public Works—Capital. Harbours and Rivers (Kingston Graving Dock) 1669, 1680; (Ship Channel, Montreal and Quebec) 1668. *Income:* Buildings (Man.) 1687; (N. W. T.) 1687; (Ont.) 1686 (i). Dredging (New Plant) 1690. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 1688 (i).
Telegraph Companies, Legislation *re* Directors (Ans.) 144 (i).
Toronto Drill Shed, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 963 (i).
——— Harbour Works, Contractors, &c. (Ans.) 2519 (ii).
Trent Valley Canal, Commissioners' Rep. (Ans.) 194, 197, 216 (i).
Vaudreuil, Construction of Wharf (Ans.) 335 (i).
Walker, Dr., Claim *re* Dundas, &c., Macadamized Road, on M. for O.C., 1058 (i).
Walkerton P.O., Contract for Fittings (Ans.) 962 (i).
——— Tenders (Ans.) 267 (i).
——— Caretaker (Ans.) 1271 (i).
——— Completion (Ans.) 335 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff (M.) to adjn. Deb., 2060 (i).
West Point Wharf, Engineer's Rep. (Ans.) 269.
Wiarton Harbour Works, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ans.) 226 (i).
Wood Islands Breakwater, P.E.I. (Ans.) 1271 (i).

LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C., *Provencher*.
Debates, Official Rep., 1st Rep. of Com. (M. to conc.) 632 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5201 (iii).
French Language in Man. (M. for Cor.) 114 (i).
Mennonite Reserve, Man. (Ques.) 198 (i).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 3912 (ii).
——— Representation Acts Amt. B. 178 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 6325 (iii).
Ontario and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s (B. 77, 1°*) 441
Private Bills Reps., Extension of Time (M.) 2961
Separate Schools in Man., Abolition (M. for Cor.) 115 (i).
SUPPLY :
Miscellaneous (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 5093 (iii)

Laurier, Hon. Wilfred, *East Quebec*.
Address, on The, 19 (i).
Adjmnt. for Holidays (remarks) 1275 (i).
Albion Mines Savings Bank B., on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to introd., 1104 (i).
Arnoldi, J. R , Govtl. Action (remarks) 3129 (ii).
Atlantic Mail Service (M. for Cor.) 124 (i).
Bridge at Quebec, Surveys, Rep. of Engineers (M. for copies) 1053 (i).
Campbellton P. O., Pets. *re* Establishment (M. for copies) 544 (i).
C.P.R., Section "B," Charges against P.M.G., on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 5954 (iii).
——— on Statutory Declaration (remarks) 6129.
Caraquet Ry., Receipts and Expenditure (Ques.) 3614 (ii).
Carleton Branch Ry. Sale B., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 1992 (i).
Cattle Trade, Shipping of Live Stock B. (remarks) 958 (i).
Chicoutimi, Representation, Ret. Officer's Rep. (remarks) 7 (i).
Commercial Treaty, England and France (remarks) 3951 (ii).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3649 (ii), 5355, 5382.
Copyright, Legislation respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5020 (iii).
Debates, Official, on M. (Mr. *Bowell*) for Sel. Com. (remarks) 7 (i).
——— on M. to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 1407.
——— 4th Rep. of Com., 5941.
Desmarteau's, Jos., Claims for Improvements (M. for Ret.) 2155 (ii).
Disallowance of Provincial Acts, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6296 (iii).
Divisions, Members' Votes, on Procedure (remarks) 4461 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5141, 5156, 5197 ; on M. for 3°, 5560 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 165 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 6227 (iii).

Laurier, Hon. W.—*Continued*.
Esquimalt Settlers' Grievances (prop. Res.) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4016 (ii) ; neg. (Y. 81, N. 100) 4056 (ii).
Evidence in Criminal Cases B. 11 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) on M. for 2°, 2961 (ii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3084 (ii).
Frauds on the Govt. Prevention B. 172 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 6280, 6289 (iii).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4300 (iii).
Govt. Business, on M. to take in Mondays, 2668, 3576 (ii).
——— Wednesdays, 1730 (i).
——— Saturdays, 6127 (iii).
Govt. Policy, on adjmnt. (remarks) 1100 (i).
——— (M.) to adjn. Hse., 1105 ; neg. (Y. 83, N. 103) 1198 (i).
Grant, J. J., case of, *re* Settlement, on M. for Ret., 3641 (ii).
Herchmer, Commsr., Enquiry into Conduct, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 2920 (ii).
High Commsr. (prop. Res.) in Amt. to M. for Com., of Sup., 570 ; neg. (Y. 79, N. 100) 881 (i).
——— on M. to adjn. Deb., 705 (i).
Homesteads (Second) N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 618 ; on M. to adjn. deb. (remarks) 629.
Indemnity to Senators and Members, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) 6290 (iii).
Indian Agent Chisholm, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6147 (iii).
Kingston Graving Dock, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3657 (ii).
Kingston P. O., Rep. of Postmaster, on M. for copies, 2546 (ii).
Lamontagne, Leda, Extradition (Ques.) 3619 (ii).
——— Pet. for Discharge (Ques.) 2907 (ii).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 5503, 5593 (iii).
Land Grants to Volunteers, in Com. on Res., 3112 (ii).
Landslide at Quebec, O. C.'s, &c., on M. for copies, 3631 (ii).
Live Stock Shipment B. 154 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 1°, 3133 (ii) ; on Sen. Amts., 4773 (iii).
Macdonald, Sir John, Illness (remarks) 600, 631 (i).
——— Decease (remarks) 884 (i).
Ministerial Changes (remarks) 888, 959, 1013 (i).
Minister of Public Works, rumoured Resignation (remarks) 3653 (ii).
——— Resignation (remarks) 4213 (ii), 5075 (iii).
Montreal Custom House Employés, on M. for Ret., 3279 (ii).
Newfoundland Bait Act, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6193 (iii).
North Shore Ry. Debentures, on M. for copies of O.C.'s, &c., 1014 (i).
——— B. 170 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. for Com. on Res., 4752, 4766, 4772 ; in Com. on B. 5081 ; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 5410 (iii).

Laurier, Sir Wilfred--*Continued.*
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 4154.
——— Sel. Com.'s Rep. (remarks) 5553 (iii).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on Sen. Amts., 6228 (iii).
——— Representation Act Amt. B. 178 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 6327.
Order (Ques. of) Public Works Dept., Papers, 984, 990 (i).
Pairing of Members (remarks) 805 (i).
P.O.'s, Rural, Opening and Closing (Ques.) 2912.
P.E.I. Ry., Messrs. Saunders and Muttart, Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 2167 (ii).
Printing Bureau, Absence of Superintendent (enquiry) 2375, 2437 (ii).
——— Type Purchased (Ques.) 3619 (ii).
Priv. and Elec. Com., afternoon Sittings, on M., 1988 (i).
——— on 7th Rep. of Com. (remarks) 5553 (iii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Amt., 1321.
——— on adjmnt. (remarks) 545 (i).
Provincial Accounts Settlement B. 99 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1065 (i).
Public Accts. Com., on M. to rescind Order of Hse., 1925 (i).
——— on M. to refer Accts. *re* Bourcier, 3949 (ii).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec. (Amt.) to adjn. Deb., neg. (Y. 29, N. 36) 6025 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 6034 (iii).
——— Papers (Ques. of Priv.) 984, 990, 1849 (i).
Quebec Garrison Club, Lease of Lands (Ques.) 527 (i).
Quebec, West, Vacancy, on Issue of Writ (objection) 4081 (ii).
——— (remarks) 6309 (iii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. for 1°, 6287 (iii).
Reciprocity, Canada and Spain (Ques.) 3619 (ii).
——— Papers (enquiry) 600 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com on Res., 3139 (ii).
Settlers on Ry. Reserve, Vancouver (M. for Ret.) 1051 (i). *See* "Esquimalt."
Soulanges Canal, Expenditure, on M. for Stmnt., 535 (i).
Speaker, Election of (remarks) 2 (i)
——— (remarks) 388 (i).
Strike in Ottawa, calling out Militia, &c. (remarks) 5555 (iii).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com. on Res., 6136 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Capital (Grenville, Goodwin's Claim) 6199. *Income* (Chambly) 6200 ; (Grenville, Goodwin's Claim) 6297 (iii).

Laurier, Sir Wilfred—*Continued.*
SUPPLY--*Continued.*
Civil Government (High Commissioner) contingencies, 493 (i) ; (Post Office) 6166 ; (Printing and Stationery) 6166 (iii).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Chinese Immigration) conc., 5419 (iii). Rys. (I.C.R.) 1742 (i).
Fisheries (Que., salaries, &c.) 3519 (ii).
Indians (B.C.) 4804 ; (Ont., Que. &c.) conc., 5411, 5414 (iii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Campbellton and Gaspé) 4700, 5349 ; (Liverpool or London and St. John or Halifax) 4686 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Banff Hot Springs) 5110 ; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 5094, 5100 ; (Commercial Agencies) conc., 5432 ; (Historical, &c., Map of Canada) 6264 (iii).
Mounted Police, 4822, 6274 ; conc., 5416 (iii).
Public Works—Capital (Kingston Graving Dock) 1674, 1683 (i). *Income*—Buildings (N.W.T.) conc., 5388, 5394 ; (Que.) 6239, conc., 5386. Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 4555 (iii).
Territorial Accounts (Surgeon General's salary) 6280, 6305 (iii).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 138 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 3584 ; in Com., 3588 ; on M. for 3°, 3649 (ii) ; on Sen. Amts., 5079, 5590 (iii).
Testimonials to Ministers, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3839 (ii).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. to adjn. Hse., 2566 (ii).
Trade Policy of the Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3313.
Trade Relations with Foreign Countries, Address from Sen., on M. to conc., 6314 (iii).
Treaty, Commercial, England and France (remarks) 3951 (ii).
U. S. Treaty with Cuba, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4015 (ii).
Walrond Ranche and Settlers, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6164 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2020, 2064 (i).
Wellington, B.C., Services of Militia (remarks) 2147 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on Order for Com. on Res., 1254 (i) ; in Com., 2205, 2224 (ii).

Lavergne, Mr. J., *Drummond and Arthabaska.*
Black River Improvements (Ques.) 739 (i).
C.P.R., L'Avenir Branch (Ques.) 197, 220 (i).
Can. Temp. Act Amt. (B. 35, 1°) 194 (i).
Census Commissioner Jones (Ques.) 1274 (i).
Dredging, &c., Black River (Ans.) 740 (i).
Garrison Club, Quebec, Lease of Lands (Ques. 527 (i).
Medical Inspection, Trans-Atlantic Steamers (Ques.) 2906 (ii).
Pairing of Members (remarks) 745 (i).

Lavergne. Mr. J.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 4557 (iii).
Votes and Proceedings, Translation (remarks) 199, 391 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2713 (ii).

Leduc, Mr. J. H., *Nicolet.*
Boisvert, George, Appmnt. as Fishery Officer (M. for Cor.*) 2935 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2875 (ii).

Legris, Mr. J. H., *Maskinongé.*
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3051 (ii).

Lépine, Mr. A. T., *East Montreal.*
Judges in Montreal District (Ques.) 2908 (ii).
Labour Statistics, Bureau (Ques.) 3615 (ii).
——— Establishment of Bureau (M. for Cor.) 201
Military Districts Nos. 5 and 6, Paymaster (Ques.) 707 (i).
Montreal Custom House Employés (M. for Ret.) 3275 (ii).
Montreal P.O., Letter Box Service, Contract (Ques.) 3615 (ii).
Queen's Bench, Que., Appmnt. of Judges, salaries (Ques.) 5405 (iii).
——— Vacancy (Ques.) 3620 (ii).
Sorel and St. John's Militia Camp Pay Roll (M. for copies*) 1062 (i).
Type-setting Machines, Cost (Ques.) 271 (i).

Lister, Mr. J. F., *West Lambton.*
Albion Mines Savings Bank B. 113, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to introd., 1104 (i).
Annapolis Public Buildings (Ques.) 529 (i).
——— Tenders, &c. (M. for copies*) 544 (i).
Bremner's Claim for Furs (Ques.) 1268 (i).
C. P. R., Section "B," Charges against P.M.G. (prop. Res.) 5852, 5942 (iii).
Cement Purchases by Govt. (Ques.) 2521 (ii).
Cockburn Islands, Location Tickets (Ques.) 1271.
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) on M. for 2°, 995 (i).
Fishery Laws, Enforcement, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1513 (i).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1180 (i).
Kaministiquia Harbour, Dredging (remarks) 600.
Land Grants to Rys. B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 5524 (iii).
Langevin Block, Papers (remarks) 992 (i).
Lindsay Public Buildings (Ques.) 268 (i).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 1067 ; in Com., 1073.
New Carlisle Wharf, Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 969 (i).
Pound-Net Licenses, Lake Huron (Ques.) 142, 529 (i).

Lister, Mr. J. F.—*Continued.*
Pound-Net Licenses, Lake St. Clair (Ques.) 198, 223
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Amt., 1306 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Wharf, Receipts (Ques.) 2905 (ii).
——— Tolls, &c. (Ques.) 3620 (ii).
——— Mr. Plummer's Services (Ques.) 1575 (i).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2552 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ottawa) 4494.
Senécal, André (M.) summoning to Bar of House, 4533 (iii).
——— (M.) Speaker's Warrant for Arrest, 4748.
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 2252 (ii).

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A., G.C.B., *Kingston.*
Address, on The, 29 (i).
Address to Her Majesty, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 227 (i).
Adjmnt., Ascension Day (remarks) 110 ; (M.) 111 (i).
Animals from U.S., Free Entry (Ans.) 129 (i).
C. P. R., L'Avenir Branch (Ans.) 220 (i).
Chicoutimi Representation, Ret. Officer's Rep. (remarks) 7 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*), on M. for 1°, 105 (i).
Election Returns, Date of Declaration, &c., on M. for Ret., 133 (i).
Employés in Elections (Ans.) 221 (i).
Hartley, H. E., Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 145 (i).
Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 111 (i).
Liverpool and Annapolis Ry., Subsidy (Ans.) 143 (i).
Ministerial Explanation, on adjmnt. (remarks) 237 (i).
Mounted Police, Comptroller's Rep. (presented) 237 (i).
——— Management (Ans.) 267 (i).
Oaths of Office (B. 1, 1°*) 5 (i).
P. E. I. Ry. Road-bed and Rails, on M. for Ret., 229 (i).
Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 104 (i).
Speaker, The (M.) nominating Peter White, Esq., 1 (i).
Speech from the Throne, consdn. (M.) 6 (i).
Standing Committees (M.) 6 (i).
——— (M.) Com. to prepare Lists, 29 (i).
——— Rep. of Sp. Com. (Lists presented) 135 ; conc. in, 140 (i).
SUPPLY :
Civil Government (High Commissioner) 426 ; contingencies, 431 ; (Public Works) 261, 401 ; (Railways and Canals) 408 (i).
Welland Canal, Extra Employés, on M. for Cor., 229 (i).
——— Turning Basin (Ans.) 270 (i).

Macdonald, Mr. A. C., *King's, P.E.I.*
Tunnel, P. E. I. and Mainland, on M. for Cor., 1644 (i).
SUPPLY :
Collection of Revenues: Public Works (Telegraphs, P. E. I. and Mainland) 4668 (iii).
Fisheries (Fish-breeding) conc., 4260; (P. E. I., salaries) conc., 4257 (iii).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Generally) 4596 (ii).

Macdonald, Mr. H. J., *Winnipeg.*
Assiniboine River Water Power (B. 91, 1°*) 549.
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4300 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 5280 (iii).
Penitentiaries (Man.) 917 (i).
Western Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 48, 1*°) 238; 2° m., 295 (i).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1400 (i).

Macdonald, Mr. P., *East Huron.*
Adjnmt., Dom. Day (remarks) 1539 (i).
Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 34 (Mr. *Flint*) in Com., 3300 (ii).
Census Returns, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup. 5001.
Coal Monopoly, B. C., in Com. of Sup., 922 (i).
Man. School Lands, Sale (Ques.) 1766 (i).
North Saskatchewan River Improvements (Ques.) 1576 (i).
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on Amt. (Mr. *Mackintosh*) 346 (i).
Quarantine (U. S.) Regulations, Sheep, &c. (Ques.) 960 (i).
Subsidies (Ry.) to Provinces (Ques.) 603 (i).
SUPPLY :
Agriculture (Experimental Farms) 1568 (i); (Two-rowed Barley) 1565 (i).
Quarantine (Vaccination) 1750 (i).
Civil Government (High Commissioner) contingencies, 444.
Collection of Revenues: Dom. Lands (conc.) 5433.
Penitentiaries (B.C.) 922 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ottawa) conc., 5401. Harbours and Rivers (Generally) conc., 5402 (iii).
Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B. C.) 3691 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2070 (ii).

Macdonell, Mr. G., *Algoma.*
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5158; on M. for 3°, 5579.
Fishery Laws, Enforcement, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1526 (i).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr *Dewdney*) in Com., 3946 (ii).
Pelee Island Sub-Collector, on M. for Cor., 1603.
——— on M. to adjn. Hse., 1984 (i).
SUPPLY :
Agriculture (Dairy Industry) 1563 (i).

Macdonell, Mr. G.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) 5218 (iii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists, Revision) 951 (i).
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 4222 (ii).
Pensions (Mounted Police, &c., Rebellion 1885) 3667 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Kaministiquia River) 4524 (iii).
Unparliamentary Language, wthdn., 3780 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3040 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1383 (i).

Macdowall, Mr. D. H., *Saskatchewan.*
Buffalo Lake and Battleford Ry. Coal and Iron Co.'s incorp. (B. 57, 1°*) 334 (i).
Homestead (Second) N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 621 (i).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 3910; in Com., 3928 (ii).
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3477 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 2218 (ii).

Mackintosh, Mr. C. H., *Ottawa City.*
Anglo-Canadian Electric Storage and Supply Co.'s incorp. (B. 92, 1°*) 549 (i); M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 2551 (ii).
Atikokan Iron Range Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 55, 1°*) 333 (i).
Census Returns, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4898 (iii).
E. B. Eddy Manufacturing Co.'s (B. 23, 1°*) 155.
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 589 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2937 (ii).
McKay Milling Co.'s (B. 24, 1°*) 155 (i).
Personal Explanation, par. in *L'Electeur* (remarks) 5351 (iii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquor on prop. Res. (Amt.) 344 (i).
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3458 (ii).

McAlister, Mr. J., *Restigouche.*
Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. *Curran*) on Amt. (Mr. *Cockburn*) to M. for 3°, 1961 (i).

McCarthy, Mr. D., *North Simcoe.*
C. P. R., Section "B," Charges against, P.M.G. on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 5958 (iii).
Collingwood and Bay of Quinté Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 47, 1°*) 238 (i).
Collingwood Harbour, Dredging, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6195 (iii).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147, in Com., 5352, 5374, 5595, 5727 (iii).

McCarthy, Mr. D.—*Continued.*
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5197 (iii).
N.W.T. Act Amt. (B. 33, 1°) 174 (i).
Provincial Govts. Transfer of Property B. 111 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5752 (iii).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies*) to M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 6064; (Amt. to Amt.) 6085; neg. (Y. 2, N. 184) 6122 (iii).

McDonald, Mr. J. A., *Victoria, N.S.*
Admiralty Jurisdiction B. 13 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1426 (i).
Farmers' Bank of Rustico (B. 40, 1°*) 206 (i).
P. E. I. Ry., Messrs. Saunders and Muttart, Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 2169 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2787 (ii).

McDougall, Mr. H. F., *Cape Breton.*
Canadian Sealers Captured, attention of Govt. directed to Rep., 5554 (iii).
Cape Breton Ry., Station Masters' Duties (Ques.) 4677 (iii).

McDougald, Mr. J., *Pictou.*
Albion Mines Savings Bank B., on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to introd., 1104; (B. 113, 1°*) 1105; in Com., 1297 (i).
Mermerly, Barque, Rescue of Crew, on M. for Ret., 714 (i).
Pictou Bank Winding-up (B. 76, 1°) 388; 2° m., 547 (i).

McGreevy, Hon. T., *West Quebec.*
Public Works Dept., Contracts, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Tarte*) 154 (i).

McGregor, Mr. W., *North Essex.*
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5155 (iii).
Indian Act Amt. B. 144 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3592 (ii).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 5529 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Experimental Farms) 1567 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Que.) 5040. Post Office (salaries, &c.) 4724 (iii). Rys. (I.C.R., &c.) 4073 (ii).
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 3732 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4585 (iii).
Quarantine, 5341 (iii).

McKay, Mr. A., *Hamilton.*
Wild Fowl, Prohibition of Export (Ques.) 1769.
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 6279 (ii).

McLean, Mr. J., *King's, P.E.I.*
Tunnel, P. E. I. and Mainland, on M. for Cor., 1605 (i).

McLennan, Mr. R. R., *Glengarry.*
Central Counties Ry. (B. 38, 1°*) 206 (i).
Pensions for Permanent Corps (Ques.) 2908 (ii).
St. Lawrence River, Canal on North Shore (Ques.) 175 (i).
Veterans of 1837-38, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 2931 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2438 (ii).

McLeod, Mr. E., *St. John, N.B., City.*
Controverted Elections Act. Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5371, 5382, 5602 (iii).
Geological Survey, Field Service (M. for Ret.*) 544 (i).
I. C. R. Management, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3814 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Liverpool or London and St. John or Halifax) 4691 (iii).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 3895; (St. John, additional accommodation) 3885 (ii).

McMillan, Mr. J., *South Huron.*
American Cattle, Slaughter in Can., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5209 (iii).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1781 (i).
Compulsory Voting B. 53 (Mr. *Amyot*) on M. for 2°, 1037 (i).
Experimental Farm, Central, Expenditure (Ques.) 1576 (i).
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) on M. for 2°, 1007 (i).
Horses, Entire, Experimental Farms (M. for Cor., &c.*) 739, 1579 (i).
——— (enquiry for Ret.) 3200 (ii).
Live Stock Shipment B. 154 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 1°, 3134; in Com., 3992 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Amt., 1310 (i).
Stallions at Experimental Farm (Ques.) 739 (i).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Dairy Industry) 1562 (i), 3574 (ii), 6176 (iii); (Experimental Farms) 1566 (i), 3552 (ii); (Haras Company) 6179 (iii); (Two-rowed Barley) 1564 (i).
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3544 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Post Office (salaries, &c.) 4725 (iii).
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 5251 (iii).
Indians (Man. and N. W. T.) 4814 (iii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists) 1560 (i).
Militia (Clothing, &c.) 3710 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ottawa) conc., 5401 (iii). Dredging (New Plant) 4606. Experimental Farms, &c., 4652. Harbours and Rivers (Generally) 4597 (iii),
Quarantine, 5338 (iii).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2557 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2400 (ii).

McMillan, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 2242 (ii).

McMullen, Mr. J., *North Wellington.*
Advertising, in Com. of Sup., 500 (i).
Banff Springs Park and Reserve (Ques.) 3957 (ii).
Beet-Root Sugar, Bounty for Production, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 3427 (ii).
Camilla and Whittington Mail Service (Ques.) 2151 (ii).
Civil Service Employés, Payments (Ques.) 2906.
Civil Servants, Regulations *re* Meals, &c. (Ques.) 3258 (ii).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 2365 (ii).
Customs Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Foster*) on Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) to M. for 3°, 5312 (iii).
Debates, Official, on M. to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 1407 (i).
Deptl. Pay Sheets (Ques.) 2520 (ii).
Divorce, Thomas Bristow Relief B. 133 (Mr. *O'Brien*) on M. for Com., 2551 (ii).
Dom. Aid to Rys. (M. for Ret.) 1053 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3246 (ii), 5158, 5207, 5551; on M. for 3°, 5581 (iii).
——— B. 5 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) on M. for 2°, 999 (i).
Election Returns, Date of Declaration, &c., on M. for Ret., 134 (i).
Finance Dept., New Safe, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 130(i)
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3091 (ii).
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) on M. for 2°, 1006 (i).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4302 (iii).
Indemnity to Senators and Members, on M.(Mr. *Foster*) 6293 (iii).
I. C. Ry. B. 105 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. for 2°, 1258; in Com., 1262 (i).
——— Elevators, Cost of Construction (M. for Ret.*) 135 (i).
Labour, Legislation respecting (Ques.) 4674 (iii).
Laidlow, Wm., Resignation, &c. (M. for Ret.) 1048 (i).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. to conc. in Res., 4307 (iii).
——— B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 5497, 5608 (iii).
Land Grants to Volunteers, in Com. on Res., 3126 (ii).
Mail Service, B.C. (Ques.) 4294 (iii).
Major's Hill Park, Tenders (Ques.) 605 (i).
Montreal Custom House, Defaulting Clerks (Ques.) 4675 (iii).
——— Employés, Superannuation (Ques.) 3616.
——— on M. for Ret., 3281 (ii).
——— Irregularities (Ques.) 3953 (ii).
——— Night Watchman (Ques.) 5406 (iii).

McMullen, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Montreal P. O. Letter Boxes, Collecting Contract (Ques.) 3953 (ii).
Order, Ques. of (Sir *John Thompson*) Unparliamentary Language, 1334 (i).
Ordnance Lands, Montreal, Leases (Ques.) 5409.
Parliament Buildings, Metal Pillars (Ques.) 1273.
Pelee Island, Sub-Collector, on M. for Cor., &c., 1598 (i).
Postmasters of Dom., Contingent Expenses (M. for Ret.*) 128 (i).
Potatoes Exported from Canada (M. for Ret.*) 544 (i).
P. O. and Dom. Savings Banks Deposits (M. for Ret.) 202, 210 (i).
Prohibition, Legislation respecting (Ques.) 144 (i).
Public Works, Deptl. Employés (enquiry for Ret., 3200 (ii).
Public Works, Employés' Names, Duties, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 1579 (i).
——— (enquiry for Ret.) 3653 (ii).
Quarantine (U.S.) Regulations for Sheep, &c. (remarks) 742 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. (B. 43, 1°) 217, 1029 (i).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. for Com. on Res., 6135; in Com., 6137, 6185 (iii).
Sugar (Raw) Imports (Ques.) 602 (i).
——— Quantity in Bond (Ques.) 740 (i).

SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Experimental Farms) 3558 (ii); (Two-rowed Barley) 1565 (i).
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3545 (ii).
Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) 5217; (Tay) 5221 (iii); (Trent) 4138 (ii). *Income* (Carillon and Grenville) 5222, 6296 (iii); (Miscellaneous) 1667 (i); (Rideau) 5222 (iii).
Charges of Management (Public Debt, Commissions) 1754; (Savings Banks) 1748 (i).
Civil Government (Agriculture) 6169 (iii); (Civil Service Examiners) contingencies 481; (Finance and Treasury Board) 252; (High Commissioner) 421, contingencies, 431, 449, 466, 476, 1733 (i), 6167 (iii); (Indian Affairs) 249 (i); (Interior) 6169 (iii); (Justice) 241; (Marine) 255; (P.O. and Finance) contingencies, 432; (Printing and Stationery) 247; (Public Works) 400; (Railways and Canals) 409 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, 5170. Customs (Chinese Immigration) 5056; (Inspectors of Ports) 5052; (Laboratory) 5054; (Ont.) 5049; (Que.) 5030. Culling Timber, 5159. Dom. Lands, 5179. Excise (Customs Collectors' allowance) 5137; (salaries, &c.) 5125. Inspection of Staples, 5165. Minor Revenues (Ordnance Lands) 5172 (iii). Rys. (I.C.R.) 1742 (i), 4065 (ii). Weights and Measures 5161 (iii).
Fisheries (Fish-breeding) conc., 4278 (iii); (N.W. T., salaries, &c.) 3527 (ii); (Ont., salaries) 3514 (ii).
Government of N. W. T. (Translating *Gazette*) 1711.
Legislation: House of Commons (contingencies) 941; (Voters' Lists) 952, 1735. (Serjeant-at-Arms' Estimates) 943. Senate Salaries, &c.) 929 (i).

McMullen, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Concluded.*
Immigration (European Agents' salaries) conc., 4276 (iii).
Indians (B.C.) 4805; (Man. and N.W.T.) 4812 (iii).
Justice, Administration of (Judges' salaries) 518 (i); (Miscellaneous) 6170 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Banff Hot Springs) 5108; (Commutation of Duties) 5084; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 5087, 5104; (Govt. of Keewatin) 5081; (Old Records) 5084, 5124; (Parliamentary Documents, distribution) 5081 (iii).
Mounted Police, 1697 (i), 4817 (iii.)
Penitentiaries (B.C.) 919; (Man.) 914; (Regina Gaol) 928; (St. Vincent de Paul) 909 (i).
Public Works, Income: Buildings (B.C.) 4451, 6252; (Man.) 4429; (N.W.T.) 4445, 6249; (N.S.) 4314; (Ont,) 5224, 6239, 6241; (Ottawa) 4472, 4486; (Printing Bureau) 6253; (Que.) 4333, 6201, conc., 5385 (iii); (Regina School) 1687 (i); (Repairs, &c.) 4469. Dredging (Man.) 4648; (New Plant) 4605; (Ont. and Que.) 4646; (Repairs) 4640. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4564; (Que.) 4555 (iii).
Public Works—Capital (Kingston Graving Dock) 1678; C. B. Ry. (construction, &c.) 1656; (Grand Narrows Bridge, &c.) 1658 (i).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (accomodation at St. John) 1655 (i); (Halifax, increased accommodation) 3855 (ii); (Rolling Stock) 1654 (i), 3882 (ii); ("Y" at Truro) 1655. Oxford and New Glasgow (construction) 1658 (i).
Steamboat Inspection, 3513 (ii).
Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B.C.) 3673, 3688 (ii).
Tarte-McGreevy Enquiry, Counsel (Ques.) 1575 (remarks) 1930 (i).
Tay Canal, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3776 (ii).
Telegrams, in Com. of Sup., 500 (i).
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3433 (ii).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2558 (ii).
Transcontinental Mail Service (Ques.) 6216 (iii).
Tunnel, P.E.I. and Mainland, on M. for Cor., 1633 (i).
Walrond Ranche and Settlers, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6153 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2336 (ii).
——— on M. to conc. in Res., 3204, 3231 (ii).
——— in Com. on Res., 4006 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119, (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1375 (i); in Com. on B., 2215, 2250, 2257 (ii).

McNeill, Mr. A., *North Bruce.*
Adjnmt., Dom. Day (remarks) 1542 (i).
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 3969, 3978 (ii).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1802 (i).
Chatsworth, Georgian Bay and Lake Huron Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 130, 1°*), 1927 (i).

McNeill, Mr. A.—*Continued.*
Dredging in North Bruce, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6197 (iii).
Fishery Laws, Enforcement, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1527 (i).
Indian Agent Allen, Charges against (Ques.) 1928 (i).
——— (remarks) 1298 (i).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 3913 (ii).
Personal Explanation *re* Vote on Prohibition, 1543 (i).
Porter, David, Claim, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6231 (iii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Amt., to prop. Res., 1304 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Amt., 1343 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Amt. to prop. Res., 359 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to Amt. to M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 6115 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3535 (ii).
Civil Government (Public Works) 405 (i).
Fisheries (Fish-breeding) 3531 (ii).
Indians (N.B.) conc., 5422 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Historical, &c., Map of Canada) 6262 (iii).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 6257 (iii).
U.S. Treaty with Cuba, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4015 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on M. to conc. in Res., 3216 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2802 (ii).

Madill, Mr. F., *North Ontario.*
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. to adjn. Hse., 2372 (ii).
Oshawa Ry. and Navigation Co.'s (B. 123, 1°*) 1574 (i).
Porter, David, Claim, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6229 (iii).

Mara, Mr. J. A., *Yale.*
Adjnmt., Dom. Day (remarks) 1543 (i).
——— Holidays (remarks) 1277 (i).
Esquimalt Settlers' Grievances, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4044 (ii).
Experimental Farms, Expenditures (M. for Ret.*) 232 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2939 (ii).
Mining Machinery, Free Entry into B.C. (M. for Cor.) 965 (i).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Experimental Farms) 3558 (ii).
Indians (B.C.) 4801 (iii).
Public Works—Income: Dredging (B.C.) 4650. Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 4593 (iii).
Vancouver Dock and Shipbuilding Co.'s incorp. (B. 51, 1°*) 266 (i).

Marshall, Mr. J. H., *East Middlesex.*
American Cattle slaughtered in Canada (remarks) 4537 (iii).
——— Cheese shipped through Can. Ports (Ques.) 114 (i).
——— (M. for Cor.*) 205 (i).

Masson, Mr. J., *North Grey.*
Adjnmt., Dom. Day (remarks) 1538 (i).
——— St. Peter and St. Paul, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1412 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) on M. for 2°, 998 (i).
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) in Com., 1979; on M. for 2°, 1008 (i).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron*) to M. to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com., 5672 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 4338. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4565 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2305 (ii).

Mignault, Mr. R. M. S., *Yamaska.*
Duguay, Jos., Exciseman, Suspension (Ques.) 3254 (ii).
Yamaska, East, Post Office, Closing (Ques.) 2153.

Mills, Hon. D., *Bothwell.*
Address, on The, 64 (i).
Adjnmt., Ascension Day (remarks) 110 (i).
——— Dom. Day (remarks) 1537 (i).
Admiralty Jurisdiction B. 13 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1419, 1731 (i).
Administration of Justice B. 14 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 893, 1090 (i).
Albion Mines Savings Bank B. 113 (Mr. *McDougald, Pictou*) in Com., 1297 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to introd., 1103 (i).
Atlantic Mail Service (M. for Cor.) 124 (i).
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 3961, 3977 (ii).
Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. for Com., 1763 (i).
Bills of Exchange Act Amt. B. 104 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1099 (i).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1835 (i).
Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 34 (Mr. *Flint*) in Com., 3296 (ii).
C. P. R., Section "B," Charges against P. M. G., on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 5962 (iii).
Census, Receipt of Returns (Ques.) 130 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4963 (iii).
Compulsory Voting B. 53 (Mr. *Amyot*) on M. for 2°, 1034 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 2365 (ii); in Com., 5376, 5598, 5729, 6224 (iii).

Mills, Hon. D.—*Continued.*
Corbin, J. S., Patent Relief B. 30 (Mr. *Reid*) on M. for 2°, 294 (i).
Criminal Law, Codification B. 32 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 157 (i).
Debates, Official, on M. to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 1408 (i).
Deptl. Files, Destruction (Ques.) 4157 (ii).
Division, Members' Votes, on Procedure (remarks) 4456 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3246 (ii), 5587; on M. to recom., 5545; on M. for 3°, 5570 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 165 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 5763 (iii).
Election Returns, Date of Declaration, &c., on M. for Ret., 132 (i).
Esquimalt Settlers' Grievances, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4038 (ii).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3176; on M. for 3°, 3237 (ii).
Fishing Bounties, Claims, &c., on M. for Stmnt., 543 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 771.
——— Repeal B. 8 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 305 (i).
——— Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3089 (ii).
Frauds on the Government Prevention B. 172 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 5751 (iii).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4301 (iii).
Gov. Genl's. Warrants, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1545, (i).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1128 (i).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 682 (i).
Homesteads (Second) N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 625 (i).
Indemnity to Senators and Members, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) 6294 (iii).
Indian Affairs, Management, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1503 (i).
——— Agent Chisholm, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6147 (iii).
I. C. R. Management, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., 3787, 3792 (ii).
Jennings, Mr., Engineer, Appmnt. by Govt. (Ques.) 2522 (ii).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. to conc. in Res., 4309; in Com. on B., 4617, 4638 (iii).
——— B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 5493; on M. for 2°, 6133 (iii).
——— Volunteers, in Com. on Res., 3121 (ii).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2937 (ii).

Mills, Hon. D.—*Continued.*

Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1068 (i).

Ministerial Changes (remarks) 890 (i).

——— on adjnmt. (remarks) 237 (i).

Motions allowed to Stand (remarks) 1932 (i).

Newfoundland Bait Act, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6193 (iii).

Northumberland, East, Charges against Member, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 4156 (ii).

N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 3924; in Com., 3927 (ii), 4298 (iii).

Orange Influence, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1971 (i).

Order, Ques. of (Sir *John Thompson*) Unparliamentary Language, 1333 (i).

——— on M. to adjn. Hse., 2370 (ii).

Petroleum at Crow's Nest Pass (Ques.) 6285 (iii).

Pictou Harbour Commissioners B. 150 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3900 (ii).

P. E. I. Ry., Messrs. Saunders and Muttart, Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 2173 (ii).

Priv. and Elec. Com., afternoon Sittings, on M., 1989 (i).

——— 6th Rep. *re* Controverted Elections, on conc., 4826 (iii).

Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Amt. to prop. Res., 358 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Amt., 1328 (i).

Provincial Govts., Transfer of Property B. 111 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 3990 (i); in Com., 5755, 6223 (iii).

Public Accts. Com., on M. to ref. Accts. *re* Boucier, 3949 (ii).

——— on M. to rescind Order of Hse., 1926 (i).

Quebec Skating Club, Conveyance of Lands B. 160 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 3984 (ii).

Quebec, West, Vacancy, on Issue of Writ (remarks) 4083 (ii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. *Barron*) on M. for 2°, 3305 (ii).

Sault Ste. Marie Wharf, Tolls, &c. (Ques.) 3620 (ii).

Ships' Inspection Act Amt. Bill 149 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 4312 (iii).

Speaker, Election of Deputy (remarks) 388 (i).

Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 6218 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (Experimental Farms) 1568; (Two-rowed Barley) 1564 (i).

Arts, &c. (Health Statistics) 6174 (iii).

Canals—Capital (Grenville) 4141; (Tay) 4144 (ii).

Civil Government (Agriculture) 254; (Auditor Gen's. Office) 1545 (i), 6167 (iii); (High Commissioner) 429, contingencies, 445; (Finance and Treasury Board) 252; (Fisheries) 255; (Inland Revenue) 253; (Interior) 248 (i), 6169 (iii), contingencies, 434; (Marine) contingencies, 441; (Printing Bureau) contingencies, 442; (Public Works) 263, 399; (Sec. of State) 242 (i.)

Mills, Hon. D.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

Collection of Revenues: Customs (Ont.) 5847 (iii); (Douglas, Mr., additional salary) 1722; (O'Meara, Mr., additional salary) 1719 (i). Post Office (Mail Service) 4705 (iii). Rys. (I.C.R.) 1742 (i), 4071 (ii). Weights and Measures, 1726 (i).

Dominion Police, 1558 (i).

Government of N. W. T. (Schools) 1711; (contingencies) 1709 (i).

Indians (T. D. Green's salary) 1552 (i); (N.B.) 5063 (iii); N.W.T. (Treaties) 1695 (i).

Justice, Administration of (Exchequer Court) 509.

Legislation: House of Commons (Expenses of Committees) 6173; (Indemnity) 6172 (iii); (Voters' Lists) 946, 1560. Senate (salaries, &c.) 936 (i).

Mail Subsidies, &c. (Liverpool or London and St. John or Halifax) 4681; (Magdalen Islands) 4678; (St. John and Halifax and West Indies, &c.) conc., 5450, 5482; (San Francisco and Victoria) 4704 (iii).

Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 4225 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Commercial Agencies) conc., 5431 (iii); (Litigation Expenses) 1708; (Lunatics, Support of) 1709 (i).

Mounted Police, 1701 (i).

Penitentiaries (Man.) 915 (i), 6171 (iii).

Public Works—Capital: (Kingston Graving Dock) 1676 (i). *Income:* Buildings (B.C.) 6251; (Man.) 4437; (N.W.T.) 6249; (N.S.) 4316; (Ottawa) 4476; (Que.) 4334, 6205. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4564, 6254 (iii).

Railways—Capital: C.P.R. (construction) 1653 (i); I. C. R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 3869 (ii).

Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B.C.) 3696 (ii).

Territorial Accounts (Surgeon General's salary) 6284 (iii).

Unprovided Items, 1747 (i).

Tarte-McGreevy Enquiry, Counsel (remarks) 1930 (i).

Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3472 (ii).

Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2558; on M. to adjn. Hse., 2564 (ii).

Trade Policy of the Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3401 (ii).

Trade Relations with Foreign Countries, on M. to conc. in Address from Sen., 6319 (ii).

——— West Indies, Papers (remarks) 2289 (ii).

Treaty Papers, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 239 (i).

Trent Valley Canal, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., 4781 (iii).

U. S. Fishing Vessels B. 10 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 3°, 234 (i).

U. S. Treaty with Cuba, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4016 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2025 (i).

——— on M. to adjn. Deb., 2067 (i).

——— in Com. on Res., 4002 (ii).

Mills, Hon. D.—*Continued.*
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1373, 1392 (i); in Com. on B., 2225, 2235, 2248; on Sen. Amts., 3985 (ii).

Mills, Mr. J. B., *Annapolis.*
Admiralty Jurisdiction B. 13 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1423 (i).
Customs Collector, Annapolis Royal (Ques.) 270.
Great Eastern Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 124, 1°*) 1574 (i).
Militia Battalion (69th) No. 5 Co. (Ques.) 268 (i).
Newfoundland Bait Act, on M. for Cor., 3268 (ii).
Private Bills Reps. (M.) to suspend Rule, 1987 (i).
Sawdust in La Have River, on M. for Ret., 1944 (i).
SUPPLY:
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Liverpool or London and St. John or Halifax) 4688 (iii).
Railways—Capital: Annapolis and Digby (construction) 1664 (i).

Moncrieff, Mr. G., *East Lambton.*
London Life Insurance Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 135, 1°*) 1989 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2497 (ii).

Monet, Mr. D., *Napierville.*
Elections in Napierville (Ques.) 1577 (i).
Montreal and Sorel Ry., Subsidy (Ques.) 3614 (ii).
Napierville and St. Remi Ry., Subsidy (M. for Ret.) 2541 (ii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Leather Supplies (Ques.) 2912 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2872 (ii).

Montague, Mr. W. H., *Haldimand.*
Adjmnt. for Holidays (remarks) 1276 (i).
Caledonia Dam, Grand River, Construction (M. for Ret.*) 3287 (ii).
——— Drill Shed, Repairs (M. for Cor., &c.*) 3287 (ii).
Canada and Michigan Tunnel Co.'s (B. 19, 1°*) 155; 2° m., 189 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3246 (ii).
Election Returns, Date of Declaration, &c., on M. for Ret., 134 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3090 (ii).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1194 (i).
Grand River, Improvement of Navigation, Engineers' Reps. (M. for copies) 2155 (ii).
Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.'s (B. 18, 1°*) 155 (i).
Order (Ques. of) on Ways and Means, 2474 (ii).
Pairing of Members, 4213 (ii).
Pelee Island Sub-Collector, on M. to adjn. Hse., 1984 (i).

Montague, Mr. W. H.—*Continued.*
Personal Explanation, Error in Official Rep., 1991.
Railway Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. *Barron*) on M. for 2°, 3305 (ii).
St. Clair River Ry. Bridge and Tunnel Co.'s (B. 17, 1°*) 155 (i).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Weights and Measures, 1727 (i).
Miscellaneous (Printing Bureau) 1706 (i),
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Generally) 4596. Roads and Bridges (Ont.) 4606 (iii).
Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B.C.) 3676 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) M. to adjn. Deb. 1482; Deb. rsmd., 1854 (i).

Mousseau, Mr. J. O., *Soulanges.*
Coteau Landing Wharf, Monopoly (Ques.) 222 (i)
Fort du Coteau du Lac, Lease (Ques.) 604 (i).
Hearn, J. G., emplymnt. by Militia Dept. (Ques.) 5078 (iii).
St. Lawrence Dredge (Ques.) 3952 (ii).
Soulanges Canal, Expenditure (M. for Stmnt.) 532 (i).
——— Reps. of Engineers (M. for copies*) 1578.
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital (St. Lawrence River and Canals) 4113 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 4557 (iii).

Mulock, Mr. W., *North York, Ont.*
Adjnmt., Dom. Day (remarks) 1539 (i).
Admiralty Jurisdiction B. 13 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1433 (i).
Albion Mines Savings Bank B. 113, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to introd., 1104 (i).
Alliston, Conflagration (remarks) 192 (i).
Anglo-Canadian Electric Storage Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. *Mackintosh*) on Sen. Amts., 2551 (ii).
Arnoldi, J. R., Govtl. Action (remarks) 3130 (ii).
Atlantic Mail Service, on M. for Cor., 124 (i).
——— (Ques.) 1765 (i).
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 3965 (ii).
Binding Twine, Free Entry (prop. Res.) 1771, 1805, 1825, 1834, 1846 (i); neg. (Y. 80, N. 100) 1847 (i).
Bourgeois, G. A., Payment to, on M. to ref. to Pub. Accts. Com., 2361 (ii).
Caraquet Ry., Receipts and Expenditures (Ques.) 3614 (ii).
Cattle Export Trade of Canada (remarks) 737 (i).
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s Bill 97 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 569 (i).
Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act (B. 139, 1°) 2140 (i); (remarks) 2552 (ii).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5356, 5574, 5382, 5594, 5727, 6225 (iii).

Mulock, Mr. W.—*Continued.*
Customs Seizures, Illegal (Ques.) 2520 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 3°, 5586 (iii).
Dom. Notes, Circulation, Redemption, &c. (M. for Stmnt.*) 1578 (i).
Election Returns, Date of Declaration, &c., on M. for Ret. (Amt.) 134 (i).
Esquimalt Settlers' Grievances, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4025 (ii).
Govt., Formation of (Ques.) 1578 (i).
Gov. Gen.'s Warrants (M. for Ret.*) 232 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 1545 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4546 (iii).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 653 (i).
Indemnity to Senators and Members, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) 6291 (iii).
Indian Agent at Sutton West (Ques.) 961 (i).
Indian Lands Provincial Settlements B. 100 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1087 (i).
I. C. Ry. B. 105 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 1260 (i).
——— Stone Carried for Langevin Block (Ques.) 1575 (i).
Keewatin, Str., Govtl. Service (Ques.) 4294 (iii).
Kingston Graving Dock, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3658 (ii).
——— P.O., Rep. of Postmaster, on M. for copies, 2546 (ii).
Land Grants to Volunteers B. 159 (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) in Com. on Res., 3117 (ii).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 4535 (iii).
——— in Com., 4609, 5541 (iii).
——— B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 5490, 5593, 5610; on M. for 2°, 6130 (iii).
Langevin Block, Construction (Ques.) 1575 (i).
——— Haulage of Stone (Ques.) 1768 (i).
——— Ottawa, Advts. for Tenders (M. for copies) 531 (i).
——— Papers (enquiry) 737, 992 (i).
——— Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1267 (i).
London and Canadian Loan and Agency Co.'s B. 27 (Mr. *Cockburn*) on M. for 2°, 190 (i).
Manchester Ship Canal, T. Munro's Rep. (M. for copy*) 1579 (i).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1078 (i).
Militia Act Amt. (B. 7, 1°) 106 (i).
Mining Machinery, Importation, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4099.
North Shore Ry. Debentures, on M. for copies of O. C.'s, &c., 1024 (i).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3930 (ii).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com., 5708 (iii).
Order (Ques. of) Ry. Subsidies, 6136 (iii).

Mulock, Mr. W.—*Continued.*
Order, Ques. of (Sir *John Thompson*) Unparliamentary Language, 1333 (i).
Porter, David, Claim, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6233 (iii).
Pub. Accts Com. Meetings, in Com. of Sup., 1712.
——— on M. to Print Evidence, 2374, 4000 (ii).
——— Witnesses on Oath (M.) 1345 (i).
Public Debt, Sinking Fund (Ques.) 2152 (ii).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to Amt. to M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 6119 (iii).
——— Papers (enquiry) 746 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 3139 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Two-rowed Barley) 1564 (i).
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3550 (ii).
Canals—Capital (Galops) 4108; (Grenville) 4141; (St. Lawrence River and Canals) 4119; (Sault Ste. Marie) 4102; (Tay) 4143; (Trent) 4140. *Income* (Carillon) 4150; (Chambly) 4147; (Grenville, Godwin's Claim) 6298; (Ste. Anne's Lock) 4149; (St. Ours Lock) 4148; (Welland) 4145 (ii).
Charges of Management (Dom. Notes) 1755; (Public Debt, Commissions) 1750 (i).
Civil Government (Auditor Gen.'s Office) 1545; (High Commissioner) contingencies, 447, 455, 472, 490; (Indian Affairs) 1547; (Printing Bureau) contingencies, 486 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Douglas, Mr., additional salary) 1724 (i). Post Office, 6279 (iii). Public Works, 1729 (i); (Agency, B.C.) 4669; (Harbours, &c., repairs) 4666. Slides and Booms (Dues) 4663 (iii). I. C. R. 1740 (i), 4059 (ii). Weights and Measures, 1726 (i).
Dominion Police, 511 (i).
Government of N. W. T. (Schools) 1712 (i).
Indians (T. D. Green, salary) 1553; (N.W.T., late Mr. Payne) 1695; (Ont., Que., &c.) 1694 (i).
Justice, Administration of (Exchequer Court) 507; (Masters, C. H., drafting Criminal Law) 1559. (Miscellaneous) 506; (Vice-Admiralty Court) 511 (i).
Legislation: House of Commous (contingencies) 942; (Voters' Lists) 950, 1559. Library (Grant) 945. Senate (salaries, &c.) 929 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 6268 (iii).
Militia (Armouries, &c.) 3726; (Clothing, &c.) 3700; (Drill Instruction) 3729 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Commercial Agencies) conc., 5432; (Printing Bureau, Plant) 5346; (Strong, W. O., gratuity to Widow) 6264 (iii).
Mounted Police, 1705 (i).
Ocean and River Service (Collision SS. *Alert* and Schr. *Scylla*) 6266 (iii).
Penitentiaries (Dorchester) 910, 1559; (Man.) 918; (St. Vincent de Paul) 907 (i).
Pensions (Harpur, G. H.) 1572.
Public Works—Capital (Kingston Graving Dock) 1669, 1683 (i). *Income:* Buildings (Man.) 4430; N.W.T., 4447; (Ont.) 6239; (Ottawa) 4480; (Printing Bureau) 6253 (iii). Dredging (New Plant) 4604; (Repairs) 4642. Experimental Farms, &c., 4654. Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 4593; (Ont.) 4560, 6258, conc., 5438.

Mulock, Mr. W.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
(Miscellaneous) 4656; (National Art Gallery) 4663. Roads and Bridges (Ont.) 4607. Surveys, &c., 4662 (iii).
Quarantine, 5338; conc., 5437 (iii).
Railways—Capital: Annapolis and Digby (construction) 1665 (i). I.C.R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 3858, 3876, 3897 (ii); (St. Charles Branch) 1655 (i); (St. John, increased accommodation) 3894 (ii).
Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B.C.) 3675 (ii).
Territorial Accounts, 6280; (Surgeon General's salary) 6281, conc., 6305 (iii).
Unprovided Items, 1746 (i).
Ships' Safety B. 44 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1089 (i).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com. on Res., 6140; on M. for 1°, 6144; in Com., 6187, 6217 (iii).
Sugar, Free Entry, Order for Com. on Res. (read) 1931 (i).
Sutton West, Indian Agent, Expenses *re* Investigation (M. for Ret.*) 145 (i).
Tay Canal, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3769 (ii).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2574 (ii).
Voters' Lists, Revision, Cost (Ques.) 268 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2033 (i).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 2256 (ii).

Murray, Mr. T., Pontiac.
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 3°, 5582 (iii).
Privilege (Ques. of) par. in *Empire*, 806 (i).
Rapide Plat Canal, Tenders, &c. (M. for copies*) 544 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3030 (ii).

O'Brien, Mr. W. E., Muskoka.
American Cattle in Can., Slaughter, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4468, 4536 (iii).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1778 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 2369 (ii); in Com., 5379.
Divorce, Thomas Bristow Relief (B. 133, 1°) 1937 (i); M. for Com., 2550 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5158, 5551; on M. for 3°, 5563 (iii).
Female Offenders in N. S. B. 143 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3597 (ii).
Fishery Laws, Enforcement, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1522 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3098 (ii).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1135 (i).

O'Brien, Mr. W. E.—*Continued.*
Homesteads (Second) N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 627 (i).
Land Grant to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4630 (iii).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 3905; in Com., 4298 (iii).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com., 5722 (iii).
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Jamieson*) 278 (i).
Provincial Accounts Settlement B. 99 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1066 (i).
Ships' Inspection B. 149 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3608 (ii).
Standing Orders Com., Rep. *re* Rathbun Co. (remarks) 5012 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (B. C., salaries) 3528 (ii).
Indians (N.B.) conc., 5423 (iii).
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 4214; (Clothing, &c.) 3713.
Public Works: Buildings (N.S.) 4319; (Ont.) 4370; (Que.) 4360; Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4578 (iii)
Quarantine, conc, 5435 (iii).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 3869 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2039 (i).
——— on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2479 (ii).

Ouimet, Hon. J. A., *Laval.*
American Cattle in Can., Slaughter, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5209 (iii).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 36, 52 (ii).
Divisions, Members' Votes, on Procedure (remarks) 4456 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. Bill 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5196 (iii).
Indemnity to Members and Senators, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) 6292 (iii).
I. C. R Management, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., 3787 (ii).
Land Grants to Volunteers, in Com. on Res., 3106 (ii).
Order (Ques. of) adjnmts., 6027, 6031 (iii).
Pairing of Members (remarks) 631 (i).
Quebec, West, Vacancy (Ques. of Order) on Issue of Writ, 4083 (i).
SUPPLY:
Legislation: House of Commons (contingencies) 942 (i).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4561 (iii).
Testimonials to Ministers, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3844 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2062 (i).

Paterson, Mr. W., *South Brant.*
Budget, The (Ques.) 953, 959 (i).
Compounders' License Fees, in Com. on Res., 3243.
Customs Act. Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 5284; neg. (Y. 78, N. 102) 5335 (iii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) in Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 779.
Fraudulent Marking Prevention B. 140 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 3583 (ii).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 851 (i).
Indian Act Amt. B. 144 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3590 (ii).
Indian Affairs, Management, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1507 (i).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 3243; in Com., 3579 (ii).
Pairing of Members, on M. for adjnmt., 3826 (ii).
Pelee Island Sub-Collector, on M. for Cor., &c., 1594 (i).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 6187 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, &c. (Census) 1569 (i); (Census and Statistics) 3531 (ii).
Canals—Capital (Grenville, Goodwin's Claim) 6199 (iii).
Civil Government (High Commissioner) 411, 421, contingencies, 431, 443, 469, 491; (Indian Affairs) 1549, contingencies, 435; (Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office) contingencies, 432; (Public Works) 256.
Indians (T. D. Green, salary) 1552 (i); (B.C.) conc., 5415; (Ont., Que., &c.) conc., 5413 (iii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists, Revision) 949. Senate (salaries, &c.) 938 (i).
Militia (Care and Maintenance, &c.) 3734; (Drill Pay, &c.) 4231 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Commercial Agencies) conc., 5427; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) conc., 5427 (iii).
Public Works—Income (Que.) 6203 (iii).
Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B.C.) 3672 (ii).
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3484.
Treaty Papers, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 240 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1458 (i).
——— on M. to conc. in Res., 3202, 3211, 3233.
——— in Com. on Res., 4005 (ii).

Patterson, Mr. W. A., *Colchester.*
SUPPLY:
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) conc., 4284 (iii).

Perry, Mr. S. F., *Prince, P.E.I.*
Brae Harbour Breakwater, Completion (Ques.) 1274 (i).
——— Tenders (Ques.) 208 (i).
Cascumpec Harbour Improvements (Ques.) 1765 (i), 2151 (ii).
Fishery Bounty Cheques, Costs, &c., on M. for Ret., 185 (i).
——— Wardens, Appmts., (Ques.) 5409 (iii).

Perry, Mr. F. S.—*Continued.*
Miminigash Breakwater (Ques.) 3959 (ii), 4296.
——— Tenders for new Works (Ques.) 130 (i).
New Carlisle Wharf, Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 968 (i).
Oyster Beds, Leases (Ques.) 3958 (ii).
Piers, Wharves and Breakwaters, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 3951 (ii).
Prince Edward, Dredge (Ques.) 1765 (i).
P.E.I. Ry., Dismissals (remarks) 4000 (ii).
——— Employés, Dismissal (enquiry for Ret.) 4087 (ii).
——— Messrs. Saunders and Muttart, Dismissal (M. for Cor.) 2158 (ii).
——— Train Service (Ques. 1274 (i).
Stanley, Str., Trips, Mainland and P. E. I. (M. for Ret.) 158, 172 (i).
——— (Ques.) 1929 (i).
Summerside Harbour, Dredging (Ques.) 3258 (ii).
——— Postmaster, Dismissal (Ques.) 3955 (ii).
——— Ry. Station (Ques.) 3263 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Post Office (salaries, &c.) 4722 (iii).
Fisheries (Fish-breeding) conc., 4264 (iii); (P.E.I., salaries, &c.) 3524 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Dredging (Repairs) 4643; Harbours and Rivers (Generally) 4598; (P.E.I.) 4532 (iii).
Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B. C.) 3670 (ii).
Tignish Breakwater, Wharfage Dues (Ques.) 130, 708 (i).
——— Harbour Master (Ques.) 3259 (ii), 4673 (iii).
Tunnel, P.E.I. and Mainland (Ques.) 208 (i).
——— Papers (remarks) 1413 (i).
——— on M. for Cor., 1618 (i).
West Point Wharf Engineer's Rep. (Ques.) 269 (i).

Prefontaine, Mr. R., *Chambly.*
Boucherville Wharf, Contractor (Ques.) 1265 (i).
Lachine Canal, Côte St. Paul Drain, Tenders (M. for copies) 2157 (ii).
Maurice, Mr. Jos. A., &c., Claim for Expropriation (M. for Ret.*) 2174 (ii).
Vaudreuil and Boucherville Wharves, Expenditure, &c. (M. for Stmnt.*) 2548 (ii).

Prior, Mr. E. G., *Victoria, B.C.*
Adjnmt., St. Peter and St. Paul, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1412 (i).
Adjutant General, Dep., Military District No. 11 (M. for Reps.*) 736 (i).
Better Terms, B.C., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4093 (ii).
Coal Monopoly, B.C., in Com. of Sup., 922 (i)
Petroleum at Crow's Nest Pass (remarks) 6285.
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s (B. 68, 1°*) 387 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: (B.C.) 4451. Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 4592 (iii).
Penitentiaries (B.C.) 922 (i).

Prior, Mr. E. C.—*Continued.*
Victoria, Saanich and New Westminster Ry. Co.'s (B. 67, 1°*) 387 (i).

Proulx, Mr. I., *Prescott.*
St. Pierre, Pierre, emplymnt. as Slide Master (Ques.) 603 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3076 (ii).

Putnam, Mr. A., *Hants.*
Ships' Inspection B. 149 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3604 (ii).

Reid, Mr. J. D., *South Grenville.*
Corbin, Jay Spencer, Patent Relief (B. 30, 1°*) 156 ; 2° m., 294 (i).
Frauds Prevention B. 4 (Mr. *Burdett*) in Com., 1980 (i).

Rider, Mr. T. B., *Stanstead.*
Coaticook P.O., Coal Contract (Ques.) 6216 (iii).
Commercial Treaty, England and France (remarks) 3950 (ii).
——— (Ques.) 4670 (iii).
Knowlton's Landing, Wharf (Ques.) 1770 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2610 (ii).

Rinfret, Mr. C. I., *Lotbinière.*
American Cattle for Slaughter (Ques.) 5776 (iii).
Baie des Chaleurs Ry., Subsidies (Ques.) 5075 (iii).
Connell, J., emplymnt. by Sorel Harbour Board (Ques.) 5076 (iii).
Duguay, Jos., Exciseman, Suspension (Ques.) 3254 (ii).
Fraserville P.O. Building, Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 3255 (ii).
Immigrants into Canada, Number (Ques.) 5075.
Jockes & Delorimier, Messrs., Stone Contractors (Ques.) 5076 (iii).
Judges in Quebec, Appmnts. (Ques.) 5076 (iii).
Laberge, Mr., emplymnt. by P. O. Dept., Que. Div. (Ques.) 3954 (ii).
Lyster Postmaster, Resignation (Ques.) 3958 (ii).
Montreal P. O. Service (Ques.) 5077 (iii).
Quebec P. O., Sunday Closing (Ques.) 1765 (i).
Ste. Croix Lighthouse Keeper, Resignation, &c. (M. for Ret.) 173 (i).
St. Jean Deschaillons, Shoals (M. for Cor.) 1053.
Sorel Harbour Works, Employés (Ques.) 5077 (iii).

Robillard, Mr. H., *Ottawa City.*
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Charlton) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Supply, 3445 (ii).

Roome, Mr. W. F., *North Middlesex.*
Adjnmt., St. Peter and St. Paul, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1409 (i).
——— Holidays (remarks) 1275 (i).
Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 34 (Mr. *Flint*) in Com., 3300 (ii).
Indian Act Amt. B. 144 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3593 (ii).

Roome, Mr. W. F.—*Continued.*
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on Amt. (Mr. *Mackintosh*) to prop. Res., 345 (i).
SUPPLY :
Agriculture (Dairy Industry) 6174 (iii).

Ross, Mr. A. W., *Lisgar.*
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Mulock) 1806 (i).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 165 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 5773 (iii).
Red River Surveys, Reps. (Ques.) 1012 (i).
Rocky Mountain Ry. and Coal Co.'s incorp. (B. 125, 1°*) 1757 (i).
SUPPLY :
Penitentiaries (B.C.) 926 ; (Man.) 917 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2596 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1374,1379 (i).

Rowand, Mr. J., *West Bruce.*
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1799 (i).
SUPPLY :
Agriculture (Experimental Farms) 3572 (ii).

Ryckman, Mr. S. S., *Hamilton.*
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2882 (ii).

Savard, Mr. P. V., *Chicoutimi and Saguenay.*
Chicoutimi Election Ret. (Ques.) 142 (i).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1196 (i).

Scriver, Mr. J., *Huntingdon.*
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 3967 (ii).
Debates, Official Rep., on M. (Mr. *Bowell*) for Sel. Com., 109 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 3°, 5565 (iii).
Personal Explanation *re* Speech on Prohibition, 2204 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Amt., 1323 (i).
SUPPLY :
Agriculture (Dairy Industry) 3575 (ii), 6176 (iii).
Canals—Capital (St. Lawrence River and Canals) 4120 (ii).
Civil Government (Auditor Gen.'s Office) 6167 (iii).
Indians (Caughnawaga School Teacher) 6272; (Ont., Que., &c.) conc., 5413 (iii).
Legislation : Library (Grant) 945 (i).
Miscellaneous (Prohibition Commission) 6276 ; (Strong, W. O., Gratuity to Widow) 6265 (iii).
Penitentiaries (St. Vincent de Paul) 6170 (iii).
Public Works—Income : Buildings (Ottawa) 4471, 4475 ; (Que.) 4337. Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 4556 (iii).
Quarantine (Tracadie Lazaretto) 3576 (ii).
Territorial Accounts (Surgeon General's salary) 6280 (iii).
Veterans of 1837-38, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 2928 (ii).

Semple, Mr. A., *Centre Wellington.*
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5740 (iii).
Galt Postmaster, Resignation, &c. (Ques.) 1263 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2731 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1395 (i).

Skinner, Mr. C. N., *St. John, N.B., City and Co.*
Admiralty Jurisdiction B. 13 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1430 (i).
Bay of Fundy Fisheries, on M. for Ret., 720 (i).
C. P. R., Section "B," Charges against P.M.G., on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 5967 (iii).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 in Com., 5364 (iii).
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) in Com., 1979 (i).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1191 (i).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 861 (i).
I. C. R. Management, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3819 (ii).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member, Com.'s Rep. (remarks) 5554 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com., 5701 (iii).
——— Rep. of Sel. Com. (presented) 5487 (iii).
——— (M.) to conc., 5612; conc. in (Y. 98, N. 75) 5725 (iii).
Provincial Govts., Transfer of Property B. 111 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5759 (iii).
Salisbury Harbour Ry. Co.'s (B. 120, 1°*) 1453 (i).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com. on Res., 6138 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 5256 (iii).
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 3897; (St. John, increased accommodation) 3886 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2860 (ii).

Smith, Sir D. A., K.C.M.G., *West Montreal.*
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (High Commissioner) contingencies, 446 (i).

Somerville, Mr. J., *North Brant.*
Banff Springs Park and Reserve (Ques.) 3957 (ii).
Barber's, Mr., Claim (Ques.) 269 (i).
Big Bay Wharf, Expenditure, &c., on Work (Ques.) 1929 (i).
——— Repairs (M. for Ret.) 232 (i).
Fishery Protection, Georgian Bay (Ques.) 220 (i)
——— Supplies (Ques.) 221 (i).
——— (M. for Ret.*) 544 (i).
Georgian Bay Islands, Timber Cut (Ques.) 603 (i)
Indian Agent at Wiarton (Ques.) 603 (i).
Letter Postage, Reduction (Ques.) 129 (i)).

Somerville, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Montreal P.O., Letter Boxes Collecting Contract (Ques.) 3953 (ii).
N. S. Central Ry., Subsidy (Ques.) 3960 (ii).
Owen Sound Harbour, Improvements (Ques.) 3960 (ii).
Public Accts. Com., Accts. *re* Boucier (M.) to ref. 3948 (ii).
——— Interior Dept. (M.) to ref. Cheques, &c., 2203 (ii).
——— on M. to rescind Order of House, 1926 (i).
——— Meetings, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1713 (i).
Polson Mfng. Co., Steel Plate Imports (Ques.) 270 (i).
Rideau Canal, Ordnance Land, Sale (Ques.) 5408 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Experimental Farms) 3560 (ii).
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3549 (ii).
Civil Government (High Commissioner) contingencies, 442, 483, 498; (Interior) 249; (Printing and Stationery) 243; (Printing Bureau) contingencies, 478 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, 5171 (iii). Customs (O'Meara, Mr., additional salary) 1714 (i). Excise (salaries, &c.) 1725 (i), 5125. Minor Revenues (Ordnance Lands) 5173.
Government of N. W. T. (Translating *Gazette*) 1710.
Legislation: House of Commons (Printing, &c.) 946; (Voters' Lists, Revision) 953. Senate (salaries, &c.) 931 (i).
Militia (Armouries, &c.) 3721; (Clothing, &c.) 3703; (Military Stores, &c.) 3719 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 5087 (iii); (Gliddon, Wm., payment) 1705; (Printing Bureau) 1706 (i); (Returns, preparation) 5107; (Royal Society's Proceedings) 5123 (iii).
Mounted Police, 1704 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 6245: (Ottawa) 4492, 4513; (Que.) 4339 (iii). Dredging (New Plant) 1691. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 1688 (i).
Tay Canal, Tenders for Construction, &c. (Ques.) 3953, 3956 (ii).
Telegrams, in Com. of Sup., 498 (i).
Veterans, 1837-38, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 2926 (ii).

Speaker, Mr. (Hon. PETER WHITE) *North Renfrew.*
Address to Her Majesty, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 227 (i).
Bay of Fundy Fisheries (remarks) 716 (i).
Bills, Royal Assent, Coms. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office (read) 1990 (i), 3098 (ii), 4534 (iii).
Bourgeois, G. A., Payment to, on M. to ref. to Pub. Accts. Com., 2461 (ii).
Cattle Trade, Shipping of Live Stock B. (remarks) 958 (i).
Commons, The, Privileges claimed in Senate, 4 (i)
Connolly, Michael, Books of Firm delivered (notification) 954 (i).
——— Ordered to appear before Bar of House, 895 (i).

Speaker, Mr.—*Continued.*
Controverted Election (Halton) Judgment, 5 (i).
——— Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (remarks) 2366 (ii); in Com., 5740 (iii).
Divisions, Procedure, Members' Votes (remarks) 4455 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3245 (ii), 5143 (iii).
Evidence in Criminal Cases B. 11 (ruling) 2961 (ii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3083 (ii).
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) in Com., 1972 (i).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4300 (iii).
Indian Agent Allen (remarks) 1298 (i).
——— Chisholm, on M. for Com. of Sup. (ruling) 6147 (iii).
Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 111 (i), 2144 (ii).
Interruptions by Members (remarks) 2069 (i), 2395, 2707 (ii).
Kingston Graving Dock, on M. for Com. of Sup. (ruling) 3657 (ii).
——— Papers (remarks) 636 (i).
Library of Parliament, Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Macdonald, Sir John, Decease, draping Chamber (remarks) 883 (i).
Member, New, notification of Return, 7 (i).
Members not Voting (remarks) 331 (i).
Members' Private Motions, Procedure (remarks) 127 (l).
Member's Vote challenged (ruling) 4428 (iii).
Mess. from His Ex. (read) 111, 227, 550, 736, 799, 1199 (i), 2144 (ii), 5589, 6289 (iii).
Ministerial Stmnts. (remarks) 1013 (i).
Monuments, Battlefields of Canada, on conc. (ruling) 4278 (iii).
Newspaper Reps., incorrect, Reading ruled out of Order, 2962 (ii).
Orange Influence (remarks) 1965; (ruling) 1971 (i).
Order, Ques. of, on adjnmts. (ruling) 6027, 6032.
——— (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) on M. to adjn. Hse., 2371 (ii).
——— (Sir *John Thompson*) *re* Second Homesteads, 616 (i).
Pairing of Members (remarks) 631 (i).
Printing Bureau, Absence of Superintendent (remarks) 2438 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Davin*) *re* par. in Toronto *Globe*, 4242 (iii).
——— Member for East Northumberland (remarks) 4087 (ii).
——— (Mr. *Tarte*) *re* Cor. in London *Times*, 4239 (iii).
Prohibition, on adjmnt. (remarks) 546, 1332, 1341 (i).
——— on personal Explanation (remarks) 1543 (i).
Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 6309 (iii).
Provincial Govts., Transfer of Property B. 111 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5753 (iii).

Speaker, Mr.—*Continued.*
Public Accts. Com., Functions (ruling) 4241 (iii).
——— on M. to ref. Accts. (ruling) 3949 (ii).
——— on M. to rescind Order of Hse. (ruling) 1925 (i).
——— Printing Evidence (ruling) 2374 (ii).
——— Witnesses on Oath (ruling) 2516 (ii).
Public Works Dept., Papers (remarks) 987, 991 (i)
Quarantine (U.S.) Regulations for Sheep, &c. (remarks) 743 (i).
Quebec, West, Issue of Writ (notification) 4081 (ii), 5014, 6309 (iii).
——— Order for Attendance of Member (read) 4001 (ii).
——— Rep. of Dep. Serjeant-at-Arms (read) 4152 (ii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. *Barron*) on Member speaking twice, 3306 (ii).
Sawdust in La Have River (remarks) 2201 (ii).
Serjeant-at-Arms, Deputy, Appmnt. (notification) 3995 (ii).
Speaker, Election as (acknowledgement) 4 (i).
Speech from the Throne (rep.) 5 (i).
Sugar, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (ruling) 1931 (i).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Dom. Lands (salaries) 5190. Weights and Measures &c., 5163 (iii).
Fisheries (Behring Sea, remarks) 6268 (iii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Clerk of Crown) 6172 (iii), (contingencies) 942 (i); (Expenses of Committees) 6173 (iii); (Sergeant-at-Arms Estimates) 943; (salaries, &c.) 941 (i).
Miscellaneous (Commercial Agencies) on conc. (remarks) 5432; (Parliamentary Documents, distribution) 5082 (iii).
Mounted Police, on conc. (remarks) 5416 (iii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.W.T., remarks) 5389, 5392, 5397, 5401; (Ont.) 4367; (Ottawa) 4514. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4571. Slides and Booms, 4650 (iii).
Trade Relations with Empire, Mess. from Sen., 6216 (iii).
Trent Valley Canal, on adjnmt. (remarks) 215 (i).
Unparliamentary Language, 2026 (i), 3780 (ii), 4973 (iii).
West Indies Steamship Service (remarks) 195 (i).

Speaker, Deputy (MR. J. G. H. BERGERON) *Beauharnois.*
High Commissioner's Office, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 493 (i).
Members called to Order, 1554 (i), 3671 (ii), 4658, 6214 (iii).
Order, Ques. of (ruling) 5330 (iii).
——— in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4659 (iii).
——— Ry. Subsidies, on Res. (ruling) 6136 (iii).
North Shore Ry. Debentures (remarks) 4758 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Collction of Revenues: Customs (remarks) 1718, 1720 (ii).
Militia (remarks) 6182 (iii).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4562, 6260; (Que.) 4556; 4658 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff (remarks) 2040 (i).

Spohn, Mr. P. H., *East Simcoe.*
SUPPLY :
Canals—Capital (Trent) 4136 (ii).
Public Works—Income : Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 6260 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3002 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1349 (i).

Sproule, Mr. T. S., *East Grey.*
Adjnmt., St. Peter and St. Paul, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1411 (i).
Atlantic Cattle Trade Regulations (Ques.) 2148.
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1787 (i).
Cattle Trade, Shipping of Live Stock (remarks) 958 (i).
Census Returns, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4875(iii).
Commercial Agencies, &c., Regulations (B. 109, 1°*) 1011 (i).
Compulsory Voting B. 53 (Mr. *Amyot*) on M. for 2°, 1037 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. to adjn. Hse., 2370 (ii); in Com., 5733 (iii).
Divisions, Members' Votes, on Procedure (remarks) 4451 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5146 (iii).
Fishery Laws, Enforcement, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1523 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2°, 1002 (i).
——— B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 787 (i).
——— B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3097.
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) on M. for 2°, 1006 (i).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1187 (i).
Homesteads (Second) N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 627 (i).
International Abattoir Co. (Ques.) 3615 (i).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4627 (iii).
Land Grants to Volunteers, in Com. on Res., 3109 (ii).
Live Stock Shipment B. 154 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 1°, 3135 (ii).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 3919 (ii).
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic (M.) to adjn. Deb., neg. (Y. 65, N. 74) 362 (i).
Public Accts. Com., Auditor Gen.'s Office Accts. (M.) to ref., 2743 (ii).
——— Kingston Graving Dock, Printing Evidence (M.) 3621 (ii).
——— Cor., &c., *re* Kingston Graving Dock, &c. (M.) 3199 (ii).
——— 21st Rep. (presented) 4608 (iii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Continued.*
Public Accts. Com., on M. to rescind Order of Hse., 1926 (i).
——— P.O. Deptl. salaries (M.) to ref., 2666 (ii).
Quarantine (U.S.) for Sheep, &c. (Ques.) 605 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 3154 (ii).
Ships' Inspection B. 149 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3611 (ii).
Steam Fans on Cattle Ships (Ques.) 1275 (i).
SUPPLY :
Agriculture (Dairy Industry) 1563 (i), 6176 (iii); (Experimental Farms) 1567; (Two-rowed Barley) 1565 (i).
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3542 (ii); (Health Statistics) 6174 (iii).
Civil Government (High Commissioner) 420 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Dom. Lands (salaries) 5179. Excise (Methylated Spirits) 5138 (iii).
Immigration (salaries) 5245 (iii).
Indians (T. D. Green, salary) 1555 (i).
Justice, Administration of (Judges' salaries) 513.
Legislation: Senate (salaries, &c.) 932 (i).
Mounted Police, 4825 (iii).
Penitentiaries (Dorchester) 912 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 6239; (Ottawa) 4509; (Que.) 6212 (iii).
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3461 (ii).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2555 (ii).
——— on M. to adjn. House, 2565 (ii).
Veterans of 1837-38, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 2927 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2687 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s Bill 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1380 (i).

Stairs, Mr. J. Fitz-W., *Halifax.*
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1795 (i).
Cape Breton and N. S. Ry. accommodation, on M. for Cor., 178 (i).
Compulsory Voting B. 53 (Mr. *Amyot*) on M. for 2°, 1036 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Foster*) on Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) to M. for 3°, 5292 (iii).
Personal Explanation *re* Blue Ribbon Twine, 2936 (ii).
Ships' Inspection B. 49 (M. *Tupper*) in Com., 3609 (ii).
Ships' Safety B. 44 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3099.
SUPPLY :
Fisheries (Fish-breeding) 3530 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings (N.S.) 4321; (Ont.) 4365.
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Halifax, accommodation at) 3867 (ii).
U. S. Treaty with Cuba, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4013 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2040 (i).
——— on M. to conc. in Res., 3206 (ii).

Stevenson, Mr. J., *West Peterborough.*
SUPPLY :
Canals—Capital (Trent) 4135 (ii),
Trent Valley Canal, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4787 (iii).

Sutherland, Mr. J., *North Oxford.*
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5737 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5198 (iii).
Ont. Express and Transportation Co.'s (B. 151) Rule suspended and 1°* of B., 2905 ; 2° m., 3230.
Pairing of Members (remarks) 805 (i).
South Ont. Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 73, 1°*) 387 (i).
SUPPLY :
Geological Survey, 4726 (iii).
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 4219 (ii).
Public Works—Income (Que.) 6203 (iii).

Tarte, Mr. J. I., *Montmorency.*
Admiral, Str., Contracts, &c. (M. for copies*) 128.
——— Services and Ownership (M. for Ret.) 2157.
Esquimalt Graving Dock, Advts. for Tenders, &c. (M. for copies) 1932 (i).
——— Amount paid Larkin & Co. (Ques.) 270 (i).
——— Tenders, &c. (M. for copies) 1937 (i).
Kingston Graving Dock, Papers (remarks) 635 (i).
——— Tenders (M. for copies*) 127 (i).
Privilege (Ques. of) *re* Cor. in London *Times*, 4239 (iii).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 5791, 6122 (iii).
——— Papers (remarks) 986, 1850 (i).
——— (Ques. of Priv.) 146 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commission, Chief Engineer (Ques.) 527, 602 (i).
——— Commissioners' Interest Acct. (Ques.) 270.
SUPPLY :
Civil Government (Public Works) 256 (i).

Taylor, Mr. G., *South Leeds.*
Adjmt., Dom. Day (remarks) 1536 (i).
——— Holidays (remarks) 1276 (i).
Alien Labour Prohibition (B. 6, 1°) 106 ; Order for 2°, 200 (i).
Can. Land and Investment Co.'s (B. 79, 1°*) 524.
Can. Power Co.'s (B. 41, 1°*) 206 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5738 (iii).
Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s (B. 94, 1°*) 549 (i).
Macdonald, Sir John, Erection of Monument (Ques.) 2148 (ii).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1084 (i).
Members not Voting (remarks) 331, 631, 800, 1199, (i), 3822, 4213, (ii), 5011 (iii).
———Votes challenged, 3780 (ii), 4428 (iii).
Mercantile Agencies, Legislation regulating (Ques.) 144 (i).

Taylor, Mr. G—*Continued.*
Order, Ques. of, Newspaper Reps. (M.) to adjn. Hse., 2963 (ii).
Pairing of Members (remarks) 631, 800 (i).
——— on M. for adjnmt., 3822 (ii).
Peterborough, Sudbury and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 72, 1°*) 387 (i).
Privilege (Ques. of) Pairing of Members, 800 (i).
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic (Amt.) to Amt. to prop. Res. (Mr. *Jamieson*) 355 ; neg. (Y. 7, N. 185) 1312 (i).
Public Accts. Com., Evidence *re* Langevin Block, 3948 (ii).
St. Lawrence and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s (B. 20, 1°*) 155 (i).
Shuswap and Okanagon Ry. Co. and C. P. R. Co.'s (B. 78, 1°*) 441 (i).
Standing Orders Com., Rep. *re* Rathbun Co. (presented) 5012 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ottawa) 4500.
Telegraph Co.'s, Legislation *re* Directors (Ques.) 144 (i).
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s (B. 80, 1°*) 524 (i).

Temple, Mr. T., *York, N. B.*
Dom. Elections Act. Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5155 (iii).

Thompson, Hon. Sir J., K.C.M.G., *Antigonish.*
Adjmnt., Queen's Birthday (Ans.) 157 (i).
Administration of Justice (B. 14, 1°) 141 ; 2° m. and in Com., 892, 1089 (i).
Admiralty Courts, Colonial (Ans.) 5778 (iii).
——— Local Judges' salaries (prop. Res.) 1849 (i).
——— Jurisdiction in Canada, Provision (B. 13, 1°) 141 ; 2° m., 1093 ; in Com., 1417, 1731 (i).
——— (B. 153) in Com. on Res., 3100 ; 1°* of B., 3102 (i).
Alien Labour Prohibition B. 6 (Mr. *Taylor*) on Order for 2°, 200 (i).
American Cattle slaughtered in Canada, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5209 (iii).
Auditor Gen.'s Functions (remarks) 392 (i).
Bancroft Tender *re* Kingston Graving Dock, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Amyot*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4170 (ii).
Battell, Wm., employé Cobourg P. O. (Ans.) 3952 (ii).
Berne Copyright Convention (Ans.) 1265 (i).
Bills of Exchange Act Amt. (B. 104, 1°*) 954 ; in Com., 1099 (i), 3138 (ii).
Bourgeois, G. A., payment to, on M. to ref. Accts. to Pub. Accts. Com. (objection) 2361 (ii).
Bremner's Claim for Furs (Ans.) 1268 (i).
Cablegrams per Reuter's Agency (Ans.) 4296 (iii).
C. P. R. Arbitrators' Award (remarks) 6129 (iii).
——— Section "B," Charges against P.M.G., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 5945 ; (Amt.) 5994 ; agreed to (Y. 102, N. 78) 5998 (iii).

Thompson, Hon. Sir J.—*Continued.*
Canal Contracts, Tenders, &c., on M. for copies, 1941 (i).
Carleton Branch Ry. (prop. Res.) 1413 (i).
Chatham P. O., Contractor, &c. (Ans.) 3951 (ii).
Civil Servants in Elections (Ans.) 1765 (i).
Coal Monopoly, B.C., in Com. of Sup., 923 (i).
Cobourg Harbour Works, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5336 (iii).
Compulsory Voting B. 53 (Mr. *Amyot*) on M. for 2°, 1031 (i).
Connell, J., emplymnt. by Sorel Harbour Board (Ans.) 5076 (iii).
Connolly, Michael, Books of Firm (M.) to produce, 906 (i).
——— (M.) to appear before Bar of House, 806 (i).
——— (M.) Order to appear before Bar postponed, 891 (i).
——— (M.) to read Rep. of Sub-Com. on Priv. and Elec., 895 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. (B. 147, 1°) 2363; in Com., 3649 (ii), 5352, 5375, 5594, 5729 (ii).
Copyright Act Amt. (B. 141, 1°) 2144 (ii); 3° m., 3244 (ii).
——— Address to Her Majesty, 6287 (iii).
——— Act, 1889 (Ans.) 335 (i).
——— Berne Convention (Ans.) 1265 (i).
——— Imperial Legislation (Ans.) 4674 (iii).
——— Laws of Canada, on M. for Cor., 728 (i).
——— Legislation respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5017 (iii).
Corbin, J. S., Patent Relief B. 30 (Mr. *Reid*) on M. for 2°, 294 (i).
Criminal Law, Codification (B. 32, 1°) 156 (i).
——— Fees *re* Drafting B. (Ans.) 3260 (ii).
Debates, Official, on M. to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 5941 (iii).
Deptl. Files, Destruction (remarks) 4157 (ii).
Desmarteau's, Jos., Claims for Improvements, on M. for Ret., 2156 (ii).
Divisions, Members' Votes, on Procedure (remarks) 4457 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) on M. for 2°, 996; (M.) to ref. to Sel. Com., 999 (i).
——— (B. 146, 1°) 2363; in Com., 3246 (ii); 5140, 5196, 5470, 5547, 5587; M. to recom., 5544; 3° m., 5556 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 165 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 6228 (iii).
Dorchester Penitentiary, Supplies (Ans.) 1928 (i).
Edgett's Landing, Ballast Wharf (Ans.) 3956 (ii).
Elections Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) on M. for 2°, 1029 (i).
Elections in Napierville (Ans.) 1577 (i).
Election Returns, Date of Declaration, &c., on M. for Ret., 134 (i).
Esquimalt Settlers' Grievances, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4029 (ii).

Thompson, Hon. Sir J.—*Continued.*
Evidence in Criminal Cases B. 11 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) on M. for 2°, 2958 (ii).
Exchequer Court Act Amt. (B. 117, 1°*) 1345 (i); in Com., 3646, 3902 (ii).
Female Offenders in N. S. (B. 143, 1°*) 2203; in Com., 3596 (ii).
Foreshores of Dom. Ownership, on M. for Cor., 179 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for 2°, 769; (Amt.) 6 m. h., 771; agreed to (Y. 109, N. 77) 798 (i).
——— B. 8 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) on M. for 2°, 302; (Amt.) 6 m. h., 305; agreed to (Y. 112, N. 85) 330 (ii).
——— B. 31 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2° (Amt.) 3 m. h., 1001 (i).
——— (B. 145, 1°) 2361; in Com., 3082 (ii).
——— Year of Passing, &c. (Ans.) 962, 1267 (i).
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) on M. for 2°, 1005; on Order for Com. (remarks) 1014; in Com., 1976 (i).
Frauds upon the Govt. Prevention (B. 172, 1°*) 5582; 2° m., 5751; in Com., 6237, 6289 (iii).
Grain Weighers Provision (B. 164, 1°*) 3983 (ii).
Grant, J. J., Case of *re* Settlement, on M. for Ret., 3643 (ii).
Great North-West Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 162) 1°*, 3950 (ii).
Govt. Business (M.) precedence on Saturdays 6127
——— on M. to take in Wednesdays, 1731 (i).
Govt., Formation of (Ans.) 1578 (i).
Govt. Policy, on adjnmt. (remarks) 1101 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1113.
Herchmer, Commissioner, Comptroller's Rep. (Ans.) 1574, 2669 (ii).
——— Cor. *re* Macleod *Gazette* (Ans.) 4293 (iii).
——— Enquiry into Conduct, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 2919 (ii).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 573 (i).
Homsteads (Second) N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 623 (i).
Indian Act Amt. B. 144 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3593 (ii).
——— Agent Chisholm, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6147 (iii).
——— Affairs, Management, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1498 (i).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 3582 (ii).
Inspection Act Amt (B. 163, 1°*) 3983 (ii).
Intoxicating Liquors, Prohibition of Sale (Ans.) 961 (i).
I. C. R., Claims for Damages (Ans.) 1770 (i).
——— Claims of Miss Lea Caron (Ans.) 209 (i).
——— Management, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3787 (ii).
Isle Bizard Bridge (Ans.) 5195 (iii).
Jacques Cartier Co., Public Works (Ans.) 4674.
——— (remarks) 5014 (iii).

Thompson, Hon. Sir J.—*Continued.*
Judges in Quebec, Appmnts. (Ans.) 5076 (iii).
——— Montreal District (Ans.) 2909 (ii).
Judges in Provincial Courts (B. 158) in Com. on Res., 3100 ; 1°* of B., 3102 (ii).
Kingston Penitentiary, Coal Supply (Ans.) 3260.
Kingston Graving Dock, Papers (remarks) 3961.
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 3657 (iii).
Labour, Legislation respecting (Ans.) 4674 (iii).
Lamontagne, Leda, Extradition (Ans.) 3619 (ii).
——— Pets. for Discharge (Ans.) 2907 (ii).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 4536 ; in Com., 4612, 5538 (iii).
——— B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 5527 (iii).
Land Grants to Volunteers, in Com. on Res., 3113 (ii).
Landslide at Quebec, O. C.'s, &c., on M. for copies, 3632 (ii).
Langevin Block, Payments on account of Contract (Ans.) 5776 (iii).
Live Stock Shipping B. 154 (Mr. *Tupper*) 2° m. and in Com., 3991, 3993 (ii).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) M. to refer to Sel. Com., 766 (i); in Com., 2940 ; on Order for Com., 3287 (ii).
Macdonald, Sir John, Illness and Govt. Business (remarks) 711 (i).
McLeod, Mr., Port Mulgrave (remarks) 2289 (ii).
Man. School Act, Papers (remarks) 807 (i).
Miminigash Breakwater (Ans.) 3959 (ii), 4296 (iii).
Ministerial Changes (remarks) 890 (i).
Minister of Public Works, rumoured Resignation (remarks) 3653, 4213 (ii).
——— Resignation (announcement) 5074 (iii).
Motions allowed to Stand (remarks) 1932 (i).
New England Paper Co. (Ans.) 1767 (i).
North Shore Ry. Debentures B. 170 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. for Com. on Res., 4748, 4770 ; conc. in and 1°* of B., 4829 ; on M. for 3°, 5410 (iii).
——— on M. for copies of O. C.'s, 981 (i).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 4154 (ii).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 4463 (iii).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3925 (ii), 4298 (iii).
——— Representation Acts Amt. (B. 148, 1°) 2373 (ii).
Ont. Express and Transportation Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. *Sutherland*) on M. for 2°, 3230 (ii).
Order (Ques. of) in Com. of Sup., 4659 (iii).
——— (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) on M. to adjn. Hse., 2371 (ii).
——— Newspaper Reps., 2964 (ii).
——— Second Homesteads, 616 (i).
——— Unparliamentary Language, 1332 (i).
Owen Sound Harbour, Improvements (Ans.) 3960.
Pairing of Members, on M. for adjnmt., 3824.
Patent Act Amt. (B. 142, 1°) 2144 (i).
Penitentiaries Rep. (presented) 129 (i).
Piers, Wharves, &c., P.E.I., Repairs, &c. (Ans). 3952 (ii).

Thompson, Hon. Sir J.—*Continued.*
Priv. and Elec. Com., Afternoon Sittings, on M., 1989 (i).
——— distribution of Evidence (remarks) 5352.
——— 1st Rep. of Com. (remarks) 799 (i).
——— 6th Rep. of Com. *re* Controverted Elections, on conc., 4828 (iii).
——— on 7th Rep. (remarks) 5553 (iii).
——— Meetings of Com. (remarks) 984, 990 (i).
Privilege, Member for East Northumberland, Charges against, 4087 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Amt., 1335 (i).
——— Order for consdn. of Res. postponed, 993.
Provincial Acts, Costs *re* Testing Validity (Ans.) 112 (i).
Provincial Accounts (Indian Lands) Settlement (B. 100, 1°*) 807 ; in Com., 1087 (i).
——— Settlement (B. 99, 1°*) 807 ; 2° m., 1065 ; in Com., 1066 (i).
Provincial Govts. Transfer of Property (B. 111, 1°) 1101 (i) ; 2° m., 3985 (ii) ; in Com., 5752 (iii).
Pub. Accts. Com., on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to M. for Com of Sup., 4091 (ii).
——— on M. to ref. Accts. *re* Bourcier, 3949 (ii).
——— on Printing Evidence, 2375 (ii).
Public Expenditure, on enquiry for Rets., 4158.
Public Works Dept., Contracts, 4th Rep. of Com. *re* Thomas McGreevy (remarks) 3738 (ii).
Quebec Colonization Lottery (Ans.) 2154 (ii).
Quebec Skating Club, Res. conc. in and 1°* of B., 3649 ; 2° m., 3984 (ii).
Quebec West, Expulsion of Member (M.) 6285 (iii)
——— (M.) to Issue Writ, 6286 (iii).
——— (M.) Member to attend Hse., 3827 (ii).
——— (M.) to Arrest, 4001 (ii).
——— Vacancy, on Issue of Writ (remarks) 4082 (ii), 6309 (iii).
Queen's Bench, Que., Appmnt. of Chief Justice (remarks) 5196 (iii).
——— Judges' salaries (Ans.) 5406 (iii).
——— Vacancy (Ans.) 3620 (ii).
Queen's Counsel, conferring Titles (Ans.) 3263.
Ry. Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. *Barron*) on M. for 2°, 3304 (ii).
Rathbun Co., Rep. of Standing Orders Com., 5012 (iii).
Reciprocity, Papers respecting (remarks) 550, 600 (i).
Revising Officers, Instruction *re* Revision (Ans.) 5079 (iii).
Revising Officer, Rimouski (Ans.) 741 (i).
St Lawrence Dredge (Ans.) 3952 (ii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Leather Supplies (Ans.) 2912 (ii).
Senécal, André, service of Writ to appear at Bar (Ques.) 4747 (iii).
Sheppard, W. A., emplymnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1266 (i).
Sillery Seigniory and Huron Indians of Lorette (Ans.) 604 (i).

Thompson, Hon. Sir J.—*Continued.*
Smith & Ripley and Hon. J. A. Chapleau (Ans.) 5404 (iii).
Sorel Harbour Works, employés (Ans.) 5077 (iii).
Stoney Island Breakwater, Contractor (Ans.) 5408
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 6219 (iii).
——— (prop. Res.) 3308 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Income : Grenville (Goodwin's Claim) 6296 (iii).
Civil Government (Justice) contingencies, 434, 1547 (i).
Collection of Revenues : Minor Revenues (Ordnance Lands) 5172 (iii). Public Works, 1728. Weights and Measures, 1727 (i).
Dominion Police, 512, 1557 (i).
Indians (N.B.) 5063, conc., 5422 (iii)
Justice, Administration of (Exchequer Court) 507 ; (L. A. Audette) 1557 ; (J. Dingwell, Legal services) 1559 ; (Masters, C. H., drafting Criminal Law) 1559 ; (Miscellaneous) 506, 1556 (i), 6170, conc., 6303 (iii) ; (Sullivan, Hon. W. T., salary, 1556 ; (Vice-Admiralty Court) 510 (i).
Legislation : House of Commons (Indemnity) 6172 (iii) ; (Voters' Lists, Revision) 946 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Campbellton and Gaspé) 5350 ; (St. John and Halifax and West Indies, &c.) conc., 5472 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Banff Hot Springs) 5114 (iii) ; (Litigation Expenses) 1707 (i) ; (Old Records) 5084, 5124 (iii) ; (Wm. Gliddon, payment) 1706 (i).
Mounted Police, 4818 (iii).
Penitentiaries (B. C.) 919 ; (Dorchester) 1558 ; (Kingston) 882 ; (Man.) 913 (i), 6171 (iii) ; (Regina Gaol) 928 ; (St. Vincent de Paul) 907 (i), 6170 (iii).
Public Works—Capital : Harbours and Rivers (Kaministiquia River) 4529. *Income :* Buildings (Man.) 4443 ; (N.W.T.) 4443, 6248, conc., 5389 ; (Ottawa) 4510 (Ont.) 4579 (iii). Dredging (New Plant) 1691 (i). Slides and Booms, 6261 (iii).
Railways—Capital : Annapolis and Digby (construction) 1659. C.P.R. (construction) 1653 (i). I.C.R. (Halifax, increased accomodation) 3862.
Territorial Accounts (Surgeon General's salary) conc., 6305 (iii).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. (B. 138, 1°) 1990 (i) ; 2° m., 3584 ; in Com., 3588 ; 3° m., 3649 (ii) ; on Sen. Amts., 5079, 5590 (iii).
Tarte-McGreevy Enquiry, Counsel (Ans.) 1575.
——— (remarks) 1930 (i).
Testimonials to Ministers, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3835 (ii).
Three Rivers Piers, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 5777 (iii).
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3488 (ii).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2563 ; in Com., 2578 (ii).
Trade Extension, &c., U.S., Canada and Newfoundland, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 736.
Trade Relations with Foreign Countries, Address from Sen., on M. to conc., 6317 (iii).

Thompson, Hon. Sir J.—*Continued.*
Trade Relations with U.S., Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 1199 (i).
Trade Marks and Industrial Designs Act Amt. (B. 101, 1°*) 807 (i).
Treaty Papers, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 238, 906 (i).
Trent Valley Canal, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4467 (iii).
U.S. Fishing Vessels B. 10 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 3°, 235 (i).
U.S. Treaty with Cuba, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4012 (ii).
Veterans of 1837-38, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 3287 (ii).
Voters' Lists, Extension of Time for Revision (Ans.) 2908, 2912 (ii).
Washington Treaty Papers (remarks) 192 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2024, 2063 (i).
——— on M. to conc. in Res., 3201 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on Order for Com. on Res., 1255 (i) ; on Sen. Amts., 3984 (ii).
Wood Supply, Ottawa Public Buildings, Contractor (Ans.) 4295 (iii).

Tisdale, Mr. D., *South Norfolk.*
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) in Com., 1975 (i).
G. T. Ry. Co. of Canada (B. 36, 1°*) 206 (i).
High Commissioner, on M. to adjn. Deb., 705 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 851 (i).
Homesteads (Second) N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 620 (i).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4622 (iii).
Maritime Chemical Pulp Co.'s (B. 39, 1°*) 206 (i).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member, Sittings of Com. (M.) 4670 (iii).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3931 (ii).
Privilege (Ques. of) par. in Ottawa *Free Press*, 5384 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 5236 (iii).
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3447 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2034 (i).

Trow, Mr. J., *South Perth.*
Adjnmt., Ascension Day (remarks) 111 (i).
——— St. Peter and St. Paul, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1413 (i).
Annapolis Public Buildings (Ques.) 529 (i).
Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. *Curran*) on Amt. (Mr. *Cockburn*) to M. for 3°, 1961 (i).

Trow, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Berlin and Canadian Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s (B. 64, 1°*) 387 (i).
Berne Copyright Convention (Ques.) 1264 (i).
Boucherville Wharf, Contractor (Ques.) 1265 (i).
Canal Contracts, Tenders, &c. (M. for copies) 1938 (i).
Civil Service Employés, Payments (Ques.) 2906.
Commercial Treaty, England and France (Ques.) 4760 (iii).
Copyright, Imp. Legislation (Ques.) 4674 (iii).
Divisions, Members' Votes, on Procedure (remarks) 4455 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5145; on M. to recom., 5546 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt B. 165 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 5773 (iii).
Elliott, G. M., Appmnt. as Gas Inspector (Ques.) 5076 (iii).
Fenelon Falls, Lockmaster's Office (Ques.) 4673.
Fitzgerald, W., Fishery Officer (Ques.) 5405 (iii).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4302 (iii).
Guévremont, Senator, Land purchased from (Ques.) 4671 (iii).
Guysborough Fishery Overseer, salary (Ques.) 5403 (iii).
Helbronner, Mr. Jules, Amount paid (Ques.) 5407 (iii).
Heney, John, Payment of Canal Tolls (Ques.) 4676 (iii).
Indian Agent Jones, Charges against (Ques.) 4673.
Jacques Cartier Co., Public Works (Ques.) 4674.
Keewatin, Str., Govtl. Service (Ques.) 4294 (iii).
Knowlton's Landing, Wharf (Ques.) 1770 (i).
Labour, Legislation respecting (Ques.) 4674 (iii).
Lake St. Peter, Fishery Districts (Ques.) 2148 (ii).
Lake Temiscamingue Colonization Ry. Co.'s (B. 22, 1°*) 155 (i).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4611 (iii).
——— B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 5514 (iii).
Lavallée, Fishery Overseer (Ques.) 2145, 2148 (ii).
Legal Services, Payments by Govt. (Ques.) 2907.
Lindsay and Haliburton Mail Clerk, Resignation (Ques.) 4671 (iii).
Liquor Seizures in Montmagny (Ques.) 2148 (ii).
Live Stock Shipment B. 154 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 1°, 3134 (ii).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2939 (ii).
Members not Voting (remarks) 331, 804, 1199 (i); 3426 (ii).
Meteghan Wharf, Digby Co. (Ques.) 530 (i).
Military College Cadets, Diplomas, &c. (Ques.) 4297 (iii).
Montreal Custom House, Night Watchman (Ques.) 5406 (iii).
Murray Canal Employés (Ques.) 4675 (iii).

Trow, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Napanee Public Buildings (Ques.) 2154 (ii).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3946 (ii).
Ont. and Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s (B. 102, 1°*) 891.
Ont. Municipalities, Deputation to Govt. (remarks) 389 (i).
Ordnance Lands, Montreal, Leases (Ques.) 5409.
Pairing of Members (remarks) 804 (i).
Pound Net Licenses, Lake Huron (Ques.) 529 (i).
Printing Bureau, Type purchased (Ques.) 3619 (ii).
Priv. and Elec. Com., afternoon Sittings, on M., 1989 (i).
Prorogation (remarks) 6327 (iii).
Quebec Central Ry. Co., Subsidy (Ques.) 4675 (iii).
Regina *Leader*, Advertising and Printing (remarks) 4465 (iii).
——— (Ques.) 4295 (iii).
Rideau Canal, Tolls Collected and Refunded (Ques.) 4676 (iii).
Robitaille, C. N., Payment (Ques.) 4673 (iii).
St. Angèle Postmaster, Dismissal (Ques.) 5407 (iii).
Sault Ste Marie Wharf, Mr. Plummer's Services (Ques.) 1575 (i).
Stoney Island Breakwater, Contractor (Ques.) 5408 (iii).
Smith & Ripley and Hon. J. A. Chapleau (Ques.) 5403 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Dairy Industry) 6176 (iii).
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3548 (ii).
Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) 5219 (iii).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Chinese Immigration) 5058. Dom. Lands (salaries) 5182. Post Office (Mail Service) 4719; (salaries, &c.) 4720.
Government of N.W.T. (Well-boring Machines) conc., 5426 (iii).
Justice, Administration of (Judges' salaries) 513.
Indians (B. C.) 4803; (Man. and N.W.T.) 4814; (N.B.) 4734 (iii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Clerk of Crown) 6172 (iii).
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 4223 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Banff Hot Springs) 5112; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 5086; (Parliamentary Documents, distribution) 5082 (iii).
Mounted Police, 1698 (i).
Penitentiaries (salaries, &c.) 928 (i).
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Kaministiquia River) 4524 (iii). Kingston Graving Dock, 1680 (i). *Income:* Buildings (N.W.T.) conc., 5394; (N.W.T) 6249 (iii).
Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B.C.) 3673 (ii).
Tay Canal, Basin at Perth, Contract (Ques.) 4672 (iii).
Weldford P. O., Conduct of Business (Ques.) 2151 (ii).

Truax, Mr. R., *East Bruce.*
Customs Seizures at Walkerton (Ques.) 3266 (ii).
Excise Collector at Stratford (Ques.) 5078 (iii).
Legal Services, Payments by Govt. (Ques.) 2907.

Truax, Mr. R.—*Continued.*
McNamara, N., Share Customs Seizures (Ques.) 3959 (ii).
Regina *Leader*, Printing, &c. (Ques.) 4295 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Ont.) 5044 (ii).
Walkerton P. O., Contract for Fittings (Ques.) 962 (i).
——— Public Buildings, Caretaker (Ques.) 1271.
——— Completion (Ques.) 335 (i).
——— Public Works (Ques.) 2151 (ii).
——— Seizure of Iron Bridge, &c. (Ques.) 3619.
——— Sub-Collector, Resignation (Ques.) 3266 (ii).

Tupper, Hon. C. H., *Pictou.*
Alert, Str., Captain's Name, &c. (Ans.) 1769.
——— Examination of Commander (Ans.) 2913.
Atlantic Cattle Trade Regulations (Ans.) 2149 (ii).
Bay of Fundy Fisheries, on M. for Ret., 722 (i).
Behring Sea Seal Fisheries, Imperial Legislation (Ans.) 960 (i).
Bernier, Capt., Examination (Ans.) 3621 (ii.)
Canadians Abroad, Distressed (Ans.) 2149 (ii).
Canadian Sealers Captured, Rep. respecting 5554 (iii).
Cattle (Export) Trade of Canada (remarks) 738 (i).
——— Rep. of Evidence (presented) 103 (i).
——— Shipping of Live Stock (remarks) 957.
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co., on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. on Res., 554 (i).
Deck and Load Lines Marking provision (B. 106, 1°) 954; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 1256 (i); in Com., 3583 (ii); M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 4773 (iii).
Deck Loads, Rep. of Evidence (presented) 103 (i).
Eel Fishery at Rimouski Ans.) 2907, 2913 (ii).
Fisheries Act Amt. (B. 122) prop. Res. and in Com., 1095; 1° of B., 1483 (i); in Com., 3158, 3165; 3° m., 3237 (ii).
Fisheries Deptl. Rep. (presented) 129 (i).
Fishery Bounty Cheques (Ans.) 129 (i).
——— Costs, &c., *re* Distribution, on M. for Ret., 182 (i).
——— Claims, &c., on M. for Stmnt., 541 (i).
——— Payments, on M. for Stmnt., 211 (i).
——— Inspector, District No. 3, Resignation (Ans.) 130 (i).
——— Laws, Enforcement, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1528 (i).
——— Protection Service, Georgian Bay (Ans.) 220 (i).
——— Cape Breton (Ans.) 527 (i).
——— Supplies (Ans.) 221 (i).
——— Overseer, Guysborough, salary (Ans.) 5403.
——— Wardens, Appmnts. (Ans.) 5409 (iii).
Fishing Licenses in Grand River (Ans.) 710 (i).
——— Restigouche River, on M. for Ret., 3284.
——— System of Issuiug (Ans.) 143 (i).
Fitzgerald, W., Fishery Officer (Ans.) 5405 (iii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 775 (i).

Tupper, Hon. C. H.—*Continued.*
Govt. Harbours, Piers, &c., Act Amt. (B. 115, 1°*) 1263 (i); 2° m. and in Com., 3104 (ii).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1131 (i).
Graham, J. R., Dismissal, on M. for Ret., 211 (i).
——— Ret *re* Dismissal (Ans.) 320 (ii).
Guévremont, Senator, Land purchased from (Ans.) 4671 (iii).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 584, 659 (i).
I. C. R. Management, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., 3802 (ii).
Lake St. Peter Fishery Districts (Ans.) 2148 (ii).
Lavallée, Fishery Overseer (Ans.) 2146, 2148 (ii).
Lily, H. M. S., Rescue of Crew, on M. for Papers, &c., 1061 (i).
Live Stock Shipment B. 154 (prop. Res.) 1200 (i); in Com. and 1°* of B., 3130 (ii); M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 4772 (iii).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt (B. 12 1°) 140; 2° m., 1066; in Com., 1068 (i), 3102.
Marine Deptl. Rep. (presented) 103 (i).
Meridian Reckoning Time (B. 166, 1°) 4237 (iii).
Mermerly, Barque, Rescue of Crew, on M. for Ret., 713 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Act Amt. (B. 95, 1°) 549; in Com., 1099; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1992 (i).
Montreal Pilots, on M. for Com. of Sup., re- 6146 (iii.)
New Carlisle Wharf, Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 966 (i).
Newfoundland Bait Act, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6192 (iii).
——— on M. for Cor., 3267 (ii).
——— Suspension (Ans.) 113 (i).
Oyster Beds, Leases (Ans.) 3958; (remarks) 4158 (ii).
Pictou Harbour Commissioners' Act Amt. (B. 150, 1°) 2667; in Com., 3594, 3899 (ii).
P. E. I. Ry., Messrs. Saunders and Muttart, Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 2167 (ii).
Public Accts. Com., Functions (remarks) 4240.
Pound-Nets, Licenses (Ans.) 143 (i).
——— Lake Huron (Ans.) 529 (i).
——— Lake St. Clair (Ans.) 198, 223 (i).
Ste. Croix Lighthouse Keeper, Resignation, on M. for Ret., 174 (i).
St. John, P.Q., Medical Examiner (Ans.) 527 (i).
Salmon Net-Fishing Licenses (Ans.) 2152 (ii).
——— Restigouche River (Ans.) 1269 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Wharf, Mr. Plummer's Services (Ans.) 1576 (i).
——— Receipts (Ans.) 2905 (ii).
——— Tolls, &c. (Ans.) 3620 (ii).
Sawdust in La Have River, on M. for Ret., 1953 (i).
——— Deb. rsmd., 2175 (ii).
Sea Fisheries Development (B. 152) prop. Res., 549 (i); conc. in and 1° of B., 3100; 2°* m., 3593.

Tupper, Hon. C. H.—*Continued.*
Seigfreid, Schooner, reward to Captain (Ans.) 224.
Ships' Inspection (B. 149, 1°) 2666; in Com., 3600 (ii), 4310; M. to conc. in Amts., 4466 (iii).
Ships' Safety Act Amt. (B. 44, 1°) 218 (remarks) 219; in Com., 1088 (i), 3099 (ii).
Sick and Distressed Mariners (Ans.) 2145 (ii).
Standard Time, on M. for Ret., 209 (i).
Stanley, Str., Trips, Mainland and P.E.I. (Ans.) 1929 (i).
——— on M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 166 (i).
Steamboat Inspection, &c., Reps. (presented) 103.
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. (B. 85, 1°) 524; in Com., 1094 (i); on Sen. Amts., 3901 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Experimental Farm) 3555 (ii).
Civil Government (Marine) 6166 (iii), contingencies, 440 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Yacht *Cruiser*) 1721 (i). Rys. (I. C. R., &c.) 4073 (ii).
Fisheries (Behring Sea) 6268 (iii); (B. C., salaries) 3527 (ii), contingencies, 1547 (i); (Fish-breeding) 3529, conc., 4261; (Man.) 3525; (N.B.) 3523, (N.W.T.) 3527 (ii); (N.S.) conc., 4245 (iii); (Ont.) 3514 (ii); (P.E.I.) conc., 4258 (iii); (Que.) 3517 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction) 3512; (Maintenance, &c.) 3510; (salaries, &c.) 3509 (ii), 6267 (iii).
Marine Hospitals, &c., conc., 4243 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Burrard Inlet Survey) 1705 (i).
Ocean and River Service (Collision S.S. *Alert* and Schr. *Scylla*) 6265 (iii); (Maintenance, &c.) 3513; (Quebec Water Police) 3508; (Tidal Observations) 3509 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings (N.S.) 4320. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 6259 (iii).
Railways—Capital: Annapolis and Digby (construction) 1660 (i). I.C.R. (Halifax, accommodation at) 3866, 3871 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection 3513 (ii), conc., 4243 (iii).
Tignish Breakwater, Wharfage Dues (Ans.) 130, 708 (i).
——— Harbour Master (Ans.) 3259 (ii).
——— Harbour Master's Rep. (Ans.) 4673 (iii).
Trade Policy of the Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3333 (ii).
U.S. Fishing Vessels (B. 10, 1°) 108; 2° m., 206; 3° m., 232 (i).

Tyrwhitt, Mr. R., *South Simcoe.*
Alliston, Conflagration (remarks) 192 (i).
SUPPLY:
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 4219 (ii).
Public Works—Income (Que.) 6205 (iii).
Territorial Accounts (Surgeon General's salary) 6280, conc., 6306 (iii).

Vaillancourt, Mr. C. E., *Dorchester.*
Quebec Eastern Ry., Subsidy (M. for Ret.) 1934.

Wallace, Mr. N. C., *West York, Ont.*
Adjmnt., Dom. Day (remarks) 1541 (i).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1783 (i).

Wallace, Mr. N. C.—*Continued.*
Construction Co. (Incorporated) of Can. incorp. (B. 128, 1°*) 1927 (i).
Divorce, Adam Russworm Relief (B. 131, 1°*) 1927 (i); 2° on div. and 3° agreed to (Y. 89, N. 23) 2549 (ii).
——— Isabel Tapley Relief (B. 134, 1°*) 1927 (i).
——— Mahala Ellis Relief (B. 132, 1°*) 1926 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 31 (Mr. *Charlton*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2°, 1002 (i).
Judges in Montreal District (Ques.) 2908 (ii).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3942 (ii).
Orange Influence, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1967 (i).
Personal Explanation, par. in *Toronto Mail*, 2962.
Public Accts. Com. (M.) to rescind Order of Hse., 1925 (i).
——— (M.) Printing Evidence, 2374 (ii).
——— (M.) Witnesses on Oath, 2516 (ii).
——— (Ms.) to ref. Printing Bureau, &c., Accts., 2905, 3308 (ii).
——— (M.) Printing Evidence *re* J. R. Arnoldi, 3308 (ii).
——— (M.) P. O. Dept., Printing Evidence, 3513.
——— (M.) Ret. *re* Kingston Graving Dock, to ref., 3576 (ii).
——— (M.) Bourcier & Co.'s Accts., 4085 (ii).
Saskatchewan Ry. and Mining Co.'s (B. 84, 1°*) 524 (i).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Minor Revenues (Ordnance Lands) 5176 (iii).
Justice, Administration of (Judges' salaries) 521.
Public Works—Income (Man.) 4432 (iii).
Temperance Colonization Society (Ques.) 606 (i).
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3480 (ii).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. (B. 15, 1°) 142 (i); 2° m., 2552; on M. to adjn. Hse., 2570 (ii).
Voters' Lists, Extension of Time for Revision (Ques.) 2908 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2107 (ii).
——— par. in Toronto *Mail* (remarks) 2964 (ii).

Watson, Mr. R., *Marquette.*
Adjnmt., St. Peter and St. Paul, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1413 (i).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1784 (i).
Brandon *Mail* in Public Departments, Number (Ques.) 3257 (ii).
Disallowance of Man. Local Acts (M. for Cor.) 544, 545 (i).
Dom. Aid to Rys., on M. for Ret., 1057 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3247 (ii), 5548 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 165 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 5771 (iii).

Watson, Mr. R.—*Continued.*
Fishing in Lake Winnipeg (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1544 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 774 (i).
——— Repeal B. 8 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 323.
Homesteads (Second) N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 619 (i).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4620, 5538 (iii).
——— B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 5491 (iii).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3932 (ii).
Papashase Indian Reserve, on M. for adjmnt. (remarks) 1403 (i).
Paspasckase Indian Reserve (Ques.) 3265 (ii).
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Amt. to prop. Res., 372 (i).
Provincial Acts, Costs *re* Testing Validity (Ques.) 112 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 3140 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Dairy Industry) 6175 (iii).
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3545 (ii); (Health Statistics) 6174 (iii).
Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) 5219 (iii).
Civil Government (Indian Affairs) 249 (i); (Interior) 6169 (iii).
Collection of Revenues: Dom. Lands (salaries) 5132 (iii). Rys. (I.C.R., &c.,) 4074 (ii).
Fisheries (Man.) 3524 (ii).
Government of N. W. T., 5072 (iii); (Schools) 1712.
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 5259 (iii).
Indians (Man. and N.W.T.) 4737, 4814 (iii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists, Revision) 952 (i).
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 3731, 4235; (Military College) 4237 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Dufresne, Mr. J. I., D.L.S.) 1707 (i); (Govt. of Keewatin) 5085; (Lunatics in Keewatin) 5085 (iii).
Mounted Police, 1705 (i), 4817, 6274 (iii).
Penitentiaries (Man.) 913, 1714 (i), 6171 (iii).
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Kaministiquia River) 4526. *Income:* Buildings (Man.) 4429; (N.W.T.) 4449; (N.S.) 4315; (Ont.) 4367; (Ottawa) 4488; (Que.) 4332. Dredging, (Man.) 4647. Harbours and Rivers (Man.) 4591 (iii.)
Territorial Accounts, 1729 (i); (Surgeon General's salary) 6281 (iii).
Tay Canal, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3751 (ii).
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3505 (ii).
Walrond Ranche and Settlers, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6161 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3057 (ii).

Watson, Mr. R.—*Continued.*
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1371, 1379 (i); in Com. on B., 2221, 2253 (ii).

Weldon, Mr. R. C., *Albert.*
Administration of Justice B. 14 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1091 (i).
Farmers' Bank of Rustico (M.) to place on Order Paper, 1101 (i).
I. C. R. Management, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3780 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Geological Survey) 410 (i).)
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1435 (i).

Welsh, Mr. W., *Queen's, P.E.I.*
Belle Creek Breakwater (Ques.) 1270 (i).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1824 (i).
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co., on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. on Res., 556; in Com., 560 (i).
New Carlisle Wharf, Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 973 (i).
New London, &c., Harbour Improvements (Ques.) 226 (i).
Red Point Pier (Ques.) 1271 (i).
Ships' Inspection Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 4310 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Que.) 5040 (iii).
Legislation: Senate (salaries, &c.) 930 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Liverpool or London and St. John and Halifax) 4682 (iii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ottawa) 4473.
Trent Valley Canal, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com., of Sup. (remarks) 4719 (iii).
Tunnel, P. E. I. and Mainland, on M. for Cor., 1638 (i).
——— Sir Douglas Fox's Rep. (Ques.) 4294 (iii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1397 (i).
Wood Islands Breakwater (Ques.) 1271 (i).

White, Mr. N. W., *Shelburne.*
Bonding Foreign Fish (Ques.) 1265 (i).
Cotton Sail Duck, Imports at Halifax (M. for Ret.*) 174 (i).
——— (Ques.) 142 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3183 (ii).
Inverness and Richmond Ry. Co., on M. for Cor., 2539 (ii).
Newfoundland Bait Act, on M. for Cor., 3273 (ii).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com., 5636 (iii).
Sawdust in La Have River, on M. for Ret., 2197 (ii).

White, Mr. N. W.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY :
Legislation : House of Commons (Voters' Lists, Revision) 947 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2669 (ii)

White, Mr. R. S., *Cardwell.*
Ont. Municipalities' Deputation and Montreal *Gazette* (remarks) 389 (i).
Pelee Island Sub-Collector, on M. for Cor., &c., 1602 (i).
SUPPLY :
Public Works : Buildings (Que.) 4353 (iii).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2562 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2965 (ii).

Wilmot, Mr. R. D., jun., *Sunbury.*
Inverness Ry. and Mining Co.'s (B. 136, 1°*) 1989 (i) ; 2° m., 2858 (ii).

Wood, Mr. J. F., *Brockville.*
Adjnmt., Ascension Day (remarks) 109 (i).
Companies' Clauses Act Amt. (B. 49, 1°*) 238 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 5, 1°) 105 ; 2° m., 994 (i).
——— B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5157, 5200 ; on M. for 3°, 5568 (iii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m h., to M. for 28, 778.
——— (B. 59, 1°) 334 ; 2° m., 1041 (i).
——— B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3085.
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com. 6186 (iii).

Wood, Mr. J. F.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Capital : Kingston Graving Dock, 1677 (i).

Wood, Mr. J., *Westmoreland.*
Adjnmt., Ascension Day (remarks) 110 (i).
——— Holidays (remarks) 1276 (i).
——— St. Peter and St. Paul, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1411 (i).
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 97 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 568 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Foster*) on Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) to M. for 3°, 5309 (iii).
I. C. R. Management, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3815 (ii).
P. E. I. Ry., Messrs. Saunders and Muttart, Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 2161 (ii).
Public Accts. Com., on M. to rescind Order of Hse., 1926 (i).
——— (M.) Printing Evidence, 5013 (iii).
——— (M.) Accts., &c., *re* Toronto Harbour, 5013.
——— (M.) Accts., &c., *re* W. I. Bradley, 5013 (iii)
——— (M.) Sittings of Com., 5014 (iii).
Ships' Inspection B. 149 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3607 (ii).
Tunnel, P. E. I. and Mainland, on M. for Cor., 1641 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2260 (ii).
——— on M. to conc. in Res., 3212 (ii).

Yeo, Mr. J., *Prince, P.E.I.*
Tunnel, P. E. I. and Mainland, on M. for Cor., 1634 (i).

INDEX.—PART II.

SUBJECTS.

ABBOTT, HON. MR., AND FORMATION OF GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1578 (i).

ACCIDENTS ON I. C. R., CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1770 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 209 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2145 (ii).

ACCOUNT, OPEN: in Com. of Sup., 1729 (i).

Accounts, Settlement. *See* "PROVINCIAL."

ADDRESS TO HER MAJESTY, ACKNOWLEDGMENT: Mes. from His Ex., 227 (i).

——— IN ANSWER TO HIS EX'S SPEECH: moved (Mr. *Hazen*) 8; seconded (Mr. *Corbould*) 17 (i).

ADJOURNMENT, CORPUS CHRISTI: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 523 (i).

——— DOM. DAY: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*, &c.) 1536 (i).

——— M. to adjn. (Mr. *Denison*), neg. (Y. 50, N. 72) 1579 (i).

——— HOLIDAYS: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*, &c.) 1275.

——— QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 157 (i).

——— M. (Sir *Hector Largevin*) 386 (i).

——— SIR JOHN MACDONALD'S FUNERAL: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 888 (i).

——— ST. PETER AND ST. PAUL: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1409 (i).

ADJUTANT GEN., DEP., MIL. DIST. NO. 11: M. for Reps.* (Mr. *Prior*) 736 (i).

Administration of Justice B. No. 14 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 141; 2°* and in Com., 892, 1089; 3°*, 1093 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 28.)

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE. *See* "JUSTICE."

Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1 (Sir *John Macdonald*). 1°*, 5 (i) (*pro forma*).

"ADMIRAL" (STEAMBOAT), SUBSIDY, CONTRACT, &C.: M. for O. C.'s, &c.* (Mr. *Tarte*) 128 (i).

——— O. C.'s *re* SERVICES, CONTRACTS: M. for copies (Mr. *Tarte*) 2157 (ii).

Admiralty Jurisdiction Provision B. No. 13 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 141; 2°, 1093; in Com., 1414, 1731; in Com. and 3°*, 1854 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 29.)

ADMIRALTY COURTS, PROCLAMATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 5776 (iii).

ADULTERATION OF FOOD: in Com. of Sup., 5166 (iii).

ADVERTISING ARRIVAL AND DEPARTURE OF OTTAWA MAILS: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 963 (i).

——— IN *Le Canada*: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2540 (ii).

AGENCIES (MERCANTILE) LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 144 (i).

AGENCY, PUBLIC WORKS, B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 4669 (iii).

AGRICULTURE, &C.:

CANADIANS (DISTRESSED) ABROAD, RELIEF: Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 2149 (ii).

CATTLE TRADE (ATLANTIC) REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 2148 (ii).

——— QUARANTINE REGULATIONS: (Mr. *Bowell*) 806.

——— SHIPPING LIVE STOCK: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 957 (i).

——— VESSELS AND STEAM FANS: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1275 (i),

——— *See* "AMERICAN."

CHEESE (AMERICAN) SHIPPED THROUGH CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Marshall*) 114(i).

——— M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Marshall*) 205 (i).

DEPTL. REPORT: presented (Mr. *Haggart*) 103 (ii).

HIGH COMMISSIONER AND IMPERIAL FEDERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 2153 (ii).

——— SUMS PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 176, 223 (i).

IMMIGRATION AGENT SHEPPARD: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1266 (i).

——— INTO CANADA, TOTAL NUMBER DURING DECADE: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 5075 (iii).

——— INTO N.W.T., MEMORIAL OF LEG. ASSEMBLY: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1269 (i).

——— EMPLYMT. OF MR. HURTEAU: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 529 (i).

INTERNATIONAL ABATTOIR CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 3615 (ii).

MERCANTILE AGENCIES, LEGISLATION REGULATING: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 144 (i).

QUARANTINE OFFICER AT RIMOUSKI: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 3616 (ii).

QUEBEC COLONIZATION LOTTERY: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2154 (ii).

TRANS-ATLANTIC STEAMERS, MEDICAL INSPECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 2906 (ii).

UNITED STATES QUARANTINE REGULATIONS *re* LAMBS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 960 (i).

[*See* "ARTS," &c., "COPYRIGHT," "EXPERIMENTAL FARMS," "IMMIGRATION," "SUPPLY," &c.

AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES, AID TO: conc., 5413 (iii).

AGRICULTURE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 254 (i), 6169 (iii).

Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s Acts Amt. B. No. 16 (Mr. *Curran*). 1°*, 155; 2°*, 214; in Com. and 3°*, 1757 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 77.)

ALBERTA RY., PAYMENT OF LABOURERS: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3956 (ii).

ALBINO POINT, CUSTOMS OFFICER: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *German*) 1579 (i).

Albion Mines Savings Bank B. No. 113 (Mr. *Macdougald, Pictou*). M. (Mr. *Foster*) to introd., 1103; wthdn. and 1°, 1105; 2°*, Rule suspended and in Com., 1297; 3°*, 1298 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 112.)

"ALERT" AND SCHR. "SCYLLA," CLAIMS *re* COLLISION: in Com. of Sup., 6265 (iii).

—— EXAMINATION OF CAPT. BERNIER AS COMMANDER: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 3621 (ii).

—— EXAMINATION OF CAPTAIN: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2913 (ii).

—— APPOINTMENT OF CAPTAIN: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1769 (i).

Alien Contract Labour Prohibition B. No. 6 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 106; wthdn., 200 (i).

ALLEN, INDIAN AGENT, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1264 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1298, 1928 (i).

ALLISONVILLE POSTMASTER, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2153 (ii).

ALLISTON CONFLAGRATION: Remarks on adjnmt., 192

AMBER DEPOSITS IN N. W., APPLICATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Bain*) 2518 (ii).

AMERICAN CATTLE FOR SLAUGHTER IN CANADA, IMPORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 5776 (iii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 3615 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *O'Brien*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4468, 4536; (Mr. *McMillan*) 5209 (iii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5209 (iii).

AMERICAN CHEESE SHIPPED THROUGH CAN.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Marshall*) 205 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Marshall*) 114 (i).

AMERICAN QUARANTINE REGULATIONS: Remarks (Mr. *McMullen*) 742 (i).

AMHERSTBURG DRY DOCK: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Allan*) 3287 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Allan*) 334 (i), 3259 (ii).

ANALYSIS OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Curran*) 203 (i).

ANALYST, DOM., OCCUPATION OF BUILDING: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2518 (ii).

Anglo-Can. Electric Storage and Supply Co.'s incorp. B. No. 92 (Mr. *Mackintosh*). 1°*, 549; 2°*, 983; in Com. and 3°*, 1964 (i); Sen. Amts. conc. in, 2551 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 128.)

ANIMALS FROM U. S., FREE ENTRY: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 129 (i).

ANNAPOLIS AND DIGBY RY., CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 1659 (i).

ANNAPOLIS PUBLIC BUILDINGS, TENDERS AND CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 529 (i).

—— M. for copies* (Mr. *Lister*) 544 (i).

ANNAPOLIS ROYAL CUSTOMS COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 270 (i).

ANNUITIES AND COMMUTATIONS (INDIANS): in Com. of Sup., 4736 (iii).

ANTIGONISH AND GUYSBOROUGH INDIANS: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 224 (i).

ARBITRATION *re* PROVINCIAL ACCOUNTS: in Com. of Sup., 6275 (iii).

ARMOURIES, CARE OF ARMS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3720 (ii).

ARMY AND NAVY, IMPORTS FOR USE: in Com. of Sup., 5084 (iii).

ARNOLDI, J. R.: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) on adjnmt., 3129 (ii).

—— REP. *re* BALLOT BOXES: M. for copy (Mr. *Landerkin*) 201 (i).

—— *See* "PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COM." "BALLOT BOXES."

ARTS, AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 953, 1562 (i), 3531 (ii), 6174 (iii).

ARTS AND STATISTICS:

CANAL STATISTICS: Rep. presented (Mr. *Bowell*) 738.

CHICAGO EXHIBITION, INVITATION TO CANADA: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1577 (i).

JONES, W. E., CENSUS COMMISSIONER FOR QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 1274 (i).

LABOUR STATISTICS, ESTABLISHMENT OF BUREAU: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Lépine*) 201 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 3615 (ii).

VOTES ACCORDING TO CENSUS OF 1881 AND 1891: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Landerkin*) 128 (i).

VOTERS, PROVINCE OF QUE., TOTAL NUMBER: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2910 (i).

[*See* "AGRICULTURE," "CENSUS," "SUPPLY," &C.]

Assiniboia River. *See* "WINNIPEG."

Atikokan Iron Range Co.'s incorp. B. No. 65 (Mr. *Mackintosh*). 1°*, 333; 2°*, 413; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 61.)

ATKINSON, J. H. C., APPOINTMENT AND DISMISSAL: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Allan*) 1580, 1980 (i).

ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Laurier* 124 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1765 (i).

ATLANTIC CATTLE TRADE, REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 2148 (ii).

AUDET, A. A., AND COLONIZATION LOTTERY: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2154 (ii).

Audit Act. *See* "CONSOLIDATED."

AUDITOR GENERAL'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 1544 (i), 6167 (iii).

—— POWERS: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 391 (i).

—— REP.: Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 103 (i).

—— *See* "PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COM."

Baie des Chaleurs Ry Co.'s B. No. 82 (Mr. *Curran*). 1°*, 524; 2°*, 579; M. for Com., 1761; in Com. and rep., 1764; 3° m. and Amt. (Mr. *Cockburn*) to recom., 1957; Amt. to Amt. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to ref. back to Ry. Com., agreed to, 1963; again in Com. and 3°*, 2174(ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 97.)

BAIE DES CHALEURS RY., SUBSIDIES: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 5075 (iii).

BAIT ACT, NEWFOUNDLAND, SUSPENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 113 (i).

BALLOT BOXES, J. R. ARNOLDI'S REP.: M. for copy (Mr. *Landerkin*) 201 (i).

BANCROFT'S TENDER *re* GRAVING DOCK: Amt. (Mr. *Amyot*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4158; neg. (Y. 82, N. 99) 4212 (ii).

BANDMASTER, 69TH BATT., N.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 268 (i).

BANFF HOT SPRINGS, SURVEY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5108 (iii).

—— PARK AND RESERVE, TOTAL COST: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3957 (ii).

BANKING AND COMMERCE COM. *See* "COMMITTEES."

BARBER, MR., CLAIM *re* PAPER CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 269 (i).

BARLEY, TWO-ROWED, DISTRIBUTION: in Com. of Sup., 1564 (i).

BARRIE P. O., ADVTS. FOR CONSTRUCTION: M. for copies* (Mr. *Barron*) 2935 (ii).

—— CONTRACTOR'S NAME: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 3255 (ii).

BARTLETT, J. H., WINDING CLOCK, OTTAWA P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 6279 (iii).

BATTELL, WILLIAM, EMPLYMT. AS CLERK OF WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Hargraft*) 3952 (ii).

BAYFIELD HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 6254 (iii).

BAY OF FUNDY FISHERIES: M. for Ret., &c. (Mr. *Bowers*) 715 (i).

BAY OF QUINTÉ, IMPROVEMENT OF NAVIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Burdett*) 208 (i).

BEACON HILL PARK (B.C.) MAGAZINE, &c.: M. for Reps., &c.,* (Mr. *Prior*) 736 (i).

BEAUDRY, LIEUT.-COL. A., CANCELLATION OF COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 1767 (i).

BEAVERTON DOCK, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 708 (i).

—— CONTRACTOR, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 226 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 4575 (iii).

BEDARD, CHAS., REVISING OFFICER FOR NAPIERVILLE: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 1577 (i).

Beet-Root Sugar Bounty Provision B. No. 168 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. prop., 3427; in Com., 3961 (ii); rep. and 1°* of B., 4300; 2° and in Com., 4466; 3°*, 4534 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 31.)

BEET-ROOT SUGAR, CULTIVATION AND MANUFACTURE: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 545 (i).

BEHRING SEA SEAL FISHERY, CLOSE SEASON: Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 959 (i).

—— COST OF EXPERTS: in Com. of Sup., 6268 (iii).

BELLECHASSE ELECTION, GAZETTING MEMBER: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 112 (i).

—— M. for Letters, &c. (Mr. *Amyot*) 187 (i).

BELLE CREEK BREAKWATER, P.E.I., REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Walsh*) 1270 (i).

BELLEVILLE HARBOUR WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 4572 (iii).

Benevolent Society. *See* "SEPTENNIAL."

BERGERON, MR. J. G. H. Appointment. as Dep. Speaker: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 388 (i).

Berlin and Can. Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s B. No. 64 (Mr. *Trow*). 1°*, 387; 2°*, 547; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 85.)

BERNE COPYRIGHT CONVENTION: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1264 (i).

BERNIER, CAPT. J. E., REPS. AGAINST BY L. LANGEVIN: M. for copies* (Mr. *Delisle*) 2935 (ii).

BIG BAY WHARF REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 1929 (i).

—— EXPENDITURE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Somerville*) 232 (i).

BILLS, DELAY IN PRINTING: Remarks (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 238 (i).

Bills of Exchange Act (1890) Amt. B. No. 104 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 954; 2°* and in Com., 1099 (i), 3137; 3°*, 3138 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 17.)

BILLS, ROYAL ASSENT, 1434, 2076 (i), 3208 (ii), 4534, 4613, 6329 (ii).

—— COM. FROM GOV. GEN. SEC.'S OFFICE: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 1990 (i), 3098 (ii), 4534, 6309 (ii).

BILL (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir *John Macdonald.*)
1°*, 5; *pro formâ* (i).

BILL (No. 2) To secure the better observance of the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday.—(Mr. *Charlton.*)
1°, 104; 2° m., 747; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 766 (i); in Com., 2936; Order for Com. read, 3287 (ii).

BILL (No. 3) Further to amend the Dominion Elections Act, chapter 8 of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. *Charlton.*)
1°, 104 (i).

BILL (No. 4) To amend the Electoral Franchise Act.—(Mr. *Edgar.*)
1°, 105; 2° m., 767; Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., 771; agreed to (Y. 109, N. 77) 798 (i).

BILL (No. 5) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. *Wood, Brockville.*)
1°, 105; 2° m., 994; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 999 (i); Order for Com. dschgd., 2936 (ii).

BILL (No. 6) To prohibit the importation and migration of Foreigners and Aliens under contract or agreement, to perform labour in Canada.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 106; wthdn., 200 (i).

BILL (No. 7) To amend the Militia Act.—(Mr. *Mulock.*)
1°, 106 (i).

BILL (No. 8) To repeal Chapter 5 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, entitled an Act respecting the Electoral Franchise, and all amendments thereto.—(Mr. *Cameron, Huron.*)
1°, 106; Order for 2°, 206; 2° m., 295; Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., 305; agreed to (Y. 112, N. 85) 330; 2° neg. (Y. 113, N. 84) 332 (i).

BILL (No. 9) To amend the Acts respecting the Election of Members of the House of Commons.—(Mr. *Cameron, Huron.*)
1°, 107 (i); 2° and ref. to Com. on B. 5, 1029; Order for Com. dschgd., 2936 (ii).

BILL (No. 10) Respecting Fishing Vessels of the United States of America.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 108; 2° and in Com., 206; 3°, 232 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 4.)

BILL (No. 11) For the further amendment of the Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases.—(Mr. *Cameron, Huron.*)
1°*, 129 (i); 2°, 2955 (ii).

BILL (No. 12) Further to amend the Act respecting Certificates to Masters and Mates of Ships.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 140; 2°, 1066; in Com., 1067 (i), 3102; 3°*, 3104 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 41.)

BILL (No. 13) To provide for the exercise of Admiralty Jurisdiction within Canada in accordance with the Colonial Courts of Admiralty Act, 1890.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 141; 2°, 1093; in Com., 1414, 1731; in Com. and 3°*, 1854 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 29.)

BILL (No. 14) With respect to certain matters affect the Administration of Justice.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 141; 2°* and in Com., 892, 1089; 3°*, 1093 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 28.)

BILL (No. 15) To amend the Act for the prevention and suppression of Combinations in restraint of Trade.—(Mr. *Wallace.*)
1°, 142 (i); 2° m., 2552; 2°, 2576; in Com., 2577 (ii)

BILL (No. 16) To amend the Acts relating to the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. *Curran.*)
1°*, 155; 2°*, 214; in Com. and 3°*, 1757 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 77.)

BILL (No. 17) Respecting the River St. Clair Railway Bridge and Tunnel Company.—(Mr. *Montague.*)
1°*, 155; 2°*, 189; in Com. and 3°*, 546 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 102.)

BILL (No. 18) Respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Montague.*)
1°*, 155; 2°*, 189; in Com. and 3°*, 1087 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 105.)

BILL (No. 19) Respecting the Canada and Michigan Tunnel Company.—(Mr. *Montague.*)
1°*, 155; 2°, 189; in Com. and 3°*, 546 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 103.)

BILL (No. 20) Respecting the St. Lawrence and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 155; 2°, 189 (i).

BILL (No. 21) To confer certain powers on the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in connection with its Telegraph business, and for other purposes.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 155; 2°, 189 (i).

BILL (No. 22) Respecting the Lake Temiscamingue Colonization Railway Company.—(Mr. *Trow.*)
1°*, 155; 2°*, 214; in Com. and 3°*, 546 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 94.)

BILL (No. 23) Respecting the E. B. Eddy Manufacturing Company, and to change its name to the E. B. Eddy Company.—(Mr. *Mackintosh.*)
1°*, 155; 2°*, 214; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 123.)

BILL (No. 24) To incorporate the McKay Milling Company.—(Mr. *Mackintosh.*)
1°*, 155; 2°*, 214; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 125.)

BILL (No. 25) To amend the Act to incorporate the Medicine Hat Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. *Daly.*)
1°*, 155; 2°*, 189; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 79.)

BILL (No. 26) To incorporate the Pembroke Lumber Company.—(Mr. *Ferguson, Leeds.*)
1°*, 156; 2°*, 189; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 121.)

BILL (No. 27) To authorize the London and Canadian Loan and Agency Company, Limited, to issue debenture stock.—(Mr. *Cockburn.*)
1°*, 156; 2°, 190; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 114.)

BILL (No. 28) To amend the Act to incorporate the *Empire* Printing and Publishing Company, Limited.—(Mr. *Cockburn.*)
1°*, 156; 2°, 191; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 130.)

BILL (No. 29) To incorporate the Montreal and Atlantic Railway Company, and for other purposes.—(Mr. *Ives.*)
1°*, 156; 2°*, 189; in Com. and 3°*, 1761 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 68.)

BILL (No. 30) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of J. Spencer Corbin.—(Mr. *Reid.*)
1°*, 156; 2°, 294 (i); M. for Com., 2174; in Com. and 3°*, 2551 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 131.)

BILL (No. 31) To amend the Electoral Franchise Act, Chapter 5 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Mr. *Charlton.*)
1°*, 156; 2° m., 999; Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 3 m. h., 1001; agreed to, 1003 (i).

BILL (No. 32) Respecting the Criminal Law.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 156 (i).

BILL (No. 33) To amend the North-West Territories Act.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)
1°, 174 (i).

BILL (No. 34) To amend the Canada Temperance Amendment Act, 1888.—(Mr. *Flint.*)
1°, 193 (i); Order for 2° read., 2580; 2°, 3288; in Com., 3292 (ii).

BILL (No. 35) In further amendment of the Canada Temperance Act.—(Mr. *Lavergne.*)
1°, 193 (i).

BILL (No. 36) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Tisdale.*)
1°*, 206; 2°*, 294; in Com. and 3°*, 1087 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 69.)

BILL (No. 37) To amend the Act respecting the New Brunswick Railway Company.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick.*)
1°*, 206; 2°*, 220; in Com. and 3°*, 1087 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 99.)

BILL (No. 38) Respecting the Central Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. *McLennan.*)
1°*, 206; 2°*, 220; in Com. and 3°*, 1087 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 89.)

BILL (No. 39) Respecting the Maritime Chemical Pulp Company, Limited, and to change the name

thereof to the Maritime Sulphite Fibre Company, Limited.—(Mr. *Tisdale.*)
1°*, 206; 2°*, 220; in Com. and 3°*, 1434 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 124.)

BILL (No. 40) Respecting the Farmers' Bank of Rustico.—(Mr. *Macdonald, King's, P.E.I.*)
1°*, 206; 2°*, 220; M. for consdn. after Private Bills, 1101; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 113.)

BILL (No. 41) Respecting the Canadian Power Company.—(Mr. *Montague.*)
1°*, 206; 2°*, 220; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 126.)

BILL (No. 42) To prevent frauds on Farmers in the sale of Seed Grain and other articles.—(Mr. *Burdett.*)
1°*, 206; 2°, 1003; Order for Com. read, 1014; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 1041; in Com., 1972 (i).

BILL (No. 43) Further to amend Chapter 11 of the Revised Statutes, entitled An Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.—(Mr. *Mc Mullen.*)
1°, 217; 2°, 1029; in Com. and 3°*, 1297 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 21.)

BILL (No. 44) To amend Chapter 77 of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Safety of Ships.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 217; 2°*, 1087; in Com., 1088 (i); Order for 3° dschgd., in Com. and 3°*, 3099 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 38.)

BILL (No. 45) To amend The Dominion Controverted Elections Act.—(Mr. *Amyot.*)
1°, 217; 2°*, 1030 (i); Order for Com. dschgd., 2936 (ii).

BILL (No. 46) Respecting the South-Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bergeron.*)
1°*, 238; 2°*, 294; in Com. and 3°*, 1434 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 83.)

BILL (No. 47) To amend an Act to incorporate the Collingwood and Bay of Quinté Railway Company.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick.*)
1°*, 238; 2°*, 294; in Com. and 3°*, 1199 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 84.)

BILL (No. 48) To incorporate the Western Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. *Macdonald, Winnipeg.*)
1°*, 238; 20, 295; in Com. and 3°*, 1434 (i). (54 55 *Vic.*, *c.* 115.)

BILL (No. 49) To amend Chapter 118 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, known as the Companies' Clauses Act.—(Mr. *Wood, Brockville.*)
1°, 238 (i).

BILL (No. 50) To incorporate the Steam-Boiler and Plate Glass Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Hyman.*)
1°*, 266; 2°*, 412; in Com. and 3°*, 1963 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 118.)

BILL (No. 51) To incorporate the Vancouver Dock and Ship-Building Company.—(Mr. *Mara.*)
1°*, 266; 2°*, 412; in Com. and 3°*, 1087 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 129.)

BILL (No. 52) To incorporate the Macleod Irrigation Company.—(Mr. *Mara.*)
1°*, 266; 2°*, 412 (i); in Com., 2097; 3°*, 2174 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 109.)

BILL (No. 53) To make Voting compulsory.—(Mr. *Amyot.*)
1°*, 266; 2° m., 1030; Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to adjn. deb., 1031; agreed to, 1040 (i).

BILL (No. 54) Further to amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. *Barron*).
1°, 266; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 1040 (i); Order for Com. dschgd., 2936 (ii).

BILL (No. 55) To incorporate the Atikokan Iron Range Railway Company.—(Mr. *Mackintosh.*)
1°*, 333; 2°*, 413; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 61.)

BILL (No. 56) Respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis.*)
1°*, 334; 2°*, 413 (i).

BILL (No. 57) To incorporate the Buffalo Lake and Battleford Railway Coal and Iron Company.—(Mr. *Macdowall.*)
1°*, 334; 2°*, 413; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 59.)

BILL (No. 58) To incorporate the Whirlpool Bridge Company.—(Mr. *German.*)
1°*, 334; 2°*, 413; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i).

BILL (No. 59) Further to amend the Electoral Franchise Act.—(Mr. *Wood, Brockville.*)
1°, 334; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 1041 (i); Order for Com. dschgd., 2936 (ii).

BILL (No. 60) respecting the Lake Erie, Essex and Detroit River Railway Company and to change the name thereof to the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company.—(Mr. *Denison.*)
1°*, 387; 2°*, 579; in Com. and 3°*, 1604 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 88.)

BILL (No. 61) Respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Railway Company.—(Mr. *Carpenter.*)
1°*, 387; 2°*, 546; in Com. and 3°*, 1964 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 87.)

BILL (No. 62) To enable the Victoria and North American Railway Company to run a Ferry between Becher Bay, in British Columbia, and a point in the Straits of Fuca, within the United States of America.—(Mr. *Earle.*)
1°*, 387; 2°*, 547; in Com. and 3°*, 1087 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 101.)

BILL (No. 63) Respecting the London and Port Stanley Railway Company.—(Mr. *Hyman.*)
1°*, 387; 2°*, 547 (i).

BILL (No. 64) Respecting the Berlin and Canadian Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. *Trow.*)
1°*, 387; 2°*, 547; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 85.)

BILL (No. 65) Respecting the Montreal and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bergeron.*)
1°*, 387; 2°*, 547; in Com. and 3°*, 1434 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 96.)

BILL (No. 66) To confirm a Lease made between the Guelph Junction Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and for other purposes.--(Mr. *Henderson.*)
1°*, 387 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1434 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 73.)

BILL (No. 67) Respecting the Victoria, Saanich and New Westminster Railway Company.—(Mr. *Prior.*)
1°*, 387 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 75.)

BILL (No. 68) To amend the Act to incorporate the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. *Prior.*)
1°*, 387 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 76.)

BILL (No. 69) To confirm an Indenture made between the New Brunswick Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick.*)
1°*, 387 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 74.)

BILL (No. 70) To incorporate the Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Company.—(Mr. *German.*)
1°*, 387 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1761 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 65.)

BILL (No. 71) To incorporate the Brighton, Warkworth and Norwood Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 387 ()).

BILL (No. 72) To incorporate the Peterborough, Sudbury and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 387 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 63.)

BILL (No. 73) Respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Sutherland.*)
1°*, 387 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 92.)

BILL (No. 74) Further to amend the Canadian Pacific Railway Act, 1889.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick.*)
1°*, 387 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 71.)

BILL (No. 75) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick.*)
1°*, 387 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 70.)

BILL (No. 76) To amend an Act to authorize and provide for the Winding-up of the Pictou Bank.—(Mr. *McDougald, Pictou.*)
1°*, 388 ; 2°, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 111.)

BILL (No. 77) Respecting the Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company.—(Mr. *LaRivière.*)
1°*, 441 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com., 1603 ; 3°*, 1957 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 82.)

BILL (No. 78) To confirm an agreement between the Shuswap and Okanagon Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and to confer further powers on the Shuswap and Okanagon Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 441 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1434 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 72.)

BILL (No. 79) Respecting the Canadian Land and Investment Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 524 ; 2°*, 579 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1963 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 119.)

BILL (No. 80) Respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 524 ; 2°*, 579 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1761 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 86.)

BILL (No. 81) Respecting the Order of Canadian Home Circles.—(Mr. *Coatsworth.*)
1°*, 524 ; 2°*, 579 ; wthdn., 1760 (i).

BILL (No. 82) Respecting the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company.—(Mr. *Curran.*)
1°*, 524 ; 2°*, 579 ; M. for Com., 1761 ; in Com. and rep., 1764 ; 3° m. and Amt. (Mr. *Cockburn*) to recom., 1957 ; Amt. to Amt. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to ref. back to Ry. Com., agreed to, 1963 ; again in Com. and 3°*, 2174 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 97.)

BILL (No. 83) Respecting the Septennial Benevolent Society.—(Mr. *Coatsworth.*)
1°*, 524 ; 2°*, 579 (i).

BILL (No. 84) Respecting the Saskatchewan Railway and Mining Company.—(Mr. *Wallace.*)
1°*, 524 ; 2°*, 579 ; in Com. and 3°*, 2321 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 78.)

BILL (No. 85) Further to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 524 ; 2°* and in Com., 1093 (i) ; 3°*, 3100 ; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 3901 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 39.)

BILL (No. 86) To incorporate the Brighton, Warkworth and Norwood Railway Company.—(Mr. *Cochrane.*)
1°*, 548 ; 2°*, 600 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1604 (i), (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 64.)

BILL (No. 87) to revive and amend the Charter of the Quebec Bridge Company. -- (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet.*)
1°*, 548 ; 2°*, 982 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1761 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 107.)

BILL (No. 88) To incorporate the St. Catharines and Merriton Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Gibson.*)
1°*, 548 ; 2°*, 601 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1756 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 104.)

BILL (No. 89) To incorporate the Kingston and Pontiac Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 548 ; 2°*, 601 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1604 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 66.)

BILL (No. 90) To amend the Act to incorporate the Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Railway Company,—(Mr. *Cochrane.*)
1°*, 549 ; 2°*, 601 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1604 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 90.)

BILL (No. 91) To amend the Act to enable the City of Winnipeg to utilize the Assiniboine River Water Power.—(Mr. *Macdonald, Winnipeg.*)
1°*, 549 ; 2°*, 983 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1761 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c, 108.)

BILL (No. 92) To incorporate the Anglo-Canadian Electric Storage and Supply Company.—(Mr. *Mackintosh.*)
1°*, 549; 2°*, 983; in Com. and 3°*, 1964 (i); Sen. Amts. conc. in, 2551 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 128.)

BILL (No. 93) To incorporate the Ontario and New York Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick.*)
1°*, 549; 2°*, 601; in Com. and 3°*, 1604 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 67.)

BILL (No. 94) Respecting the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 549; 2°*, 601; in Com. and 3°*, 1604 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 95.)

BILL (No. 95) Further to amend the Act 36 Vic., Chapter 61, respecting the Trinity House and Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 549; 2°*, 1098; in Com. and 3°*, 1099 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 53.)

BILL (No. 96) To confirm a Deed of amalgamation between the Ottawa and Parry Sound Railway Company and the Ottawa, Arnprior and Renfrew Railway Company.—(Mr. *Jamieson.*)
1°*, 600; 2°*, 828; in Com. and 3°*, 1761 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 93.)

BILL (No. 97) To amend the Acts respecting the granting of a Subsidy to the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company, Limited.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
Res. prop., 441; M. for Com., 550; in Com., 558; conc. in and 1° of B., 636; 2° and in Com., 1087; 3°, 1253 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 12.)

BILL (No. 98) Further to amend the Electoral Franchise Act.—(Mr. *Barron.*)
1°, 738 (i).

BILL (No. 99) Respecting the Settlement of Accounts between the Dominion of Canada and the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, and between the said Provinces—(E) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 807; 2°, 1064; in Com. and 3°*, 1065 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 6.)

BILL (No. 100) For the Settlement of certain questions between the Governments of Canada and Ontario, respecting Indian Lands—(A) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 807; 2° and in Com., 1087 (i); 3°*, 1087 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 5.)

BILL (No. 101) To amend the Act respecting Trade Marks and Industrial Designs—(F) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 807; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1099 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 35.)

BILL (No. 102) Respecting the Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Company, Limited.—(Mr. *Sutherland.*)
1°*, 891; 2°*, 983; in Com., and 3°*, 1963 (i.) (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 120.)

BILL (No. 103) Further to amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Barron.*)
1°*, 891 (i); 2° m., 3303 (ii).

BILL (No. 104) To amend the Bills of Exchange Act, 1890—(B) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 954; 2°* and in Com., 1099 (i), 3137; 3°*, 3138 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 17.)

BILL (No. 105) Respecting the Intercolonial Railway. (Mr. *Bowell.*)
1°, 959; 2° m., 1256; 2° and in Com., 1260 (i); 3°*, 3130 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 50.)

BILL (No. 106) To provide for the marking of Deck and Load Lines.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 954; 2°, 1256 (i); in Com., 3583; 3°*, 3899 (ii); Sen. Amt. conc. in, 4773 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 40.)

BILL (No. 107) To incorporate the Burrard Inlet and Westminster Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. *Corbould.*)
1°*, 1011; 2°*, 1087; in Com. and 3°*, 1761 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 57.)

BILL (No. 108) To amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. *Davin.*)
1°, 1010 (i); Order for 2° read, 3307 (ii).

BILL (No. 109) To regulate Private Detective, Financial and Commercial Agencies and Corporations.—(Mr. *Sproule.*)
1°*, 1011 (i).

BILL (No. 110) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Davin.*)
1°, 1062 (i); 2°, 3307 (ii).

BILL (No. 111) To authorize the transfer of certain Public Property to the Provincial Governments.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 1101 (i); 2°, 3985 (ii); in Com., 5751, 6223; 3°*, 6224 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 7.)

BILL (No. 112) Further to amend the North-West Territories Representation Act.—(Mr. *Davin.*)
1°, 1101 (i).

BILL (No. 113) To continue the Acts respecting the Albion Mines Savings Bank.—(Mr. *McDougald, Pictou.*)
M. (Mr. *Foster*) to introd., 1103; wthdn. and 1°, 1105; 2°*, Rule suspended and B. in Com., 1297; 3°*, 1298 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 112.)

BILL (No. 114) For better securing the Safety of certain Fishermen—(G) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°*, 1406 (i).

BILL (No. 115) To amend the Act respecting Government Harbours, Piers and Breakwaters.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°*, 1263 (i); 2° and in Com., 3104; 3°*, 3105 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 52.)

BILL (No. 116) Further to amend the Inland Revenue Act.—(Mr. *Costigan.*)
Res. prop., 1221; in Com., 1253 (i), 4001 (ii); conc. in and ref. to Com. on B., 4299 (ii); 1°* of B., 1345 (i); 2°* and in Com., 3242, 3579; Order for 3° dschgd., 4008 (iii); again in Com., 4299; 3°*, 4465 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 46.)

BILL (No. 117) Further to amend the Exchequer Court Act.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 1345 (i); 2°* and in Com., 3646, 3902; 3°*, 3902 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 26.)

BILL (No. 118) Respecting the Citizens' Insurance Company—(H) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Desjardins, Hochelaga.*)
1°*, 1403 ; 2°*, 1434 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 2465 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 116.)

BILL (No. 119) Respecting a certain agreement therein mentioned with the Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)
Res. prop., 549 ; Order for Com. read, 1253 ; in Com., 1347 ; conc. in and 1°* of B., 1414 ; 2° m., 1994 (i) ; 2°* and in Com., 2205 ; Amts. conc. in and 3°*, 2289 ; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 3984 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 81.)

BILL (No. 120) Respecting the Salisbury and Harvey Railway Company.—(Mr. *Skinner.*)
1°*, 1483 ; 2°*, 1757 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 2174 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 100.)

BILL (No. 121) To amend an Act to incorporate the Montreal Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 1483 ; 2°*, 1757 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 2321 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 106.)

BILL (No. 122) To further amend the Fisheries Act Chap. 95 of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 1483 (i) ; 2°* and in Com., 3157 ; 3° m., 3237 ; 3° on a div., 3242 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 43.)

BILL (No. 123) To revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Oshawa Railway and Navigation Company, and to change the name thereof to the Oshawa Railway Company.—(Mr. *Madill.*)
1°*, 1574 ; 2°*, 1757 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 2174 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 91.)

BILL (No. 124) Further to amend an Act to incorporate the Great Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 1574 ; 2°*, 1757 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 2174 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 98.)

BILL (No. 125) To incorporate the Rocky Mountain Railway and Coal Company—(M) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Ross, Lisgar.*)
1°*, 1757 ; M. for 2°, 1848 ; 2°*, 1964 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 2174 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 58.)

BILL (No. 126) To amend the Acts respecting the North-West Territories.—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)
1°, 1760 (i) ; 2° m., 3902 ; 2° and in Com., 3925, 4297 (ii) ; 3°*, 4299 ; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 6228 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 22.)

BILL (No. 127) For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1891, and the 30th June, 1892, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
Res. in Com., rep. conc. in, 1°*, 2°*, 3°*, 1853 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 1.)

BILL (No. 128) To incorporate the Incorporated Construction Company—(L) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Wallace.*)
1°*, 1927 (i) ; 2°*, 2097 ; in Com. and 3°*, 2321 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 127.)

BILL (No. 129) To incorporate the Manitoba and Assiniboia Grand Junction Railway Company—(Q) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Darin.*)
1°*, 1964 (i) ; 2°*, 2097 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2321 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 60.)

BILL (No. 130) To incorporate the Chatsworth, Georgian Bay and Lake Huron Railway Company—(N) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *McNeill.*)
1°*, 1927 ; 2° m., 1989 (i) ; 2°*, 2097 ; in Com. and 3°*, 2321 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 62.)

BILL (No. 131) For the relief of Adam Russworm (C) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Wallace.*)
1°*, 1927 (i) ; 2° on a div., 2174 ; in Com., and 3° agreed to (Y. 89, N. 23) 2549 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 134.)

BILL (No. 132) For the relief of Mahala Ellis—(I) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Wallace.*)
1°*, 1926 ; 2° m., 1989 (i) ; 2° on a div., 2175 ; in Com. and 3° on a div., 2551 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 133.)

BILL (No. 133) For the relief of Thomas Bristow—(J) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *O'Brien.*)
1°*, 1927 (i) ; 2° on a div., 2175 ; M. for Com., 2550 ; in Com. and 3° on a div., 2551 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 132.)

BILL (No. 134) For the relief of Isabel Tapley—(K) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Wallace.*)
1°*, 1927 (i) ; 2° on a div., 2175 ; in Com. and 3° on a div., 2551 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 135.)

BILL (No. 135) Further to amend the Act respecting the London Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Moncrieff.*)
1°*, 1989 (i) ; 2°*, 2097 ; in Com. and 3°*, 2859 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 117.)

BILL (No. 136) To incorporate the Inverness Railway and Mining Company.—(Mr. *Wilmot.*)
1°*, 1989 (i) ; 2°*. 2321 ; M. for Com., 2858 ; in Com. and 3°*, 2859 (ii).

BILL (No. 137) To amend the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
1°*, 1989 (i) ; 2°* and in Com., 3236 ; 3°*, 3237 (ii.) (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 16.)

BILL (No. 138) To amend Chapter 135 of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Supreme and Exchequer Courts.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 1990 (i) ; 2°, 3584 ; in Com., 3588 ; 3° m., 3649 ; 3°*, 3984 (ii) ; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 5079 ; conc. in, 5590 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 25.)

BILL (No. 139) In further amendment of the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act.—(Mr. *Mulock.*)
1°, 2140 (i).

BILL (No. 140) In restraint of Fraudulent Marking.—(Mr. *Costigan.*)
1°, 2144 ; 2°* and in Com., 3583 ; 3°*, 3646 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 32.)

BILL (No. 141) To amend the Copyright Act.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 2144 ; 2°* in Com. and 3°, 3244 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 34.)

BILL (No. 142) To amend the Patent Act.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 2144; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3244 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 33.)

BILL (No. 143) Respecting certain Female Offenders in the Province of Nova Scotia—(R) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 2203; 2°* and in Com., 3595 (ii); 3°*, 5139 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 55.)

BILL (No. 144) Further to amend the Indian Act, Chapter 43 of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)
1°, 2203; 2°* and in Com., 3590; 3°*, 3593 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 30.)

BILL (No. 145) Further to amend the Electoral Franchise Act.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 2336; 2°* and in Com., 3082; 3°*, 3098 (ii) (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 18.)

BILL (No. 146) Further to amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 2337; 2°* and in Com., 3244 (ii), 5139, 5196; Order for 3° dschgd. and recom., 5544; 3° m., 5556; recom. and 3°, 5587 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 19.)

BILL (No. 147) Further to amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 2337; 2°*, 3649; in Com., 3649 (ii), 5352, 5374, 5594, 5727, 6224; 3°*, 6226 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 20.)

BILL (No. 148) Further to amend the North-West Territories Representation Act.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 2373; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3157 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 56.)

BILL (No. 149) Respecting the Inspection of Ships.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 2666; 2°* and in Com., 3600, 4310 (ii); M. to conc. in Amts. made in Com. of Whole, 4466; conc. in and 3°*, 4467 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 37.)

BILL (No. 150) To amend the Acts respecting the Harbour of Pictou, in Nova Scotia.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 2667; 2° and in Com., 3594; 3°*, 3961 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 54.)

BILL (No. 151) Respecting the Ontario Express and Transportation Company.—(Mr. *Sutherland.*)
Rules, &c., suspended and 1° of B., 2905; 2° m., 3230; 2°, 3593 (ii); in Com. and 3°*, 4256 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 110.)

BILL (No. 152) To amend Chapter 96 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, to encourage the development of the Sea Fisheries and the building of Fishing Vessels.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
Res. prop., 549; in Com., 1095 (i); conc. in and 1°* of B., 3100; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 3593 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 42.)

BILL (No. 153) Further to amend Chapter 138 of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
Res. prop., 1849 (i); in Com., 3100; conc. in and 1°* of B., 3102; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3157 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 27.)

BILL (No. 154) Respecting the Shipping of Live Stock.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
Res. prop., 1200 (i); in Com., conc. in and 1° of B., 3130; 2°, 3991; in Com., 3992; 3°*, 3995 (ii); Sen. Amt. conc. in, 4772 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 36.)

BILL (No. 155) To amend the Acts respecting the Duties of Customs.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
Res. prop., 1221; in Com., 1253 (i); consdn. of Res., 3201; conc. in and 1°* of B., 3236 (ii); 2°, 4829; in Com., 5139; 3° m., 5284; Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 5284; neg. (Y. 78, N. 102) 5334; 3°, 5335 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 45.)

BILL (No. 156) Further to amend the Customs Act.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
1°*, 3254; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3649 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 44.)

BILL (No. 157) To amend the Petroleum Inspection Act.—(Mr. *Costigan.*)
1°, 3462; 2°* and in Com., 3648; 3°*, 3649 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 49.)

BILL (No. 158) to authorize the Sale of the Carleton, City of Saint John, Branch Railroad.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
Res. prop., 1413; M. for Com., 1992; in Com., 1993 (i); conc. in and 1°* of B., 3579; 2°* and in Com., 3899; 3°*, 3961 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 15.)

BILL (No. 159) To make further provision respecting grants of land to members of the Militia Force on active service in the North-West.—(Sir *Adolphe Caron.*)
Res. prop., 634 (i); in Com. 3105; conc. in and 1°* of B., 3582; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3902 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 13.)

BILL (No. 160) To authorize the conveyance to the Quebec Skating Club of certain Lands in the City of Quebec.—(Sir *John Thompson*).
Res. prop., 891 (i); in Com. 3584; 1°* of B., 3649; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 3984 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 14.)

BILL (No. 161) In relation to the unlawful disinterment of dead bodies—(P) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 4825 (iii).

BILL (No. 162) To correct a clerical error in the Act 53 Victoria, Chapter 81, respecting the Great North-West Central Railway Company.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 3950 (ii); 2°* in Com. and 3°*, 4307 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 80.)

BILL (No. 163) Further to amend the General Inspection Act—(S) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 3983 (ii); 2°* and in Com., 4300; 3°*, 4307 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 48.)

BILL (No. 164) To make further provision respecting Weighers of Grain—(T) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 3983 (ii); 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4307 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 47.)

BILL (No. 165) To further amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)

1°, 3995; 2° m., 5762; 2° and in Com., 5770 6226; 3°*, 6228. (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 24.)

BILL (No. 166) Respecting the Reckoning of Time.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 4237 (iii).

BILL (No. 167) For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1892, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
Res. prop., in Com. and 1°* of B., 4297; 2°* and 3°*, 4373 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 2.)

BILL (No. 168) To encourage the production of Beet Reet Sugar.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
Res. prop., 3427; in Com., 3961 (ii); rep. and 1°* of B., 4300; 2° and in Com., 4466 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 31.)

BILL (No. 169) Further to amend the Act 52 Victoria, Chapter 4, to authorize the granting of Subsidies in Land to Railway Companies.—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)
Res. prop., 1200 (i); in Com., 3138 (ii); recom., 4307; rep. and 1°* of B., 4309; 2°, 4534; in Com., 4609, 5538; 3°*, 5590 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 9.)

BILL (No. 170) Respecting the North Shore section of the Canadian Pacific Railway.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
Res. prop., 3577 (ii); in Com., 4748; conc. in and 1°* of B., 4829; 2°* and in Com., 5081; 3° m., 5410; Amt. (Mr. Laurier) to recom., 5410; neg. on a div. and 3°, 5411 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 11.)

BILL (No. 171) Respecting the Rathbun Company.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick.*)
Rules 49 and 51 suspended, 5012; 1°* of B., 5013; 2°*, 5075; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 5374 (iii) (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 122.)

BILL (No. 172) Respecting Frauds upon the Government—(U) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 5589; 2°, 5751; in Com., 6289, 6327; 3°*, 6327 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 23.)

BILL (No. 173) To authorize the granting of Subsidies in Land to certain Railway Companies.—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)
Res. prop., 3308 (iii); in Com., 5487, 5593, 5607; conc. in and 1°* of B., 5727; 2° m., 6130; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 6134 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 10.)

BILL (No. 174) To amend Chapter 41 of the Revised Statutes respecting the Militia and Defence.—(Sir *Adolphe Caron.*)
1°, 6126 (iii).

BILL (No. 175) To authorize the payment of Subsidies in aid of the construction of lines of Railway therein mentioned.—(Mr. *Bowell.*)
Res. prop., 6032; in Com., 6135; conc. in and 1° of B., 6142; 2°* and in Com., 6185, 6217; 3°*, 6223 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 8.)

BILL (No. 176) To amend the Railway Acts.—(Mr. *Bowell.*)
1°, 6286; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 6287 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 51.)

BILL (No. 177) For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1892, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
Res. in Com., rep., conc. in, 1°*, 2°* and 3°*, 6307, (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 3.)

BILL (No. 178) To further amend the Acts respecting the North-West Territories.—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)
1°, 6307; 2°, 6326 (iii).

BINDING TWINE AND FREE LIST: prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1771; neg. (Y. 80, N. 100) 1847 (i).
Deb. (Mr. *Grieve*) 1774; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 1776; (Mr. *Casey*) 1779; (Mr. *McMillan*) 1781; Mr. *Wallace*) 1783; (Mr. *Watson*) 1784; (Mr. *Sproule*) 1787; (Mr. *Bain*) 1790; (Mr. *Stairs*) 1795; (Mr. *Fairbairn*) 1799; (Mr. *Rowand*) 1799; (Mr. *Gillmor*) 1801: (Mr. *McNeill*) 1802; (Mr. *Ferguson, Leeds*) 1805; (Mr. *Ross, Lisgar*) 1806; (Mr. *Armstrong*) 1807; (Mr. *Daly*) 1808; (Mr. *Bowell*) 1811; (Mr. *Charlton*) 1818; (Mr. *Davin*) 1821; (Mr. *Welsh*) 1824; (Mr. *Mulock*) 1825; (Mr. *Foster*) 1828; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1835; (Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*) 1842 (i).

BLACK RIVER IMPROVEMENTS, ARTHABASKA CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 740 (i).

—— DRUMMOND CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 739 (i).

"BLIZZARD," SCHOONER, RESCUE OF CREW: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 224 (i).

—— REWARDS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Flint*) 735 (i).

Body Snatching. *See* "CRIMINAL LAW."

BOISVERT, GEO., APPMNT. AS FISHERY OFFICER, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Leduc*) 2935 (ii).

BONAVENTURE PIER, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 335 (i).

BONDING OF FOREIGN FISH: Ques. (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 1265 (i).

BOUCHERVILLE WHARF, CONTRACTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 1265 (i).

BOUCHIER, GEO. L., AND CAPT. GIGUERE, REP. *re* DREDGING ST. LAWRENCE: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1266 (i).

BOURGEOIS, DR. G. A., P. O. INSPECTOR, RETIREMENT: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2935 (ii).

BOUNTIES, FISHERY, PAID IN GUYSBOROUGH CO.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Fraser*) 232 (i).

—— PAID IN QUEEN'S, N.S.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 734 (i).

BOUNTY CHEQUES, FISHERY, COSTS, &C., *re* DISTRIBUTION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Flint*) 180 (i).

—— BY PROVINCES, &C., &C.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Flint*) 537 (i).

—— CHEQUES, DISTRIBUTION: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 129 (i).

—— PAYMENTS: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Flint*) 211 (i).

BOUNTY ON PRODUCTION, &C., OF MAPLE SUGAR: Ques. (Mr. *Godbout*) 1576 (i).

BOURINOT, J. G., Commissioner to Administer Oaths, 1 (i).

BRAE BREAKWATER, P.E.I., CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 208, 1274 (i).

BRAMPTON POSTMASTERSHIP, VACANCY THROUGH DEATH: Ques. (Mr. *Featherston*) 3259 (ii).

BRANDON "MAIL" IN PUBLIC DEPTS., NUMBER: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 3257 (ii).

BRANDON P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 4429, 5348 (iii).

BRANTFORD DRILL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 4362 (iii).

BREAKWATERS, GUYSBOROUGH CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1012 (i).

——— P.E.I., IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 226 (i).

——— WHARFAGE DUES, REPAIRS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 130 (i).

BREMNER'S CLAIM FOR FURS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1268 (i).

BRIDGE AT QUEBEC, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2912 (ii).

——— SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 525 (i).

——— M. for Engineer's Rep. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1053 (i).

——— M. for O. C.'s (Mr. *Langelier*) 104 (i).

Bridge Companies. *See* "MONTREAL AND QUEBEC."

BRIGADE MAJORS' SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3699 (ii).

BRIGHT, J. B., EMPLYMNT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 3263 (ii).

Brighton, Warkworth and Norwood Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 71 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 387 (i).

——— **B. No. 86** (Mr. *Cochrane*). 1°*, 548; 2°*, 600; in Com. and 3°*, 1604 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 64.)

Bristow, Thomas. *See* "DIVORCE."

B. C. Southern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 56 (Mr. *Davis*). 1°*, 334; 2°*, 413 (i).

BRITISH COLUMBIA:

ADJUTANT GEN. (DEP.) MIL. DIST. NO. 11: M. for Reps.* (Mr. *Prior*) 736 (i).

B. C. MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 4294 (iii).

BEACON HILL PARK MAGAZINE, &C.: M. for Reps., &c.* (Mr. *Prior*) 736 (i).

BEHRING'S SEA SEAL FISHERY, CLOSE SEASON: Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 9594i).

——— SEALERS CAPTURED BY RUSSIANS: Remarks (Mr. *McDougall, Cape Breton*) 5554 (iii).

——— COST OF EXPERTS: in Com. of Sup., 6268 (iii).

BURRARD INLET SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 1705 (i).

"C" BATTERY SERVICES AT WELLINGTON: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Gordon*) 146 (i).

CHINESE IMMIGRATION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Gordon*) 1578 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 5056; conc., 5419 (iii).

ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK, TENDERS FOR CAISSON, ADVTS.: M. for copies (Mr. *Tarte*) 1932 (i).

——— REP. *re* LENGTH: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 530 (i).

——— SUMS PAID ON ACCT.: Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 270 (i).

——— TENDERS, REP. OF H. F. PERLEY, &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Tarte*) 1937 (i).

LARKIN, CONNOLLY & CO., *re* ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK: Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 270 (i).

MINING MACHINERY, FREE ENTRY INTO B.C.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Mara*) 965 (i).

NELSON, P.O., POSTMASTER'S SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2521 (ii).

PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 919 (i).

RAILWAY LANDS, VANCOUVER ISLAND, REPS.: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 1051 (i).

BRITISH COLUMBIA—*Continued.*

TENDER FOR CAISSON, ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK, ADVTS.: M. for copies (Mr. *Tarte*) 1932 (i).

VANCOUVER ISLAND RY. RESERVE, REPS., &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 1051 (i).

VICTORIA DRILL HALL, for Reps.* (Mr. *Prior*) 736(i).

WELLINGTON, MILITARY AID TO CIVIL AUTHORITIES: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Gordon*) 146 (i).

——— MILITIA, PAYMENTS FOR ACTIVE SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 2146 (ii).

[*See* "P.O.," "PUB. WORKS," "SUPPLY," &C.]

BROCKVILLE, WESTPORT AND SAULT STE. MARIE RY.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 6185 (iii).

BROWN, MR. ADAM, HONORARIUM: in Com. of Sup., 6174 (iii).

BRUCE COUNTY INDIANS, SALE OF LIQUOR TO: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 270, 530, 1272 (i).

BRYDGES, LATE C. J., AND NORTH SASKATCHEWAN IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 1576 (i).

BUCKINGHAM P.O., CONSTRUCTION: M. for Letters, &c. (Mr. *Devlin*) 229 (i).

BUDGET, THE: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on adjmnt., 738, 953 (i).

——— Annual Stmnt. (Mr. *Foster*) 1200 (i).

——— Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1224 i).

——— *See* "WAYS AND MEANS."

Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 70 (Mr. *German*). 1°*, 387; 2°*, 547; in Com. and 3°*., 1761 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 65.)

Buffalo Lake and Battleford Ry., Coal and Iron Co.'s incorp. B. No. 57 (Mr. *Macdowall*). 1°*, 334; 2°*, 413; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 59.)

BUREAU OF LABOUR STATISTICS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Lépine*) 201 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 3615 (ii).

BURRARD INLET SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 1705 (i).

Burrard Inlet and Westminster Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 107 (Mr. *Corbould*). 1°*, 1011; 2°*, 1087; in Com. and 3°*, 1761 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 57.)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE: Remarks (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*, &c.) 109 (i)

——— Remarks (Sir *John Thompson*) 711 (i).

——— *See* "GOVT. BUSINESS."

CABLEGRAMS, REUTER'S AGENCY, AMOUNT PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4296 (iii).

CAÇOUNA, TIMBER FOR WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Carroll*) 158 (i).

CALEDONIA DAM, GRAND RIVER, RECONSTRUCTION M. for Pets., &c.* (Mr. *Montague*) 3287 (ii).

——— DRILL SHED, REPAIRS: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Montague*) 3287 (ii).

CALGARY AND EDMONTON MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3255 (ii).

——— AND FORT MACLEOD MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3256 (i).

CAMILLA AND WHITTINGTON MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2151 (ii).

CAMP AT ST. JOHN AND SOREL, PAY ROLL: M. for copies* (Mr. *Lépine*) 1062 (i).

CAMP, MILITARY DISTRICT No. 1: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Hyman*) 231 (i).

CAMPBELLTON AND GASPÉ SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 4700, 5349 (iii).

—— P. O., INVERNESS CO., ESTABLISHMENT, PETS., &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Laurier*) 544 (i).

CAN. ATLANTIC RY. CO., FUNERAL TRAIN: in Com. of Sup., 6276 (iii).

"CANADA GAZETTE": conc., 5417 (iii).

Can. and Michigan Tunnel Co.'s B. No. 19 (Mr. *Montague*). 1°*, 155; 2°, 189; in Com. and 3°*, 546 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 103.)

Can. Temp. Act (1888) Amt. B. No. 34 (Mr. *Flint*). 1°, 193 (i); Order for 2° read, 2580; 2°, 3288; in Com., 3292 (ii).

Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. No. 35 (Mr. *Laveryne*). 1°, 193 (i).

CAN. TEMP. ACT: in Com. of Sup., 5086; conc., 5426 (iii).

CANADIANS (DISTRESSED) ABROAD, RELIEF: Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 2149 (i).

Can. Land and Investment Co.'s B. No. 79 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 524; 2°*, 579; in Com. and 3°*, 1963 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 119.)

Can. Order of Home Circles B. No. 81 (Mr. *Coatsworth*). 1°*, 524; 2°*, 579; wthdn., 1760 (i).

C.P.R. Co.'s Act (1889) Amt. B. No. 74 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). 1°, 387; 2°*, 547; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 71.)

C.P.R. Co.'s B. No. 75 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). 1°*, 387; 2°*, 547; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 70.)

C.P.R. Co.'s Telegraphs B. No. 21 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 155; 2°, 189 (i).

C.P.R.—Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s Lease B. No. 66 (Mr. *Henderson*). 1°*, 387; 2°*, 547; in Com. and 3°*, 1434 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 73.)

C.P.R.—New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. No. 69 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). 1°*, 387; 2°*, 547; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 74.)

C.P.R.—North Shore Ry. Debentures B. No. 170 (Sir *John Thompson*). Res. prop., 3577 (ii); in Com., 4748; conc. in and 1°* of B., 4829; 2°* and in Com., 5081; 3° m., 5410; Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to recom., 5410; neg. on a div. and 3°, 5411 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 11.)

C. P. R.—Shuswap and Okanagon Ry. Co.'s Agreement B. No. 78 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 441; 2°*, 547; in Com. and 3°*, 1434 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 72.)

C.P.R. Co.'s ADDITIONAL LAND SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 3308 (ii).

—— ARBITRATORS' AWARD: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 6129 (iii).

—— CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup. 1652 (i), 3821 (ii).

—— MAIL SERVICE, 1890-91: in Com. of Sup., 1744 (i).

C.P.R., SECTION "B" CONTRACT, CHARGES AGAINST P. M. G.: Notice of Stmnt., 5852 (iii).

—— prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 5942; Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 5945; agreed to (Y. 102, N. 78) 5997 (iii).

Deb. (Mr. *Laurier*) 5954; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 5958; (Mr. *Mills*, *Bothwell*) 5962; (Mr. *Skinner*) 5967; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 5971; (Mr. *Casey*) 5975; (Mr. *Girouard*) 5984; (Mr. *Edgar*) 5989; (Mr. *Lister*) 5993 (iii).

—— Statutory Declaration read (Mr. *Haggart*) 6127 (iii).

—— SOURIS BRANCH, O. C.'s GRANTING AID: M. for copies* (Mr. *Daly*) 1938 (i).

Can. Power Co.'s B. No. 41 (Mr. *Montague*). 1°*, 206; 2°*, 220; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 126.)

CAN. SEALERS, CAPTURED BY RUSSIAN AUTHORITIES: Remarks (Mr. *McDougall*, *Cape Breton*) 5554 (iii).

CAN., WEST INDIAN AND SOUTH AMERICAN SS. CO., SUBSIDIES: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Davies*, *P.E.I.*) 544.

CANALS:

CANAL CONTRACTS, ENLARGEMENT OR CONSTRUCTION: M. for copies (Mr. *Trow*) 1938 (i).

CANAL (NEW) NORTH SHORE OF ST. LAWRENCE: Ques. (Mr. *McLennan*) 175 (i).

CANAL STATISTICS: presented (Mr. *Bowell*) 738 (i).

CHAMBLY CANAL, CONTRACT FOR SPREADING STONE: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 3959 (ii).

In Com. of Sup., 1665 (i), 4102, 4145, 5210, 5222, 6198.

LACHINE CANAL, SPECIFICATIONS, TENDERS, &c., *re* DRAIN: M. for copies (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 2157 (ii).

MANCHESTER SHIP CANAL, THOS. MUNRO'S REP.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Mulock*) 1579 (i).

MURRAY CANAL, OFFICIALS EMPLOYED: Ques. (Mr. *Hargraft*) 4675 (iii).

RAPIDE PLAT CANAL, TENDERS, &c.: M. for copies, &c.* (Mr. *Murray*) 544 (i).

RIDEAU CANAL, DAMAGES TO LAND: Ques. (Mr. *Dawson*) 3618 (ii).

—— KINGSTON AND JONES' FALLS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 711 (i).

—— ORDNANCE LANDS, SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 5408 (iii).

—— RESERVE, LOTS OCCUPIED BY JOHN HENEY: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4296 (iii).

—— TOLLS COLLECTED AND REFUNDED: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4675 (iii).

ST. LAWRENCE CANALS, DEEPENING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Coatsworth*) 1927 (i).

SOULANGES CANAL, EXPENDITURE, REPS., &c.: M. for Stmnt., &c. (Mr. *Mousseau*) 532 (i).

—— ENGINEER'S REPS.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Mousseau*) 1578 (i).

TAY CANAL, BASIN AT PERTH, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 4672 (iii).

—— CONSTRUCTION: on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Cameron*) 3738; neg. (Y. 82, N. 100) 3779 (ii).

—— NUMBER OF EMPLOYÉS: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*, *Huron*) 3617 (ii).

—— TENDERS FOR EXTENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*, *Huron*) 3261, 3952, 3956 (ii).

—— VESSELS PASSED THROUGH, NUMBER: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*, *Huron*) 3259 (ii).

TRENT VALLEY CANAL, COMMISSIONER'S REP.: Remarks (Mr. *Barron*) 194, 550 (i).

CANALS—*Continued.*
TRENT VALLEY CANAL, COST OF LOCKS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 1929 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Barron*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4467, 4773 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Barron*) on adjnmt., 214 (i).
WELLAND CANAL EMPLOYES, EXTRA : M. for Letters, &c. (Mr. *German*) 229, 3200 (ii).
—— TURNING BASIN : Ques. (Mr. *Gibson*) 270 (i).
—— USE OF SURPLUS WATER : M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Gibson*) 963 (i).
[*See* "PUBLIC WORKS," "SUPPLY."]
CANSO, ARICHAT, &c., AND PORT MULGRAVE SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 4702.
CAOUETTE, J. B., ENQUIRY *re* LOSS OF LETTERS, &c. : M. for Rep.* (Mr. *Amyot*) 544 (i).
CAPE BRETON AND N. S. RY. ACCOMMODATION : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Fraser*) 177 (i).
CAPE BRETON RY., CONSTRUCTION AND EQUIPMENT : in Com. of Sup., 1656 (i), 3898 (ii).
—— STATION MASTERS' DUTIES : Ques. (Mr. *Mc Dougall*) 4677 (iii).
CAPE TRAVERSE WHARF EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 1758 (i).
CAPE TORMENTINE HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 4522.
CARAQUET RY., RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES : Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3614 (ii).
CARILLON AND GRENVILLE CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 4150 (ii), 5222 (iii).
CARLETON BRANCH RY., PAPER *re* SALE : Mess. from His Ex., 550 (i).
Carleton Branch Ry. Sale B. No. 158 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. prop., 1413 ; M. for Com., 1992 ; in Com., 1993 (i) ; Res. conc. in and 1°*, of B., 3579 ; 2°*, and in Com., 3899 ; 3°*, 3961 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 15.)
CARLETON PLACE P.O. : in Com. of Sup., 4362 (iii).
CARON, MISS LEA, INDEMNITY FOR ACCIDENT : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 209 (i).
CASCUMPEC HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1765, 2151 (i).
CASE, H. N., LATE POSTMASTER AT HAMILTON : in Com. of Sup., 6279 (iii).
CATTLE DISEASES AND SHEEP SCAB : in Com. of Sup., 5336 ; conc., 5435 (iii).
—— EXPORT TRADE OF CANADA : Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) on adjnmt., 737 (i).
—— FROM U.S., FREE ENTRY : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 129 (i).
—— QUARANTINE REGULATIONS : Remarks (Mr. *Bowell*) 806 (i).
—— conc., 5435 (iii).
—— SHIPPING LIVE STOCK : Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 957 (i),
—— **Shipping.** *See* "LIVE STOCK."
—— TRADE (ATLANTIC) REGULATIONS : Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 2148 (i).
—— VESSELS AND STEAM FANS : Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1275 (i).
—— *See* "AMERICAN."
CAVALRY SCHOOL, TORONTO : Ques. (Mr. *Denison*) 222 (i).
CAVALRY, 1ST REGT. : Ques. (Mr. *Hyman*) 198 (i).
"C" BATTERY (B.C.) BARRACKS : M. for Reps.* (Mr. *Prior*) 736 (i).
—— SERVICES AT WELLINGTON, B. C. : M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Gordon*) 146 (i).
CEMENT PURCHASES BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2521 (ii) ; (Mr. *Forbes*) 4674 (iii).
CENSUS, THE : Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to M. for Com. of Sup. 4829 ; neg. (Y. 81, N. 103) 5010 (iii).
Deb. (Mr. *Foster*) 4845 ; (Mr. *Charlton*) 4858 ; (Mr. *Sproule*) 4875 ; (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 4885 ; (Mr. *Mackintosh*) 4898 ; (Mr. *Amyot*) 4929 ; (Mr. *Dupont*) 4953 ; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 4963 ; (Mr. *Craig*) 4979 ; (Mr. *Brodeur*) 4983 ; (Mr. *Haggart*) 4992 ; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 5001 (iii).
—— COMMISSIONER JONES : Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 1274 (i).
—— 1881 AND 1891, VOTES ACCORDING TO POPULATION, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Landerkin*) 128 (i).
—— RETURNS : Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 130 (i), 4465, 4534 (iii).
—— (Mr. *Casey*) 3999 (ii).
—— in Com. of Sup., 1569 (i), 3531 (ii).
—— *See* "AGRICULTURE," "IMMIGRATION."
Central Counties Ry. Co.'s B. No. 38 (Mr. *McLennan*). 1°*, 206 ; 2°*, 220 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1087 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 89.)
CENTRAL EXPERIMENTAL FARM, BULLETINS, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Devlin*) 1579 (i).
—— ENTIRE HORSES : M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Mc Millan*) 1579 (i).
—— EXPENDITURE : Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 1576 (i).
CENTREVILLE, N.S., BREAKWATER, REP. *re* REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 962 (i).
Certificates. *See* "MASTERS AND MATES."
CHAMBLY CANAL, CONTRACT FOR SPREADING STONE : Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 3959 (ii).
—— in Com. of Sup., 4146 (ii), 6200 (iii).
CHAPLEAU, ST. O., Clerk of Crown in Chancery, 1 (i)
CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 1748 (i)
CHARLEBOIS & CO., AMOUNT PAID ON LANGEVIN BLOCK : Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1575 (i).
CHATHAM P O., CONTRACTOR'S NAME, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 3951 (ii).
—— N. B., in Com. of Sup., 4331 (iii).
Chatsworth, Georgian Bay and Lake Huron Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 130 (Mr. *McNeill*). 1°*, 1927 ; 2° m., 1989 (i) ; 2°*, 2097 ; in Com. and 3°*, 2321 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 62.)
CHAUDIÈRE RENTS, COLLECTION : in Com. of Sup., 1728 (i).
CHEESE (AMERICAN) SHIPPED THROUGH CANADA : M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Marshall*) 205 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Marshall*) 114 (i).
CHEVALIER, DR. E. N., DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. *Bechard*) 527 (i).
CHICAGO EXHIBITION, INVITATION TO CANADA : Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1577 (i).
CHICOUTIMI ELECTION RETURN : Ques. (Mr. *Savard*) 142 (i).

CHICOUTIMI REPRESENTATION, RET. OFFICER'S REP.: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 7 (i).

Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s (Subsidy) Acts Amt. B. No. 97 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. prop., 441; M. for Com., 550; in Com., 558; conc. in and 1° of B., 636; 2° and in Com., 1087; 3°, 1253 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 12.)

CHINESE IMMIGRATION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Gordon*) 1578 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 5056; conc., 5419 (iii).

CHIPPEWA INDIANS, LETTER TO SIR JOHN MACDONALD *re* IRREGULARITIES: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3264.

CIGARS AND TOBACCO, LAW *re* CULTIVATION: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 194 (i).

Citizens' Ins. Co.'s B. No. 118 (Mr. *Desjardins, Hochelaga*). 1°*, 1403; 2°*, 1434 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2465 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 116.)

CITY MARKET HALIFAX, PROPERTY, SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1770 (i).

CIVIL GOVERNMENT: in Com. of Sup., 240, 397, 1544, 1732 (i), 6166 (iii).

CIVIL SERVICE, DEPTL. PAY SHEETS: Ques. (Mr. *Mc Mullen*) 2520, 2906 (ii).

——— EXAMINERS' REP.: Presented (Mr. *Chapleau*) 103 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 481 (i).

CIVIL SERVANTS AND ELECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 221 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1765 (i).

——— RECESS FOR LUNCH, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3258 (ii).

CLERK OF CROWN IN CHANCERY: in Com. of Sup., 6172.

CLOTHING AND GREAT COATS, MILITIA: in Com. of Sup., 3700 (ii).

——— MOUNTED POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 4822; conc., 5416 (iii).

COATICOOK P. O., COAL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 6216 (iii).

COBOURG HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 4559 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Hargraft*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5335 (ii).

Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 90 (Mr. *Cochrane*). 1°*, 549; 2°*, 601; in Com. and 3°*, 1604 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 90.)

COBOURG P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 1687 (i), 4363 (iii).

COCKBURN ISLAND LOCATION TICKETS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1271 (i).

COLLECTION OF REVENUES. *See* "SUPPLY."

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS, PAYMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 5137 (iii).

Collingwood and Bay of Quinté Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt B. No. 47 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). 1°*, 238; 2°*, 294; in Com and 3°*, 1199 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 84.)

Colonial Courts. *See* "ADMIRALTY."

Combinations. *See* "TRADE."

Commercial Agencies. *See* "PRIVATE DETECTIVE."

COMMERCIAL AGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 5108; conc., 5427 (iii).

COMMERCIAL TREATY, ENGLAND AND FRANCE: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 3950 (ii), 4670 (iii).

COMMITTEES:

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION: List of Members, 139 (i).

BANKING AND COMMERCE: List of Members, 139 (i).

DEBATES, OFFICIAL REP.: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Bowell*) 7 (i).

——— 1ST REP.: presented (Mr. *Desjardins, Hochelaga*) 1200 (i).

——— 2ND REP.: presented (Mr. *Desjardins*) 548 (i).

——— M. (Mr. *LaRivière*) to conc., 632 (i).

——— M. (Mr. *Desjardins*) to conc., 1407 (i).

——— 3RD REP.: presented (Mr. *Desjardins*) 2289.

——— 4TH REP.: Translators, &c.: M. (Mr. *Desjardins, Hochelaga*) to conc., 5941, 6286 (iii).

EXPIRING LAWS: List of Members, 136 (i).

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT, JOINT COM.: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 156 (i).

NORTHUMBERLAND, EAST. *See* general heading.

PRINTING: List of Members, 138 (i).

——— JOINT COM.: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 156 (i).

——— 9TH AND 10TH REPS.: M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to conc., 6286 (iii).

PRIVATE BILLS, MISCELLANEOUS: List of Members, 137 (i).

——— *See* general heading.

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS: List of Members, 135.

——— *See* general heading and "PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS."

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: List of Members, 138 (i).

——— *See* general heading.

SELECT STANDING: prop. M. (Sir *John Macdonald*) 6 (i).

——— REP. presented (Sir *John Macdonald*) 135 (i).

——— SUBSTITUTION OF NAMES: M. (Mr. *Bowell*) 237 (i).

STANDING ORDERS: List of Members, 138 (i).

Companies' Clauses Act (*Chap.* 118, *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 49** (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*). 1°, 238 (i).

Compulsory Voting B. No. 53 (Mr. *Amyot*). 1°*, 266; 2° m., 1030; Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to adjn. deb., 1031 (i).

CONCURRENCE, 1758 (i), 5411, 6303 (iii).

CONNOLLY, M., BOOKS OF FIRM: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) to produce, 906 (i).

——— ORDER TO ATTEND AT BAR OF HOUSE: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 806 (i).

——— ORDER FOR ATTENDANCE AT BAR: postponed, 891; in attendance, and Rep. of Sub. Com. on Priv. and Elec. read, 895 (i).

CONSOLIDATED FUND, RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 135, 213 (i).

Consolidated Revenue and Audit Acts Amt. B. No. 137 (Mr. *Foster*). 1°*, 1989 (i); 2°* and in Com., 3236; 3°*, 3237 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 16.)

——— **B. No. 139** (Mr. *Mulock*). 1°, 2140 (i).

Construction Company. *See* "INCORPORATED."

CONTINGENCIES, DEPTL.: in Com. of Sup., 431, 1544, 1732 (i), 6167 (iii).

CONTRACTS. *See* "PUBLIC WORKS DEPT."

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS, TIME LIMIT: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 112 (i).
——— HALTON: Judgment, 5 (i).

Controverted Elections. *See* "DOMINION."

Copyright Act Amt B. No. 141 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 2144; 2°*, in Com., and 3°, 3244 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 34.)

COPYRIGHT ACT (1889) ENFORCEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 335 (i).
——— ADDRESS TO HER MAJESTY: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) conc. in, 6287 (iii).
——— BERNE CONVENTION: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1264.
——— IMPERIAL LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 4674 (iii).
——— LAWS OF CAN.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Edgar*) 726.
——— Remarks (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5014 (ii).

Corbin, J. Spencer, Patent Relief B. No. 30 (Mr. *Reid*). 1°*, 156; 2°, 294 (i); M. for Com., 2174; in Com. and 3°*, 2551 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 131.)

CORN MEAL, FREE ENTRY: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 143 (i).
CORNWALLIS VALLEY RY. SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2153 (ii).
COSGROVE, JOHN, RESIGNATION, &c.: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Devlin*) 145 (i).
COSTELLO, M., MONTREAL CUSTOM HOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 5406 (iii).
COTEAU LANDING WHARF AND SHEDS: Ques. (Mr. *Mousseau*) 222 (i).
——— PIER: in Com. of Sup., 4557 (iii).
COTTON SAIL DUCK, IMPORTS AT HALIFAX: Ques. (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 142 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 174 (i).
COUNSEL, TARTE-MCGREEVY ENQUIRY: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1575 (i).
COUNTRY SAVINGS BANKS, N.B., N.S., P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1748 (i).
COWAN, THOS., POSTMASTER AT GALT: Ques. (Mr. *Semple*) 1263 (i).
CULLERS' SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 1725 (i), 5159.

CUSTOMS:
ALBINO POINT CUSTOMS OFFICER: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *German*) 1579 (i).
ANNAPOLIS ROYAL CUSTOMS COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 270 (i).
CATTLE FROM U. S., FREE ENTRY: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 129 (i), 5776 (iii).
——— IMPORTS FOR SLAUGHTER: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 3615 (ii).
——— *See* "AMERICAN."
CHEESE (AMERICAN) SHIPPED THROUGH CAN.; Ques. (Mr. *Marshall*) 114 (i).
——— M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Marshall*) 205 (i).
CHINESE IMMIGRATION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Gordon*) 1578 (i).
CORN MEAL, FREE ENTRY: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 143.
COSTELLO, MICHAEL, MONTREAL CUSTOM HOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 5406 (iii).
COTTON SAIL DUCK, IMPORTS AT HALIFAX: Ques. (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 142 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 174 (i).

CUSTOMS—*Continued.*
EXPORTS AND IMPORTS: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 135 (i).
EXPORT CATTLE TRADE, REP. OF EVIDENCE: Presented (Mr. *Tupper*) 103 (i).
FISH, BONDING OF FOREIGN: Ques. (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 1265 (i).
FOWL, WILD, PROHIBITION OF EXPORT: Ques. (Mr. *McKay*) 1769 (i).
GRANITE, SCOTCH, INCREASE OF DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 335 (i).
GUYSBOROUGH CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2524 (ii).
IRON BOUNTIES PAID, ENQUIRY FOR RET. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2580, 2668 (ii).
JOHNSTON, SAML., DISMISSAL FROM CUSTOMS SERVICE: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *German*) 2935 (ii).
LIQUOR, ILLEGAL SEIZURE: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 208, 741 (i), 2148 (ii).
MCRAE, JAMES, DISMISSAL AS PREVENTIVE OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 4672 (iii).
MINING MACHINERY, FREE ENTRY INTO B.C.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Mara*) 965 (i).
——— IMPORTATIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4099 (ii).
MONTREAL CUSTOM HOUSE EMPLOYÉS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Lépine*) 3275 (ii).
——— IRREGULARITIES: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3953 (ii), 4675 (iii).
——— SUPERANNUATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3616 (ii).
PELÉE ISLAND, SUB-COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Allan*) 334 (i).
——— M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Allan*) 1580, 1980 (i).
PLATE PRESENTED TO MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS, DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2912 (ii).
POLSON MANUFACTURING CO., IMPORTS OF STEEL PLATES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 270 (i).
POTATOES EXPORTED FROM CANADA: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 544 (i).
POWNAL BAY PREVENTIVE OFFICER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 4672 (iii).
ROBITAILLE, C. N., PAYMENT FROM CUSTOMS DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 4673 (iii).
SEIZURES, ILLEGAL: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2520 (ii).
SMUGGLING IN QUEBEC, SUITS, JUDGMENTS, &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Delisle*) 1062 (i).
STEEL PLATES, &c., FREE IMPORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 270 (i).
SUGAR (RAW) IN BOND: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 740.
SUGAR DUTIES: prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1931 (ii).
——— *See* "CUSTOMS ACT AMT. B."
WALKERTON, CUSTOMS SEIZURES, SHARE OF CLAIM: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 3268, 3959 (ii).
——— SEIZURE OF IRON BRIDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 3619 (ii).
——— SUB-COLLECTOR, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 3266 (ii).
WILD FOWL, PROHIBITION OF EXPORT: Ques. (Mr. *McKay*) 1769 (i).

[*See* "TARIFF," "SUPPLY," "WAYS AND MEANS," &c.]

Customs Acts Amt. B. No. 155 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. prop., 1221; in Com., 1253 (i); consdn. of Res., 3201; conc. in and 1°* of B., 3236 (ii); 2°, 4829; in Com., 5139; 3° m., 5284; Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) Sugar Duties, 5284; neg. (Y. 78, N. 102) 5334; 3°, 5335 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 45.)

Customs Acts Amt. B. No. 156 (Mr. *Foster*). 1°*, 3254; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3649 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 44.)

CRIBBIN'S POINT WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4530 (iii).

Criminal Law Amt. B. No. 32 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 156 (i).

Criminal Law Amt. (Body Snatching) B. No. 161 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 4825 (iii).

Criminal Law Amt. (Evidence in Criminal Cases) B. No. 11 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*). 1°*, 129 (i); 2°, 2955 (ii).

CRIMINAL LAW BILL, PAYMENT FOR DRAFTING: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 3260 (ii).

CROSS POINT AND GASPÉ BASIN MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Joncas*) 113 (i).

—— AND PASPEBIAC MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Joncas*) 113 (i).

CROWN TIMBER AGENT, NEW WESTMINSTER: in Com. of Sup., 5189 (iii).

"CRUISER," MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1714, 1721 (i).

CRYSTAL BEACH AND POINT ALBINO CUSTOMS OFFICERS: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *German*) 1579 (i).

DAIRYING INTERESTS AND EXPERIMENTAL FARMS: in Com. of Sup., 1562 (i), 3574 (ii), 6174 (iii).

DEBATES, OFFICIAL, PUBLICATION: in Com. of Sup., 942 (i).

—— *See* "COMMITTEES."

DEBENTURES, NORTH SHORE RY.: M. for O. C.'s (Mr. *Langelier*) 974; deb. resmd., 1014 (i).

—— *See* "NORTH SHORE RY."

Deck and Load Lines Provision B. No. 106 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 954; 2°, 1256 (i); in Com., 3583; 3°*, 3899 (ii); Sen. Amts. conc. in, 4773 (iii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 40.)

DECK LOADS, REP. OF EVIDENCE: presented (Mr. *Tupper*) 103 (i).

DEPTL. PAY SHEETS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2520, 2906 (ii).

DESMARTEAU'S, JOS., CLAIM, PET. OF RIGHT: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 2155 (ii).

Detective Corporations. *See* "PRIVATE."

DETECTIVE (CUSTOMS) SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 5053.

DIGBY, NEW PIER AT RAQUETTE: in Com. of Sup., 4532 (iii).

DIGBY, N.S., POSTAL ACCOMMODATION: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 1264 (i).

DINGMAN, INDIAN INSPECTOR, ENQUIRY *re* AGENT ALLEN: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1766 (i).

DINGWELL, J., PROF. SERVICES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1559 (i).

DISALLOWANCE OF MAN. ACT *re* DISEASES OF ANIMALS: M. for Papers, &c.* (Mr. *Watson*) 545 (i).

—— *re* INSTITUTIONS, &C., TRANSACTING BUSINESS: M. for Papers, &c.* (Mr, *Watson*) 544 (i).

—— PROVINCIAL ACTS: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 6296 (iii).

DISPUTED TERRITORY (ONT.) TIMBER CUT, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barron*) 128 (i).

DISTILLERIES, &C., EXTRA DUTY PAY TO OFFICERS: in Com. of Sup., 5136 (iii).

DISTRESSED CANADIANS ABROAD: Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 2149 (ii).

DIVISIONS:

BINDING TWINE AND FREE LIST: prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1771: neg. (Y. 80, N. 100) 1847 (i).

C. P. R, SECTION "B" CONTRACT, CHARGES AGAINST POSTMASTER GENERAL: prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 5942; Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 5945; agreed to (Y. 102, N. 78) 5997 (iii).

CENSUS OF THE DOM.: on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4829; neg. (Y. 81, N. 103) 5010 (iii).

CUSTOMS ACT AMT. B. 155 (Mr. *Bowell*): on M. for 3*, Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) Sugar Duties, 5284; neg. (Y. 78, N. 102) 5334 (iii).

DIVORCE (ADAM RUSSWORM) B. 131 (Mr. *Wallace*): 3° agreed to (Y. 89, N. 23) 2549 (ii).

DOMINION DAY: M. (Mr. *Denison*) to adjn. Hse., neg. (Y. 50, N. 72) 1579 (i).

ESQUIMALT AND NANAIMO RY. BELT, SETTLERS GRIEVANCES: on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 4016; neg. (Y. 81, N. 100) 4056 (ii).

FRANCHISE ACT AMT. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*): on M. for 2°, Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., 769; agreed to (Y. 109, N. 77) 797 (i).

FRANCHISE ACT REPEAL B. 8 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*): on M. for 2°, Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., agreed to (Y. 112, N. 85) 330; Main M., as amended, agreed to (Y. 113, N. 84), 332 (i).

GOVT. POLICY: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., neg. (Y. 83, N. 103) 1198 (i).

GOV. GENERAL'S WARRANTS: on M. for Com. of Sup. Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4537; neg. (Y. 82, N. 97) 4551 (iii).

HIGH COMMISSIONER AND LATE ELECTIONS: on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 570; neg. (Y. 79, N. 100) 880 (i).

HOMESTEADS (SECOND) N.W.T.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 606; M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to adjn. deb., agreed to (Y. 87, N. 73) 629 (i).

NORTHUMBERLAND EAST, CHARGES AGAINST MEMBER: on M. (Mr. *Skinner*) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Sel. Com., Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) Minority Rep., 5612; neg. (Y. 74, N. 99) 5724; Majority Rep. agreed to (Y. 98, N. 75) 5725 (iii).

PROHIBITION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS: on prop. Res. (Mr. *Jamieson*), Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Amt. neg. (Y. 7, N. 185) 1312; Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Amt. agreed to (Y. 107, N. 88) 1344 (i).

—— M. (Mr. *Sproule*) to adjn. deb., neg. (Y. 65, N. 74) 362; M. (Mr. *Gillies*) to adjn. deb., agreed to (Y. 98, N. 80) 385 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS: M. (Mr. *Girouard*) to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 5778; Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 5919; neg. (Y. 83, N. 104) 6124; Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to Amt., 6085; neg. (Y. 2, N. 184) 6121; Rep. conc. in (Y. 101, N. 86) 6126 (iii).

—— M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. deb., neg. (Y. 29, N. 36) 6026 (iii).

TAY CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3738; neg. (Y. 82, N. 100) 3779 (ii).

TIMBER LICENSES, &C.: on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) 3428; neg. (Y. 81, N. 100) 3506 (ii).

TRADE POLICY OF THE GOVT.: on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) 3309; agreed to (Y. 99, N. 77) 3425 (ii).

DIVISIONS—*Continued.*
WAYS AND MEANS: on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to conc. in Res., Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) neg. (Y. 88, N. 114) 3081 (ii).
Divorce (Bristow, Thomas) B. No. 133 (Mr. *O'Brien*). 1°*, 1927 (i); 2° on a div., 2175; M. for Com., 2550; in Com. and 3° on a div., 2551 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 132.)
Divorce (Ellis, Mahala) B. No. 132 (Mr. *Wallace*). 1°*, 1926; M. for 2°, 1989 (i); 2° on a div., 2551 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 133.)
Divorce (Russworm, Adam) B. No. 131 (Mr. *Wallace*). 1°*, 1927 (i); 2° on a div., 2174; in Com. and 3° agreed to (Y. 89, N. 23) 2549 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 134.)
Divorce (Tapley, Isabel) B. No. 134 (Mr. *Wallace*). 1°*, 1927 (i); 2° on a div., 2175; in Com. and 3° on a div., 2551 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 135.)
DOCUMENTS MENTIONED IN SPEECH FROM THRONE: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 157 (i).
DOM. AID TO RAILWAYS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1053 (i).
Dom. Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. No. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 2337; 2°*, 3649; in Com., 3649 (ii), 5352, 5374, 5594, 5727, 6224; 3°*, 6226 (iii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 20.)
Dom. Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. No. 45 (Mr. *Amyot*). 1°, 217; 2°*, 1030 (i); Order for Com. dschgd., 2936 (ii).
DOM. DAY, ADJNMT.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*, &c.) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1536 (i).
——— M. (Mr. *Denison*) to adjn. House, neg. (Y. 50, N. 72) 1579 (i).
Dom. Elections Act (*Chap.* 8 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 3** (Mr. *Charlton*). 1°, 104 (i).
Dom. Elections Act (*Chap.* 8 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 5** (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*). 1°, 105: 2° m., 994; 2° and ref to Sel. Com., 999 (i); Order for Com. dschgd., 2936 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act (*Chap.* 8 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 54** (Mr. *Barron*). 1°, 266; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 1040 (i); Order for Com. dschgd., 2936 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. No. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 2337; 2°* and in Com., 3244 (ii), 5139, 5196; Order for 3° dschgd. and recom., 5544; 3° m., 5556; recom. and 3°, 5587 (iii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 19.)
——— *See* "ELECTIONS."
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. No. 108 (Mr. *Davin*). 1°, 1010 (i); Order for 2° read, 3307 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. No. 165 (Mr. *Dewdney*). 1°*, 3995 (ii); 2° m., 5762; 2° and in Com., 5770, 6226; 3°*, 6228 (iii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 24.)
DOM. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 5179, 6279; conc., 5433 (iii).
DOM. NOTES IN CIRCULATION, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Mulock*) 1578 (i).
——— ISSUE AND REDEMPTION: in Com. of Sup., 1754 (i).
DOM. NOTES, PRINTING: in Com. of Sup., 1755 (i).
DOM. POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 511, 1557 (i).
DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 910, 1558 (i).
——— SUPPLIES, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1928 (i).
DOUCET, LOUIS, DISMISSAL FROM I. C. R. SHOPS: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 741 (i).
DOUGLAS, JAMES, ACTING CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, TORONTO: in Com. of Sup., 1714 (i).
DREDGING DU LOUP RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Carroll*) 158 (i).
——— KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER, PAYMENTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 1267 (i).
——— TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell* 129 (i).
——— PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 1690 (i), 4640, 5222.
——— SISSIBOO RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers* 1574 (i).
——— *See* "PUBLIC WORKS."
DRILL INSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 3729, 4214 (ii).
DRILL SHED, TORONTO, CONTRACT FOR ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 963 (i).
DUFRESNE, J. L., COMPENSATION FOR INJURIES: in Com. of Sup., 1706 (i).
DUGUAY, JOSEPH, EMPLYMT. AS EXCISEMAN: Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 3254 (ii).
DUNDAS AND WATERLOO MACADAMIZED ROAD: Ques. (Mr. *Bain*) 223 (i).
——— M. for O.C.'s, &c. (Mr. *Bain*) 1058 (i).
EASTERN TOWNSHIPS, GEOLOGICAL SURVEYS: Ques. (Mr. *Frechette*) 198 (i).
EAST RIVER, N.S., DEEPENING: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1011 (i).
Eddy, E. B., Mnfg. Co.'s B. No. 23 (Mr. *Mackintosh*). 1°*, 155; 2°*, 214; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 123.)
EDGETT'S LANDING, BALLAST WHARF, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *King*) 3956 (ii).
EEL FISHERIES, RIMOUSKI, DESTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2907, 2913 (ii).
ELECTION EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 1734 (i).
ELECTIONS (1891) RECOUNTS: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 142, 177 (i).
——— RETURNS TO CLERK OF CROWN IN CHANCERY: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 131 (i).
——— VOTES POLLED, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Landerkin*) 128 (i).
——— BELLECHASSE: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Amyot*) 187 (i).
——— GAZETTING MEMBER: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 112.
Elections Act. *See* "DOMINION."
Elections Acts Amt. B. No. 9 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*). 1°, 107; 2° m., 1029 (i); Order for Com. dschgd., 2936 (ii).
ELECTIONS AND PUBLIC EMPLOYÉS: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 221 (i).
——— CONTROVERTED, TIME LIMIT: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 112 (i).
——— SENATORS AS CANDIDATES: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1578 (i).
ELECTORAL DIVISIONS IN N. W. T.: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 221 (i).
Electoral Franchise. *See* "FRANCHISE."

ELECTORAL LISTS (DOM.) REVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 143 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 946 (i).
ELECTRIC LIGHT, MONTREAL P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 4347 (iii).
Electric Storage. *See* "ANGLO-CANADIAN."
ELEVATORS ON I. C. R.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 135 (i).
ELGIN (EAST) RET. OFFICER'S ACCOUNT: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Ingram*) 1579 (i).
ELLIOTT, GEO. M., APPOINTMENT AS GAS INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Allison*) 5076 (iii).
Ellis, Mahala. *See* "DIVORCE."
"Empire" Printing and Publishing Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 28 (Mr. *Cockburn*). 1°*, 156; 2°, 191; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 130.)
ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK, REP. *re* LENGTH: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 530 (i).
—— SUMS PAID ON ACCT.: Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 270.
—— TENDERS FOR CAISSON, ADVTS.: M. for copies (Mr. *Tarte*) 1932 (i)
—— TENDERS, REP. OF H. F. PERLEY, &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Tarte*) 1937 (i).
See "PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS."
ESTIMATES, THE: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on Adjnmt. 214 (i).
—— 1891-92: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 227 (i).
—— SUPPL., 1891: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 799 (i).
—— SUPPL.: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 5555 (iii).
—— Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 5589 (iii).
—— SUPPL., FURTHER, 1891-92: Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 6289 (iii).
Evidence in Criminal Cases. *See* "CRIMINAL LAW."
Exchequer Court Act Amt. B. No. 117 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 1345 (i); 2°* and in Com., 3646, 3902; 3°*, 3902 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 26.)
EXCHEQUER COURT: in Com. of Sup., 507, 1557 (i).
—— *See* "SUPREME."
EXCISE: in Com. of Sup., 1724 (i), 5125 (iii).
EXPERIMENTAL FARMS (CENTRAL) BULLETINS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Devlin*) 1579 (i).
—— BUILDINGS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4652 (iii).
—— EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 1576 (i).
—— M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *McMillan*) 1579 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mara*) 232 (i).
—— STALLIONS: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 739 (i).
—— PAPERS *re* Horses: Remarks (Mr. *McMillan*) 3200 (ii).
—— REP. OF DIRECTOR, &C.: Presented (Mr. *Haggart*) 104 (i).
EXPENDITURE FOR PUBLIC WORKS SINCE CONFEDN.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1061 (i).
EXPORTS AND IMPORTS: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 135 (i).
EXPORT CATTLE TRADE, REP. OF EVIDENCE: Presented (Mr. *Tupper*) 103 (i).
EXPORT OF POTATOES FROM CANADA: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 544 (i).
FABRE, HECTOR, SALARY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5086; conc., 5427 (iii).
Farmers' Bank of Rustico B. No. 40 (Mr. *Macdonald, King's, P.E.I.*) 1°*, 206; 2°*, 220; M. for consdn. after Priv. B.'s, 1101; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 113.)
FEDERAL AID TO RYS.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1053 (i).
Female Offenders in Nova Scotia B. No. 143 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 2203, 2°* and in Com., 3595 (ii); 3°*, 5139 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 55.)
FENELON FALLS, LOCKMASTER'S HOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 4673 (iii).
FENIAN RAID, PENSIONS: in Com. of Sup., 3660 (ii).
Ferry, International. *See* "VICTORIA."
FINANCE:
AUDITOR GENERAL'S POWERS: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 391 (i).
CABLEGRAMS, REUTER'S AGENCY, AMOUNT PAID: Ques; (Mr. *Lankerkin*) 4296 (iii).
CONSOLIDATED FUND: RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 135, 213 (i).
DEBENTURES, NORTH SHORE RY.: M. for O. C.'s (Mr. *Langelier*) 974; deb. rsmd., 1014 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 525 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Fremont*) 527 (i).
—— LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2521 (i).
DEPTL. PAY SHEETS: Ques. (Mr, *McMillan*) 2520, 2906 (ii).
DOM. NOTES IN CIRCULATION, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Mulock*) 1578 (i).
FINANCE AND TREASURY BOARD: in Com. of Sup., 250 (i).
GOVERNOR GEN.'S WARRANTS, DETAILS OF EXPENDITURE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mulock*) 232 (i).
—— on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4537; neg. (Y. 82, N. 97) 4551 (iii).
—— Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4467 (iii).
P. O. SAVINGS BANKS, INTEREST ON DEPOSITS: Ques. (Mr. *Christie*) 1577 (i).
PUBLIC DEBT AND SINKING FUND, TRUSTEES: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2152 (ii).
PUBLIC EXPENDITURE, ENQUIRY FOR RET.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4158 (ii).
QUE. HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, INTEREST OWING: Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 270 (i).
QUE. RY. BRIDGE AND NORTH SHORE RY. DEBENTURES: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 525 (i).
SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 202, 210 (i),
[*See* "BUDGET," "ESTIMATES," "SUPPLY," &C.]
Financial Corporations. *See* "PRIVATE DETECTIVE."
FINES FOR VIOLATING FISHERY LAWS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Fraser*) 189 (i).
FISHERIES:
BAY OF FUNDY FISHERIES: M. for Ret., &c. (Mr. *Bowers*) 715 (i).
BEHRING'S SEA, SEAL FISHERY, CLOSE SEASON: Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 959 (i).
—— SEALERS CAPTURED BY RUSSIANS: Remarks (Mr. *McDougall, Cape Breton*) 5354 (iii).
BOISVERT, GEO., APPMNT. AS FISHERY OFFICER, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Leduc*) 2935 (ii).

FISHERIES—*Continued.*

BOUNTIES, FISHERY, PAID IN GUYSBOROUGH Co. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Fraser*) 232 (i).

—— PAID IN QUEEN'S Co., N.S. : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 734 (i).

BOUNTY CLAIMS BY PROVINCES, &C. : M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Flint*) 537 (i).

—— CHEQUES, DISTRIBUTION : Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 129 (i).

—— COSTS, &C., *re* DISTRIBUTION : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Flint*) 180 (i).

—— M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Flint*) 211 (i).

EEL FISHERY, RIMOUSKI, DESTRUCTION : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2907, 2913 (ii).

FINES FOR VIOLATING FISHERY LAWS : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Fraser*) 189 (i).

FISH-BREEDING : in Com. of Sup., 3529 (ii).

FISHERY LAWS, ENFORCEMENT : Remarks (Mr. *Lister*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1513 (i).

FISHERY INSPECTOR, DIST. No. 3, N.S., RESIGNATION : Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 130 (i).

FISHERY OVERSEER, GUYSBOROUGH, SALARY PAID : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 5403 (iii)

LAKE ST. PETER FISHING DIVISION : Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2148 (ii).

LAVALLÉE, N., FISHERY OVERSEER, APPOINTMENT : Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2145, 2148 (ii).

LICENSES, BONAVENTURE Co. : Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 2152 (ii).

—— CONTINUATION OF SYSTEM : Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 143 (i).

—— GRAND RIVER : Ques. (Mr. *Brown, Monck*) 709.

—— GRANTED IN QUEBEC : M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 145 (i).

—— POUND NETS : Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 142, 198, 223, 529 (i).

—— RESTIGOUCHE RIVER : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 3283 (ii).

FISHERY PROTECTION, CAPE BRETON : Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 527 (i).

—— GEORGIAN BAY : Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 220(i).

—— SUPPLIES : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Somerville*) 544.

—— Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 221 (i).

—— WARDENS, P.E.I. : Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3958 (ii).

—— APPOINTMENTS : Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 5409 (iii).

FISH, FOREIGN, REGULATIONS *re* BONDING : Ques. (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 1265 (i).

FITZGERALD, FISHERY OFFICER, PETERBOROUGH Co. : ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 5405 (iii).

MCLEOD, MR., CHARGES AGAINST : Remarks (Mr. *Fraser*) 2171, 2289 (ii).

OYSTER BEDS, LEASING, P.E.I. : Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3958 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 4157 (ii).

ROULEAU, F. F., FISHING RIGHTS : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Choquette*) 2936 (ii).

SALMON NET FISHING ON RESTIGOUCHE : Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 1268 (i).

[*See* "NEWFOUNDLAND," "SUPPLY," &c.]

Fisheries Act Amt. B. No. 122 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°*, 1483 (i) ; 2°* and in Com., 3157 ; 3° m., 3237 ; 3° on a div., 3242 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 43.)

FISHERIES DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 255, 1547 (i).

Fisheries Development. *See* "SEA FISHERIES."

FISHERIES INSPECTORS' REPS. : Presented (Mr. *Chapleau*) 738 (i).

FISHERIES : in Com. of Sup., 3514 (ii), 6268 (iii).

Fishermen's Safety B. No. 114 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°*, 1406 (i).

Fishing Vessels. *See* "U. S."

FITZGERALD, G. W., FISHERY OFFICER, PETERBOROUGH Co. : Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 5405 (iii).

Foreshores. *See* "PROVINCIAL GOVTS., B. III."

FORESHORES, &C., OF THE DOM., OWNERSHIP : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Flint*) 178.

FORT ERIE AND BUFFALO FERRY : Ques. (Mr. *German*) 1768 (i).

FOWL, WILD, PROHIBITION OF EXPORT : Ques. (Mr. *McKay*) 1769 (i).

FOX, SIR DOUGLAS, ESTIMATES *re* SUBMARINE TUNNEL : Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 208 (i).

FRANCHISE ACT, 1885 : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 961, 1267 (i).

Franchise Act (*Chap.* 5 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 4** (Mr. *Edgar*). 1°, 105 ; 2° m., 767 ; Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m.h., 769 ; agreed to (Y. 109, N. 77) 798 (i).

Deb. on Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 771 ; (Mr. *Watson*) 774 ; (Mr. *Tupper*) 775 ; (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 776 ; (Mr. *Cockburn*) 777 ; (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 778 ; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 779 ; (Mr. *Denison*) 781 ; (Mr. *Landerkin*) 781 ; (Mr. *Davin*) 783 ; (Mr. *Choquette*) 785 ; (Mr. *Sproule*) 787 ; (Mr. *Dupont*) 788 ; (Mr. *Brodeur*) 791 ; (Mr. *Amyot*) 792 ; (Mr. *Edgar*) 795 (i).

Franchise Act (*Chap.* 5 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 8** (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*). 1°, 106 ; Order for 2°, 206 ; 2° m, 295 ; Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m.h., 305 ; agreed to (Y. 112, N. 85) 330 ; 2° neg. (Y. 113, N. 84) 332 (i).

Franchise Act (*Chap.* 5 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 31** (Mr. *Charlton*). 1°*, 156 ; 2° m., 999 ; Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 3 m. h., 1001 ; agreed to, 1003 (i).

Franchise Act Amt. B. No. 59 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*). 1°, 334 ; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 1041 (i) ; Order for Com. dschgd., 2936 (ii).

Franchise Act Amt. B. No. 98 (Mr. *Barron*) 1°, 738 (i).

Franchise Act Amt. B. No. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 2336 ; 2°* and in Com., 3082 ; 3°*, 3098 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 18.)

FRANKUM, J., PENSION : in Com. of Sup., 1729 (i).

FRASER RIVER : in Com. of Sup., 4594 (iii).

FRASERVILLE P. O., CONTRACTOR'S NAME, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 3255 (ii).

Frauds on Farmers Prevention B. No. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*). 1°*, 206 ; 2°, 1003 ; Order for Com. read, 1014 ; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 1041 ; in Com., 1972 (i).

Frauds upon the Government B. No. 172 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 5589 ; 2°, 5751 ; in Com., 6289, 6327 ; 3°*, 6327 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 23.)

Fraudulent Marking Prevention B. No. 140 (Mr. *Costigan*). 1°, 2144 ; 2°* and in Com., 3583 ; 3°*, 3646 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 32.)

FRENCH LANGUAGE IN MAN., ABOLITION: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 114 (i).
FULLERTON, AUGUSTUS, SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 270 (i).
GALOPS CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 4107 (i).
GALT POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Semple*) 1263 (i).
GALT P. O., CONTRACTOR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 225 (i).
GALWAY P.O., ESTABLISHMENT: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barron*) 736 (i).
GARRISON CLUB, QUEBEC, LANDS LEASED: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 527 (i).
GAS, ELECTRIC LIGHT, &C., OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 4512 (iii).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 163 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 3983 (ii); 2°* and in Com., 4300; 3°*, 4307 (iii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 48.)
GENEST, SAMUEL, RESIGNATION, &C.: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Devlin*) 145 (i).
GEOLOGICAL MAPS, MARITIME PROVINCES: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1101 (i).
—— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Dewdney*) 103 (i).
—— EASTERN TOWNSHIPS: Ques. (Mr. *Fréchette*) 198
—— EXPENDITURE IN FIELD WORK: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McLeod*) 544 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 410 (i), 4725; conc., 5411 (iii).
GEORGIAN BAY, FISHERY PROTECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 220 (i).
—— REMOVAL OF ROCKS: in Com. of Sup., 4574.
GIGUERE, CAPT. CLAUDE, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1266 (i).
GLIDDON, WM., SPECIAL SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 1705 (i.)
GOODWIN, LATE JAS., CLAIMS OF HEIRS: in Com. of Sup., 6198, 6296 (iii).
GOVT. BUSINESS: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) precedence on Thursdays, 1064 (i).
—— M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) Wednesdays, 1730.
—— Ms. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) Mondays, 2668, 3576 (ii).
—— M. (Sir *John Thompson*) Saturday sittings, 6127 (iii).
GOVT., FORMATION AFTER SIR JOHN MACDONALD'S DEATH: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1578 (i).
GOVT. OFFICIALS AND RECENT ELECTIONS: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Allan*) 1580 (i).
GOVT. OF N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 1709 (i), 5066, 5424, 6276 (iii).
Govt. Piers. *See* "HARBOURS."
GOVT. POLICY: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. House, 1105; neg. (Y. 83, N. 103) 1198 (i).
Deb. (Sir *John Thompson*) 1113; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1120; (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1126; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1128; (Mr. *Tupper*) 1131; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 1135; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1136; (Mr. *Cockburn*) 1142; (Mr. *Edgar*) 1145; (Mr. *Hazen*) 1150; (Mr. *Fraser*) 1159; (Mr. *Kenny*) 1162; (Mr. *Amyot*) 1166; (Mr. *Haggart*) 1172; (Mr. *Devlin*) 1174; (Mr. *Costigan*) 1176; (Mr. *Lister*) 1180; (Mr. *Curran*) 1183; (Mr. *Sproule*) 1187; (Mr. *Skinner*) 1191; (Mr. *Daly*) 1192; (Mr. *Montague*) 1194; (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 1195; (Mr. *Savard*) 1196 (i).
GOVT. POLICY: Ans. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 959, 1013 (i).
GOVT. SAVINGS BANKS, DEPOSITS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 202, 210 (i).
GOVT. STEAMERS: in Com. of Sup., 3513 (ii).
GOV. GEN'S SECRETARY'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 240, 433 (i).
—— WARRANTS, DETAILS OF EXPENDITURE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mulock*) 232 (i).
—— Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 103 (i).
—— Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4467; Amt., 4537; neg. (Y. 82, N. 97) 4551 (ii).
GRAHAM, J. R., DISMISSAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Barron*) 210 (i).
—— Enquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Barron*) 3200 (ii).
Grain. *See* "WEIGHERS."
GRAND NARROWS BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 1658 (i).
GRAND RIVER FISHING LICENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Brown, Monck*) 709 (i).
—— IRON BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 4606 (iii).
—— NAVIGATION, ENGINEER'S REPS.: M. for copies (Mr. *Montague*) 2155 (ii).
GRAND MANAN, N.B., AND MAINLAND SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 4678 (iii).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. No. 36 (Mr. *Tisdale*). 1°*, 206; 2°*, 294; in Com. and 3°*, 1087 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 69.)
GRANITE, SCOTCH, INCREASE OF DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 335 (i).
GRANT, J. J., ENTRY FOR DOM. LANDS, N.W.T.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Davin*) 3635 (ii).
GRAVING DOCKS. *See* "ESQUIMALT," "LÉVIS" AND "KINGSTON."
GREAT BRITAIN AND CAN. MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1765 (i).
Great Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B No. 124 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 1574; 2°*, 1757 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2174 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 98.)
GREAT EASTERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033; in Com., 6138 (iii).
GREAT NORTHERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6032; in Com., 6136 (iii).
Great North-West Central Ry. Co.'s Correction B. No. 162 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 3950 (ii); 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4307 (iii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 80.)
GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY., ENGINEER'S CERTIFICATES: Ques. (Mr. *Daly*) 2144 (i).
GRENVILLE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 4141 (ii), 6198(iii).
GROSSE ISLAND QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 4332 (iii).
Guelph Junction Ry. *See* "C.P.R."
GUÉVREMONT, HON. SENATOR, PURCHASE OF LAND FROM: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 4671 (iii).
GUYSBOROUGH CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2520 (ii).
—— FISHERY OVERSEER, SALARY PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 5403 (iii).
HARAS NATIONAL CO.: in Com. of Sup., 6179 (iii).
HALIFAX COUNTY COURT JUDGE, INCREASE OF SALARY: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2547 (ii).

HALIFAX SUFFERANCE WAREHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 3894 (ii).
HALL, W. H., CLAIM: in Com. of Sup., 4151 (ii).
HALTON CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judgment, 5 (i).
HAMILTON P. O., ADDITIONAL CARRIERS: in Com. of Sup., 6279 (iii).
HARBOURS AND BREAKWATERS, P.E.I., IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 226 (i).
HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS (QUE.), INTEREST OWING GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 270 (i).
——— *See* "QUEBEC."
HARBOURS, DOCKS AND SLIDES, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 4665 (iii).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1687 (i), 4530, 4552, 4954, 5438, 6254 (iii).
Harbours, Piers and Breakwaters (Govt.) Act Amt. B. No. 115 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°*, 1263 (i); 2° and in Com., 3104; 3°*, 3105 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 52.)
HARPUR, H. G., PENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1572 (i).
HARTLEY, H. E., DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Christie*) 144 (i).
HARTNEY, H., Commissioner to administer Oaths, 1.
HASTING COUNTY MAIL SERVICE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Burdett*) 212 (i).
——— PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Burdett*) 208 (i).
HEARN, J. G., EMPLYMT. BY MILITIA DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Mousseau*) 5078 (iii).
HEATING BUILDINGS, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 4474.
HELBRONNER, JULES, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT., PAYMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 5407 (iii).
HERCHMER, L. W., REP. OF DEPT. *re* ENQUIRY: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 267, 1574 (i).
——— COMPT. WHITE'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2669 (ii).
——— ENQUIRY INTO CONDUCT: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 2913; wthdn., 2923 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) *re* Res., 711 (i).
HERCHMER, LIEUT.-COL. WM., LETTER FROM C. E. D. WOOD: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 4292 (iii).
HIGH COMMISSIONER AND LATE ELECTIONS: Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 570; deb. rsmd., 636, 807; neg. (Y. 79, N. 100) 880 (i).
Deb. (Sir *John Thompson*) 573; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 579; (Mr. *Mackintosh*) 589; (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 636; (Mr. *Davin*) 646; (Mr. *Mulock*) 653; (Mr. *Tupper*) 659; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 682; (Mr. *Dickey*) 690; (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 698; (Mr. *Charlton*) 808; (Mr. *Kenny*) 817; (Mr. *Fraser*) 828; (Mr. *Gillies*) 842; (Mr. *Langelier*) 848; (Mr. *Tisdale*) 851; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 851; (Mr. *Skinner*) 861; (Mr. *Flint*) 867; (Mr, *Dupont*) 876 (i).
——— AND IMPERIAL FEDERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 2153 (ii).
——— OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 411, 431, 1555, 1732 (i), 6167 (iii).
——— REP.: Presented (Mr. *Haggart*) 104 (i).
——— SUMS PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 176, 223.
HOLSTEIN POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1766, 1929 (i).
Home Circles. *See* "CANADIAN ORDER."
HOMESTEAD INSPECTOR'S SALARIES: conc., 5433 (iii).
HOMESTEADS (SECOND) N. W. T.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 606; M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to adjn. deb. agreed to (Y. 87, N. 73) 629 (i).
——— deb. rsmd. and M. wthdn., 3302 (ii).
HORSES, CENTRAL EXPERIMENTAL FARM: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *McMillan*) 1579 (i), 3200 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 739 (i).
HOUSE OF COMMONS:
ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH: moved (Mr. *Hazen*) 8; seconded (Mr. *Corbould*) 17 (i).
ADDRESS TO HER MAJESTY, ACKNOWLEDGMENT: Mess. from His Ex., 227 (i).
ARNOLDI, J. R., REP. *re* BALLOT BOXES: M. for copy (Mr. *Landerkin*) 201 (i).
BILLS, ROYAL ASSENT, 1434, 2076 (i), 3238 (ii), 4613, 6329 (iii).
BILLS, DELAY IN PRINTING: Remarks (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 238 (i).
BOURINOT, J. G.: Commissioner to administer Oaths, 1 (i).
CHAPLEAU, ST. O.: Clerk of Crown in Chancery, 1 (i),
CHICOUTIMI, REPRESENTATION, RET. OFFICER'S REP.: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 7 (i).
COMMITTEES. *See* general heading.
IN COM. OF SUP., 941, 1559, 1734 (i), 6172 (ii).
CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS (HALTON): Judgment 5 (i).
DEBATES, OFFICIAL REP. *See* "COMMITTEES."
DIVISIONS, MEMBERS VOTES: (Mr. *Speaker's* ruling), 4455 (iii).
GOVT. BUSINESS: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) precedence on Mondays, 2668, 3576 (ii).
——— M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) precedence on Wednesdays, 1730 (i).
——— M. (Sir *John Thompson*) Saturday Sittings 6127 (iii).
——— M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) precedence on Thursdays, 1064 (i).
——— Remarks (Sir *John Thompson*) 711 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*, &c.) 109 (i).
GOVT. POLICY: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1105; neg. (Y. 83, N. 103) 1198 (i).
——— Ans. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1013 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 959 (i).
HALTON CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judgment, 5 (i).
HARTNEY, H.: Commissioner to administer Oaths, 1.
INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION: Mess. from His Ex., presented (Sir *John Macdonald*) 111 (i).
——— Mess. from His Ex., presented (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 2144 (ii).
MACDONALD, SIR JOHN: Illness announced (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 599 (i).
——— Bulletin read (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 707 (i).
——— DECEASE, PUBLIC FUNERAL: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1883 (i).
——— DRAPING CHAMBER: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 883 (i).
MACDONELL, D. W.: Commissioner to administer Oaths, 1 (i).
MEMBER, NEW: Savard, Mr. Paul V., 7 (i).
MESS. FROM HIS EX., 111, 227, 550, 1199 (i), 2144 (ii), 5589 (iii).
MILEAGE, MEMBERS. *See* "SENATE."
MINISTERIAL EXPLANATION: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 237 (i).
MINISTRY, NEW: Stmnt. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 891.
GOVERNMENT, FORMATION AFTER SIR JOHN MACDONALD'S DEATH: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1578 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Continued.*
MOTIONS ALLOWED TO STAND: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1932 (ii).
MOTIONS, PRIVATE MEMBERS: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 127 (i).
NORTHUMBERLAND, EAST. *See* general heading.
ORDER, QUES. OF. *See* "ORDER."
PAIRING OF MEMBERS: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor, &c.*) 331, 386, 631, 742, 800, 1199 (i), 3226 (ii), 4488 (iii).
PARLIAMENT, 7th: Opening, 1 (i); Prorogation, 6329,
PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS: 1543, 1991 (i), 2204, 2936, 2964, 3427, 3822, 3947 (ii), 5331 (iii). *See* "ORDER."
PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS. *See* general heading.
PRIVILEGE. *See* "ORDER," &c.
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COM. *See* general heading.
QUEBEC, WEST. *See* general heading.
ROULEAU, F. F.; Commissioner to administer Oaths, 1 (i).
SAVARD, MR. PAUL V., MEMBER FOR CHICOUTIMI; Notification of Ret. (Mr. *Speaker*) 7 (i).
SELECT STANDING COMS. *See* "COMMITTEES."
SENATORS AND MEMBERS, INDEMNITY: M. (Mr. *Foster*) 6290 (iii).
SENÉCAL, ANDRÉ: M. (Mr. *Lister*) Ordering attendance at Bar of Hse., 4533 (iii).
—— Order for attendance before Bar read, 4747 (iii).
SERJEANT-AT-ARMS, DEP.: Appmnt. announced (Mr. *Speaker*) 3995 (ii).
SESSIONAL CLERKS EMPLOYED BY HOUSE: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Joncas*) 544 (i).
SPEAKER, ELECTION: M. (Sir *John Macdonald*) 1 (i).
—— DEPUTY, ELECTION: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 388 (i).
SPEECH FROM THE THRONE: Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 5 (i).
—— DOCUMENTS MENTIONED: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 157 (i),
—— Prorogation, 6330 (iii).
TESTIMONIALS TO MINISTERS: on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3827 (ii).
VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS, TRANSLATION: Remarks (Mr. *Lavergne*) 199, 391 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Chapleau*) 389 (i).
WHITE, PETER, ESQ., ELECTION AS SPEAKER: M. (Sir *John Macdonald*) 1 (i).
[*See* "SECRETARY OF STATE," "SUPPLY," &c.]
HULL P. O. CLOCK: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 222 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 1685 (i).
HURTEAU, MR. HILAIRE, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 529 (i).
ILLEGAL CUSTOMS SEIZURES: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2520 (ii).
IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup.
Deb. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 5224; (Mr. *Davin*) 5224; (Mr. *Fraser*) 5229; (Mr. *Tisdale*) 5236; (Mr. *Armstrong*) 5240; (Mr. *Sproule*) 5245; (Mr. *Dawson*) 5249; (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 5251; (Mr. *Skinner*) 5256; (Mr. *Watson*) 5259; (Mr. *Ingram*) 5264; (Mr. *Gillmor*) 5265; (Mr. *Hazen*) 5271; (Mr. *King*) 5277; (Mr. *Macdonald, Winnipeg*) 5280; (Mr. *Forbes*) 5283 (iii).
IMMIGRATION AGENT SHEPPARD: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1266 (i).
—— EMPLYMT. OF MR. HURTEAU: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 529 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 3579, 4800, 5224; conc., 4514.
IMMIGRATION, TOTAL NUMBER DURING DECADE: Ques. *Amyot*) 5075 (i).
—— INTO N.W.T., MEMORIAL OF LEG. ASSEMBLY: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1269 (i).
IMPERIAL FEDERATION AND HIGH COMMISSIONER: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 2153 (ii).
IMPERIAL POSTAL UNION: Ques. (Mr. *Denison*) 131.
Incorporated Construction Co.'s incorp. B. No. 128 (Mr. *Wallace*). 1°*, 1927 (i); 2°*, 2097; in Com. and 3°*, 2321 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 127.)
Indian Act (*Chap.* 43 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No 144** (Mr. *Dewdney*). 1°, 2203; 2°* and in Com., 3590; 3°*, 3593 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 30.)
Indian Lands Settlement B. No. 100 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 807; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1087 (i). (54-55 *Vic. c.* 5.)
INDIANTOWN BRANCH, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 3884 (ii).
INDIANS:
ALLEN, INDIAN AGENT, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1264, 1272 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1298, 1928 (i).
ANTIGONISH AND GUYSBOROUGH INDIANS: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 224 (i).
BRUCE COUNTY INDIANS, SALE OF LIQUOR TO: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 270, 530 (i).
—— LIST OF CHARGES: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1272 (i).
CHIPPEWA INDIANS, LETTER TO SIR JOHN MACDONALD *re* IRREGULARITIES: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3264 (ii).
CHISHOLM, INDIAN AGENT: Remarks (Mr. *Flint*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 6147 (iii).
DINGMAN, INDIAN INSPECTOR, ENQUIRY *re* AGENT ALLEN: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1766 (i).
INDIAN AFFAIRS MANAGEMENT: Remarks (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1484 (i).
—— REP.: Presented (Mr. *Dewdney*) 103 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 1694 (i), 4727, 5059, 6272; conc., 4515, 5411, 5419 (iii).
JONES, INDIAN AGENT, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4673 (iii).
LIQUOR SALES TO INDIANS: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 270, 530, 1264 (i).
PAPASHASE INDIAN RESERVE: Remarks (Mr. *Watson, &c.*) on adjnmt., 1403 i).
PASPASCKASE INDIAN RESERVE, SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 3265 (ii).
REGINA, INDIAN DEPTL. ESTIMATES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 2935 (ii).
RESERVE NO. 6, TIMBER CUT: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 111 (i).
SEA BIRD ISLAND INDIAN RESERVATION: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 709 (i).
SHAWANAKISKIC INDIANS, BOUNTY UNDER TREATY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 209 (i).
SUTTON, WEST, INDIAN AGENT: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 961 (i).
—— COST OF INVESTIGATION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mulock*) 145 (i).
SUPPLIES, &c., PURCHASED FOR INDIANS IN N.S.: M. for List, &c.* (Mr. *Fraser*) 232 (i).
[*See* "SUPPLY," &C.]
Industrial Designs. *See* "TRADE MARKS."

INGLIS, BANDMASTER, 69TH BATT. : Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 268 (i).

Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. No. 116 (Mr. *Costigan*). Res. prop., 1221; in Com., 1253 (i), 4001 (ii); conc. in and ref. to Com. on B., 4299 (iii); 1°* of B., 1345 (i); 2°* and in Com., 3242, 3579; Order for 3° dschgd., 4008 (ii); again in Com., 4299; 3°*, 4465 (iii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 46.)

INLAND REVENUE :

ANALYST, DOM., OCCUPATION OF BUILDING : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2518 (ii).

CIGARS AND TOBACCO, LAW *re* CULTIVATORS : Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 194 (i).

DEPTL. REP. : Presented (Mr. *Costigan*) 103 (i).

DUGUAY, JOSEPH, EMPLYMT. AS EXCISEMAN : Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 3254 (ii).

INLAND REVENUE REGULATIONS : Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 194; in Com. of Sup., 252 (i).

NAPANEE GAS INSPECTOR, APPOINTMENT : Ques. (Mr. *Allison*) 5076 (iii).

STRATFORD EXCISE COLLECTOR : Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 5078 (iii).

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES FEES : Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 194 (i).

[*See* "COLLECTION OF REVENUES" under "SUPPLY."]

INSPECTORS OF PORTS : in Com. of Sup., 5052; conc., 5418 (iii).

Inspection. *See* "GENERAL," "PETROLEUM," "SHIPS," &c.

INSPECTION OF STAPLES : in Com. of Sup., 5165 (iii).

I. C. R. B. 105 (Mr. *Bowell*). 1°, 959; 2° m., 1256; 2° and in Com., 1260 (i); 3°*, 3130 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 50.)

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY :

CARON, MISS LEA, CLAIMS : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 209 (i).

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES : Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1770 (i).

CONTRACT FOR REFRESHMENTS : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 3617 (ii).

EMPLOYÉS, ENQUIRY AT ST. FLAVIE : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1937. (i).

HOGG, WALTER : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 5407 (iii).

HALIFAX, INCREASED RY. ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 3857 (ii).

IN COM. OF SUP., 1653, 1758 (i), 3857, 4057 (ii), 6197 (iii).

LANGEVIN BLOCK, STONE HAULAGE : Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1768 (i)).

MCCULLY, S. W., EMPLYMT. : Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3613 (ii).

MANAGEMENT ; Remarks (Messrs. *Weldon*, Sir *John Thompson*, &c.) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3780 (ii).

RATES FOR CLERGYMEN : Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 3261.

REDUCTION OF LABOURERS' PAY : Ques. (Mr. *Hazen*) 3266 (ii).

ST. JOHN, ADDITIONAL PROPERTY : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1578 (i).

ST. JOSEPH DE LÉVIS, ACCIDENT : Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 2145 (ii).

TRANS-CONTINENTAL MAIL SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 6216 (iii).

[*See* "RYS.," "SUPPLY," &c.]

INTEREST, COMPUTING : in Com. of Sup., 432 (i).

—— 1 PER CENT. COMMISSION : in Com. of Sup., 1748 (i).

—— ON DEPOSITS IN P. O. SAVINGS BANKS : Ques. (Mr. *Christie*) 1577 (i).

INTERIOR :

AMBER DEPOSITS IN N. W., APPLICATIONS : Ques. (Mr. *Bain*) 2518 (ii).

BANFF SPRINGS PARK AND RESERVE, TOTAL COST : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3957 (ii).

COCKBURN ISLAND LOCATION TICKETS : Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1271 (i).

DEPTL. REP. : Presented (Mr. *Devdney*) 103 (i).

HOMESTEADS (SECOND) N. W. T. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 606; M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to adjn. deb., 629 (i); deb. rsmd. and M. wthdn., 3302.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEYS, EASTERN TOWNSHIPS : Ques. (Mr. *Fréchette*) 193 (i).

—— EXPENDITURE IN FIELD WORK : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McLeod*) 544 (i).

—— MAPS, MARITIME PROVINCES : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1101 (i).

GRANT, J. J., ENTRY FOR DOM. LANDS, N.W.T. : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Davin*) 3635 (ii).

IN COM. OF SUP., 247, 433 (i), 6169 (iii).

MANITOBA SCHOOL LANDS : Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 1766 (i).

MENNONITE RESERVE, MAN. : Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 198 (i).

N. W. T. SETTLEMENT, prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) wthdn., 2913 (ii).

ORDNANCE LANDS, MONTREAL CITY, LEASES : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 5409 (iii).

—— RIDEAU CANAL, SALE : Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 5408 (iii).

QUEBEC GARRISON CLUB, LANDS LEASED : Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 527 (i).

RAILWAY LANDS, VANCOUVER ISLAND, REPS. : M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 1051 (i).

RED RIVER SURVEYS, COST : Ques. (Mr. *Ross, Lisgar*) 1012 (i),

SCHOOL LANDS, MAN., SALES : Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 1766 (i).

TIMBER CUT ON INDIAN RESERVE NO. 6 : Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 111 (i).

—— CUT IN DISPUTED TERRITORY ; M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barron*) 128 (i).

VANCOUVER ISLAND RY. RESERVE, REPS., &C. : M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 1051 (i).

[*See* "INDIANS," "SUPPLY," &c.]

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION : Mess. from His Ex. : Presented (Sir *John Macdonald*) 111 (i).

—— Mess. from His Ex. : Presented (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 2144 (ii).

INTERNATIONAL ABATTOIR CO. : Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 3615 (ii).

INTOXICATING LIQUORS, ANALYSIS : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Curran*) 203 (i).

—— INTO QUEBEC : M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Delisle*) 1062 (i).

—— LEGISLATION *re* WHOLESALE SALE : Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 961 (i).

—— SALE TO INDIANS : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 270, 530 (i).

INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*) 2522 (ii).

—— SUBSIDY : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2911 (ii).

Inverness and Victoria Ry. and Mining Co.'s incorp. B. No. 136 (Mr. *Wilmot*). 1°*, 1989 (i); 2°*, 2321; M. for Com., 2858; in Com. and 3°*, 2859 (ii).

IRON BOUNTIES PAID: Enquiry for Ret. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2580, 2668 (ii).
ISLE VERTE P.O., CAOUETTE'S ENQUIRY *re* LOSS OF LETTERS, &c.: M. for Rep.* (Mr. *Amyot*) 544 (i).
ISLE BIZARD BRIDGE: Remarks (Mr. *Brodeur*) 5014, 5195 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 4674 (iii).
JAMAICA EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 1568 (i).
JENNINGS, MR., APPOINTMENT BY GOVT. AS CHIEF ENGINEER: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*, *Bothwell*) 2522 (ii).
JOCKES AND DELORIMIER, ARREARS OF ROYALTY: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 5076 (iii).
JOHNSTON, S., DISMISSAL FROM CUSTOMS SERVICE: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *German*) 2935 (ii).
JONES, W. E., CENSUS COMMISSIONER FOR QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 1274 (i).
JUDGES IN PROVINCE OF QUEBEC, APPOINTMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 5076, 5405 (iii).
——— MONTREAL DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 2908.
——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 511 (i).
——— *See* "QUEEN'S BENCH."
Judges. *See* "PROVINCIAL COURTS."
JUSTICE, ADMINISTRATION OF: in Com. of Sup., 506, 1556 (i), 6169; conc., 6303 (iii).
JUSTICE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 241, 433, 1547 (i).
Justice. *See* "ADMINISTRATION."
JUSTICE:
ADMIRALTY COURTS, PROCLAMATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 5776 (iii).
BREMNER'S CLAIM FOR FURS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1268 (i).
CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS, TIME LIMIT: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 112 (i).
COUNSEL, TARTE-MCGREEVY ENQUIRY: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1575, 1930 (i).
CRIMINAL LAW BILL, PAYMENT FOR DRAFTING: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 3260 (ii).
DISALLOWANCE OF MAN. ACT *re* INSTITUTIONS, &C., TRANSACTING BUSINESS: M. for Papers, &c.* (Mr. *Watson*) 544 (i).
——— ACT *re* DISEASES OF ANIMALS: M. for Papers, &c.* (Mr. *Watson*) 545 (i).
——— PROVINCIAL ACTS: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 6296 (iii).
DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY SUPPLIES, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1928 (i).
HALIFAX COUNTY COURT JUDGE, INCREASE OF SALARY: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2547 (ii).
JUDGES, MONTREAL DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 2908 (ii).
——— IN PROV. OF QUEBEC, SALARIES AND APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 5405 (iii).
——— APPOINTMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 5076 (iii).
LAMONTAGNE, LÉDA, PETS. *re* DISCHARGE: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2907 (ii).
——— EXTRADITION: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3619 (ii).
LEGAL SERVICES, PAYMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 2907 (ii).
MAN. SCHOOL QUESTION: Remarks (Mr. *Devlin*) 807.
NEWFOUNDLAND BAIT ACT. *See* general heading.
PROVINCIAL ACTS, TESTING VALIDITY: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 112 (i).
QUEEN'S BENCH, QUEBEC, DEATH OF CHIEF JUSTICE: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 3620 (ii), 5405 (iii).
JUSTICE—*Continued.*
QUEEN'S BENCH: Remarks (Mr. *Langelier*) 5195 (iii).
QUEEN'S COUNSEL, CONFERRING TITLE; Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 3263 (ii).
ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY, SUPPLIES: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 2912 (ii).
SCHOOL ACTS OF MAN.: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Devlin*) 116 (i).
SEPARATE SCHOOLS IN MAN., ABOLITION: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 115 (i).
[*See* "SUPPLY," &c.]
KAMINISTIQUIA HARBOUR, RETURN *re* DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 600 (i).
——— PAYMENTS FOR DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 1267 (i).
——— TENDERS FOR DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 129 (i).
——— TURNING BASIN: in Com. of Sup., 4523 (iii).
KEEWATIN, GOVT. OF, EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 5084 (iii).
"KEEWATIN," POLICE PATROL BOAT: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 4294 (iii).
KENTVILLE, N.S., POSTMASTER, SUSPENSION: Ques: (Mr. *Borden*) 221 (i).
KILTED BATTALION, TORONTO: in Com. of Sup., 6182.
Kingston and Pontiac Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 89 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°ˣ, 548; 2°*, 601; in Com. and 3°*, 1604 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 66.)
KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK, ORIGINAL PLAN: M. for copy* (Mr. *Amyot*) 1579 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 1669 (i).
——— Notice of prop. Res. (Mr. *Tarte*) 635 (i).
——— PAPERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1764 (i).
——— Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1848 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Amyot*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3653 (ii).
——— TENDERS, &C.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Tarte*) 128.
——— *See* "PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS."
——— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 4559 (iii).
——— MILLS, SURVEY ABOVE: in Com. of Sup., 1666.
——— PENITENTIARY, COAL SUPPLY: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*, *Huron*) 3260 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 882, 908 (i).
——— *See* "PUBLIC WORKS DEPT."
KINGSTON, P. O., LESSEE OF BOX 524: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 962, 1266 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1578 (i).
——— REP. OF POSTMASTER, &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Amyot*) 2545 (ii).
Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s B. No. 94 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 549; 2°*, 601; in Com. and 3°*, 1604 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 95.)
——— SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033 (iii).
KNOWLTON'S LANDING, CONSTRUCTION OF WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 1770 (i).
LABERGE, MR., ASST. POSTMASTER, QUE.: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 3954 (ii).
LABORATORY, CUSTOMS: in Com. of Sup., 5054 (iii).
LABOUR, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Mc Mullen*) 4674 (iii).
Labour Prohibition. *See* "ALIEN."

LABOUR STATISTICAL BUREAU, ESTABLISHMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 3615 (ii).
——— M. for Cor. (Mr. *Lépine*) 201 (i).
LACHINE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 4102 (ii).
——— SPECIFICATIONS, TENDERS, &c., *re* DRAIN: M. for copies (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 2157 (ii).
LACHINE P.O., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4332 (iii).
LACHANCE, CAPT., EXAMINATION: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2913 (ii).
LA HAVE RIVER, N.S. *See* "SAWDUST."
LAIDLOW, WM. (N.W.M.P.) RESIGNATION, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1048 (i).
Lake Erie, Essex and Detroit River Ry. Co.'s B. No. 60 (Mr. *Denison*). 1°*. 387; 2°*, 579; in Com. and 3°*, 1604 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 88.)
LAKEPORT HARBOUR OF REFUGE, CONSTRUCTION: M. for Pets. &c.* (Mr. *Hargraft*) 232 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Hargraft*) 207 (i).
LAKE ST. CLAIR, POUND NET LICENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 142, 198, 223 (i).
LAKE ST. PETER FISHING DIVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2148 (ii).
Lake Témiscamingue Colonization Ry. Co.'s B. No. 22 (Mr. *Trow*). 1°*, 155; 2°*, 214; in Com. and 3°*, 546 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 94.)
LAMONTAGNE, LÉDA, EXTRADITION: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3619 (ii).
——— PETS., *re* DISCHARGE: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2907 (ii).
LAMOUREAUX BROS.' CLAIM: in Com. of Sup., 4147.
Land Grants to Rys. Act Amt. B. No. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*). Res. prop., 1200 (i); in Com., 3138 (ii); recom., 4307; conc. in and 1°* of B., 4309; 2°, 4534; in Com., 4609, 5538; 3°*, 5590 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 9.)
Land Grants to Ry. Co.'s Authorization B. No. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*). Res. prop., 3308; in Com., 5487, 5593, 5607; conc. in and 1°* of B., 5727; 2° m., 6130; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 6134 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 10.)
Land Grants to Militia Provision B. No. 159 (Sir *Adolphe Caron*). Res. prop., 634 (i); in Com., 3105; conc. in and 1°* of B., 3582; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3902 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 13.)
LANDSLIDE AT QUEBEC: M. for O. C.'s, &c. (Mr. *Frémont*) 3621 (ii).
LANGEVIN BLOCK, DISTRIBUTION OF EVIDENCE: Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) 4000 (ii).
——— ADVTS. FOR TENDERS, &c.: M. for copies, &c. (Mr. *Mulock*) 531 (i).
——— TOTAL EXPENDITURE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1267, 1575 (i).
——— PAYMENTS TO SEPT. 1st, 1891: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 5776 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) on adjmnt., 737 (i).
——— STONE HAULED OVER I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1768 (i).
LANGEVIN, LAFORCE, CERTIFICATE AS C. E.: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 1769 (i).
LANGEVIN, LAFORCE, REPS. AGAINST CAPT. J. E. BERNIER: M. for copies* (Mr. *Delisle*) 2935 (ii).
——— SERVICES *re* LÉVIS GRAVING DOCK: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 2149 (ii).
LAPRAIRIE P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 4338 (iii).
L'ARDOISE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4530 (iii).
L'AVENIR BRANCH OF C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 197, 220 (i).
LARKIN, CONNOLLY & Co., *re* ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK: Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 270 (i).
——— *See* "PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS," &c.
LAVALLÉE, N., FISHING IN RICHELIEU COUNTY: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2145, 2148 (ii).
LEASE OF BUILDING, SPARKS ST.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2518 (ii).
LEATHER TRUNKS FOR MEMBERS: in Com. of Sup., 1562 (i).
"LE CANADA," ADVERTISING OTTAWA MAIL SERVICE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2540 (ii).
LEDUC, CHARLES, RESIGNATION, &c.: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Devlin*) 145 (i).
LEGAL SERVICES, PAYMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 2907.
LEGISLATION: in Com. of Sup., 941, 1559, 1734 (i), 6172 (iii).
LE LIÈVRE AND OTTAWA RIVERS, DEEPENING: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 2907 (ii).
LETHBRIDGE CUSTOM HOUSE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6248 (iii).
LETTER POSTAGE, CHANGE IN RATE: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 129 (i).
LETTERS, REGISTRATION FEE, REDUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 143 (i).
LÉVIS GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 1687 (i), 4552 (iii).
——— MANAGEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 2149 (ii).
——— *See* "PUBLIC WORKS DEPT."
LEWIS, LIEUT.-COL., VACANCY THROUGH DEATH: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Burnham*) 733 (i).
LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT, JOINT COM.: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 156 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 945 (i).
LICENSES (FISHING) CONTINUATION OF SYSTEM: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 143 (i).
——— GRANTED IN QUEBEC: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 145 (i).
——— RESTIGOUCHE RIVER: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 3283 (ii).
——— POUND NETS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 142, 198, 228, 529 (i).
——— SALMON FISHING, BONAVENTURE CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 2152 (ii).
LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3509 (ii), 6266 (iii).
"LILY," H.M.S., RESCUE OF CREW: M. for Papers, &c. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1059 (i).
LINDSAY P.O., CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 225 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, COMPLETION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 268 (i).
LIQUOR, ILLEGAL SEIZURE: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 208 741 (i), 2148 (ii).

LIQUOR PERMITS IN N.W.T., REPS., &c.: M. for copies, &c.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 545 (i).

LIQUOR SALES TO INDIANS: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 270, 530, 1264 (i).

LITIGATED MATTERS, COSTS: in Com. of Sup., 1707 (i), 5107 (iii).

LITTLE CURRENT IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 4573 (iii).

LITTLE NATION RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 6261 (iii).

LIVERPOOL AND ANNAPOLIS RY.: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 143 (i).

LIVERPOOL, N. S., P. O. ACCOMMODATION: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1768 (i).

LIVERPOOL OR LONDON AND ST. JOHN AND HALIFAX SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 4679 (iii).

Live Stock Shipping B. No. 154 (Mr. *Tupper*). Res. prop., 1200 (i); in Com., conc. in and 1°* of B., 3130; 2°, 3991; in Com., 3992; 3°*, 3995 (ii); Sen. Amt. conc. in, 4772 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 36.)

LIVE STOCK AND SUPPLIES: in Com. of Sup., 4738 (iii).

LOBO P.O., CHANGE OF POSTMASTER: M. for Pets.* (Mr. *Armstrong*) 1579 (i).

LOGAN'S FARM AND DESMARTEAU'S CLAIM, PET. OF RIGHT: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 2155 (ii).

London and Can. Loan and Agency Co.'s B. No. 27 (Mr. *Cockburn*). 1°*, 156; 2°, 190; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 114.)

London and Port Stanley Ry. Co.'s B. No. 63 (Mr. *Hyman*). 1°*, 387; 2°*, 547 (i).

London Life Ins. Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 135 (Mr. *Moncrieff*). 1°*, 1989 (i); 2°*, 2097; in Com. and 3°*, 2859 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 117.)

Lord's Day Observance B. No. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*). 1°, 104; 2°m., 747; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 766 (i); in Com., 2936; Order for Com. read, 3287 (ii).

LUNATICS IN KEEWATIN, SUPPORT: in Com. of Sup., 1709 (i), 5085 (iii).

LUNDY'S LANE, COMMEMORATION OF BATTLE: Ques. (Mr. *German*) 3618 (ii).

LUNENBURG P. O., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6201 (iii).

LYSTER, POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 3958 (ii).

MACDONALD, SIR JOHN: Illness announced (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 599 (i).

—— Bulletin read (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 707 (i).

—— DECEASE, PUBLIC FUNERAL: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 883 (i).

—— MONUMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 2148 (i).

MACDONELL, D. W.: Commissioner to Administer Oaths, 1 (i).

MACDONELL, MR., M.P., SESSIONAL INDEMNITY: in Com. of Sup., 6172 (iii).

MACKENZIE AND PEACE RIVERS INDIAN TREATY: in Com. of Sup., 1695 (i).

Macleod Irrigation Co.'s incorp. B. No. 52 (Mr. *Mara*). 1°*, 266; 2°*, 412 (i); in Com., 2097; 3°*, 2174 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 109.)

MACPHERSON, ADDISON, CLAIMS FOR LOSSES THROUGH REBELLION: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3257.

MCARTHUR, WM., APPOINTMENT AS MAIL CLERK: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 4671 (iii).

MCCORMICK, F. B., REMOVAL AND REINSTATEMENT: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Allan*) 1580, 1980 (i).

McKay Milling Co.'s incorp. B. No. 24 (Mr. *Mackintosh*). 1°*, 155; 2°*, 214; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 125.)

MCLEAN, ROGER & CO.'S CLAIM AGAINST GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 269 (i).

MCLEOD, MR., CHARGES AGAINST: Remarks (Mr. *Fraser*) 2171, 2289 (ii).

MCMAHON, CHAS. W., POSTMASTER AT KINMOUNT: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barron*) 736 (i).

MCRAE, JAMES, DISMISSAL AS PREVENTIVE OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 4672 (iii).

MAGDALEN ISLANDS SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 4678 (iii).

MAIL SUBSIDIES AND STEAMSHIP SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 4678, 5349, 5450 (iii).

MAJOR'S HILL PARK, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 4520 (iii).

Manitoba and Assiniboia Grand Junction Ry. Co's. incorp. B. No. 129 (Mr. *Davin*). 1°*, 1964 (i); 2°*, 2097; in Com. and 3°*, 2321 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 60.)

MAN. SOUTH-WESTERN COLONIZATION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 3308 (ii).

MANITOBA:

BRANDON "MAIL" IN PUBLIC DEPTS., NUMBER: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 3257 (ii).

DISALLOWANCE OF MAN. ACT *re* DISEASES OF ANIMALS: M. for Papers, &c.* (Mr. *Watson*) 545 (i).

—— ACT *re* INSTITUTIONS, &c., TRANSACTING BUSINESS: M. for Papers, &c.* (Mr. *Watson*) 544 (i).

FRENCH LANGUAGE IN MAN., ABOLITION: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 114 (i).

INSANE ASYLUM: in Com. of Sup., 5072 (iii).

MAN. SOUTH-WESTERN COLONIZATION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 3308 (ii).

MENNONITE RESERVE, MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 198 (i).

PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 913 (i), 6171 (iii).

PAPASHASE INDIAN RESERVE: Remarks (Mr. *Watson*) on adjnmt., 1403 (i).

PASPASCKASE INDIAN RESERVE, SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 3265 (ii).

RED RIVER SURVEYS, COST: Ques. (Mr. *Ross, Lisgar*) 1012 (i)

SCHOOL ACTS: M. for Pets., &c, (Mr. *Devlin*) 116 (i).

SCHOOL LANDS, SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 1766 (i).

SCHOOL QUESTION, PAPERS: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 741, 807 (i).

SEPARATE SCHOOLS, ABOLITION: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 115 (i).

—— M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Devlin*) 116 (i).

SOURIS BRANCH, C. P. R., O. C.'s GRANTING AID: M. for copies* (Mr. *Daly*) 1938 (i).

[*See* "INTERIOR," "PUB. WORKS," "SUPPLY."]

MAPLE SUGAR, BOUNTY ON PRODUCTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Godbout*) 1576 (i).

MAP OF DOM., HISTORICAL AND TOPOGRAPHICAL: in Com. of Sup., 6261 (ii).

"MARIE ELIZA," SCH., SEIZURE AND SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 710 (i).

"MARIE ELIZA," M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Langelier*) 1578 (i).
MARINE DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 255, 440 (i), 6166 (iii).
MARINE DEPTL. REP. : Presented (Mr. *Tupper*) 103.
MARINERS, RELIEF OF SICK AND DISTRESSED : Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2145 (ii).
MARITIME PROVINCES, GEOLOGICAL MAPS : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1011 (i).

Maritime Sulphite Fibre Co.'s B. No. 39 (Mr. *Tisdale*). 1°*, 206 ; 2°*, 220 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1434 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 124.)

MARINE :
"ALERT," STEAMER, APPOINTMENT OF CAPTAIN : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1769 (i).
—— EXAMINATION OF CAPTAIN : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2913 (ii).
—— EXAMINATION OF CAPT. BERNIER AS COMMANDER : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 3621 (ii).
"BLIZZARD," SCH., RESCUE OF CREW : Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 224 (i).
—— REWARDS : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Flint*) 735 (i).
DECK LOADS, REP. OF EVIDENCE : Presented (Mr. *Tupper*) 103 (i).
FORT ERIE AND BUFFALO FERRY : Ques. (Mr. *German*) 1768 (i).
GRAND RIVER NAVIGATION, ENGINEER'S REPS. : M. for copies (Mr. *Montague*) 2155 (ii).
LACHANCE, CAPT., EXAMINATION : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2913 (ii).
"LILLY" H.M.S., RESCUE OF CREW : M. for Papers, &c. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1059 (i).
"MARIE ELIZA," SCH., SEIZURE AND SALE : Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 710 (i).
—— M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Langelier*) 1578 (i).
MARINERS, RELIEF OF SICK AND DISTRESSED : Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2145 (ii).
"MERMERLY" BARQUE, WRECK, REWARDS TO CREW : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Fraser*) 712 (i).
MONTREAL PILOTS : Remarks (Mr. *Delisle*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 6144 (iii).
STE. CROIX LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, RESIGNATION : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 173 (i).
ST. LAWRENCE RIVER NAVIGATION, IMPROVMENT OF : Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 207 (i).
SAWDUST DEPOSITS IN LA HAVE RIVER : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 1942 (i), 2175 (ii).
"SEIGFREID," SCH., REWARDS TO CAPT., &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 224 (i).
—— M. for Cor. (Mr. *Flint*) 735 (i).
SHIPS' SAFETY, LEGISLATION RESPECTING : Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 218 (i).
SICK AND DISTRESSED MARINERS, REFIEF : Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2145 (ii).
"STANLEY," STR., TRIPS BETWEEN P.E.I. AND MAINLAND : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 158 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1929 (i).
STEAMBOAT INSPECTION, &C., &C., DEPTL. REP. : Presented (Mr. *Tupper*) 103 (i).
THURBER, LIEUT.-COL., RESIGNATION AS LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER : M. for O. C.'s (Mr. *Rinfret*) 173 (i).
[*See* "SUPPLY," &c.]

Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. No. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 140 ; 2°, 1066 ; in Com., 1067 (i), 3102 ; 3°*, 3104 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 41.)

MASTERS, C. H., DRAFTING CRIMINAL LAW, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1559 (i).
MASON, JNO., CARPENTER, SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 6279 (iii).
MAURICE, JOS. A., AND JULIE FOURNIER, CLAIMS, &C. : M. for copies (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 2174 (ii).
MEDICINE HAT IMMIGRANT BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 6249 (iii).

Medicine Hat Ry. and Coal Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 25 (Mr. *Daly*). 1°*, 155 ; 2°*, 189 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 79.)

MEMBER, NEW : Savard, Mr. Paul V., 7 (i).
MENNONITE RESERVE, MAN. : Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 198 (i).

Meridian Time. *See* "RECKONING."

MERCANTILE AGENCIES, LEGISLATION REGULATING : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 144 (i).
"MERMERLY" BARQUE, WRECK, REWARDS TO CREW : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Fraser*) 712 (i).

MESSAGES FROM HIS EX. :
CARLETON BRANCH RY., SALE, 550 (i).
ESTIMATES, THE, for 1891-92, 227 (i).
—— Suppl., 1890-91, 799 (i).
—— Suppl., 1891-92, 5589 (iii).
—— Further Suppl., 6289 (iii).
INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION, 111 (i)), 2144 (ii).
TRADE RELATIONS WITH U. S. AND NEWFOUNDLAND, 726, 1199 (i).

METEGHAN WHARF, REP. *re* REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 530 (i).
METAL PILLARS FOR PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1273 (i).
METHYLATED SPIRITS, COST OF SUPPLY : in Com. of Sup., 5138 (iii).
MILEAGE, MEMBERS. *See* "SENATE."

Militia Act Amt. B. No. 7 (Mr. *Mulock*). 1°, 106 (i).

Militia and Defence Act (*Chap.* 41 *Revised Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 174** (Sir *Adolphe Caron*). 1°, 6126 (iii).

MILITIA AND DEFENCE :
ADJUTANT GEN., DEP., MIL. DIST. NO. 11 : M. for Reps.* (Mr. *Prior*) 736 (i).
BEACON HILL PARK (B.C.), MAGAZINE, &C. : M. for Reps., &c.* (Mr. *Prior*) 736 (i).
BEAUDRY, LIEUT. COL. A., CANCELLATION OF COMMISSION : Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 1767 (i).
"C" BATTERY, SERVICES AT WELLINGTON, B.C. : M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Gordon*) 146 (i).
—— BARRACKS : M. for Reps.* (Mr. *Prior*) 736 (i).
CAMP AT ST. JOHN'S and SOREL, PAY ROLL : M. for copies* (Mr. *Lépine*) 1062 (i).
—— DISTRICT NO. 1 : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Hyman*) 231 (i).
—— DISTRICT NO. 7, SELECTION : Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 3264 (ii).
CAVALRY, 1ST REGT. : Ques. (Mr. *Hyman*) 198 (i).
—— SCHOOL, TORONTO : Ques. (Mr. *Denison*) 222 (i).
DEPTL. REP. : Presented (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 135 (i).
HEARN, J. G., EMPLYMT. BY MILITIA DEPT. : Ques. (Mr. *Mousseau*) 5078 (iii).
INGLIS, BANDMASTER, 69TH BATT : Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 268 (i).

MILITIA AND DEFENCE—*Continued.*
IN COM. OF SUP., 1573 (i), 3699, 3717, 4214, 4236 (ii), 6182, 6245 (iii).
LEWIS, LIEUT.-COL., VACANCY THROUGH DEATH: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Burnham*) 733 (i).
LUNDY'S LANE, COMMEMORATION OF BATTLE: Ques. (Mr. *German*) 3618 (ii).
MACPHERSON, ADDISON, CLAIMS FOR LOSSES THROUGH REBELLION: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3257.
MILITARY COLLEGE GRADUATES: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 3957 (ii).
—— CADETS ENTERED SINCE FOUNDATION: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 4297 (iii).
—— COMMISSIONS TO GRADUATES: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3960 (ii).
PAYMASTER, MIL. DISTS. NOS. 5 AND 6: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 707 (i).
PELLETIER, H. H., EMPLYMT. BY MILITIA DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 3258 (ii).
PENSIONS, PERMANENT CORPS, &c., SYSTEM: Ques. (Mr. *McLennan*) 2908 (ii).
PROPERTIES, CARE AND MAINTENANCE: in Com. of Sup., 3734 (ii).
REBELLION OF 1837-38, LAND GRANTS TO VOLUNTEERS: Ques. (Mr. *Allison*) 961 (i).
SADDLERY, 1ST REGT. OF CAVALRY: Ques. (Mr. *Hyman*) 198 (i).
SCHOOL OF INFANTRY, ST. JOHN, SURGEON: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 3620 (ii).
STORES: in Com. of Sup., 3717 (ii).
STRIKE IN OTTAWA AND VICINITY, CALLING OUT MILITIA: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 5555 (iii).
VETERANS OF 1837-38, RECOGNITION OF SERVICES: prop. Res. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 2923, 3287 (ii).
WELLINGTON, B.C., MILITARY AID TO CIVIL AUTHORITIES: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Gordon*) 146 (i).
—— PAYMENTS FOR ACTIVE SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 2146 (ii).
WHITMAN, CAPT. C. W. S., APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 268 (i).
WINNIPEG MILITARY BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 4444 (iii).

MIMINIGASH BREAKWATER, WHARFAGE DUES: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 130 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 4532.
—— PET. OF FISHERMEN, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 4296 (iii).
—— PROGRESS OF WORK: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3959.
MINING MACHINERY, FREE ENTRY INTO B. C.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Mara*) 965 (i).
MINISTERIAL EXPLANATION: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 237 (i).
MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS, RUMOURED RESIGNATION: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 3653 (ii).
—— RESIGNATION: Announced (Sir *John Thompson*) 5074 (iii).
MINISTRY, NEW: Stmnt. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 891.
MINOR REVENUES: in Com. of Sup., 5171 (iii).
MISCELLANEOUS JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 506, 1556 (i); conc., 6303, 6169 (iii).
MISCELLANEOUS: in Com. of Sup., 1705 (i), 5081, 5346, 5417, 6261; conc., 5426 (iii).
Modus Vivendi. *See* "U. S."
MONCTON, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 1653 (i), 3882 (ii).

Montreal and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 29 (Mr. *Ives*). 1°*, 156; 2°*, 189; in Com. and 3°*, 1761 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 68.)
MONTREAL AND OTTAWA RY. CO.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033 (iii).
—— AND SOREL RY., COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 3614 (ii).
Montreal Bridge Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 121 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 1483; 2°*, 1757 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2321 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 106.)
MONTREAL AND MILE END, &c., MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 5077 (iii).
—— CUSTOMS HOUSE EMPLOYÉS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Lépine*) 3275 (ii).
—— IRREGULARITIES: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3953 (ii), 4675 (iii).
—— SUPERANNUATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3616.
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Act Amt. B. No. 95 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 549; 2°*, 1098; in Com. and 3°*, 1099 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 53.)
Montreal and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s B. No. 65 (Mr. *Bergeron*). 1°*, 387; 2°*, 547; in Com. and 3°*, 1434 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 96.)
—— PILOTS: Remarks (Mr. *Delisle*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 6144 (iii).
—— P. O. LETTER BOX CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 3615 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3953 (ii).
MONUMENT OF SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 2148 (ii).
MOTIONS ALLOWED TO STAND: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1932 (i).
—— PRIVATE MEMBERS: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 127 (i).

MOUNTED POLICE:
BUILDINGS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4448 (iii).
COMPENSATION TO MEMBERS: in Com. of Sup., 5086; conc., 5427 (iii).
HERCHMER, L. W., REP. OF DEPTL. ENQUIRY: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 267, 1574 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) *re* Res., 711 (i).
—— COMPT. WHITE'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1574 (i), 2669 (ii).
—— ENQUIRY INTO CONDUCT: prop. Res, (Mr. *Davin*) 2913; wthdn., 2923 (ii).
DEPTL. REP.: presented (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 237 (i).
HERCHMER, LIEUT. COL. WM., LETTER FROM C. E. D. WOOD: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 4292 (iii).
IN COM. OF SUP., 1697 (i), 4817, 6274; conc., 5415, 5427 (iii).
"KEEWATIN," POLICE PATROL BOAT: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 4294 (iii).
LAIDLOW, WM., RESIGNATION, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1048 (i).
PRESS ARTICLE *re* REFORM: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1269.
MULGRAVE AND POINT TUPPER TRAIN FERRY: in Com. of Sup., 3898 (ii).
MUNRO, THOS., REP. *re* MANCHESTER SHIP CANAL: M. for copies* (Mr. *Mulock*) 1579 (i).
MUNROE, HUGH, CLAIM FOR DAMAGES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2546 (ii).
MURRAY CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1728 (i), 4125 (ii).

MURRAY CANAL, OFFICIALS EMPLOYED: Ques. (Mr. *Hargraft*) 4675 (iii).
MUTTART, MR., DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Perry*) 2158 (ii).
NAPANEE GAS INSPECTOR, APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Allison*) 5076 (iii).
——— P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 6242 (iii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Allison*) 1272 (i), 2154 (ii).
NAPIERVILLE AND ST. REMI RY. SUBSIDY, PETS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Monet*) 2541 (ii).
NAPIERVILLE ELECTION AND REVISING OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 1577 (i).
NATIONAL ART GALLERY: in Com. of Sup., 4663 (iii).
NAVIGABLE RIVERS, OBSTRUCTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 3508 (ii).
NAVIGATION, IMPROVEMENT OF ST. LAWRENCE RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 207 (i).
NEGRO POINT BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4533.
NELSON, B. C., POSTMASTER'S SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2521 (ii).
New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 37 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). 1°*, 266; 2°*, 220; in Com. and 3°*, 1087 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 99.)
——— *See* "C. P. R."
NEW CARLISLE WHARF, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 966 (i).
NEW ENGLAND PAPER CO., PURCHASES BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1767 (i).
NEWFOUNLAND BAIT ACT, SUSPENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 113 (i).
——— M. for Cor. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 3267 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 6188 (iii).
——— TRADE RELATIONS: Mess. from His. Ex., 736, 1199 (i).
NEW GLASGOW, INCREASED RY. ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 3882 (ii), 6197 (iii).
NEW HARBOUR, &c., N.S., BREAKWATERS: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1012 (i).
NEW LONDON HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 226 (i).
Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.'s B. No. 18 (Mr. *Montague*). 1°*, 155; 2°*, 189; in Com. and 3°*, 1087 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 105.)
NORTH NATION RIVER, WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 222 (i).
NORTH SASKATCHEWAN RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 1576 (i).
NORTH SHORE RY., DEBENTURES, LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2521 (ii).
——— M. for O.C.'s (Mr. *Langelier*) 974; deb. rsmd., 1014 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 525, 527 (i).
North Shore Ry. *See* "C. P. R."
NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES:
ALBERTA RY., PAYMENT OF LABOURERS: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3956 (ii).
AMBER DEPOSITS, APPLICATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Bain*) 2518 (ii).
BANFF SPRINGS PARK AND RESERVE, TOTAL COST: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3957 (ii).
NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES—*Continued.*
BREMNER'S CLAIM FOR FURS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1268 (i).
BRYDGES, LATE C. J., AND NORTH SASKATCHEWAN IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 1576 (i).
CALGARY AND EDMONTON MAIL SERVICE; Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3255 (ii).
——— AND FORT MACLEOD MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3256 (ii).
ELECTORAL DIVISIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 221.
GRANT, J. J., ENTRY FOR DOM. LANDS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Davin*) 3635 (ii).
GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY., ENGINEER'S CERTIFICATES: Ques. (Mr. *Daly*) 2144 (ii).
HERCHMER, COMMISSIONER. *See* general heading.
IMMIGRATION, MEMORIALS OF LEG. ASSEMBLY: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1269 (i).
INDIAN DEPTL. ESTIMATES, REGINA: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 2935 (ii).
"KEEWATIN," POLICE PATROL BOAT: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 4294 (iii).
LIQUOR PERMITS IN N.W.T., REPS., &c.: M. for copies, &c.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 545 (i).
MACPHERSON, ADDISON, CLAIMS FOR LOSSES THROUGH REBELLION: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3257 (ii).
MOUNTED POLICE. *See* general heading.
NORTH SASKATCHEWAN RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 1576 (i).
REGINA "LEADER", PAYMENTS FOR PRINTING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 4295 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Trow*) 4465 (iii).
SETTLEMENT: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) wthdn., 2913.
See "GOVERNMENT."
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. No. 33 (Mr. *McCarthy*). 1°, 174 (i).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. No. 178 (Mr. *Dewdney*). 1°, 6307; 2°, 6326 (iii).
N.W.T. Acts Amt. B. No. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*). 1°, 1760 (i); 2° m., 3902; 2° and in Com., 3925 (ii), 4297; 3°*, 4299; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 6228 (iii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 22.)
N.W.T. Representation Act Ant. B. No. 112 (Mr. *Davin*). 1°, 1101 (i).
N.W.T. Representation Act Amt. B. No. 148 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 2373; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3157 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 56.)
NORTHUMBERLAND, EAST, CHARGES AGAINST MEMBER: Stmnt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 4085 (ii)
——— Formal Stmnt. (Mr. *Flint*) 4462 (iii).
——— Stmnt. (Mr. *Flint*) 4533 (iii).
——— SITTINGS OF SEL. COM.: M. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 4670.
——— PRINTING EVIDENCE, 4825 (iii).
——— 2ND REP. OF SEL. COM.: presented (Mr. *Skinner*) 5487 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 5553 (iii).
——— 2ND REP. OF SEL. COM.: M. (Mr. *Skinner*) to conc., 5612; Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 5612; neg. (Y. 74, N. 99) 5724; Rep. conc. in (Y. 98, N. 75) 5725 (iii).
Deb. (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 5636; (Mr. *Barron*) 5644; (Mr. *German*) 5664; (Mr. *Masson*) 5672: (Mr. *Flint*) 5687; (Mr. *Skinner*) 5701; (Mr. *Mulock*) 5708; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 5722 (iii).

NOVA SCOTIA :
ANNAPOLIS PUBLIC BUILDINGS, TENDER AND CONTRACTS : Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 529 (i).
—— M. for copies* (Mr. *Lister*) 544 (i).
ANNAPOLIS ROYAL CUSTOMS COLLECTOR : Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 270 (i).
ANTIGONISH AND GUYSBOROUGH INDIANS : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 224 (i).
BANDMASTER, 69TH BATT. : Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 268 (i),
BAY OF FUNDY FISHERIES : M. for Ret., &c. (Mr. *Bowers*) 715 (i).
" BLIZZARD," SCH., RESCUE OF CREW, REWARDS : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Flint*) 735 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 224 (i).
BOUNTIES, FISHERY, PAID IN GUYSBOROUGH CO. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Fraser*) 232 (i).
—— PAID IN QUEEN'S : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 734 (i).
BREAKWATERS, GUYSBOROUGH CO. : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1012 (i),
CAMPBELLTON P.O., ESTABLISHMENT, PETS., &C. : M. for copies* (Mr. *Laurier*) 544 (i).
CAPE BRETON AND N.S. RY. ACCOMMODATION : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Fraser*) 177 (i).
—— STATION MASTERS' DUTIES : Ques. (Mr. *Mc Dougall, C.B.*) 4677 (iii).
CENTREVILLE BREAKWATER, REP. *re* REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 962 (i).
HALIFAX CITY MARKET PROPERTY, SALE : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1770 (i).
COSGROVE, JOHN, RESIGNATION, &C. : M. for Cor. &c.* (Mr. *Devlin*) 145 (i).
COTTON SAIL DUCK, IMPORTS AT HALIFAX : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 174 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 142 (i).
DIGBY POSTAL ACCOMMODATION : Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 1264 (i).
DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY SUPPLIES, TENDERS : Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1928 (i).
EAST RIVER, DEEPENING : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1011.
FINES FOR VIOLATING FISHERY LAWS : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Fraser*) 189 (i).
FISHERY INSPECTOR, DIST. NO. 3, RESIGNATION : Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 130 (i).
FISHERY PROTECTION, CAPE BRETON : Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 527 (i).
FORESHORES, &C., OF THE DOM., OWNERSHIP : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Flint*) 178 (i).
FULLERTON, AUGUSTUS, SUPERANNUATION : Ques. (Mr. *White, Annapolis*) 270 (i).
GUYSBOROUGH CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, SUPERANNUATION : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2520 (ii).
—— FISHERY OVERSEER, SALARY PAID : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 5403 (iii).
HALIFAX COUNTY COURT JUDGE, INCREASE OF SALARY : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2547 (ii).
INDIANS IN ANTIGONISH AND GUYSBOROUGH : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 224 (i).
INGLIS, BANDMASTER OF 69TH BAT. : Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 268 (i).
INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*) 2522 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2911 (ii).
KENTVILLE POSTMASTER, SUSPENSION : Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 221 (i).
LAHAVE RIVER, SAWDUST DEPOSITS : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 1942 (i), 2175 (ii).
LIVERPOOL AND ANNAPOLIS RY. : Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 143 (i).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Continued.*
LIVERPOOL P. O. ACCOMMODATION : Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1768 (i).
METEGHAN WHARF, REP. *re* REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 530 (i).
MUNROE, HUGH, CLAIM FOR DAMAGES : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2546 (ii).
NEW HARBOUR, &C., BREAKWATERS : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1012 (i).
NOVA SCOTIA CENTRAL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 3960 (ii).
OXFORD AND PICTOU MAIL SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1768 (i).
PORT GEORGE PIER, TENDERS, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 2910 (ii).
RAQUETTE PIER, CONTRACTS FOR CONSTRUCTION : Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 1575 (i).
RYS. IN INVERNESS CO. : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2911 (ii).
RETURNING OFFICER FOR VICTORIA, APPOINTMENT : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Flint*) 2935 (ii).
"SEIGFREID," SCHOONER, REWARD TO CAPTAIN, &C. : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Flint*) 735 (i).
SHORT LINE RAILWAY, NEW ROUTE : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 3266 (ii).
SISSIBOO RIVER, DREDGING : Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 1574 (i).
SUPPLIES, &C., PURCHASED FOR INDIANS IN N.S. : M. for List, &c.* (Mr. *Fraser*) 232 (i).
STONY ISLAND BREAKWATER, AMOUNTS PAID, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 5408 (iii).
WHITMAN, CAPT C. W. S., APPOINTMENT : Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 268 (i).
[*See* "SUPPLY," &C.]
Oaths of Office. *See* "ADMINISTRATION."
OCEAN MAIL SERVICE : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Laurier*) 124 (i).
OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 3508 (ii), 6265 (iii).
OKA INDIANS, REMOVAL TO GIBSON : in Com. of Sup., 4728 (ii) ; conc., 5411 (iii).
Okanagon Ry. Co. *See* "C. P. R."
OLD MAN'S RIVER, FORT MACLEOD, FREE BRIDGE : in Com. of Sup., 4607 (iii).
OLD RECORDS, CLASSIFICATION : in Com. of Sup., 5084, 5124 (iii).
O'MEARA, D. D., ACTING CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, QUE. : in Com. of Sup., 1714 (i).
Ont. Express and Transportation Co.'s B. No. 151 (Mr. *Sutherland*). Rules, &c., suspended and 1° of B., 2905 ; 2° m., 3230 ; 2°, 3593 (ii) ; in Com. and 3°*, 4256 (iii). (54-55 Vic., c. 110.)
ONT. MUNICIPALITIES, DEPUTATION, COR. IN MONTREAL "GAZETTE" : Remarks (Mr. *Trow*) 389 (i).
Ont. and New York Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 93 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). 1°*, 549 ; 2°*, 601 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 1604 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 67.)
Ont. and Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s B. No. 102 (Mr. *Sutherland*). 1°*, 891 ; 2°*, 983 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1963 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 120.)
Ont. and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s B. No. 77 (Mr. *LaRivière*). 1°*, 441 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com., 1603 ; 3°*, 1957 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 82.)
ONTARIO :
ALBINO POINT, CUSTOMS OFFICERS : M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *German*) 1579 (i).

ONTARIO—*Continued.*

ALLEN, INDIAN AGENT, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1264 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1298, 1928 (i).
ALLISONVILLE POSTMASTER, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2153 (ii).
AMHERSTBURG DRY DOCK: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Allan*) 3287 (ii).
——— SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Allan*) 334 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Allan*) 3259 (ii).
ATKINSON, J. H. C., APPOINTMENT AND DISMISSAL: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Allan*) 1580, 1980 (i).
BARRIE P. O., ADVTS. FOR CONSTRUCTION: M. for copies* (Mr. *Barron*) 2935 (ii).
——— CONTRACTOR'S NAME: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 3255.
BATTELL, WILLIAM, EMPLYMT. AS CLERK OF WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Hargraft*) 3952 (ii).
BAY OF QUINTE, IMPROVEMENT OF NAVIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Burdett*) 208 (i).
BEAVERTON DOCK, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 708 (i).
——— HARBOUR WORKS, CONTRACTOR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 226 (i).
BIG BAY WHARF, REPAIRS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 1929 (i).
——— EXPENDITURE; M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Somerville*) 232 (i).
BRAMPTON POSTMASTER, VACANCY THROUGH DEATH: Ques. (Mr. *Featherston*) 3259 (ii).
BRUCE COUNTY INDIANS, SALE OF LIQUOR TO: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 270, 1272 (i).
CALEDONIA DAM, GRAND RIVER, CONSTRUCTION: M. for Pets., &c.* (Mr. *Montague*) 3287 (ii).
——— DRILL SHED, REPAIRS: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Montague*) 3287 (ii).
CAMILLA AND WHITTINGTON MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2151 (ii).
CAMP, MILITIA DISTRICT NO. 1: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Hyman*) 231 (i).
CAVALRY, 1ST REGT.: Ques. (Mr. *Hyman*) 198 (i).
——— SCHOOL, TORONTO: Ques. (Mr. *Denison*) 222 (i).
CHARLEBOIS & CO., AMOUNT PAID ON LANGEVIN BLOCK: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1575 (i).
CHATHAM POST OEFICE, CONTRACTOR'S NAME, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 3931 (ii).
CHIPPEWA INDIANS, LETTER TO SIR JOHN MACDONALD *re* IRREGULARITIES: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3264.
COCKBURN ISLAND LOCATION TICKETS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1271 (i).
COWAN, THOS., POSTMASTER AT GALT: Ques. (Mr. *Semple*) 1263 (i).
DINGMAN, INDIAN INSPECTOR, ENQUIRY *re* AGENT ALLEN: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1766 (i).
DISPUTED TERRITORY (ONT.), TIMBER CUT, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barron*) 128 (i).
DRILL SHED, TORONTO, CONTRACT FOR ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 963 (i).
DUNDAS AND WATERLOO MACADAMIZED ROAD; M. for O. C.'s, &c. (Mr. *Bain*) 1058 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Bain*), 223 (i).
ELGIN (EAST) ELECTORAL DIST., RET. OF OFFICER'S ACCOUNT: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Ingram*) 1579.
ELLIOTT, GEO. M., APPOINTMENT AS GAS INSPEDTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Allison*) 5076 (iii).
EXPERIMENTAL FARMS (CENTRAL) BULLETINS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Devlin*) 1579 (i).
——— *See* general heading.
FENELON FALLS, LOCKMASTER'S HOUSE: Ques, (Mr. *Barron*) 4673 (iii).

ONTARIO—*Continued.*

FISHERY PROTECTION, GEORGIAN BAY: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 220 (i).
——— SUPPLIES; M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Somerville*) 544.
——— Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 221 (i).
FITZGERALD, FISHERY OFFICER, PETERBOROUGH CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 5405 (iii).
FORT ERIE AND BUFFALO FERRY: Ques. (Mr. *German*) 1768 (i).
GALT POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Semple*) 1263 (i).
GALT P. O., CONTRACTOR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 225 (i).
GALWAY P. O., ESTABLISHMENT: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barron*) 736 (i).
GRAHAM, J. R., DISMISSAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Barron*) 210 (i).
GRAND RIVER FISHING LICENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Brown, Monck*) 709 (i).
——— NAVIGATION, ENGINEER'S REPS.: M. for copies (Mr. *Montague*) 2155 (ii).
GRAVING DOCK. *See* "KINGSTON."
HASTINGS CO., PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Burdett*) 208 (i).
——— MAIL SERVICE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Burdett*) 212.
HOLSTEIN POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1766, 1929 (i).
ILLEGAL CUSTOMS SEIZURES: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2520 (i).
INDIAN AFFAIRS, NORTH BRUCE, LIST OF CHARGES: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1272 (i).
INDIAN AGENT ALLEN, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1264 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1298, 1928 (i).
——— AGENT AT SUTTON, WEST; Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 961 (i).
——— COST OF INVESTIGATION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mulock*) 145 (i).
——— AGENT JONES, CHARGES AGAINST; Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4673 (iii).
——— RESERVE NO. 6, TIMBER CUT: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 111 (i).
INTERNATIONAL ABATTOIR CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 3615 (ii).
JOHNSTON, SAML., DISMISSAL FROM CUSTOMS SERVICE: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *German*) 2935 (ii).
KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER, PAYMENTS FOR DREDGING: Ques (Mr. *Campbell*) 1267 (i).
——— TENDERS FOR DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 129 (i).
KINGSTON DRY DOCK, ORIGINAL PLAN: M. for copy* (Mr. *Amyot*) 1579 (i),
——— PAPERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1764 (i).
——— Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1848 (i).
——— TENDERS, &C.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Tarte*) 128.
KINGSTON PENITENTIARY, COAL SUPPLY: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3260 (i).
KINGSTON P.O., LESSEES OF BOXES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1578 (i).
——— LESSEE OF BOX 524: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 962 (i).
——— LETTER BOXES, LEASES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1266 (i).
——— REP. OF POSTMASTER, &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Amyot*) 2545 (ii).
LAKEPORT HARBOUR OF REFUGE, CONSTRUCTION: M. for Pets. &c.* (Mr. *Hargraft*) 232 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Hargraft*) 207 (i).
LANGEVIN BLOCK. *See* "PUBLIC WORKS."
LEGAL SERVICES, PAYMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 2907.

ONTARIO—*Continued.*

LEWIS, LIEUT.-COL., VACANCY THROUGH DEATH: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Burnham*) 733 (i).

LICENSES FOR POUND NETS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 142, 198, 223, 238, 529 (i).

LINDSAY, P. O., CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 225.

——— COMPLETION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 268 (i).

LIQUOR SALES TO INDIANS: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 270, 530, 1264 (i).

LOBO P. O., CHANGE OF POSTMASTER: M. for Pets.* (Mr. *Armstrong*) 1579 (i).

LUNDY'S LANE, COMMEMORATION OF BATTLE: Ques. (Mr. *German*) 3618 (ii).

MCARTHUR, WM., APPOINTMENT AS MAIL CLERK: Ques. (Mr *Barron*) 4671 (iii).

MCCORMICK, F. B., REMOVAL AND REINSTATEMENT: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Allan*) 1580, 1980 (ii).

MCMAHON, CHAS. W., POSTMASTER AT KINMOUNT: M. for Ret * (Mr. *Barron*) 736 (i).

MILITIA. *See* general heading.

NAPANEE, GAS INSPECTOR, APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Allison*) 5076 (iii).

——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, CONTRACTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Allison*) 2154 (ii).

——— TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Allison*) 1272 (i).

ORDNANCE LANDS, RIDEAU CANAL, SALES: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 5408 (iii).

OWEN SOUND HARBOUR, CHANGES IN SPECIFICATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 3960 (ii).

PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, METAL PILLARS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1273 (i).

PELEE ISLAND, SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Allan*) 1580, 1980 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Allan*) 334 (i).

PETERBOROUGH POST OFFICE CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 225 (i).

PLUMMER, M., SERVICES AT SAULT STE. MARIE WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1575 (i), 2905 (ii).

POUND NET LICENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 142, 198, 223, 238, 529 (i).

QUINTÉ, BAY OF, IMPROVEMENT OF NAVIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Burdett*) 201 (i).

RAPIDE PLAT CANAL, TENDERS, &C.: M. for copies, &c.* (Mr. *Murray*) 544 (i).

REBELLION OF 1837-38, LAND GRANTS TO VOLUNTEERS: Ques. (Mr. *Allison*) 961 (i).

REED AND SHANNONVILLE MAIL SERVICE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Burdett*) 212 (i).

RIDEAU CANAL. *See* "CANALS,"

SADDLERY, 1ST REGT. OF CAVALRY: Ques. (Mr. *Hyman*) 198 (i).

ST. LAWRENCE CANALS, DEEPENING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Coatsworth*) 1927 (i).

SAULT STE. MARIE WHARF, MR. PLUMMER'S SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1575 (ii).

——— PURCHASE OF PROPERTY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillmor*) 1268 (i).

——— RECEIPTS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2905 (ii).

——— RETURN OF FEES: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 3620 (ii).

SHAW & SHAW, LEGAL SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 2907 (ii).

SHAWANAKISKIC INDIANS, BOUNTY UNDER TREATY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 269 (i).

STRATFORD, EXCISE COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 5078 (iii).

STRATHROY P.O. BUILDING, TENDERS, &C.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Flint*) 2935 (ii).

——— CONTRACTOR'S NAME, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hyman*) 3262

ONTARIO—*Continued.*

SUTTON, WEST, INDIAN AGENT, COST OF INVESTIGATION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mulock*) 145 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 961 (i).

TAY CANAL. *See* "CANALS."

THAMES RIVER, REMOVAL OF BAR: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 1268 (i).

TIMBER CUT, &C., IN DISPUTED TERRITORY: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barron*) 128 (i).

——— ON INDIAN RESERVE NO. 6: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 111 (i).

TORONTO DRILL SHED, CONTRACTS FOR ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 964 (i).

TURNING BASIN, WELLAND CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Gibson*) 270 (i).

WALKER, DR., CLAIM: M. for O. C., &c. (Mr. *Bain*) 1058 (i).

WALKERTON CUSTOMS SEIZURES: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 3266 (ii).

——— P. O., CONTRACT FOR FITTING: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 963 (i).

——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, CARETAKER: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 1271 (i).

——— CLERK OF WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Traux*) 2151 (ii).

——— HEATING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 335 (i).

——— TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 267 (i).

——— SEIZURE OF IRON BRIDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 3619 (ii).

——— SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 3266 (ii).

WIARTON HARBOUR WORKS, CONTRACTOR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 226 (i).

WELLAND CANAL. *See* "CANALS."

WILSON, JAS., POSTMASTER AT KINMOUNT: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Barron*) 736 (i).

ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE:

ORDER:

COBOURG HARBOUR, IN COM. OF SUP.: Reference by Mr. *Mulock* to a past deb. questioned by Mr. *Foster*. Ruled (Mr. *Deputy Speaker*) out of Order, 4658 (iii).

CUSTOMS ACT AMT. (SUGAR DUTIES): Member called to Order for using unparliamentary language and referring to matters connected with Committees outside the House. Ruled (Mr. *Deputy Speaker*) out of Order, 5330 (iii).

DOMINION CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT AMT. B. 147: On M. to adjn. deb. on 1°, Member called to Order by Mr. *Mills* (*Bothwell*) for imputing improper motives to previous speaker *re* conduct of certain returning officers, 2370. Mr. *Speaker's* ruling, and remarks wthdn., 2371 (ii).

FRANCHISE ACT REPEAL B. 8: On 2°, Member called to Order for using unparliamentary language, the same wthdn., 324 (i).

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS: Raising discussions; intervention of Mr. *Speaker* calling for the Orders of the Day, 1013 (i).

NEWSPAPER REPORTS, INCORRECT: Reading of same ruled out of Order by Mr. *Speaker*, 2962 (ii).

NORTH SHORE RY. DEBENTURES: Member requested by Mr. *Deputy Speaker* to confine himself to question before the Chair, 4757 (iii).

PROHIBITION DEB.: Unparliamentary expressions. Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) that Member who uses them must withdraw same absolutely and without qualification, 1332, 1334 1341 (i).

P. E. I. RY., IN COM. OF SUP.: Member's remarks checked, by Mr. *Deputy Speaker*, in referring to a past deb., 3671 (ii).

ORDER, PRIVILEGE, &c.—*Continued.*
ORDER—*Continued.*
PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS COM., SITTINGS, &c.: Remarks of Mr. *Davies* (*P.E.I.*) called in question by Sir *John Thompson*, 984; on M. for adjmnt., Mr. *Speaker* drew Member's attention to the fact that he was not speaking to the subject, 987; further remarks by Mr. *Speaker*, 991 (i).
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COM., ACCTS. *re* BOURCIER: on M. (Mr. *Somerville*) to ref. to Com., objection taken by Mr. *Foster*, notice not having been given; objection sustained by Mr. *Speaker* and M. ruled out of Order, 3949 (ii).
—— ACCTS. *re* P. O. DEPT.: M. (Mr. *Barron*) to ref. objected to; ruled out of Order by Mr. *Speaker*, 2517 (ii).
—— PRINTING EVIDENCE *re* LANGEVIN BLOCK: M. (Mr. *Mulock*) objected to by Mr. *Wallace*. Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) that same can only be put by unanimous consent of the House, 2375 (ii).
—— M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to rescind Order of House, *re* Witnesses under Oath, objected to by Mr. *Laurier* and same sustained by Mr. *Speaker*, no notice being given, 1925 (i), 2517 (ii).
REGINA "LEADER," AMOUNTS PAID: Toronto *Globe's* statement, culled from Auditor Gen.'s Rep., repudiated by Mr. *Davin*, 4241; speaking disrespectfully of a Member of another branch of the Legislature ruled out of Order and withdrawal requested by Mr. *Speaker*, 4242 (iii).
SECOND HOMESTEADS, RELEVANCY OF DEB.: Objection taken by Sir *John Thompson* to Member introducing private business transactions into deb. Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) subject-matter introduced not relevant, 616 (i).
TRENT VALLEY CANAL: Reference to previous deb. ruled out of Order by Mr. *Speaker*, 215 (i).
WEST INDIES SS. SUBSIDIES: Members addressing the House should not make insinuations (Mr. *Deputy Speaker*) 4974 (iii).
—— Discussion ruled out of Order; M. to adjn. should be made before Member can make a speech (Mr. *Speaker*) 195.
PRIVILEGE:
BINDING TWINE DEB.: Personal Explanation (Mr. *Stairs*) correction of speech, 2936 (ii).
CIRCULAR ADDRESSED TO INDIANS: Publication of same repudiated by the Member for Haldimand, 2474. Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 2475 (ii).
DEBATES, OFFICIAL: Personal Explanation *re* incorrect rep. of speech on the Budget, 1991 (i).
FEDERAL AND QUEBEC POLITICS: Article in *L'Electeur* and Mr. Mackintosh's visit to Montreal; personal explanation (Mr. *Mackintosh*) 5351 (iii).
LIBERAL MEETING (ALLEGED) IN MONTREAL: Personal Explanation (Mr. *Beausoleil*) *re* telegram forwarded to Toronto *Empire* newspaper, 3427.
MONTREAL PILOTS: Cor. in Montreal *Herald*, *re* grounding of ship *Trobique*, read by Mr. *Delisle*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6144 (iii).
NORTHUMBERLAND, EAST, CHARGES AGAINST MEMBER: Formal statement, Mr. *Cameron* (*Huron*) read, 4085; cannot be entered upon the Journals unless a motion is made (Mr. *Speaker*) 4087 (ii).
—— REP. OF SEL. COM.: Rep. in Ottawa *Free Press*, *re* Investigation. Remarks (Mr. *Skinner*) 5384 (iii).

ORDER, PRIVILEGE, &c.—*Continued.*
PRIVILEGE—*Continued.*
ORANGE INFLUENCE: Personal Explanation (Mr. *Charlton*) *re* statement made in House and contradicted by the Minister of Customs; extract from *Globe* of 1883 read, 1964 (i).
—— (Mr. *Wallace*) *re* report of speech in Toronto *Mail*, 2962; reference to incorrect report of remarks not made in the House, ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) not in Order, 2962; authority quoted, 2963 (ii).
PAIRING OF MEMBERS: Alleged breaking denied (Mr. *Colter*) and attention of the House drawn to offensive newspaper articles in Ottawa *Citizen* and Montreal *Gazette*, 3578 (ii).
—— Personal Explanation (Mr. *Edwards*) Remarks, and Letter from Mr. *Ross* (*Lisgar*) read, 3822 (ii).
PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSE; Report published in the Toronto *Mail*, misstatement corrected by Mr. *Charlton*, 2069 (i).
PROHIBITION DEB.: Personal Explanation (Mr. *Scriver*) *re* Speech and quotations made, 2204 (ii).
REUTER'S AGENCY AND DESPATCH IN LONDON "TIMES": Truthfulness denied by Mr. *Tarte*, 4239. Quoting from paper of proceedings that did not occur in the House not a question of privilege; only statements by newspapers respecting proceedings of the House is a Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Speaker*) 4239 (iii).
ROOM PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE: Personal Explanation (Mr. *Murray*) *re* paragraph in Toronto *Empire* reflecting on the Member for Pontiac, 806 (i).
TESTIMONIALS TO MINISTERS: Personal Explanation (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Minister of Inland Revenue not referred to in remarks, 3974 (ii).
TUNNEL, P.E.I., AND MAINLAND: Cor. in Charlottetown *Daily Examiner* taken exception to by Mr. *Cockburn*, and rights and privileges of Members claimed from Mr. *Speaker*, 1604 (i).
VOTE ON TRADE, SIR RICHARD CARTWRIGHT'S AMT.: paragraph *re* Refusal, as published in Toronto *Empire*, denied, 3200 (ii).
WANT OF CONFIDENCE VOTE (ALLEGED): Remarks (Mr. *Joncas*) on article in *Le Monde* newspaper, 1346 (i).
PROCEDURE:
ADJOURNMENTS: Mr. *Laurier* having moved the adjnmt. of the deb. subsequently moved the adjnmt. of the House, at which objection was taken by Mr. *Ouimet* as to regularity of procedure. Objection ruled by Mr. *Speaker* to be well taken and M. to adjn. the House wthdn., 6027 (iii).
ALLEN, INDIAN AGENT: Questions put to Ministers on Orders of the Day being called not being questions of urgency ruled out of Order by Mr. *Speaker*, 1298 (i).
CHISHOLM, INDIAN AGENT: On M. for Com. of Sup., Mr. *Flint's* remarks *re* declaration ruled out of Order by Mr. *Speaker* and Rule read, 6147 (iii).
CONCURRENCE: Members' attention directed by Mr. *Speaker* to the Rule that Items must be taken as they are called, 4278 (iii).
EVIDENCE IN CRIMINAL CASES B. 11: On 2°, Mr. *Speaker* ruled that the mover of the B. has not the right of reply, the 2° being an Order of the Day and not a substantive motion, 2961 (ii).

ORDER, PRIVILEGE, &c.—*Continued.*
PROCEDURE—*Continued.*
KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK, PAPERS, &c.: On M. for Com. of Sup., Member's remarks checked on referring to papers and evidence taken before the Pub. Accts. Com., the same not having been reported to the House, 3656; Member ruled not in Order (Mr. *Speaker*) 3658 (ii).
MEMBER SPEAKING TWICE: On M. for 2° of B. 103, Member having spoken his right to make a second speech exhausted. Rule quoted (Mr. *Speaker*) 3306 (ii).
MEMBER'S VOTE CHALLENGED: Must be in the House when the question is put by the Speaker, or vote cannot be recorded (Mr. *Speaker*) 4428 (ii).
PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS: Member not present when motion which stands in his name is called, the same will be dropped, unless it stands at the request of the Government (Mr. *Speaker*) 127 (i).
PROHIBITION, ON ADJNMT.: Criticising conduct of Govt. and interrupting Order of Business can only take place by consent of the House (Mr. *Speaker*) 546 (i).
—— VOTE ON MR. FOSTER'S AMT.: on M. for Com. of Sup., explanation (Mr. *McNeill*) 1543. Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) should be made on the Orders of the Day being called, 1544 (i).
READING SPEECHES: Attention of Mr. *Speaker* being called to the fact of Member reading his speech, Mr. *Speaker* ruled that the same is not permissible, the Rule being imperative that written speeches cannot be delivered; extracts may be read, 716 (i).
RESUMING DEBATE ON M. TO ADJN. THE HOUSE: M. to adjn. the deb. having been voted on and negatived, Mr. *Ouimet* (6031) raised the question "That under the cover of a M. of adjnmt. an hon. member is not allowed to speak on a question which is on the Order Paper;" authorities (May and Bourinot) quoted in support. Mr. *Speaker* partly agreed in the question raised, but could not agree that a Member cannot discuss the question which was before the House when the adjnmt. is moved, 6032 (iii).
QUARANTINE (U.S.) REGULATIONS: M. (Mr. *McMullen*) ruled out of Order, and authority quoted *re* making a speech on Calling of Orders (Mr. *Speaker*) 743 (i).
SUBSIDIES (MONEY) TO RYS. RES. IN COM.: Objection taken by Mr. *Mulock* to Member discussing railways not in the resolutions before the Com. Mr. *Deputy Speaker* sustained the objection, 6136 (iii).
SUGAR DUTIES: Order called for House in Com. of Whole on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*). Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) the M. anticipating a discussion on the Order Paper, according to Parliamentary practice, cannot be taken up, 1931 (i).
VOTING ON DIVISIONS: The question being raised as to recording a Member's vote, he entering the House during the reading of a motion, Mr. *Speaker* quoted from Bourinot to the effect that "If a Member was not present in the House when the question was put by the Speaker, he cannot have his vote recorded," 4455. Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) that Member must be in the House and have heard the question read from the beginning, in either official language, to entitle him to vote, 4462 (iii).

Ordnance Lands. *See* "QUEBEC SKATING CLUB."
—— in Com. of Sup., 5171 (iii).
—— MONTREAL CITY, LEASES: Ques. (Mr. *Mc Mullen*) 5409 (iii).
—— RIDEAU CANAL, SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 5408 (iii).
Oshawa Ry. Co.'s B. No. 123 (Mr. *Madill*). 1°*, 1574; 2°*, 1757 (i); in Com. on 3°*, 2174 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 91.)
OSHAWA RY. AND NAVIGATION CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033; in Com., 6137 (iii).
Ottawa and Parry Sound Ry. Co.'s, &c., B. No. 96 (Mr. *Jamieson*). 1°*, 600; 2°*, 828; in Com. and 3°*, 1761 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 93.)
OTTAWA COUNTY POSTAL SERVICE: M. for Letters, &c. (Mr. *Devlin*) 229 (i).
—— GROUNDS AROUND BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 4470 (iii).
—— P. O., ADVERTISING ARRIVAL AND DEPARTURE OF MAILS: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 963 (i).
—— IN "LE CANADA": M. for Ret. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2540 (ii).
—— RIVER, CHANNEL THROUGH NARROWS: in Com. of Sup., 4571 (iii).
—— DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 2522 (ii).
—— GATINEAU BOOM: in Com. of Sup., 6261 (iii).
OUILLET, HERMIDAS, ENQUIRY AT STE. FLAVIE: M. for Pet. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1937 (i).
OWEN SOUND HARBOUR, CHANGES IN SPECIFICATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 3960 (ii).
—— in Com. of Sup., 4565 (iii).
OXFORD AND NEW GLASGOW RY.: in Com. of Sup., 1658 (i), 6197 (iii).
—— AND PICTOU MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1768 (i).
OYSTER BEDS, LEASES: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3958 (ii), 5157 (iii).
PALMER, LATE CHIEF JUSTICE, ALLOWANCE TO FAMILY: in Com. of Sup., 6276 (iii).
PAIRING OF MEMBERS: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor, &c.*) 331, 386, 631, 742, 800, 1199 (i), 3426 (ii), 4488)iii).
PAPER CONTRACT, CLAIM OF MR. BARBER: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 269 (i).
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, METAL PILLARS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1273 (i).
PARLIAMENTARY DOCUMENTS, DISTRIBUTION: in Com. of Sup., 5081 (iii).
PARLIAMENT, 7TH, opening, 1 (i).
PAPASHASE INDIAN RESERVE: Remarks (Mr. *Watson*, &c.) on adjnmt., 1403 (i).
PASPASCKASE RESERVE, SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 3265 (ii).
Patent Act Amt. B. No. 142 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 2144; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3244 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 33.)
"PATENT RECORD": in Com. of Sup., 953 (ii).
Patents. *See* "CORBIN."
PAYMASTER, MIL. DISTS. NOS. 5 AND 6: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 707 (i).
PAYNE, LATE JAS., ALLOWANCE TO HEIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1695 (i).

PAY ROLL, MIL. CAMP, SOREL AND ST. JOHN'S: M. for copies* (Mr. *Lépine*) 1062 (i).
PELEE ISLAND, SUB-COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Allan*) 334 (i).
——— M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Allan*) 1580, 1980 (i).
PELLETIER, H. H., EMPLYMT. BY MILITIA DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Aymot*) 3258 (ii).
Pembroke Lumber Co.'s incorp. B. No. 26 (Mr. *Ferguson, Leeds*). 1°*, 156; 2°*, 189; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 121.)
PEMBROKE P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 4369 (iii).
PENITENTIARIES: in Com. of Sup., 242, 882, 1558 (i), 6170 (iii).
——— INSPECTOR'S REP.: presented (Sir *John Thompson*) 129 (i).
PENSIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1572, 1729 (i), 3660 (ii).
——— PERMANENT CORPS, &c., SYSTEM: Ques. (Mr. *McLennan*) 2908 (ii).
PERLEY, H. F., AND QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS: Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 527 (i).
PERMANENT FORCES, BATTERIES AND SCHOOLS: in Com. of Sup., 3737 (i).
PERMITS, LIQUOR, IN N.W.T., REPS., &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Charlton*) 545 (i).
PERSONAL EXPLANATION (Mr. *Beausoleil*) par. in *Empire* newspaper, 3427 (ii).
——— (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) *re* Minister of Inland Rev., 3947 (ii).
——— (Mr. *Edwards*) *re* Pairs, 3822 (ii).
——— (Mr. *Mackintosh*) *re* par. in *L'Electeur*, 5351.
——— (Mr. *McNeil*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1543; (Mr. *Watson*) 1544 (i).
——— (Mr. *Montague*) *Hansard* Rep., 1991 (i).
——— (Mr. *Scriver*) Speech on Prohibition, 2204 (ii).
——— (Mr. *Stairs*) Speech on Binding Twine, 2936.
——— (Mr. *Wallace*) Orange Influence, par. in Toronto *Mail*, 2962, 2964 (ii).
——— (Mr. *Charlton*) quotation from *Globe*, 1883, read, 1964 (i).
PETERBOROUGH CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 4370, 6246 (iii).
——— P. O. CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 225 (i).
Peterborough, Sudbury and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 72 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 387; 2°*, 547; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 63.)
PETERSON, CAPT., REWARD FOR SAVING LIFE: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 224 (i).
PETROLIA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4372.
Petroleum Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 157 (Mr. *Costigan*). 1°, 3426; 2°* and in Com., 3648; 3°*, 3649 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 49.)
PICKFORD & BLACK, MESSRS., PAYMENT OF SUBSIDIES: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 544 (i).
Pictou Bank Winding-up Act Amt. B. No. 76 (Mr. *Macdougald, Pictou*). 1°, 388; 2°, 547; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 111.)
Pictou Harbour Commissioners' Acts Amt. B. No. 150 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 2667; 2° and in Com., 3594; 3°*, 3961 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 54.)
PIERS, WHARVES AND BREAKWATERS, P. E. I.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3951 (ii).
PINETTE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 226 (i).
PLATE PRESENTED TO MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS, DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2912 (ii).
PLUMMER, M., SERVICES AT SAULT STE. MARIE WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1575 (i), 2905 (ii).
POLSON MANUFACTURING CO., STEEL PLATES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 270 (i).
PONNELL, JOHN, EMPLYMT. BY SOREL HARBOUR BOARD: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 5076 (iii).
PORT ARTHUR P. O., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4371 (iii).
PORT GEORGE PIER, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 2910 (ii).
PORT MAITLAND BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 6254.
PORT MULGRAVE, &c., AND CHETICAMP SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 4701 (iii).
PORTNEUF ELECTION AND REVISING OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 207 (i).
PORTER, DAVID, CLAIM: Remarks (Mr. *Madill*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 6229 (iii).
POSTMASTER GENERAL'S DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 254, 440 (i), 6166 (iii).
——— DEPTL. REP.: presented (Mr. *Haggart*) 103 (i).
POSTMASTERS OF THE DOMINION, SALARIES, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 128 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *German*) 1275, 1767 (i).
POST OFFICE:
ALLISONVILLE POSTMASTER, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2153 (ii).
ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Laurier*) 124 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1765 (i).
BRAMPTON, POSTMASTER, VACANCY THROUGH DEATH: Ques. (Mr. *Featherston*) 3259 (ii).
B. C. MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 4294 (iii).
BOURGEOIS, DR. G. A., P. O. INSPECTOR, RETIREMENT: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2935 (ii)
CALGARY AND EDMONTON MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3255 (ii).
——— AND FORT MACLEOD MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3256 (i).
CAMILLA AND WHITTINGTON MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2151 (ii).
CAMPBELLTON P.O., ESTABLISHMENT, PETS., &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Laurier*) 544 (i).
CAOUETTE, J. B., ENQUIRY *re* LOSS OF LETTERS, &c.: M. for Rep.* (Mr. *Amyot*) 544 (i).
CROSS POINT AND GASPÉ BASIN MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Joncas*) 113 (ii).
——— AND PASPEBIAC MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Joncas*) 113 (i).
DIGBY, POSTAL ACCOMMODATION: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 1264 (i).
GALT POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION; Ques. (Mr. *Semple*) 1263 (i).
GALWAY P. O., ESTABLISHMENT: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barron*) 736 (i).
GRAHAM, DISMISSAL, ENQUIRY FOR RET. (Mr. *Barron* 3200 (ii).
GREAT BRITAIN AND CAN. MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1765 (i).
HASTINGS COUNTY MAIL SERVICE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Burdett*) 212 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Continued.*

HOLSTEIN POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1766, 1929 (i).

IMPERIAL POSTAL UNION: Ques. (Mr. *Denison*) 131.

IN COM. OF SUP., 1744 (i), 4705, 6279 (iii).

KENTVILLE, N.S., POSTMASTER, SUSPENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 221 (i).

KINGSTON P. O., LESSEE OF BOX 524: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 962 (i).

—— LETTER BOXES, LEASES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1266 (i).

—— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1578 (i).

—— REP. OF POSTMASTER, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Amyot*) 2545 (ii).

LABERGE, MR., ASST. POSTMASTER, QUE.: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 3954 (ii).

"LE CANADA," ADVERTISING OTTAWA MAIL SERVICE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2540 (ii).

LETTER POSTAGE, CHANGE IN RATE: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 129 (i),

LETTERS, REGISTRATION FEE, REDUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 143 (i).

LIVERPOOL P.O., ACCOMMODATION: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1768 (i).

LOBO P. O., CHANGE OF POSTMASTER: M. for Pets.* (Mr. *Armstrong*) 1579 (i).

LYSTER POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 3958 (ii).

MONTREAL AND MILE END, &c., MAIL SERVICE CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 5077 (iii).

MONTREAL P.O., LETTER CONCERNING CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3953 (ii).

MCARTHUR, WM., APPOINTMENT AS MAIL CLERK: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 4671 (iii).

MCMAHON, CHAS. W., POSTMASTER AT KINMOUNT: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barron*) 736 (i).

NELSON, B. C., POSTMASTER'S SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Fremont*) 2521 (ii).

OTTAWA P.O. ADVERTISING, ARRIVAL AND DEPARTURE OF MAILS: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 963 (i).

OTTAWA COUNTY POSTAL SERVICE: M. for Letters, &c., (Mr. *Devlin*) 229 (i).

OXFORD AND PICTOU MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1768 (i).

POSTMASTERS' SALARIES: Ques. (Mr. *German*) 1275, 1767 (i).

—— SALARIES AND CONTINGENCIES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 128 (i).

QUEBEC P.O., SUNDAY CLOSING; Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 1765 (i).

REED AND SHANNONVILLE MAIL SERVICE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Burdett*) 212 (i).

REGISTERED LETTERS, REDUCTION OF FEE: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 143 (i).

REGISTRATION STAMPS, REVENUE: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 158 (i),

RURAL POST OFFICES, OPENING AND CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2912 (ii).

ST. ANGÉLE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 5407 (iii).

—— DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Brodeur*) on M, for Com. of Sup., 6233 (iii).

STE. EMILE DE SUFFOLK, &c., POSTAL SERVICE: M. for Rets. (Mr. *Devlin*) 230 (i).

ST. HELEN'S, MAIL SERVICE *viâ* GODERICH: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3262 (ii).

SUMMERSIDE, POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3955, 3956 (ii).

POST OFFICE—*Continued.*

TRANS-CONTINENTAL MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 6216 (iii).

TWO-CENT LETTER POSTAGE: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 129 (i).

—— UNIFORM RATE: Ques. (Mr. *Denison* 131 (i).)

WELDFORD, N.B., P.O., COMPLAINTS *re* MANAGEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Gillmor*) 2151 (ii).

WILSON, JAS., POSTMASTER AT KINMOUNT: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Barron*) 736 (ii).

YAMASKA, EAST, P.O., CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 2153 (ii).

POTATOES EXPORTED FROM CANADA: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 544 (i).

POUND NET LICENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 142, 198, 223, 529 (i).

POWNAL BAY, PREVENTIVE OFFICER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 4672 (iii).

PRINCE ALBERT CROWN LANDS OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 4450 (ii).

—— IMMIGRATION BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 6251 (iii).

"PRINCE EDWARD," DREDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1765 (i).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND:

BELLE CREEK BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Walsh*) 1270 (i).

BRAE BREAKWATER, CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr *Perry*) 1274 (i).

BRAE HARBOUR WHARF, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 208 (i).

—— DUES, REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 130.

CASCUMPEQUE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1765, 2151 (i).

FISHERY WARDENS, APPOINTMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 5409 (iii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3958 (ii).

FOX, SIR DOUGLAS, ESTIMATES *re* SUBMARINE TUNNEL: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 208 (i).

HARBOURS AND BREAKWATERS, IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 226 (i).

MIMINIGASH BREAKWATER, PET. OF FISHERMEN, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 4296 (iii).

—— PET. OF FISHERMEN, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 4296 (iii).

—— PROGRESS OF WORK: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3959.

—— WHARFAGE DUES: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 130 (i).

MUTTART, MR., DISMISSAL: M. for Cor., (Mr. *Perry*) 2158 (ii).

NEW LONDON HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 226 (i).

OYSTER BEDS, LEASING: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3958 (ii).

PINETTE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 226 (i).

PIERS, WHARVES AND BREAKWATERS: Ques. (Mr *Perry*) 3951 (ii).

POWNAL BAY, PREVENTIVE OFFICER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 4672 (iii).

"PRINCE EDWARD" DREDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1765.

RED POINT PIER, EXPEND. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 1371 (ii).

SAUNDERS, WM., DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Perry*) 2158 (ii).

"STANLEY," STEAMER, AND COM. WITH P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1929 (i).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—*Continued.*

SUMMERSIDE HARBOUR, DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3258 (ii).

—— POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3955 (ii).

TIGNISH BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 130 (i).

—— WHARFAGE DUES: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 708 (i).

—— HARBOUR MASTER, MONEYS COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 4673 (iii).

—— REFUND OF MONEYS COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3259 (ii).

TUNNEL BETWEEN P.E.I. AND MAINLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 208 (i).

—— SIR DOUGLAS FOX'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 4294 (ii).

WEST POINT WHARF, ENGINEER'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 269 (i).

WINTER COMMUNICATION WITH P.E.I.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 158 (i).

WOOD ISLANDS BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 1271 (i).

WOOD ISLAND HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 226 (i).

P. E. I. AND MAINLAND SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 4701 (iii).

P. E. I. RY., DISMISSAL OF EMPLOYÉS: Enquiry for Ret.* (Mr. *Perry*) 4000 (iii).

—— EMPLOYÉS, DISMISSAL: Enquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 4087 (ii).

—— DISMISSAL OF SECTION FOREMEN: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Perry*) 2158 (ii).

—— in Com. of Sup., 1758 (i), 3898 (ii), 6198 (i).

—— ROAD-BED AND RAILS: M. for Reps. &c. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 228 (i).

—— TRAIN SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1274 (i).

PRINTING, ADVERTISING, INSPECTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1756 (i).

PRINTING AND STATIONERY, DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Chapleau*) 738 (i).

—— DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 243, 442 (i), 6166 (iii).

PRINTING BUREAU, ABSENCE OF SUPERINTENDENT: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 2375, 2437 (ii).

—— ADDITIONAL PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 1706, (i), 5346 (iii).

—— BABCOCK FIRE EXTINGUISHERS: in Com. of Sup., 6253 (iii).

—— in Com. of Sup., 4393 (iii).

—— PURCHASE OF TYPE, COST: Ques. (Mr. *Trow*) 3619 (ii).

—— REGULATIONS *re* EMPLOYÉS: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 3618 (ii).

—— TYPE-SETTING MACHINES: Ques. (Mr. *Lepine*) 271 (i).

PRINTING, CLAIM OF LATE CONTRACTORS AGAINST GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 269 (i).

PRINTING COM., JOINT: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 156 (i).

PRINTING, MISCELLANEOUS: conc., 5418 (iii).

PRINTING, PAPER, BINDING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 946.

—— CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr *Delisle*) 528 (i).

PRINTING TIME TABLES, &c., GOVT. RYS.: Ques. (Mr. *Joncas*) 3614 (ii).

PRIVATE BILLS PETS., EXTENSION OF TIME: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 128 (i).

—— PRESENTATION, EXTENSION OF TIME: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 156 (ii).

—— REPS. FROM COM., EXTENSION OF TIME: M. (Mr. *Foster*) 3738 (ii).

—— M. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2961 (ii).

—— REP. FROM COMS., EXTENSION OF TIME: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 828, 1483 (i), 2233, 3308 (iii)

—— SUSPENSION OF RULES: M. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 286; M. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 1987 (i).

Private Detective, Financial, &c., Corporations Regulations B. No. 109 (Mr. *Sproule*). 1°*, 1011 (i).

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS COM., MEETINGS: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*, &c.) 983, 1987 (i).

—— PRINTING EVIDENCE: Remarks (Mr. *Armstrong*) 5352 (iii).

—— 1ST REP.: Presented (Mr. *Girouard*) 799 (i).

—— 2ND REP.: M. (Mr. *Girouard*) reducing Quorum, 2360 (ii).

—— 4TH REP.: Presented (Mr. *Girouard*) 3738 (ii).

—— 5TH REP.: M. (Mr. *Girouard*) to conc., 4085 (ii)

—— 6TH REP., CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS: M. (Mr. *Girouard*) to conc., 4825 (iii).

—— 7TH REP.: Presented (Mr. *Girouard*) 5553 (iii).

—— *See* "PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS."

PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF. *See* "ORDER," &c.

PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 241, 433, 1556 (i), 6167 (iii).

PROROGATION: Com. from GOV. GEN.'s Sec. read (Mr. *Speaker*) 6309 (iii).

PROHIBITION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS: prop. Res. (Mr. *Jamieson*) 271; Amt. (Mr. *Mackintosh*) 344; Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Amt., 355; neg. (Y. 7, N. 185) 1312; M. (Mr. *Sproule*) to adjn. deb., neg. (Y. 65, N. 74) 362; M. (Mr. *Gillies*) to adjn. deb., agreed to (Y. 98, N. 80) 385; Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Amt., 1313; agreed to (Y. 107, N. 88) 1344 (i).

—— COMMISSION, EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6276 (iii).

—— Order for further consdn. postponed, 993 (i).

—— Remarks on adjnmt. (Sir *Hector Langevin, &c.*) 545, 736.

Provincial Accounts (Ont. and Que.) Settlement B. No. 99 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 807; 2°*, 1064; in Com. and 3°*, 1065 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 6.)

PROVINCIAL ACTS, TESTING VALIDITY: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 112 (i).

Provincial Courts Judges Act (*Chap.* 138 *Revised Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 153** (Sir *John Thompson*). Res. prop. 1849 (i); in Com., 3100; conc. in and 1°* of B., 3102; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3157 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 27.)

Provincial Govts. Transfer of Property B. No. 111 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 1101 (i); 2°, 3985 (ii); in Com., 5751, 6223; 3°*, 6224 (iii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 7.)

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 103 (i).

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE:
ACCOUNTS *re* LANGEVIN BLOCK: M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to ref., 3948 (ii).
BOURCIER & Co.'s ACCTS.: M. (Mr. *Somerville*) to ref., 3948 (ii).
BOURGEOIS, G. A., PAYMENT: M. (Mr. *Choquette*) to ref. Accts., 2361, 2437 (ii).
BRADLEY, W. I., ACCTS.: M. (Mr. *Wood, Westmoreland*) to ref., 5013 (iii).
COR., PUBLIC WORKS AND FINANCE: M. (Mr. *Sproule*) to produce, 3199 (ii).
DEPT. OF INTERIOR: M. (Mr. *Somerville*) to ref. Accts., 2203 (ii).
EXAMINATION OF WITNESSES: M. (Mr. *Wallace*) 2516 (ii).
FUNCTIONS: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4088 (i).
HAYTER AND GORMAN'S ACCTS.: M. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) to ref., 2743 (ii).
KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK ACCTS.: M. (Mr. *Sproule*) to ref., 3621 (ii).
P. O. D. ACCTS.: M. (Mr. *Barron*) to ref., 2517 (ii).
—— M. (Mr. *Sproule*) to ref., 2666 (ii).
PRINTING BUREAU ACCTS.&c.: M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to ref., 2905 (ii).
—— PAPER ACCTS.: M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to ref., 3308 (ii).
PRINTING EVIDENCE *re* J. R. ARNOLDI: M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to ref., 3308 (ii).
—— *re* AUDIT OFFICE: M. (Mr. *Wood, Westmoreland*) 5013 (iii).
—— Ms. (Mr. *Wallace*) 2374, 3513 (ii).
—— 21ST REP. OF COM.: Presented (Mr. *Sproule*) 4608 (iii).
RET., &c., *re* GRAVING DOCK: M. (Mr. *Wallace*) 3576 (ii).
TÊTU, J. E., ACCTS.: M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to ref., 2517.
TORONTO HARBOUR CONTRACT: M. (Mr. *Wood, Westmoreland*) to ref. Accts., 5013 (iii).
WITNESSES' EVIDENCE: M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4089 (ii).
WITNESSES ON OATH: M. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1345 (i).
—— M. (Mr. *Wallace*) 1925 (i).

PUBLIC DEBT AND SINKING FUND, TRUSTEES: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2152 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS, DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 103 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 255, 397, 439 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, CHARGES OF CONSPIRACY: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Tarte*) 146; Amt. (Mr. *Edgar*) to ref. to Priv. and Elec. Com., agreed to, 155 (i).
—— M. (Mr. *Girouard*) to conc. in 7TH REP. OF COM. ON PRIV. AND ELEC., 5778; Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 5919; neg. (Y. 83, N. 104) 6124; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) neg. (Y. 2, N. 184) 6121; Rep. conc. in (Y. 101, N. 86) 6125 (iii).
Deb. (Mr. *Tarte*) 5791, 6122; (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 5824; (Mr. *Coatsworth*) 5853; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 5881; Amt., 5919 (iii).
Deb. on Amt. (Mr. *Dickey*) 5919; (Mr. *Amyot*) 5999; (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 6034; (Mr. *Laurier*) 6043; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 6064; Amt. to Amt., 6085 (iii).
Deb. on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Curran*) 6086; (Mr. *Davin*) 6100; (Mr. *Edgar*) 6100; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 6112; (Mr. *McNeill*) 6115; (Mr. *Mulock*) 6119 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS: M. to summon Hon. T. Robitaille (Mr. *Girouard*) 2437 (ii).
—— M. Connolly's Books produced, notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 954 (i).
—— PAPERS: Enquiry (Mr. *Edgar*) 219, 395, 746. [*See* "BANCROFT," "CONNOLLY," "LARKIN;" *also* "ESQUIMALT," "KINGSTON," "LÉVIS."]
—— Rep. of Sub-Com. on Priv. and Elec. *re* M. Connolly read, 895 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., PERMANENT EMPLOYÉS, &c.: M. for Pet.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 1579 (i).
—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1849 (i).
—— EMPLOYÉS, RET.: Welland Canal employés, enquiry (Mr. *McMullen*) 3200 (ii).
—— RESIGNATION OF MINISTER: Stmnt. read (Sir *John Thompson*) 5074 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 3653 (ii).
—— EXPENDITURE SINCE CONFEDN.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1061 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS:
AMHERSTBURG DRY DOCK, SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Allan*) 334 (i), 3259 (ii).
—— M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Allan*) 3287 (ii).
ANNAPOLIS PUBLIC BUILDINGS, TENDERS, &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Lister*) 544 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 529 (i).
BARRIE P.O., ADVTS. FOR CONSTRUCTION: M. for copies* (Mr. *Barron*) 2935 (ii).
—— CONTRACTOR'S NAME: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 3255.
BAY OF QUINTÉ, IMPROVEMENT OF NAVIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Burdett*) 208 (i).
BEAVERTON HARBOUR WORKS, CONTRACTOR, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 226 (i).
—— TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 708 (i).
BELLE CREEK BREAKWATER, P.E.I., REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 1270 (i).
BIG BAY WHARF REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 1929 (i).
—— EXPENDITURE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Somerville*) 232 (i).
BLACK RIVER IMPROVEMENTS, ARTHABASKA CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 740 (i).
—— DRUMMOND CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 739 (i).
BONAVENTURE PIER, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 335 (i).
BOUCHERVILLE WHARF, CONTRACTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 1265 (i).
BRAE BREAKWATER, P.E.I., CONTRACT. &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1274 (i).
BRAE HARBOUR WHARF, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 208.
BREAKWATERS, GUYSBOROUGH CO., N.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1012 (i).
—— P.E.I., WHARFAGE DUES, REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 130 (i).
—— IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 226 (i).
BRIDGE AT QUEBEC, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2912 (ii).
—— SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 525 (i).
—— QUEBEC AND LÉVIS: M. for O. C.'s (Mr. *Langelier*) 104, 1041 (i).
—— M. for Eng.'s Reps. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1053 (i).
BUCKINGHAM P.O.: CONSTRUCTION: M. for Letters, &c. (Mr. *Devlin*) 229 (i).
CACOUNA TIMBER FOR WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Carroll*) 158 (i).
CALEDONIA DAM, GRAND RIVER, RECONSTRUCTION: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Montague*) 3287 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Continued.*

CALEDONIA DRILL SHED, REPAIRS: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Montague*) 3287 (ii).

CASCUMPEQUE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1765, 2151 (i),

CEMENT PURCHASES BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 4674 (iii).

CENTREVILLE, N.S., BREAKWATER, REP. *re* REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 962 (i).

CHATHAM P. O., CONTRACTOR'S NAME, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 3951 (ii).

COATICOOK P.O., COAL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 6216 (ii).

COTEAU LANDING WHARF AND SHEDS: Ques. (Mr. *Mousseau*) 222 (i).

DREDGING DU LOUP RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Carroll*) 158.

—— EAST RIVER, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1011 (i).

—— KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER, PAYMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 1267 (i).

—— RETURN *re* DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 600.

—— TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 129 (i).

—— LE LIÈVRE AND OTTAWA RIVERS: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 2907 (ii).

—— OTTAWA RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 2522 (ii),

—— "PRINCE EDWARD" DREDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1765 (i).

—— "ST. LAWRENCE" DREDGE, RESTIGOUCHE RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Brown, Chateauguay*) 3952.

—— ST. JEAN DESCHAILLONS SHOALS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 1053 (i).

—— BOUCHIER, GEO. L., AND CAPT. GIGUÈRE, REPS.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1266 (i).

—— SISSIBOO RIVER: Ques (Mr. *Bowers*) 1574 (i).

—— SUMMERSIDE HARBOUR: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3258 (ii).

—— THAMES RIVER, REMOVAL OF BAR: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 1268 (i).

DUNDAS AND WATERLOO MACADAMIZED ROAD: M. for O. Co.'s, &c. (Mr. *Bain*) 1058 (i).

EDGETT'S LANDING, BALLAST WHARF CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *King*) 3956 (i).

ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK, TENDERS, REP. OF H. F. PERLEY, &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Tarte*) 1937 (i).

—— TENDERS FOR CAISSON, ADVTS.: M. for copies (Mr. *Tarte*) 1932 (i).

—— REP. *re* LENGTH: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 530 (i).

—— SUMS PAID ON ACCT.: Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 270.

FENELON FALLS, LOCKMASTER'S HOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 4673 (iii).

FRASERVILLE P.O., CONTRACTOR'S NAME, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 3255 (ii).

GALT P.O., CONTRACTOR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 225 (i).

HARBOURS AND BREAKWATERS, P.E.I., IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 226 (i).

HASTINGS CO., PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Burdett*) 208 (i).

HULL P.O. CLOCK: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 222 (i).

ISLE BIZARD BRIDGE: Ques. and Remarks (Mr. *Brodeur*) 4674, 5014, 5195 (iii).

KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK ACCTS.: M. (Mr. *Sproule*) to ref. to Public Accts. Com., 3621 (ii).

—— BANCROFT TENDER: on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Amyot*) 4158; neg. (Y. 82, N. 99) 4212 (ii).

—— Notice for prop. Res. (Mr. *Tarte*) 635 (i).

—— ORIGINAL PLAN: M. for copy* (Mr. *Amyot*) 1579 (i).

—— PAPERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1764 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Continued.*

KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1848 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Amyot*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3653 (ii).

—— TENDERS, &C.*: M. for copies (Mr. *Tarte*) 127, 128 (i).

KNOWLTON'S LANDING, CONSTRUCTION OF WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 1770 (i).

LAKEPORT HARBOUR OF REFUGE: Ques. (Mr. *Hargraft*) 207 (i).

—— CONSTRUCTION: M. for Pets., &c.* (Mr. *Hargraft*) 232 (i).

LANGEVIN BLOCK, OTTAWA, ADVTS. FOR TENDERS, &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Mulock*) 531 (i).

—— PAYMENTS TO SEPT. 1, 1891: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 5776 (iii).

—— STONE HAULED OVER I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1768 (i).

—— TOTAL EXPENDITURE, &C: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock* 1267, 1575 (i).

LÉVIS GRAVING DOCK, MANAGEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 2149 (ii).

LINDSAY PUBLIC BUILDINGS, COMPLETION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 268 (i).

—— POST OFFICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 225 (i).

METEGHAN WHARF, REP. *re* REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 530 (i).

MIMINIGASH BREAKWATER, WHARFAGE DUES: Ques. (Mr; *Perry*) 130 (i).

—— PROGRESS OF WORK: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3959 (ii), 4296 (iii).

NAPANEE PUBLIC BUILDINGS, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Allison*) 1272 (i), 2154 (ii).

NEW CARLISLE WHARF, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 966 (i).

NEW HARBOUR, &C., N.S., BREAKWATERS: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1012 (i).

NEW LONDON HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Walsh*) 226 (i).

NORTH NATION RIVER, WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 222 (i).

NORTH SASKATCHEWAN RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 1576 (i).

OWEN SOUND HARBOUR, CHANGES IN SPECIFICATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 3960 (ii).

PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, METAL PILLARS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1273 (i).

PETERBOROUGH P.O., CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 225 (i).

PINETTE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 226 (i).

PORT GEORGE PIER, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 2910 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS, EXPENDITURE SINCE CONFEDN.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1061 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 1668, 1685, 1728, (i), 4314, 4444, 552, 4640, 4663, 6201, 6304 (iii).

—— DEPT., PERMANENT EMPLOYÉS, &C.: (Mr. *McMullen*) 1579 (i).

QUINTÉ, BAY OF, IMPROVEMENT OF NAVIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Burdett*) 201 (i).

QUE. HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, CHIEF ENGINEER: Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 527 (i).

RAQUETTE PIER, N.S., CONTRACTS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 1575 (i).

RED POINT PIER, P. E. I., EXPEND. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 1271 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Continued.*
RICHELIEU RIVER FLOODS: Ques. (Mr. *Béchard*) 336.
—— M. for Engineers Rep. (Mr. *Béchard*) 128 (i).
ST. JEAN DESCHAILLONS, REP. *re* DREDGING: Remarks (Mr. *Rinfret*) 2437 (ii).
ST. LAWRENCE RIVER, IMPROVEMENT OF NAVIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 207 (i).
SAFE IN FINANCE DEPT., TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Mc Mullen*) 130 (i).
SAULT STE. MARIE WHARF, MR. PLUMMER'S SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1575 (i).
—— PURCHASE OF PROPERTY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillmor*) 1268 (i).
—— RECEIPTS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2905 (ii).
—— RETURN OF FEES: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 3620 (ii).
STRATHROY P. O., BUILDING, TENDERS, &C.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Flint*) 2935 (ii).
—— CONTRACTOR'S NAME, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hyman*) 3262 (ii).
STONEY ISLAND BREAKWATER, AMOUNTS PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 5408 (iii).
SOREL HARBOUR WORKS, MEN EMPLOYED, NUMBER: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 5077 (iii).
TIGNISH BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 130 (i).
—— WHARFAGE DUES: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 708 (i).
TIGNISH HARBOUR MASTER, MONEYS COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3259, 4673 (iii).
THREE RIVERS PIER, TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 5776 (iii).
TORONTO DRILL SHED, CONTRACTS FOR ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 964 (i).
TUNNEL, P.E.I. AND MAINLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 203, 227 (i).
—— Explanation (Mr. *Foster*) 227 (i).
—— M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1277, 1605 (i).
—— SIR DOUGLAS FOX'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 4294 (ii).
VAUDREUIL WHARF, COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Harwood*) 335 (i).
VAUDREUIL AND BOUCHERVILLE WHARVES, EXPENDITURE, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 2548.
VICTORIA, B. C., DRILL HALL: M. for Reps.* (Mr. *Prior*) 736 (i).
WALKERTON PUBLIC BUILDINGS, CARETAKER: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 1271 (i).
—— BUILDINGS, HEATING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 335 (i).
—— CLERK OF WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 2151 (ii)
—— CONTRACT FOR FITTING: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 962 (i).
—— TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 267 (i).
WEST POINT WHARF, ENGINEER'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 269 (i).
WIARTON HARBOUR WORKS, CONTRACTOR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 226 (i).
WOOD ISLAND HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 226, 1271 (i).
WOOD SUPPLY, PUBLIC BUILDINGS, JOHN HENEY'S CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4295 (iii).
[*See* "SUPPLY," &c.]

PUGSLEY, WM., PET.: M. (Mr. *Davin*) to ref. to Standing Orders Com., 799 (i).

QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 1570 (i), 3576, 5336; conc., 5435 (iii).
—— OFFICER AT RIMOUSKI: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 3616 (ii).
QUARANTINE REGULATIONS, U. S.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 960 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. *McMullen, &c.*) 742 (i).
QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. EXTENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2145 (ii).
—— SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6032; in Com., 6137 (iii).
Quebec Bridge Co.'s B. No. 87 (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*). 1°*, 548; 2°*, 982; in Com. and 3°*, 1761 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 107.)
QUEBEC CENTRAL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY, PAYMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Godbout*) 4675 (iii).
—— SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033 (iii).
QUEBEC COLONIZATION LOTTERY: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2154 (ii).
QUEBEC EASTERN RY. SUBSIDY, PETS., &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Vaillancourt*) 1934 (i).
QUEBEC GARRISON CLUB, LANDS LEASED: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 527 (i).
QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, CHIEF ENGINEER: Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 527 (i).
—— INTEREST OWED GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 270.
—— LAFORCE LANGEVIN'S SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 2149 (ii).
—— CONTRACTS, REP. OF COM.: presented (Mr. *Girouard*) 799 (i); M. (Sir *John Thompson*) summoning M. Connolly to Bar of House, 806 (i).
QUEBEC LANDSLIDE: M. for O. C.'s, &c. (Mr. *Frémont*) 3621 (ii).
QUEBEC P. O., SUNDAY CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 1765 (i).
QUEBEC RY. BRIDGE AND NORTH SHORE RY. DEBENTURES: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 525 (i).
Quebec Skating Club, Conveyance of Land B. No. 160 (Sir *John Thompson*). Res. prop., 891 (i); in Com., 3584; 1°* of B., 3649; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 3984 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 14.)
QUEBEC WATER POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 3508 (ii).
QUEBEC, WEST, EXPULSION OF MEMBER: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6285 (iii).
—— M. (Sir *John Thompson*) Ordering attendance of Member, 3827 (ii).
—— Order for attendance of Member read, 4001 (ii).
—— M. (Sir *John Thompson*) for Arrest, 4001 (ii).
—— SEAT, REP. OF SUB.-COM. ON PRIV. AND ELEC.: presented (Mr. *Girouard*) 4747 (iii).
—— VACANCY, ISSUE OF WRIT: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6286 (iii).
—— Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 4081 (ii), 6309 (iii).
—— ON ISSUE OF WRIT: Res. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 4088 (ii).
—— *Supersedeas* WARRANT (Mr. *Speaker*) 5014 (iii).
QUEBEC:
"ADMIRAL" (STEAMBOAT) SUBSIDY, CONTRACT, &C.: M. for O.C.'s* (Mr. *Tarte*) 128 (i).
BAIE DES CHALEURS RY., SUBSIDIES: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 5075 (iii).
BEAUDRY, LIEUT. COL. A., CANCELLATION OF COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 1767 (i).
BEDARD, CHAS., REVISING OFFICER FOR NAPIERVILLE: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 1577 (i).

QUEBEC—*Continued.*

BELLECHASSE ELECTION, GAZETTING MEMBER: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 112 (i).

—— RET.: M. for Letters, &c. (Mr. *Amyot*) 187 (i)

BERNIER, CAPT. J. E., REPS. AGAINST BY L. LANGEVIN: M. for copies* (Mr. *Delisle*) 2935 (ii).

BLACK RIVER IMPROVEMENTS, ATHABASKA CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 740 (i).

—— DRUMMOND CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 739 (i).

BOISVERT, GEO., APPMNT. AS FISHERY OFFICER, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Leduc*) 2935 (ii).

BONAVENTURE PIER., CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 335 (i).

BOUCHIER, GEO. L., AND CAPT. GIGUERE, REP. *re* DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1266 (i).

BOUCHERVILLE WHARF, CONTRACTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 1265 (i).

BOURGEOIS, DR. G. A., P. O. INSPECTOR, RETIREMENT: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2935 (ii)

BRIDGE AT QUEBEC. *See* "PUBLIC WORKS."

BRIGHT, J. R., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 3263 (ii).

BUCKINGHAM P. O., CONSTRUCTION: M. for Letters, &c. (Mr. *Devlin*) 229 (i).

CACOUNA TIMBER FOR WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Carroll*) 158 (i).

CAMP AT ST. JOHN'S AND SOREL, PAY ROLL: M. for copies* (Mr. *Lépine*) 1062 (i).

CAOUETTE, J. B., ENQUIRY *re* LOSS OF LETTERS, &c.: M. for Rep.* (Mr. *Amyot*) 544 (i).

CENSUS COMMISSIONER W. E. JONES: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 1274 (i).

CHAMBLY CANAL, CONTRACT FOR SPREADING STONE: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 3959 (ii).

CHEVALIER, DR. E.N., DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Béchard*) 527 (i).

COATICOOK P. O., COAL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 6216 (iii).

COSTELLO, M., MONTREAL CUSTOM HOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 5406 (iii).

CHICOUTIMI ELECTION RETURN: Ques. (Mr. *Savard*) 142 (i).

COTEAU LANDING WHARF AND SHEDS: Ques. (Mr. *Mousseau*) 222 (i).

CROSS POINT AND GASPÉ BASIN MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Joncas*) 113 (i).

—— AND PASPEBIAC MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Joncas*) 113 (i).

DESMARTEAU'S, JOS., CLAIM, PETS. OF RIGHT: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 2155 (ii).

DOUCET, LOUIS, DISMISSAL FROM I. C. R. SHOPS: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 741 (i).

DREDGING DU LOUP RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Carroll*) 158.

DUGUAY, JOSEPH, EMPLOYMENT AS EXCISEMAN: Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 3254 (ii).

EASTERN TOWNSHIPS, GEOLOGICAL SURVEYS: Ques. (Mr. *Fréchette*) 198 (i).

EEL FISHERY, RIMOUSKI, DESTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2907, 2913 (ii).

FRASERVILLE P.O., CONTRACTOR'S NAME, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 3255 (ii).

FISHING LICENSES. *See* "FISHERIES."

GENEST, SAMUEL, RESIGNATION, &c.: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Devlin*) 145 (i).

GEOLOGICAL SURVEYS, EASTERN TOWNSHIPS: Ques. (Mr. *Fréchette*) 198 (i).

GIGUÉRE, CAPT. CLAUDE, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1266 (i).

QUEBEC—*Continued.*

HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS (QUE.) INTEREST OWED GOVT.: Ques (Mr. *Tarte*) 270 (i).

HARTLEY, H. E., DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Christie*) 144 (i),

HEARN, J. G., EMPLYMT. BY MILITIA DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Mousseau*) 5078 (iii).

HELBRONNER, JULES, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT., PAYMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 5407 (iii).

HULL P.O. CLOCK: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 222 (i).

HURTEAU, MR. HILAIRE, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 529 (i).

ISLE VERTE P.O., CAOUETTE'S ENQUIRY *re* LOSS OF LETTERS, &c.: M. for Rep.* (Mr. *Amyot*) 544.

JOCKES AND DELORIMIER, STONE CONTRACTORS, ARREARS OF ROYALTY: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 5076:

JONES, W. E., CENSUS COMMISSIONER FOR QUEBEC. Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 1274 (i).

JUDGES IN PROVINCE OF QUEBEC, APPOINTMENTS: (Mr. *Delisle*) 5076 (iii).

—— SALARIES AND APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 5405 (iii).

——MONTREAL DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 2908.

KNOWLTON'S LANDING, CONSTRUCTION OF WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 1770) (i).

LABERGE, MR., ASST. POSTMASTER, QUE.: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 3954 (ii).

LACHANCE, CAPT., EXAMINATION: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2913 (i).

LACHINE CANAL, SPECIFICATIONS, TENDERS, &c., *re* DRAIN: M. for copies (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 2157 (ii).

LAKE ST. PETER FISHING DIVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2148 (ii).

LANDSLIDE AT QUEBEC: M. for O. C.'s, &c. (Mr. *Frémont*) 3621 (i).

LANGEVIN, LAFORCE, CERTIFICATE AS C. E.: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 1769 (i).

—— REPS. AGAINST CAPT. J. E. BERNIER: M. for copies* (Mr. *Delisle*) 2935 (ii).

—— SERVICES *re* LÉVIS GRAVING DOCK: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 2149 (ii).

L'AVENIR BRANCH OF C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 197, 220 (i).

LAVALLÉE, N., FISHING IN RICHELIEU COUNTY, FISHERY OVERSEER, APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2148 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2145 (ii).

LEDUC, CHARLES, RESIGNATION, &c.: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Devlin*) 145 (i).

LÉVIS GRAVING DOCK, MANAGEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 2149 (ii).

LICENSES, FISHING. *See* "FISHERIES."

—— Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 2152 (ii).

LIQUOR, ILLEGAL SEIZURE: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 208, 741 (i), 2148 (ii).

LOGAN'S FARM AND DESMARTEAU'S CLAIM: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 2155 (ii).

LYSTER, POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION; Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 3958 (ii).

"MARIE ELIZA," SCH., SEIZURE AND SALE: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Langelier*) 1578 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 710 (i).

MAURICE, JOS. A., AND JULIE FOURNIER, CLAIMS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 2174 (ii).

"MERMERLY," BARQUE, WRECK, REWARDS TO CREW: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Fraser*) 712 (i).

MILITARY DISTRICT NO. 7. *See* "MILITIA."

MONTREAL AND MILE END, &c., MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 5077 (iii).

QUEBEC—*Continued.*

MONTREAL AND SOREL RY., COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 3614 (ii).

—— CUSTOM HOUSE. *See* "CUSTOMS."

—— P. O. LETTER BOX CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 3615 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3953 (ii).

NAPIERVILLE ELECTION AND REVISING OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 1577 (i).

—— AND ST. RÉMI RY., SUBSIDY, PETS., &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Monet*) 2541 (ii).

NAVIGATION, IMPROVEMENT OF ST. LAWRENCE RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 207 (i).

NEW CARLISLE WHARF, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 966 (i).

NORTH SHORE RY. *See* general heading.

NORTH NATION RIVER WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 222 (i).

ORDNANCE LANDS, MONTREAL CITY, LEASES: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 5409 (iii).

OTTAWA COUNTY POSTAL SERVICE; M. for Letters, &c. (Mr. *Devlin*) 229 (i).

OUILLET, HERMIDAS, ENQUIRY AT STE. FLAVIE: M. for Pet. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1937 (i).

PELLETIER, H. H., EMPLYMT. BY MILITIA DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 3258 (ii).

PERLEY, H. F., AND QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS: Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 527 (i).

PONNELL, JOHN, EMPLYMT. BY SOREL HARBOUR BOARD: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 5076 (iii).

PORTNEUF, ELECTION AND REVISING OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 207 (i).

QUARANTINE OFFICER AT RIMOUSKI: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 3616 (ii).

QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. EXTENSION, SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2145 (ii).

QUEEN'S BENCH, APPOINTMENT OF CHIEF JUSTICE: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 5405 (iii).

REVISING OFFICERS FOR RIMOUSKI: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 741 (i).

RICHELIEU COUNTY FISHING PRIVILEGES: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2145 (ii).

RICHELIEU RIVER FLOODS: M. for Rep. of Engineers* (Mr. *Béchard*) 128, 336 (i).

ROBITAILLE, C. N., PAYMENT FROM CUSTOMS DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 4673 (iii).

—— ROULEAU, F. F., FISHING RIGHTS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Choquette*) 2936 (ii).

RURAL POST OFFICES, OPENING AND CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2912 (ii).

STE. ANGÈLE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 5407 (iii).

STE. CROIX LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, RESIGNATION: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 173 (i).

STE. EMILE DE SUFFOLK, &C., POSTAL SERVICE: M. for Rets. (Mr. *Devlin*) 230 (i).

ST. JEAN DESCHAILLONS SHOALS, DREDGING: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 1053 (i).

ST. JOHN'S, P.Q., MEDICAL OFFICER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Béchard*) 527 (i).

"ST. LAWRENCE" DREDGE, WORK ON RESTIGOUCHE RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Brown, Chateauguay*) 3952.

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY, SUPPLIES: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 2912 (i).

SALMON NET FISHING ON RESTIGOUCHE: Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 1268 (i).

SALMON FISHERY LICENSES, BONAVENTURE CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 2152 (i).

QUEBEC—*Continued.*

SCHOOL OF INFANTRY ST. JOHN, SURGEON: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 3620 (ii).

SHEPPARD, W. A., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1266 (i).

SMUGGLING IN QUEBEC, SUITS, JUDGMENTS, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Delisle*) 1062 (i).

SOUCY, EUGÉNE, DISMISSAL FROM I.C.R. EMPLYMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1274 (i).

SOREL HARBOUR WORKS, MEN EMPLOYED, NUMBER: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 5077 (iii).

SOULANGES CANAL, ENGINEER'S REPS.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Mousseau*) 1578 (i).

—— EXPENDITURE, REPS., &C.: M. for Stmnt., &c. (Mr *Mousseau*) 532 (i).

SOUTH EASTERN RY. AND C. P. R.: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 197, 220 (i).

THREE RIVERS PIER, TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 5776 (i).

THURBER, LIEUT.-COL., RESIGNATION AS LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER: M. for O.C.'s (Mr. *Rinfret*) 173 (i).

VAUDREUIL AND BOUCHERVILLE WHARVES, EXPENDITURE, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 2548 (ii).

—— COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Harwood*) 335 (i).

VOTERS, PROVINCE OF QUE., TOTAL NUMBERS: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2940 (i).

WALLS OF QUEBEC, EXTENSION OF STREETS: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 3957 (ii).

YAMASKA, EAST, P. O., CLOSING: Ques, (Mr. *Mignault*) 2153 (ii).

QUEEN'S BENCH, APPOINTMENT OF CHIEF JUSTICE: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 5405 (iii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Langelier*) 5195 (ii).

—— DEATH OF CHIEF JUSTICE: Ques. (Mr. *Lepine*) 3620 (ii).

QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY, ADJNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 157.

QUEEN'S COUNSEL, CONFERRING TITLE: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 3263 (ii).

QUINTÉ, BAY OF, IMPROVEMENT OF NAVIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Burdett*) 201 (i).

RAQUETTE PIER, N.S., CONTRACTS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 1575 (i).

RAPIDE PLAT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 4107 (ii).

—— TENDERS, &C.: M. for copies, &c.* (Mr. *Murray*) 544 (i).

Rathbun Co.'s B. No. 171 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). Rules suspended, 5012; 1°* of B., 5013; 2°*, 5075; in Com. and 3°*, 5374 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 122.)

Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 103 (Mr. *Barron*). 1°*, 891 (i); 2° m., 3303 (ii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 110 (Mr. *Davin*). 1°, 1062 (i); 2°, 3307 (ii).

Ry. Acts Amt. B. No. 176 (Mr. *Bowell*). 1°*, 6286; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 6287 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 51.)

RAILWAY BRIDGE, QUEBEC AND LÉVIS: M. for Engineer's Reps. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1053 (i).

——M. for O. C.'s (Mr. *Langelier*) 1041 (i).

RAILWAY LANDS, VANCOUVER ISLAND, REPS.: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 1051 (i).

RAILWAYS AND CANALS DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 407 (i), 6169 (iii).

RAILWAYS DEPTL. REP. : Presented (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 104 (i).
—— COM. : List of Members, 136 (i).
RYS. IN INVERNESS CO., N.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2911 (ii).
RAILWAYS :
ALBERTA RY., PAYMENT OF LABOURERS : Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3956 (ii).
CARAQUET RY., RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES : Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3614 (ii).
CAPE BRETON AND N. S. RY. ACCOMMODATION : M. for Cor., &c., (Mr. *Fraser*) 177 (i).
CAPE BRETON RY., STATION MASTERS' DUTIES : Ques. (Mr. *Macdougall, C.B.*) 4677 (iii).
CANADIAN PACIFIC RY. *See* general heading.
CARLETON BRANCH RY., PAPER *re* SALE : Mess. from His Ex., 550 (i).
DOM. AID TO RYS. : M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1053 (i).
GOVT. RYS., EXPENDITURE ON CAPITAL ACCT. : Stmnts. presented (Mr. *Bowell*) 4092 (ii).
GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY., ENGINEER'S CERTIFICATES : Ques. (Mr. *Daly*) 2144 (i).
IN COM. OF SUP., 1652, 1758 (i), 3857, 4057 (ii), 6197.
INTERCOLONIAL RY. *See* general heading.
INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*) 2522 (ii).
LIVERPOOL AND ANNAPOLIS RY. : Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 143 (i).
MONTREAL AND SOREL RY., COMPLETION : Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 3614 (ii).
P.E.I. RY., DISMISSAL OF SECTION FOREMEN : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Perry*) 2158 (ii).
—— DISMISSAL OF EMPLOYÉS : Enquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 4000, 4087 (ii).
—— ROAD-BED AND RAILS ; M. for Reps., &c. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 228 (i).
—— TRAIN SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1274 (i).
RYS. IN INVERNESS CO., N.S. : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2911 (ii).
SHORT LINE RY., ACCOMMODATION IN C.B. AND N.S. : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Fraser*) 177 (i).
—— NEW ROUTE : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 3266 (ii).
SOUTH EASTERN RY. AND C.P.R. : Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 197, 220 (i).
WINNIPEG AND HUDSON BAY CO.'S SHAREHOLDERS : Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1852 (i).

See ALSO :
ALBERTA RY. AND COAL CO.
ATIKOKAN IRON RANGE RY. CO.
BAIE DES CHALEURS RY. CO.
BRITISH COLUMBIA SOUTHERN RY. CO.
BRIGHTON, WARKWORTH AND NORWOOD RY. CO.
BUFFALO LAKE AND BATTLEFORD RY., &C., CO.
BURRARD INLET AND WESTMINSTER VALLEY RY. CO.
CANADIAN PACIFIC RY.
CARLETON BRANCH RY.
CENTRAL COUNTIES RY. CO.
CHATSWORTH, GEORGIAN BAY AND LAKE HURON R. CO.
CHIGNECTO MARINE TRANSPORT RY. CO.
COBOURG, NORTHUMBERLAND AND PACIFC RY. CO.
COLLINGWOOD AND BAY OF QUINTÉ RY. CO.
GRAND TRUNK RY. CO.
GREAT EASTERN RY. CO.
GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY. CO.
GUELPH JUNCTION AND C.P.R.
HARVEY AND SALISBURY RY. CO.
INTERCOLONIAL RY.

RAILWAYS—*Continued.*
INVERNESS RY. AND MINING CO.
KINGSTON AND PONTIAC RY. CO.
KINGSTON, SMITH'S FALLS AND OTTAWA RY. CO.
LAKE ERIE AND DETROIT RIVER RY. CO.
LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE COLONIZATION RY. CO.
LONDON AND PORT STANLEY RY. CO.
MANITOBA AND ASSINIBOIA GRAND JUNCTION RY. CO.
MEDICINE HAT RY. AND COAL CO.
MONTREAL AND OTTAWA RY. CO.
NEW BRUNSWICK RY. CO.
ONTARIO AND RAINY RIVER RY. CO.
OSHAWA RY. CO.
PETERBOROUGH, SUDBURY AND SAULT STE. MARIE RY. CO.
RED DEER VALLEY RY. CO.
ROCKY MOUNTAIN RY. CO.
ST. CATHARINES AND NIAGARA CENTRAL RY. CO.
ST. CLAIR RIVER RY. BRIDGE AND TUNNEL CO.
ST. LAWRENCE AND OTTAWA RY. CO.
SASKATCHEWAN RY. AND MINING CO.
SHUSWAP AND OKANAGON RY. CO.
SOUTH ONTARIO PACIFIC RY. CO.
SOUTH-WESTERN RY. CO.
TORONTO, HAMILTON AND BUFFALO RY. CO.
VICTORIA AND NORTH-AMERICAN RY. CO.
VICTORIA, SAANICH AND NEW WESTMINSTER RY. CO.
WINNIPEG AND HUDSON BAY RY. CO.
[*See* "SUBSIDIES," "SUPPLY," &c.]

REBELLION, N.W.T., 1885, PENSIONS : in Com. of Sup., 3662 (ii).
—— CLAIMS *re* : in Com. of Sup., 6274 (iii).
—— OF 1837-38, LAND GRANTS TO VOLUNTEERS : Ques. (Mr. *Allison*) 961 (i).
RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE, CONSOLIDATED FUND : M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 135, 213 (i).
Reckoning of Time B. No. 166 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 4237 (ii).
RECOUNTS, LATE ELECTION : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 142, 177 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 68 (Mr. *Prior*). 1°*, 387 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 76.)
RED POINT PIER, P.E.I., EXPEND. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 1271 (i).
RED RIVER SURVEYS, COST : Ques. (Mr. *Ross, Lisgar*) 1012 (i).
REED AND SHANNONVILLE MAIL SERVICE : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Burdett*) 212 (i).
REGINA COUNCIL CHAMBER : in Com. of Sup., 4450, 6249 (iii).
—— GAOL : in Com. of Sup., 928 (i).
—— INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL : in Com. of Sup., 1687 (i).
—— "LEADER," PAYMENTS FOR PRINTING, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 4295 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Trow*) 4465 (iii).
—— LIEUT. GOV.'S RESIDENCE : in Com. of Sup., 4444 (iii).
REGISTERED LETTERS, REDUCTION OF FEE : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 143 (i).
REGISTRATION STAMPS, REVENUE : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 158 (i).

REPAIRS, FURNITURE, HEATING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4469 (iii).

REPORTS PRESENTED :
AGRICULTURE (Mr. *Haggart*) 103 (i).
AUDITOR GENERAL (Mr. *Foster*) 103 (i).
CANAL STATISTICS (Mr. *Bowell*) 738 (i).
CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINERS (Mr. *Chapleau*) 103 (i).
CIVIL SERVICE LIST (Mr. *Chapleau*) 103 (i).
DECK LOADS, REP. OF EVIDENCE (Mr. *Tupper*) 103 (i)
EXPERIMENTAL FARMS (Mr. *Haggart*) 104 (i).
EXPORT CATTLE TRADE, REP. OF EVIDENCE (Mr. *Tupper*) 103 (i).
FISHERIES INSPECTORS' REPORTS (Mr. *Chapleau*)738.
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY (Mr. *Dewdney*) 103 (i).
GOVERNOR GENERAL'S WARRANTS (Mr. *Foster*) 103 (i)
HIGH COMMISSIONER (Mr. *Haggart*) 104 (i).
INDIAN AFFAIRS (Mr. *Dewdney*) 103 (i).
INLAND REVENUE (Mr. *Costigan*) 103 (i).
INTERIOR (Mr. *Dewdney*) 103 (i).
MARINE (Mr. *Tupper*) 103 (i).
MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 135 (i).
MOUNTED POLICE (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 237 (i).
PENITENTIARIES (Sir *John Thompson*) 129 (i).
POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. *Haggart*) 103 (i).
PRINTING AND STATIONERY (Mr. *Chapleau*) 738 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 103 (i).
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS (Mr. *Foster*) 103 (i).
RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 104.
SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. *Chapleau*) 103 (i).
STEAMBOAT INSPECTION, &c., &c. (Mr. *Tupper*) 103 (i).
TRADE AND NAVIGATION (Mr. *Bowell*) 104 (i).
WEIGHTS, MEASURES AND GAS (Mr. *Costigan*) 103 (i)

REPRESENTATION. *See* "N.W.T."

RETURNING OFFICER FOR VICTORIA, N.S., APPOINTMENT : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Flint*) 2935 (ii).

RETURNS (ELECTION) TO CLERK OF CROWN IN CHANCERY : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 131 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c. :
"ADMIRAL" (STEAMBOAT), SUBSIDY, CONTRACTS, &c.* : Mr. *Tarte*, 128 (i).
—— STR., O. C.'s *re* SERVICES, CONTRACTS : Mr. *Tarte*, 2157 (ii).
ADVERTISING OTTAWA MAIL SERVICE IN "LE CANADA" : Mr. *Beausoleil*, 2540 (ii).
ALBINO POINT, CUSTOMS OFFICER* : Mr. *German*, 1579 (i).
AMERICAN CHEESE SHIPPED THROUGH CAN.* : Mr. *Marshall*, 205 (i).
AMHERSTBURG DRY DOCK* : Mr. *Allan*, 3287 (ii).
ANALYSIS OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS : Mr. *Curran*, 203 (i).
ANNAPOLIS PUBLIC BUILDINGS, TENDERS, &c.* ; Mr. *Lister*, 544 (i).
ARNOLDI, J. R., REP. *re* BALLOT BOXES : Mr. *Landerkin*, 201 (i).
ATKINSON, J. H. C., APPOINTMENT AND DISMISSAL : Mr. *Allan*, 1580, 1980 (i).
ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE : Mr. *Laurier*, 124 (i).
BALLOT BOXES, J. R. ARONLDI'S REP. : Mr. *Landerkin*, 201 (i).
BARRIE P. O., ADVTS. FOR CONSTRUCTION* : Mr. *Barron*, 2935 (ii).
BAY OF FUNDY FISHERIES ; Mr. *Bowers*, 715 (i).
BEACON HILL PARK (B.C.) MAGAZINE, &c.* : Mr. *Prior*, 736 (i).
BEET-ROOT SUGAR, CULTIVATION AND MANUFACTURE* : Mr. *Beausoleil*, 545 (i).
BELLECHASSE ELECTORAL RET. : Mr. *Amyot*, 187 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*
BERNIER, CAPT. J. E., REPS. AGAINST BY L. LANGEVIN* : Mr. *Delisle*, 2935 (ii).
BIG BAY WHARF REPAIRS, EXPENDITURE* : Mr. *Somerville*, 232.
"BLIZZARD," SCHOONER, RESCUE OF CREW, REWARDS : Mr. *Flint*, 735 (i).
BOISVERT, GEO., APPMNT. AS FISHERY OFFICER, &c.* : Mr. *Leduc*, 2935 (ii).
BOUNTIES, FISHERY, PAID IN QUEEN'S, N.S. ; Mr. *Forbes*, 734 (i).
—— PAID IN GUYSBOROUGH CO.* : Mr. *Fraser*, 232.
BOUNTY CHEQUES, FISHERY, COSTS, &c., *re* DISTRIBUTION : Mr. *Flint*, 180 (i).
—— PAYMENTS, FISHING : Mr. *Flint*, 211 (i).
—— CLAIMS, BY PROVINCES, &c., &c. : Mr. *Flint*, 537 (i).
BOURGEOIS, DR. G. A., P. O. INSPECTOR, RETIREMENT* : Mr. *Choquette*, 2935 (ii).
BRIDGE, QUEBEC AND LÉVIS : Mr. *Langelier*, 1041 (i).
—— Mr. *Laurier*, 1053)i).
BUCKINGHAM P. O., CONSTRUCTION : Mr. *Devlin*, 229 (i).
BUREAU OF LABOUR STATISTICS : Mr. *Lépine*, 201 (i).
"C" BATTERY, SERVICES AT WELLINGTON, B.C.* ; Mr. *Gordon*, 146 (i).
—— BARRACKS* : Mr. *Prior*, 736.
CALEDONIA DAM, GRAND RIVER, RECONSTRUCTION* ; Mr. *Montague*, 3287 (ii).
CALEDONIA DRILL SHED, REPAIRS* : Mr. *Montague* 3287 (ii).
CAMP, MILITIA DISTRICT NO, 1 : Mr. *Hyman*, 231 (i).
CAMPBELLTON P. O., INVERNESS CO., ESTABLISHMENT, PETS., &c.* : Mr. *Laurier*, 544 (i).
CAMP AT ST. JOHN'S AND SOREL, PAY ROLL* : Mr. *Lépine*, 1062 (i).
CANADIAN, WEST INDIAN AND SOUTH AMERICAN SS. CO., SUBSIDIES TO* : Mr. *Davies* (*P.E.I.*), 544 (i).
CANAL CONTRACTS, ENLARGEMENT OR CONSTRUCTION : Mr. *Trow*, 1938 (i).
CAOUETTE, J. B., ENQUIRY *re* LOSS OF LETTERS, &c.* : Mr. *Amyot*, 544 (i).
CAPE BRETON AND N. S. RY. ACCOMMODATION : Mr. *Fraser*, 177 (i).
CENSUS, 1881 AND 1891, VOTERS ACCORDING TO POPULATION, &c.* : Mr. *Landerkin*, 128 (i).
CENTRAL EXPERIMENTAL FARM, ENTIRE HORSES* : Mr. *McMillan*, 1579 (i).
—— BULLETINS, &c.* ; Mr. *Devlin*, 1579 (i).
CHEESE, AMERICAN, SHIPPED THROUGH CAN.* : Mr. *Marshall*, 205 (i).
CHINESE IMMIGRATION* : Mr. *Gordon*, 1578 (i).
CONSOLIDATED FUND, RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES* : Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 135, 213 (i).
COPYRIGHT LAWS OF CANADA : Mr. *Edgar*, 726 (i).
COSGROVE, JOHN, RESIGNATION, &c.* : Mr. *Devlin*, 145 (i).
COTTON SAIL DUCK, IMPORTS AT HALIFAX* : Mr. *White* (*Shelburne*), 174 (i).
CRYSTAL BEACH AND POINT ALBINO CUSTOMS OFFICERS* : Mr. *German*, 1579 (i).
C. P. R. *See* general heading.
DEBENTURES, NORTH SHORE RY. : Mr. *Langelier*, 974 ; deb. rsmd., 1014 (i).
DEP. ADJUTANT GEN., MIL. DIST. NO. 11* : Mr. *Prior*, 736 (i).
DESMARTEAU'S, JOS., CLAIM, PET. OF RIGHT : Mr. *Laurier*, 2155 (ii).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*
DISPUTED TERRITORY (ONT.) TIMBER CUT, &c.*: Mr. *Barron*, 128 (i).
DISALLOWANCE OF MAN. ACT *re* INSTITUTIONS, &c., TRANSACTING BUSINESS*: Mr. *Watson*, 544 (i).
—— ACT *re* DISEASES OF ANIMALS*: Mr. *Watson*, 545 (i).
DOM. AID TO RYS.: Mr. *McMullen*, 1053 (i).
DOM. NOTES IN CIRCULATION, &c.*: Mr. *Mulock*, 1578 (i).
DUNDAS AND WATERLOO MACADAMIZED ROAD: Mr. *Bain*, 1058 (i).
ELECTION (1891) VOTES POLLED, &c.*: Mr. *Landerkin*, 128 (i).
—— RETURNS TO CLERK OF CROWN IN CHANCERY: Mr. *Landerkin*, 131 (i).
—— RET. FOR BELLECHASSE: Mr, *Amyot*, 187.
ELEVATORS BUILT ON INTERCOLONIAL RY.*: Mr. *McMullen*, 135 (i).
ELGIN (EAST) ELECTORAL DIST., RET. OFFICER'S ACCOUNTS*: Mr. *Ingram*, 1579 (i).
ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK, ADVTS. FOR TENDERS FOR CAISSON: Mr. *Tarte*, 1932 (i).
—— TENDERS, REP. OF H. F. PERLEY, &c.: Mr. *Tarte*, 1937 (i).
EXPENDITURES FOR PUBLIC WORKS SINCE CONFEDN.: Mr. *Landerkin*, 1061 (i).
EXPERIMENTAL FARMS, EXPENDITURE*: Mr. *Mara*, 232 (i).
—— ENTIRE HORSES*: Mr. *McMillan*, 1579 (i).
—— BULLETINS, &c.*: Mr. *Devlin*, 1579 (i).
EXPORT OF POTATOES FROM CANADA*: Mr. *McMullen*, 544 (i).
EXPORTS AND IMPORTS*: Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 135 (i).
FEDERAL AID TO RYS.: Mr. *McMullen*, 1053 (i).
FINES FOR VIOLATING FISHERY LAWS*: Mr. *Fraser*, 1891 (i).
FISHERIES. *See* general heading.
FORESHORES, &c., OF THE DOM., OWNERSHIP: Mr. *Flint*, 178 (i).
FRENCH LANGUAGE IN MAN., ABOLITION: Mr. *La Rivière*, 114 (i).
GALWAY P. O., ESTABLISHMENT*: Mr. *Barron*, 736.
GENEST, SAMUEL, RESIGNATION, &c.*: Mr. *Devlin*, 145 (i).
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, EXPENDITURE IN FIELD WORK*: Mr. *McLeod*, 544 (i).
GOVERNOR GEN.'S WARRANTS, DETAILS OF EXPENDITURE*: Mr. *Mulock*, 232 (i).
GOVT. OFFICIALS AND RECENT ELECTIONS: Mr. *Allan*, 1580 (i).
GOVT. SAVINGS BANKS, DEPOSITS: Mr. *McMullen*, 202, 210 (i).
GRAHAM, J. R., DISMISSAL: Mr. *Barron*, 210 (i).
GRAND RIVER NAVIGATION, ENGINEERS' REPS.: Mr. *Montague*, 2155 (ii).
GRANT, J. J., ENTRY FOR DOM. LANDS, N.W.T.: Mr. *Davin*, 3635 (ii).
GRAVING DOCK, KINGSTON*: Mr. *Tarte*, 127 (i).
HALIFAX COUNTY COURT JUDGE, INCREASE OF SALARY; Mr. *Fraser*, 2547(ii).
HARTLEY, H. E., DISMISSAL: Mr. *Christie*, 144 (i).
HASTINGS COUNTY MAIL SERVICE: Mr. *Burdett*, 212.
HORSES, CENTRAL EXPERIMENTAL FARM: M. for Cor. (Mr. *McMillan*) 1579 (i).
INDIANS. *See* general heading.
INDIAN DEPTL. ESTIMATES, REGINA*: Mr. *Davin*. 2935 (ii).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Contenued.*
INTERCOLONIAL RY. *See* general heading.
INTOXICATING LIQUORS, ANALYSIS: Mr. *Curran*, 203 (i).
—— INTO QUEBEC*: Mr. *Delisle*, 1062 (i).
INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY.: Mr. *Cameron* (*Inverness*) 2522 (ii).
ISLE VERTE P. O., ENQUIRY *re* LOSS OF LETTERS, &c.*: Mr. *Amyot*, 544 (i).
JOHNSTON, SAML., DISMISSAL FROM CUSTOMS SERVICE*: Mr. *German*, 2935 (ii).
KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK*: Mr. *Tarte*, 128 (i).
—— ORIGINAL PLAN*: Mr. *Amyot*, 1579 (i).
KINGSTON P. O., LESSEES OF BOXES: Mr. *Amyot*, 1578 (i).
—— REP. OF POSTMASTER, &c.: Mr. *Amyot*, 2545.
LABOUR STATISTICS, ESTABLISHMENT OF BUREAU: Mr. *Lépine*, 201 (i).
LACHINE CANAL, SPECIFICATIONS, TENDERS, &c., *re* DRAIN: Mr. *Préfontaine*, 2157 (ii).
LAHAVE RIVER, N. S., SAWDUST DEPOSITS: Mr. *Kaulbach*, 1942 (i), 2175 (ii).
LAIDLOW, WM. (N.W.M.P.) RESIGNATION, &c.: Mr. *McMullen*, 1048 (i).
LAKEPORT HARBOUR OF REFUGE, CONSTRUCTION*: Mr. *Hargraft*, 232 (i).
LANDSLIDE AT QUEBEC: Mr. *Frémont*, 3621 (ii).
LANGEVIN BLOCK, OTTAWA, ADVTS. FOR TENDERS, &c.: Mr. *Mulock*, 531 (i).
LANGEVIN, LAFORCE, REPS, AGAINST CAPT. J. E. BERNIER*: Mr. *Delisle*, 2935 (ii).
LEDUC, CHARLES, RESIGNATION, &c.*: Mr. *Devlin*, 145 (i).
"LE CANADA," ADVERTISING OTTAWA MAIL SERVICE: Mr. *Beausoleil*, 2540 (ii).
LEWIS, LIEUT.-COL., VACANCY THROUGH DEATH: Mr. *Burnham*, 733 (i).
LICENSES, FISHING, GRANTED IN QUEBEC*: Mr. *Beausoleil*, 145 (i).
—— RESTIGOUCHE RIVER: Mr. *Fauvel*, 3283 (ii).
"LILY," H.M.S.. RESCUE OF CREW: Mr. *Edgar*, 1059 (i).
LIQUOR PERMITS IN N. W. T., REPS., &c.*: Mr, *Charlton*, 545 (i).
LOBO P. O., CHANGE OF POSTMASTER*: Mr. *Armstrong*, 1579 (i).
LOGAN'S FARM AND DESMARTEAU'S CLAIM, PET. OF RIGHT: Mr. *Laurier*, 2155 (ii).
MANITOBA SEPARATE SCHOOLS: Mr. *LaRivière*, 115; Mr. *Devlin*, 116 (i).
"MARIE ELIZA," SCHOONER, SEIZURE AND SALE*: Mr. *Langelier*, 1578 (i).
MAURICE, JOS. A., AND JULIE FOURNIER, CLAIMS, &c.: Mr. *Préfontaine*, 2174 (ii).
MCCORMICK, F. B., REMOVAL AND REINSTATEMENT: Mr. *Allan*, 1580, 1980 (i).
MCMAHON, CHAS. W., POSTMASTER AT KINMOUNT: Mr. *Barron*, 736 (i).
"MERMERLY," BARQUE, WRECK, REWARDS TO CREW: Mr. *Fraser*, 712 (i).
MILITIA. *See* general heading.
MINING MACHINERY, FREE ENTRY INTO B. C.: Mr. *Mara*, 965 (i).
MONTREAL CUSTOM HOUSE EMPLOYÉS: Mr. *Lépine*, 3275 (ii).
MUNROE, HUGH, CLAIM FOR DAMAGES: Mr. *Fraser*, 2546 (ii).
MUNRO, THOS., REP. *re* MANCHESTER SHIP CANAL*: Mr. *Mulock*, 1579 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*
MUTTART, MR., DISMISSAL: Mr. *Perry*, 2158 (ii).
NAPIERVILLE AND ST. RÉMI RY., SUBSIDY, PETS., &C.: Mr. *Monet*, 2541.
NEW CARLISLE WHARF, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: Mr. *Fauvel*, 966 (i).
NEWFOUNDLAND BAIT ACT: Mr. *Kaulbach*, 3267 (ii).
NORTH SHORE RY. DEBENTURES: Mr. *Langelier*, 974; deb. rsmd, 1014 (i).
OCEAN MAIL SERVICE: Mr. *Laurier*, 124 (i).
OTTAWA COUNTY POSTAL SERVICE: Mr. *Devlin*, 229.
OUILLET, HERMIDAS, ENQUIRY AT STE. FLAVIE *re*: Mr. *Choquette*, 1937 (i).
PAY ROLL, MIL. CAMP, SOREL AND ST. JOHN'S*: Mr. *Lépine*, 1062 (i).
PELEE ISLAND, SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS: Mr. *Allan*, 1580, 1980 (i).
P. E. I. RY., ROAD-BED AND RAILS: Mr. *Davies*, (*P.E.I.*) 228 (i).
—— DISMISSAL OF SECTION FOREMEN: Mr. *Perry*, 2158 (ii).
PERMITS, LIQUOR, IN N.W.T., REPS., &C.*: Mr. *Charlton*, 545 (i).
PICKFORD & BLACK, MESSRS., PAYMENT OF SUBSIDIES TO*: Mr. *Davies* (*P.E.I.*) 544 (i).
POSTMASTERS OF THE DOM., SALARIES AND CONTINGENCIES*: Mr. *McMullen*, 128 (i).
POTATOES EXPORTED FROM CANADA*: Mr. *McMullen*, 544 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS, EXPENDITURE SINCE CONFEDN.: Mr. *Landerkin*, 1061 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS, DEPTL. PERMANENT EMPLOYÉS, &C.*: Mr. *McMullen*, 1579 (ii).
QUEBEC EASTERN RY., SUBSIDY, PETS., &C.: Mr. *Vaillancourt*, 1934 (i).
QUEBEC LANDSLIDE: Mr. *Frémont*, 3621 (ii).
RAILWAY BRIDGE, QUEBEC AND LÉVIS: Mr. *Langelier*, 1041 (i).
—— Mr. *Laurier*, 1053 (i).
RAILWAYS, DOM. AID TO: Mr. *McMullen*, 1053 (i).
RAILWAY LANDS, VANCOUVER ISLAND, REPS.: Mr. *Laurier*, 1051 (i).
RAPIDE PLAT CANAL, TENDERS, &C.*: Mr. *Murray*, 544 (i).
RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES, CONSOLIDATED FUND*: Sir *Richard Cartwright* 135, 213 (i).
REED AND SHANNONVILLE MAIL SERVICE: Mr. *Burdett*, 212 (i).
RETURNING OFFICER FOR VICTORIA, N.S., APPMNT.*: Mr. *Flint*, 2935 (ii).
RETURNS (ELECTION) TO CLERK OF CROWN IN CHANCERY: Mr. *Landerkin*, 131 (i).
RICHELIEU RIVER FLOODS*: Mr. *Béchard*, 128 (i).
RIDEAU CANAL, KINGSTON AND JONES' FALLS: Mr. *Kirkpatrick*, 711 (i).
ROULEAU, F. F., FISHING RIGHTS*: Mr. *Choquette*, 2936 (ii).
STE. CROIX LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, RESIGNATION: Mr. *Rinfret*, 173 (i).
STE. EMILE DE SUFFOLK, &C., POSTAL SERVICE: Mr. *Derlin*, 230 (i).
ST. JEAN DESCHAILLONS SHOALS, DREDGING: Mr. *Rinfret*, 1053 (i).
ST. JOHN, N.B., INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I. C.R.*: Mr. *Davies* (*P.E.I.*) 1578 (i).
ST. JOSEPH DE LÉVIS, ACCIDENT ON I.C.R.: Mr. *Carroll*, 177 (i).
SAUNDERS, WM., DISMISSAL: Mr. *Perry*, 2158 (ii).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &C.—*Continued.*
SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS WITH GOVT.: Mr. *McMullen*, 202, 210 (i).
SAWDUST DEPOSITS IN LAHAVE RIVER: Mr. *Kaulbach*, 1942 (i), 2175 (ii).
SCHOOL ACTS OF MAN.: Mr. *Devlin*, 116 (i).
"SEIGFREID," SCHOONER, REWARDS TO CAPTAIN, &C.: Mr. *Flint*, 735 (i).
SEPARATE SCHOOLS IN MAN., ABOLITION: Mr. *La Rivière*, 115 (i).
SESSIONAL CLERKS EMPLOYED BY HOUSE*: Mr. *Joncas*, 544 (i).
SHORT LINE RY., ACCOMMODATION IN C. B. AND N.S.: Mr. *Fraser*, 177 (i).
SMUGGLING IN QUEBEC, SUITS, JUDGMENTS, &C.*: Mr. *Delisle*, 1062 (i).
SOULANGES CANAL, EXPENDITURE, REPS., &C.: Mr. *Mousseau*, 532 (i).
—— ENGINEERS' REPS.*: Mr. *Mousseau*, 1578 (i).
SOURIS BRANCH, C.P.R., O.C.'S GRANTING AID*: Mr. *Daly*, 1938 (i).
STANDARD TIME, LEGALIZATION, &C.: Mr. *Kirkpatrick*, 209 (i).
"STANLEY," STR., TRIPS BETWEEN P.E.I. AND MAINLAND: Mr. *Perry*, 158 (i).
STEEL RAILS AND ROAD-BED, P. E. I. RY.: Mr. *Davies* (*P.E.I.*) 228 (i).
STRATHROY P. O. BUILDING, TENDERS, &C.*: Mr. *Flint*, 2035 (ii).
SUBMARINE TUNNEL, P.E.I., AND MAINLAND: Mr. *Davies* (*P.E.I.*) 1277, 1605 (i).
SUBSIDY TO QUEBEC EASTERN RY., PETS., &C.: Mr. *Vaillancourt*) 1934 (i).
—— NAPIERVILLE AND ST. RÉMI RY., PETS., &C.: Mr. *Monet*, 2541 (ii).
—— WEST INDIES SS. SERVICE*: Mr. *Davies* (*P.E.I.*) 205 (i).
SUPPLIES, &C., PURCHASED FOR INDIANS IN N.S.*: Mr. *Fraser*, 232 (i).
SUTTON WEST, INDIAN AGENT, COST OF INVESTIGATION*: Mr. *Mulock*, 145 (i).
TENDERS FOR CAISSON, ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK, ADVTS.: Mr. *Turte*, 1932 (i).
THURBER, LIEUT.-COL., RESIGNATION AS LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER: Mr. *Rinfret*, 173 (i).
TIMBER CUT, &C., IN DISPUTED TERRITORY: Mr. *Barron*, 128 (i).
VANCOUVER ISLAND RY., LAND RESERVE, REPS., &C.: Mr. *Laurier*, 1051 (i).
VAUDREUIL AND BOUCHERVILLE WHARVES, EXPENDITURE, &C.: Mr. *Préfontaine*, 2548 (ii).
VICTORIA (B.C) DRILL HALL*: Mr. *Prior*, 736 (i).
VICTORIA (N.S.) APPMNT. OF RETURNING OFFICER*: Mr. *Flint*, 2935 (ii).
VOTERS ACCORDING TO CENSUS OF 1881 AND 1891*: Mr. *Landerkin*, 128 (i).
VOTES POLLED AT ELECTION, 1891*: Mr. *Landerkin*, 128 (i)
WALKER, DR., CLAIM: Mr. *Bain*, 1058 (i).
WELLAND CANAL EMPLOYÉS: Mr. *German*, 220 (i).
—— USE OF SURPLUS WATER: Mr. *Gibson*, 963 (i).
WELLINGTON, B.C., MILITARY AID TO CIVIL AUTHORITIES*: Mr. *Gordon*, 146 (i).
WEST INDIES, STEAMSHIP SERVICE, SUBSIDY*: Mr. *Davies* (*P.E.I.*), 205 (i).
WILSON, JAS., POSTMASTER AT KINMOUNT*: Mr. *Barron*, 736 (i).
WINTER COMMUNICATION WITH P E.I.: Mr. *Perry*, 158.
RETURNS, PREPARATION: in Com. of Sup., 5107 (iii).

Revenue and Audit. *See* "CONSOLIDATED."
REVENUE CRUISER, NEW: in Com. of Sup., 6277 (iii).
REVISING OFFICERS AND ELECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 207 (i).
REVISING OFFICERS FOR RIMOUSKI: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 741 (i).
RICHELIEU COUNTY FISHING PRIVILEGES: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2145 (ii).
RICHELIEU RIVER FLOODS: M. for Rep. of Engineers* (Mr. *Béchard*) 128 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Béchard*) 336 (i).
RIDEAU CANAL, BRIDGE AT MERRICKVILLE: conc., 6304 (iii).
——— DAMAGES TO LAND: Ques. (Mr. *Dawson*) 3618.
——— in Com. of Sup., 1666 (i), 5222, 6304 (iii).
——— KINGSTON AND JONES' FALLS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 711 (i).
——— ORDNANCE LANDS, SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 5408 (iii).
——— RESERVE, LOTS OCCUPIED BY JOHN HENEY: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4296 (iii).
——— TOLLS COLLECTED AND REFUNDED: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4675 (iii).
RIDEAU HALL, FUEL AND LIGHT: in Com. of Sup., 4515 (iii).
RIVER ST. LOUIS IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 4556 (iii).
RIVIÈRE DU LOUP P. O., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4357.
ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 4606 (iii).
ROBINSON TREATIES, PAYMENTS UNDER: in Com. of Sup., 4728 (iii).
ROBITAILLE, C. N., PAYMENT FROM CUSTOMS DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 4673 (iii).
Rocky Mountain Ry. and Coal Co.'s incorp. B. No. 125 (Mr. *Ross, Lisgar*). 1°*, 1757; 2° m., 1848; 2°*, 1964 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2174 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 58.)
ROLLING STOCK: in Com. of Sup., 1654 (i), 3882 (ii).
RONDEAU HARBOUR REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 4583.
ROULEAU, F. F.: Commissioner to administer Oaths, 1.
——— FISHING RIGHTS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Choquette*) 2936 (i).
ROYAL COMMISSIONS ISSUED SINCE CONFEDN.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4297(iii).
ROYAL SOCIETY, PUBLICATION OF PROCEEDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 5123 (iii).
ROY, OVIDE, INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 6272 (iii).
RURAL POST OFFICES, OPENING AND CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2912 (ii).
Russworm, Adam. *See* "DIVORCE."
STE. ANGÈLE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Brodeur*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 6233 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 5407 (iii).
STE. ANNE'S LOCK: in Com. of Sup., 4149 (ii).
STE. CROIX LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, RESIGNATON: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Rinfret*)) 173 (i).
STE. EMILE DE SUFFOLK, &C., POSTAL SERVICE: M. for Rets. (Mr. *Devlin*) 230 (i).
STE. HELEN'S MAIL SERVICE *vid* GODERICH: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3262 (ii).
ST. BONIFACE INDIAN SCHOOLS, ADDITIONAL PUPILS: in Com. of Sup., 6274 (iii).
St. Catharines and Merritton Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 88 (Mr. *Gibson*). 1°*, 548; 2°*, 601; in Com. and 3°*, 1756 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 104.)
St. Catharines and Niagara Ry. Co.'s B. No. 61 (Mr. *Carpenter*). 1°*, 387; 2°*, 546; in Com. and 3°*, 1964 (i). (54-55 *Vic.* *c.* 87.)
ST. CATHARINES WATER POWER: in Com. of Sup., 4145 (ii).
ST. CHARLES BRANCH, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 1655 (i), 3884 (ii).
St. Clair River Ry. Bridge and Tunnel Co.'s B. No. 17 (Mr. *Montague*). 1°*, 155; 2°*, 189; in Com. and 3°*, 546 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 102 (i).
ST. HENRI P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 4359 (iii).
ST. JEAN DESCHAILLONS SHOALS, DREDGING: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 1053 (i).
——— REP. *re* DREDGING: Remarks (Mr. *Rinfret*) 2437 (ii).
ST. JOHN'S GATE, QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 1573 (i).
ST. JOHN AND HALIFAX AND WEST INDIES, &C., SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 5450 (iii).
ST. JOHN, N.B., INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1578 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 1655 (i), 3883 (ii).
ST. JOHN'S P. Q., MEDICAL OFFICER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Béchard*) 527 (i).
ST. JOHN STATION, I.C.R., ADDITIONAL ACCOMMODATION: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 739 (i).
ST. JOSEPH DE LÉVIS, ACCIDENT ON I.C.R.: M. for Letters, &c. (Mr. *Carroll*) 177 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 209 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2145 (i).
St. Lawrence and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s B. No. 20 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 155; 2°, 189 (i).
ST. LAWRENCE CANALS, DEEPENING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Coatsworth*) 1927 (i).
"ST. LAWRENCE," DREDGE, WORK ON RESTIGOUCHE RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Brown, Chateauguay*) 3952.
ST. LAWRENCE, LOWER LAURENTIAN AND SAGUENAY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033; in Com., 6138 (iii).
ST. LAWRENCE RIVER AND CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 4107 (ii).
ST. LAWRENCE RIVER, IMPROVEMENT OF NAVIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 207 (i).
——— SHIP CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 4523 (ii).
ST. OURS LOCK: in Com. of Sup., 4148 (ii).
ST. PETER'S CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 5223 (iii).
ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 907 (i), 4362, 6170 (iii).
——— SUPPLIES: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 2912 (ii).
SADDLERY, 1ST REGT. OF CAVALRY: Ques. (Mr. *Hyman*) 198 (i).
SAFE IN FINANCE DEPT., TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Mc Mullen*) 130 (i).
SCHOOL ACTS OF MAN.: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Devlin*) 116 (i).

SCHOOL LANDS, MAN., SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 1766 (i).

SCHOOL OF INFANTRY, ST. JOHN, SURGEON: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 3620 (ii).

SCOTCH GRANITE, INCREASE OF DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 335 (i).

SALARIES FOR POSTMASTERS: Ques. (Mr. *German*) 1767 (i).

SALMON FISHERY LICENSES, BONAVENTURE CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 2152 (i).

SALMON NET FISHING ON RESTIGOUCHE: Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 1268 (i).

Salisbury and Harvey Ry. Co.'s B. No. 120 (Mr. *Skinner*). 1°*, 1483; 2°*, 1757 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2174 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 100.)

SANDSTONE FOR LANGEVIN BLOCK, FREIGHT RATE: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1575 (i).

SAN FRANCISCO AND VICTORIA, B.C., SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 4703 (ii).

Saskatchewan Ry. and Mining Co.'s B. No. 84 (Mr. *Wallace*). 1°*, 524; 2°*, 579 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2321 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 78.)

SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 4102 (ii), 5210, 6254 (iii).

—— WHARF, MR. PLUMMER'S SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1575 (i).

—— RECEIPTS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2905 (ii).

—— PURCHASE OF PROPERTY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillmor*) 1268 (i).

—— RETURN OF FEES: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 3620 (i).

SAUNDERS, WM., DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Perry*) 2158 (i).

SAVARD, MR. PAUL V., MEMBER FOR CHICOUTIMI: Notification of Ret., 7 (i).

SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS WITH GOVT.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 202 (i).

SAWDUST DEPOSITS IN LAHAVE RIVER: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 1942 (i), 2175 (ii).

Deb. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 1944; (Mr. *Flint*) 1946; (Mr. *Devlin*) 1948; (Mr. *Forbes*) 1950; (Mr. *Borden*) 1951; (Mr. *Fraser*) 1952; (Mr. *Tupper*) 1953.

Deb. rsmd. (Mr. *Tupper*) 2175; (Mr. *Flint*) 2189; (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 2197; (Mr. *Kenny*) 2198; (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 2201 (ii).

SEA-BIRD ISLAND INDIAN RESERVATION: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 709 (i).

Sea Fisheries Development, &c. (*Chap.* 96, *Rev. Statutes*) **B. No. 152** (Mr. *Tupper*). Res. prop., 549; in Com., 1095 (i); conc. in and 1°* of B., 3100; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 3593 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 42.)

SEALING IN BEHRING SEA: Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 959.

SECRETARY OF STATE:

BÉDARD, CHAS., REVISING OFFICER FOR NAPIERVILLE: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 1577 (i).

BALLOT BOXES., J. R ARNOLDI'S REP.: M. for copy (Mr. *Landerkin*) 201 (i).

BARBER, MR., CLAIM re PAPER CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 269 (i).

BELLECHASSE ELECTION, GAZETTING MEMBER: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 112 (i).

—— RET.: M. for Cor. &c, (Mr. *Amyot*) 187 (i).

SECRETARY OF STATE—*Continued.*

BRANDON "MAIL" IN PUBLIC DEPTS., NUMBER: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 3257 (ii).

CHICOUTIMI ELECTION RET.: Ques. (Mr. *Savard*) 142.

CIVIL SERVANTS AND ELECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 221, 1765 (i).

—— RECESS FOR LUNCH, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mc Mullen*) 3258 (ii).

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS, TIME LIMIT Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 112 (i).

DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Chapleau*) 103 (i).

ELECTION (1891) RECOUNTS: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 142, 177 (i).

—— RETURNS TO CLERK OF CROWN IN CHANCERY: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 131 (i).

—— VOTES POLLED, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Landerkin*) 128 (i).

ELECTORAL DIVISIONS IN N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 221 (i).

—— LISTS (DOM.) REVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 143 (i),

ELECTIONS, SENATORS AS CANDIDATES: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1578 (i).

ELECTION RETURNS TO CLERK OF CROWN IN CHANCERY: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 131 (i).

ELGIN (EAST) ELECTORAL DIST., RET. OF OFFICER'S ACCOUNTS: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Ingram*) 1579.

FRANCHISE ACT, 1885: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 961, 1267 (i).

GOVT. OFFICIALS AND RECENT ELECTIONS: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Allan*) 1580 (i).

HELBRONNER, JULES, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT., PAYMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 5407 (iii).

IN COM. OF SUP., 6167 (iii).

LABOUR, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Mc Mullen*) 4674 (iii).

—— STATISTICAL BUREAU: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Lépine*) 201 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 3615 (i).

MCLEAN, ROGER & CO.'S CLAIM AGAINST GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 269 (i).

NAPIERVILLE ELECTION AND REVISING OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 1577 (i).

NEW ENGLAND PAPER CO., PURCHASES BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1767 (i).

PORTNEUF ELECTION AND REVISING OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 207 (i).

PAPER CONTRACT, CLAIM OF MR. BARBER: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 269 (i).

PRINTING PAPER CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 528 (i).

PRINTING BUREAU, ABSENCE OF SUPERINTENDENT: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 2375, 3437 (ii).

—— PURCHASE OF TYPE, COST: Ques. (Mr. *Trow*) 3619 (ii).

—— REGULATIONS *re* EMPLOYÉS: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 3618 (ii).

PRINTING TIME TABLES. &C., GOVT. RYS.: Ques. (Mr. *Joncas*) 3614 (ii).

RECOUNTS, LATE ELECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 142, 177 (i).

REGINA "LEADER," PAYMENTS FOR PRINTING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 4295 (iii).

—— PRINTING AND ADVERTISING: Remarks (Mr. *Trow*) 4465 (iii).

RETURNING OFFICER FOR VICTORIA, N.S., APPOINTMENT: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Flint*) 2935 (ii).

REVISING OFFICERS AND ELECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 207 (i).

SECRETARY OF STATE—*Continued.*
REVISING OFFICERS FOR RIMOUSKI: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 741 (i).
ROYAL COMMISSIONS ISSUED SINCE CONFEDN.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4297 (i).
SENATORS AS CANDIDATES AT ELECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1577 (i).
SMITH & RIPLEY AND SEC. OF STATE: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 5403 (iii).
TYPE-SETTING MACHINES, COST: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 271 (i).
VOTERS' LISTS (DOM.) REVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 143 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 268 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 2912 (ii).
VOTES POLLED AT ELECTION, 1891, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 128 (i).

Seed and Grain. *See* "FRAUDS."

SEED GRAIN, ACCOUNTS DUE FOR PURCHASE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1729 (i).
"SEIGFREID," SCHOONER, REWARDS TO CAPTAIN, &C.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Flint*) 735 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 224 (i).
SEIZURES OF LIQUORS, ILLEGAL: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 208, 741 (i), 2148 (ii).
SELDEN, MR. S., STATISTICAL SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 1569 (i).
SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES. *See* "COMMITTEES."

Senate and H. of C. further Act Amt. B. No. 43 (Mr. *McMullen*). 1°, 217; 2°, 1029; in Com. and 3°*, 1297 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 21).

SENATE: in Com. of Sup., 929 (i).
SENATORS AND MEMBERS, INDEMNITY: M. (Mr. *Foster*) 6290 (iii).
SENATORS AS CANDIDATES AT ELECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1577 (i).
SENÉCAL, ANDRÉ: M. (Mr. *Lister*) Ordering attendance at Bar of Hse. 4533 (iii).
—— *See* "PRINTING BUREAU."
—— Order for attendance before Bar read, 4747 (iii).
SEPARATE SCHOOLS IN MAN., ABOLITION: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 115 (i).

Septennial Benevolent Society's B. No. 83 (Mr. *Coatsworth*). 1°*, 524; 2°*, 579 (i).

SERJEANT-AT-ARMS, DEP., APPMNT. ANNOUNCED (Mr. *Speaker*) 3995 (ii).
SESSIONAL CLERKS EMPLOYED BY HOUSE: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Joncas*) 544 (i).
SETTLERS' GRIEVANCES IN B.C.: Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4016; neg. (Y. 81, N. 100) 4056 (ii).
SHAWANAKISKIC INDIANS, BOUNTY UNDER TREATY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 269 (i).
SHAW & SHAW, LEGAL SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 2907 (ii).
SHEPPARD, W. A., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1266 (i).
SHIP CHANNEL, MONTREAL AND QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 1668 (i).

Ships' Inspection B. No. 149 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 2666; 2°* and in Com., 3600, 4310 (ii); M. to conc. in Amts., 4466; conc. in and 3°*, 4467 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 37.)

Ships' Safety Act (*Chap.* 77 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 44** (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 217; 2°*, 1087; in Com., 1088 (i); Order for 3° dschgd., in Com. and 3°*, 3099 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 38.)

SHIPS' SAFETY, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 218 (i).
SHORT LINE RY. ACCOMMODATION IN C.B. AND N.S.: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Fraser*) 177 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 1658 (i).
—— NEW ROUTE: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 3266 (ii).
SICK AND DISTRESSED MARINERS, RELIEF: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2145 (ii).
SINKING FUND AND PUBLIC DEBT, TRUSTEES: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2152 (i).
SIOUX INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 4747; conc., 4515.
SISSIBOO RIVER, DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 1574.
SLIDE AND BOOM DUES, COLLECTION: in Com. of Sup., 4645, 4663 (iii).
SMITH & RIPLEY AND SECRETARY OF STATE: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 5403 (iii).
SMITH, DR. W. F., INDIAN MEDICAL ATTENDANT: in Com. of Sup., 1696 (i).
SMITH, RONALD, EXPROPRIATION OF LAND: in Com. of Sup., 6198 (iii).
SMITH'S FALLS PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4372 (iii).
SMUGGLING IN QUEBEC, SUITS, JUDGMENTS, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Delisle*) 1062 (i).
SNOW, REMOVAL, BUILDINGS, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 4474 (iii).
SOUCY, EUGÈNE, CONDUCTOR ON I. C. R., DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*), 1274, 1927 (i).
SOREL HARBOUR WORKS, MEN EMPLOYED, NUMBER: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 5077 (iii).
SOULANGES CANAL, ENGINEER'S REPS.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Mousseau*) 1578 (i).
—— EXPENDITURE, REPS., &C.: M. for Stmnt., &c. (Mr. *Mousseau*) 532 (i).
SOURIS BRANCH, C. P. R., O.C.'s GRANTING AID: M. for copies* (Mr. *Daly*) 1938 (i).
SOUTH-EASTERN RY. AND C. P. R.: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 197, 220 (i).
SOUTHAMPTON BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1688 (i), 4573 (iii).

South Ont. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 73 (Mr. *Sutherland*). 1°*, 387; 2°*, 547; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 92.)
—— SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033; in Com., 6138 (iii).

South-Westsrn Ry. Co.'s B. No. 46 (Mr. *Bergeron*). 1°*, 238; 2°*, 294; in Com. and 3°*, 1434 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 83.)

SPANISH AMERICAN TREATY: Cor. presented (Mr. *Foster*) 5852 (iii).
SPEAKER, ELECTION: M. (Sir *John Macdonald*) 1 (i).
—— DEP., ELECTION: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 388 (i).
SPEECH FROM THE THRONE: Rep. (Mr. Speaker) 5 (i); Prorogation, 6330 (i).
STALLIONS AT EXPERIMENTAL FARM: Ques. (Mr. *Mc Millan*) 739 (i).

STANDARD TIME LEGALIZATION, &c. : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 209 (i).
"STANLEY," STEAMER, AND COM. WITH P.E.I. : Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1929 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 158 (i).
STATISTICS. *See* "ARTS."
Steam Boiler and Plate Glass Ins. Co. of Can. B. No. 50 (Mr. *Hyman*). 1°*, 266; 2°*, 412; in Com. and 3°*, 1963 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 118.)
STEAM FANS ON CATTLE VESSELS : Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1275 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 85 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 524; 2°* and in Com., 1093 (i); 3°*, 3100; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 3901 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 39.)
STEAMBOAT INSPECTION, &c., &c., REPS. : Presented (Mr. *Tupper*) 103 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 3513 (ii).
STEAMSHIP SUBVENTIONS. *See* "SUPPLY."
STEEL PLATES, &c., FREE IMPORTS : Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 270 (i).
STEEL RAILS AND ROAD-BED, P.E.I. RY. : M. for Reps., &c. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 228 (i).
STONEY ISLAND BREAKWATER, AMOUNTS PAID, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 5408 (iii).
STRATHROY P.O. BUILDING, TENDERS, &c. : M. for copies* (Mr. *Flint*) 2935 (ii).
——— CONTRACTOR'S NAME, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Hyman*) 3262 (ii).
STRATFORD, EXCISE COLLECTOR : Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 5078 (iii).
STRIKE IN OTTAWA AND VICINITY, CALLING OUT MILITIA : Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 5555 (ii).
STROMNESS CULVERT AND BRIDGE : in Com. of Sup., 4145 (ii).
STRONG, LATE W. O., GRATUITY TO WIDOW : in Com. of Sup., 6264 (iii).
SWING BRIDGE, &c., AT HASTINGS : in Com. of Sup., 1665 (i).
SUBMARINE TUNNEL, P.E.I. AND MAINLAND : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1277, 1605 (i).
Subsidies. *See* "LAND GRANTS."
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. Authorization B. No. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*). Res. prop., 6032; in Com., 6135; conc. in and 1° of B., 6142; 2°* and in Com., 6185, 6217; 3°*, 6223 (iii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 8.)
SUBSIDIES :
"ADMIRAL" (STEAMBOAT) CONTRACT, &c. : M. for O. C.'s, &c. (Mr. *Tarte*) 128 (i), 2157 (ii).
BAIE DES CHALEURS RY. : Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 5075.
BROCKVILLE, WESTPORT AND SAULT STE. MARIE RY. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 6185 (iii).
C. P. R. Co.'S ADDITIONAL LAND : prop. Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 3308 (ii).
CANADIAN, WEST INDIAN AND SOUTH AMERICAN SS. Co. : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 544 (i).
GREAT EASTERN RY. Co. : prop. Res. Mr. *Bowell*) 6033; in Com., 6138 (iii).
GREAT NORTHERN RY. Co. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6032; in Com., 6136 (iii).
INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2911 (ii).
SUBSIDIES—*Continued.*
KINGSTON, SMITH'S FALLS AND OTTAWA RY. Co. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033 (iii).
MAN. SOUTH-WESTERN COLONIZATION RY. Co. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033; in Com., 6138 (iii).
MONTREAL AND OTTAWA RY. Co. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033 (iii).
NAPIERVILLE AND ST. RÉMI RY., PETS, &c. : M. for copies (Mr. *Monet*) 2541 (ii).
NOVA SOCTIA CENTRAL RY. Co. : Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 3960 (ii).
OSHAWA RY. AND NAVIGATION Co. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033; in Com., 6137 (iii).
PICKFORD & BLACK, MESSRS., PAYMENTS : M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 544 (i).
QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY., EXTENSION : Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2145 (ii).
——— prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6032; in Com., 6137.
QUEBEC CENTRAL RY. Co., PAYMENTS : Ques. (Mr. *Godbout*) 4675 (iii).
——— prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033 (iii).
QUEBEC EASTERN RY., PETS., &c. : M. for copies (Mr. *Vaillancourt*) 1934 (i).
ST. LAWRENCE, LOWER LAURENTIAN AND SAGUENAY RY. Co. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033; in Com., 6138 (iii).
SOUTH ONTARIO PACIFIC RY. Co. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033; in Com., 6138 (iii).
TOBIQUE VALLEY RY. Co. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033; in Com., 6139 (iii).
WEST INDIES SS. SERVICE : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 205 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 4373; neg. (Y. 82, N. 107) 4427 (iii.)
——— Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 195 (i).
SUGAR DUTIES : prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1931 (i).
——— *See* "CUSTOMS ACT AMT. B."
——— (RAW) IN BOND : Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 740.
SULLIVAN, HON. W. W. : in Com. of Sup., 1556 (i).
SUMMERSIDE, CHARLOTTETOWN, &c., BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 6201; conc., 6305 (iii).
SUMMERSIDE HARBOUR, DREDGING : Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3258 (ii).
——— POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3955 (ii).
——— STATION, REMOVAL : in Com. of Sup., 3898 (ii).
Sunday Observance. *See* "LORD'S DAY."
SUPERANNUATION : in Com. of Sup., 3670 (ii).
SUPERINTENDENT OF MINES, SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 5187 (iii).
SUPPLIES, DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY : Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1928 (i).
SUPPLIES, &c., PURCHASED FOR INDIANS IN N. S. : M. for List, &c.* (Mr. *Fraser*) 232 (i).
SUPPLY :
[Only subjects which caused remark or discussion [noted under this head.]
AMTS. AND REMARKS TO MS. FOR COM. : Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*, &c.) Treaty Papers, 238. Remarks (Mr. *Edgar*, &c.) Papers *re* Tarte-Mc Greevy Enquiry, 393. Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) The High Commissioner, 570; deb. rsmd., 636, 807; neg. (Y. 79, N. 100) 881. Remarks (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) Indian Affairs, 1484. Remarks (Mr. *Lister*) Fishery Laws, Enforcement, 1513. Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*, &c.) Dominion Day, adjmnt., 1536.

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

Personal Explanations (Mr. *McNeill*) 1543; (Mr. *Watson*) 1544 (i). Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) Trade Policy of Govt., 3309; agreed to (Y. 99, N. 77) 3425. Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) Timber Licenses, &c., 3428; neg. (Y. 81, N. 100) 3507. Remarks (Mr. *Amyot*, &c.) Kingston Graving Dock Papers, 3653. Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) Tay Canal, construction, 3738; neg. (Y. 82, N. 100) 3779. Remarks (Messrs. *Weldon*, Sir *John Thompson*, &c.) Intercolonial Ry. Management, 3780. Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Testimonials to Ministers, 3827. Remarks (Messrs. *Borden, Foster*, &c.) U.S. Treaty with Cuba, 4008. Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) Settlers' Grievances, B. C., 4016; neg. (Y. 81, N. 100) 4056. Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Rights of Pub. Accts. Com., 4088; (Mr. *Prior*) Progress of B. C., 4093. Amt. (Mr. *Amyot*) Bancroft's Tender *re* Graving Dock. 4158; neg. (Y. 82, N. 99) 4212 (ii). Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) West Indies SS. Service, 4373; neg. (Y. 82, N. 107) 4428. Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Gov. General's Warrants, 4467; Amt., 4537; neg. (Y. 82, N. 97) 4551. Remarks (Mr. *Barron*) Trent Valley Canal, 4467; (Mr. *O'Brien*) American Cattle in Can., slaughter, 4468; (Mr. *McMillan*) 5209. Remarks (Mr. *Barron*) Trent Valley Canal, 4773. Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) The Census, 4829; neg. (Y. 81, N. 103) 5010. Remarks (Mr. *Edgar*) Copyright, 5014.; (Mr. *Hargraft*) Cobourg Harbour, 5335; (Mr. *Delisle*) Montreal Pilots, 6144; (Mr. *Flint*) Indian Agent Chisholm, 6147; (Mr. *Flint*) Walrond Ranche, &c., 6148; (Mr. *Kaulbach*) Newfoundland Bait Act, 6188; (Mr. *Laurier*) Disallowance of Provincial Acts, 6296 (iii).

MESS. FROM HIS EX.: Transmitting Estimates for 1891-92, 227; Suppl., 1890-91, 799 (i); Suppl., 1891-92, 5589: further Suppl., 6289 (iii).

RES. (Mr. *Foster*) FOR COM., 102; Ms. for Com., 238, 393, 442, 570, 906, 1484 (i), 3309, 3428, 3653, 3738, 3827, 4008, 4088, 4092, 4158 (ii), 4373, 4467, 4537, 4640, 4677, 4773, 4830, 5014, 5209, 5335, 6144, 6188 (iii).

IN COM.: 240, 397, 442, 842, 907, 1544, 1651, 1732 (i), 3309, 3508, 3660, 3821, 3856, 4057, 4101, 4214 (ii), 4313, 4429, 4469, 4552, 4640, 4678, 4800, 5011, 5023, 5081, 5159, 5210, 5336, 6166, 6197, 6239, 6296 (iii).

COMMITTEE:

Administration of Justice. See "Justice."

Agriculture:

Barley, Two-rowed, distribution, 1564 (i).
Dairying Interests and Experimental Farms, 1562 (i), 3574 (ii), 6174 (iii).
Experimental Farms, 1566 (i), 3552 (ii).
Haras National Co., 6179 (iii).
Patent Record, 953 (i).

Arts and Statistics:

Brown, Mr. Adam, honorarium, 6174 (iii).
Census, 1569 (i), 3531 (ii).
Jamaica Exhibition, 1568 (i).
Selden, Mr. S., statistical services, 1569 (i).

Canals. See "Collection of Revenues" and "Railways."

Charges of Management:

Country Savings Banks, N.B., N.S., P.E.I., 1748.
Dominion Notes, issue and redemption, 1754 (i).
—— printing, 1755 (i).
Interest, 1 per cent. commission, 1748 (i).
Printing, Advertising, Inspection, &c., 1756 (i).

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

COMMITTEE—*Continued.*

Civil Government:

Agriculture Dept., 254 (i), 6169 (iii).
Auditor General's Office, 6167 (iii).
Contingencies, Deptl.:
Advertising subscriptions, outside printing, 478, 488 (i).
Auditor General's Office, 1544 (1).
Civil Service Examiners, 481, 483 (i).
Fisheries, 1547 (i).
Governor Gen.'s Secretary's Office, 433 (i).
High Commissioner's Office, 431, 442, 486, 490, 1555, 1732 (i), 6167 (iii).
Indian Affairs, 1547 (i).
Interior, 433 (i).
Justice, 433, 1547 (i).
Marine, 440 (i).
Post Office, 440 (1).
Printing Bureau, cleaning, &c., 442 (i).
Privy Council Office, 433, 1556 (i).
Public Works, 439 (i).
Telegrams, 498 (i).
Customs Dept., 254 (i).
Finance and Treasury Board, 250 (i).
Fisheries Dept., 255 (i).
Geological Survey, 410 (i).
Governor Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 240 (i).
High Commissioner's Office, 411 (i), 6167 (iii).
Indian Affairs, 249, 1552 (i).
Inland Revenue Dept., 253 (i).
Interior Dept., 247 (i), 6169 (iii).
Justice Dept., 241 (i).
Penitentiaries Branch, 242 (i).
Marine Dept., 255 (i), 6166 (iii).
Postmaster General's Dept., 254 (i), 6166 (iii).
Computing Interest, 432 (i).
Printing and Stationery Dept., 243 (i), 6166 (iii).
Privy Council Office, 241 (i), 6167 (iii).
Public Works Dept., 255, 397 (i).
Railways and Canals Dept., 407 (i), 6169 (iii).
Secretary of State Dept., 6167 (iii).

Collection of Revenues:

Adulteration of Food:
General Vote, 5166 (iii).
Canals:
Murray Canal Staff, 1728 (i).
Williamsburg Canal Staff, 1728 (i).
Culling Timber:
Contingencies, 5160 (iii).
Cullers' Salaries, 1725 (i), 5159 (iii).
Customs:
Board of Customs, conc., 5419 (iii).
British Columbia, 5051 (iii).
Chinese Immigration, 5056; conc., 5419 (iii).
Cruiser, Maintenance and Repairs, 1714, 1721.
Detective Service, 5053 (iii).
Douglas, Jas., Acting Collector, Toronto, 1714.
Inspectors of Ports, 5052; conc., 5418 (iii).
Laboratory, 5054 (iii).
New Brunswick, 5023 (iii).
Nova Scotia, 5023 (iii).
Ontario, 5042 (iii).
O'Meara, D. D., Acting Collector, Que., 1714.
Prince Edward Island, 5024; conc., 5418 (iii).
Quebec, 5030 (iii).
Revenue Cruiser, new, 6277 (iii).
Vacuum Oil Co., Refund, Law Costs, &c., 1714, 1721 (i).

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Collection of Revenues—Continued.
Dominion Lands:
Commissioner's Salary, 5179 (iii).
Crown Timber Agent, New Westminster, 5189.
Extra Clerks at Head Office, Ottawa, 5194 (iii).
Homesteads Inspectors' Salaries, conc., 5433.
Mason, Jno., Carpenter, Salary, 6279 (iii).
Outside Service, Salaries, 5189 (iii).
Superintendents of Mines, Salary, 5187 (iii).
Travelling Expenses, 5191 (iii.)
Excise, 1724 (i).
Collectors of Customs, Payments, 5137.
Distilleries, &c., Extra Duty Pay, 5136.
Methylated Spirits, Cost of Supply, 5138 (iii).
Salaries, Officers and Inspectors, 5125 (iii).
Inspection of Staples:
General Vote, 5165.
Minor Revenues:
Ordnance Lands, 5171 (iii).
Post Office:
Bartlett, J. H., Clock services, Ottawa, 6279.
Case, H.N., late Postmaster at Hamilton, 6279.
General Vote, 4705 (iii).
Hamilton Post Office, additional Carriers, 6279,
Mail Service, C,P.R., deficiency, 1890-91, 1744.
Miscellaneous, 4725 (iii).
Salaries and Allowances, 4719 (iii).
Public Works:
Agency, B.C., 4669 (iii).
Chaudière Rents, Collection, 1728 (i).
Harbours, Docks and Slides, Repairs, 4665.
Land and Cable Telegraph Lines, 4668 (iii).
Slide and Boom Dues, collection, 4663 (iii).
Telegraph Line, P.E.I. and Mainland, 4668 (iii).
Telegraph and Signal Service, 4669 (iii).
Telegraph Lines, N.W.T., 4668 (iii).
—— B C., 4669 (iii).
Railways:
Intercolonial Ry., &c., 4057 (ii).
Weights and Measures and Gas:
Contingencies, 1725 (i).
Salaries, Officers, Inspectors, &c., 5161 (iii).
Rent, Fuel, &c., for Gas, 5162 (iii).
Weights and Measures, 5163.
Customs. See "Collection of Revenues."
Dominion Lands—See "Collection of Revenues."
Dominion Police:
General Vote, 511; suppl., 1557 (i).
Excise. See "Collection of Revenues."
Fisheries:
Behring Sea Seal Fisheries, Cost of Experts, 6268 (ii).
British Columbia, 3527 (ii).
Fish-Breeding, 3529 (ii).
Manitoba, 3524 (ii).
New Brunswick, 3522 (ii).
Ontario, Salaries, &c., of Officers, 3514 (ii).
Prince Edward Island, 3524 (ii).
Quebec, Salaries, &c., of Officers, 3514 (ii).
Geological Survey:
General Vote, 4725; conc., 5411 (iii).
Government of N. W. T.:
Books for Library, 6277 (iii).
Caretakers, &c., Legislative Hall, 5067 (iii).
Clerical assistance, 5066 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Government of N. W. T.—Continued.
Clerk of Council, Statutory increase, 6276 (iii).
Contingencies, 1709 (i); conc., 5426 (iii).
Elections, probable Cost, 5066 (iii).
General Vote, 5066 (iii).
Light and Fuel, Govt. House, 5072 (iii).
Manitoba Insane Asylum, 5072 (iii).
Schools, 1711 (i).
Subscriptions to Newspapers, 5067 (iii).
Translating *Gazette*, 1710 (i).
Well-boring Machines, 5073; conc., 5424 (iii).
Government Steamers. See "Ocean and River Service."
Immigration:
General Vote, 3579 (ii), 5224 (iii).
Indians:
Agricultural Societies, aid to, conc., 5413 (iii).
British Columbia:
Schools, Day and Industrial, 4800; conc., 4514 (iii).
Steam Launch, 4809; conc., 4514 (iii).
Surveys, 4810.
Manitoba and North-West Territories:
Allowance to Heirs of late James Payne, 1695.
Annuities and Commutations, 4736 (iii).
General Expenses, 4810 (iii).
Live Stock and Supplies, 4738 (iii).
Mackenzie River and Peace River Treaty, 1695.
Schools, Day, Boarding, &c., 4739 (iii).
Sioux Indians, 4747; conc., 4515 (iii).
St. Boniface Schools, additional Pupils, 6274.
Supplies for Farmers, 4746 (iii).
Surveys, 4744 (iii).
Triennial Clothing, 4739 (iii).
Nova Scotia:
Agents' Salaries, &c., 4729 (iii).
Indian Chapel, Chapel Island, C.B., 6273 (iii).
Smith, Dr. W. F., Medical attendance, 1696 (i).
New Brunswick:
Agents' Salaries, &c., 4732, 5059; conc., 5419.
Medical attendance, 4735; conc., 5423 (iii).
Oka Indians, removal to Gibson, 4728; conc., 5411 (iii).
Ontario and Quebec, &c., 1694 (i), 4727 (iii).
Prince Edward Island:
Agents' Salaries, &c., 4735 (iii).
Robinson Treaties, Payments under, 4728 (iii).
Roy, Ovide, increase of salary, 6272 (iii).
Schools, Ont., Que., N.S. and N.B., 4727 (iii).
Surveys, Ont., Que. and Mar. Provs., conc., 5413.
Justice, Administration of:
Exchequer Court of Canada, 507, 1557 (i).
Miscellaneous Expenditure, including N.W.T., 506, 1556 (i); conc., 6169, 6303 (iii).
Salaries of Judges, 511 (i).
Sullivan, Hon. W. W., 1556 (i).
Vice-Admiralty and Maritime Courts, 510 (i).
Legislation:
House of Commons:
Clerk of Crown in Chancery, 6172 (iii).
Committees, extra Expenses, 6173 (iii).
Contingencies, 941 (i).
Debates, Official Publication, 942 (i).
Dingwell, J., prof. services, &c., 1559 (i).
Election Expenses, 1734 (i).
Electoral Lists, Revision, 946 (i).

SUPPLY——*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Legislation—Continued.
House of Commons—*Continued.*
Leather Trunks for Members, 1562 (i).
Macdonell, Mr., Sessional Indemnity, 6172.
Masters, C. H., Drafting Criminal Law, &c., 1559 (i).
Printing, paper, binding, 946 (i).
Salaries, &c., Serjeant-at-Arms Estimate, 943.
Salaries, per Clerk's Estimate, 941 (i).
Voters' Lists, Printing, 1559, 1734 (i).
Library:
Salaries of Officers and Grant, 945 (i).
Senate:
Salaries and Contingencies, 929 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service:
Lighthouses and Fog Alarms, construction, &c., 3512 (ii).
Maintenance and Repairs, 3510 (ii).
Salaries, &c., Lighthouse Keepers, 3509 (ii), 6266.
Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions:
Campbellton and Gaspé, 4700, 5349 (iii).
Canso, Arichat, &c., and Port Mulgrave, 4702.
Grand Manan, N.B., and Mainland, 4678 (iii).
Liverpool or London and St. John and Halifax, 4679 (iii).
Magdalen Islands, 4678 (iii).
P.E.I. and Mainland, 4701 (iii).
Port Mulgrave, &c., and Cheticamp, 4701 (iii).
San Francisco and Victoria, B.C., 4703 (iii).
St. John and Halifax and West Indies, &c., 5450 (iii).
Militia:
Armouries, care of Arms, &c., 3720 (ii).
Brigade Majors' Salaries, &c., 3699 (ii).
Clothing and Great Coats, 3700 (ii).
Contingencies, conc., 5417 (iii).
Drill Instruction, 3729, 4214 (ii).
Drill Pay, &c., 3730 (i).
Kilted Battalion, Toronto, 6182 (iii).
Military Stores, 3717 (ii).
Military Properties, care, maintenance, &c., 3734 (ii).
Permanent Forces, Batteries and Schools, 3737.
Royal Military College, 4236 (ii).
St. John's Gate, Quebec, 1573 (i).
Mounted Police:
Arms, Ammunition, Repairs, &c., 4823; conc., 5416 (ii).
Books, Stationery, &c., conc., 5417 (iii).
Clothing, 4822; conc., 5416 (iii).
Contingencies, conc., 5417 (iii).
General Vote, 4817; conc., 5415 (iii).
Rebellion, 1885, Claims *re*, 6274 (iii).
Suppl. Vote, 1697 (i).
Miscellaneous:
Arbitration *re* Provincial Accounts, 6275 (iii).
Army and Navy, Imports for Use, 5084 (iii).
Banff Hot Springs, Survey, &c., 5108 (iii).
Burrard Inlet Survey, 1705 (i).
Canada Atlantic Ry. Co., Funeral Train, 6276.
Canada Gazette, conc., 5417 (iii).
Commercial Agencies, 5108 (iii).
Canada Temperance Act, 5086; conc., 5426 (iii),
Dufresne, Mr. J. L., compensation for Injuries, 1706 (i).
Fabre, Hector, Salary, &c., 5086 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Miscellaneous—Continued.
Gliddon, Wm., Special Services, 1705 (i).
Govt. of Keewatin, Expenses, 5084 (iii).
Historical and Topographical Map of Dom., 6261 (iii).
Litigation Expenses, 1707 (i).
Litigated Matters, Costs, 5107 (iii).
Lunatics in Keewatin support, 1709 (i), 5085 (iii).
Mounted Police, compensation to Members, 5086; conc., 5427 (iii).
Old Records, classification, 5084, 5124 (iii).
Palmer, late Chief Justice, allowance to Family 6276 (ii).
Parliamentary Documents, distribution, 5081.
Printing Bureau, additional Plant, 1706 (i), 5346 (iii).
Printing, Miscellaneous, 5418 (iii).
Prohibition Commission, Expenses, 6276 (iii).
Returns, preparation, 5107 (iii).
Royal Society, publication of Proceedings, 5123 (iii).
Strong, late W. O., Gratuity to Widow, 6264 (iii).
North-West Territories. See "Government."
Ocean and River Service:
Alert and schooner *Scylla*, Claims *re* Collision, 6265 (iii).
Government Steamers, 3513 (ii).
Obstructions in Navigable Rivers, 3508 (ii).
Quebec Water Police, 3508 (ii).
Tidal Observations, 3508 (ii).
Open Account:
Seed Grain, Accounts due for purchase, &c., 1729 (i).
Penitentiaries:
British Columbia, 919 (i).
Dorchester, 910, 1558 (i).
Kingston, 882, 908 (i).
Manitoba, 913 (i), 6171 (ii).
Regina Gaol, 928 (i).
St. Vincent de Paul, 907 (i), 6170 (ii).
Pensions:
Frankum, J., late Gunner "A" Battery, 1729.
Fenian Raid, 3660 (ii).
Harpur, G. H., Rebellion of 1885, 1572 (i).
Rebellion, N. W. T., 1885, 3662 (ii).
Veterans of 1812, 3661 (ii).
Police. See "Dominion" and "Mounted."
Post Office. See "Collection of Revenues."
Public Works—Capital:*
Kingston Graving Dock, 1669 (i).
Ship Channel, Montreal and Quebec, 1668 (i).
Public Works—Income:
Buildings:
British Columbia:
Vancouver Post Office, &c., 4451 (iii).
Victoria Drill Hall, 4453 (iii).
Victoria Military Buildings, conc., 6304 (iii).
Manitoba:
Brandon Post Office, 4429, 5348 (iii).
Military Buildings, Winnipeg, 4441 (iii).
Winnipeg Immigrant Buildings, 1687 (i) 4444.
North-West Territories:
Court House, Lock-up, &c., 4450, 6248 (iii).
Lethbridge Custom House, &c., 6248 (iii).

**See* "Collection of Revenues."

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

COMMITTEE—*Continued.*

Public Works—Income—Continued.

Buildings—*Continued.*

North-West Territories—*Continued.*

Medicine Hat Immigrant Building, 6549 (iii).
Mounted Police Buildings, &c., 4448 (iii).
Prince Albert Crown Lands Office, 4450 (iii).
Regina, Council Chamber, &c., 4450, 6249 (iii).
Regina Industrial School, 1687 (i).
Regina, Lieut. Gov.'s Residence, 4444 (iii).
Prince Albert Immigration Building, 6251 (iii).

New Brunswick:

Chatham Post Office, 4331 (iii).
Lunenburg Post Office, &c,, 6201 (iii).

Nova Scotia, 4314 (iii),

Ontario:

Brantford Drill Shed, 4362 (iii).
Carleton Place Post Office, 4362 (iii).
Cobourg Post Office, 1687 (i), 4363 (iii).
Military College. Kingston, 6245 (iii).
Napanee Post Office, 6242 (iii).
Pembroke Post Office, 4369 (iii).
Peterborough Custom House, 4370, 6246 (iii).
Petrolia Public Building, 4372 (iii).
Port Arthur Post Office, &c., 4371 (iii).
Printing Bureau, 4363 (iii).
Smith's Falls Public Building, 4372 (iii).
Toronto Drill Hall, 4372 (iii).
Walkerton Post Office, 1686 (i), 4372 (iii).

Prince Edward Island:

Summerside, Charlottetown, &c., Buildings, 6201; conc., 6305 (iii).

Quebec:

Grosse Isle Quarantine Station, 4332 (iii).
Hull Post Office, 1685 (i).
Lachine Post Office, &c., 4332 (iii).
Lapriarie Post Office, 4338 (iii)
Montreal Post Office, Electric Light, 4347 (iii).
Rivière du Loup Post Office, &c., 4357 (iii).
St. Henri Post Office, 4359 (iii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, 4362 (iii).
West Farnham Post Office, 6201, 6239 (iii).

Repairs, Furniture, Heating, &c.:

Dom. Buildings, Petty Repairs, 4521 (iii).
Gas, Electric Light, Ottawa, 4512 (iii).
Heating Buildings, Ottawa, 4474 (iii).
Major's Hill Park, Ottawa, 4520 (iii).
Ottawa, Grounds around Buildings, 4470.
Printing Bureau, Babcock Fire Extinguishers, 6253 (iii).
Repairs, Furniture, &c., 4469 (iii.)
Rideau Hall, Fuel and Light, 4515 (iii).
Snow, Removal, Buildings, Ottawa, 4474.
Supplies, Sundry, for Caretakers, &c., 4521.
Telephone Service, Buildings, Ottawa, 4517.
Vault for Finance Dept., 1686 (i).
Ventilation and Lighting, Buildings, Ottawa, 4521 (iii).
Water, Buildings, Ottawa, 4514 (iii).
Wellington St. Building, Ottawa, 4522 (iii).

Dredging:

British Columbia, 4649 (iii).
Dredge Vessels, Repairs, 4640 (iii).
General services, 4650 (iii).
Manitoba, 4647 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

COMMITTEE—*Continued.*

Public Works—Income—Continued.

Dredging—*Continued.*

New Plant, 1690 (i).
Quebec and Ontario, 4646 (iii).

Experimental Farms, Buildings, &c., 4652 (iii).
Harbours and Rivers generally, 4595 (iii).

Harbours and Rivers:

British Columbia:

Fraser River, 4594 (iii).
General Repairs, 4594 (iii).
Victoria Harbour, 4592 (iii).

Manitoba:

General Repairs and Improvements, 4591 (iii).

Nova Scotia:

Bayfield Harbour, 6254 (iii).
Cribbin's Point Wharf, 4530 (iii).
Digby, new Pier at Raquette, 4532 (iii).
L'Ardoise Breakwater, 4530 (iii).
Port Maitland Breakwater, 6254 (iii).

Ontario:

Beaverton Wharf, 4575 (iii).
Belleville Harbour Works, 4572 (iii).
Cobourg Harbour, 4559 (iii).
General Repairs, 1688 (i).
Georgian Bay, Removal of Rocks, 4574 (iii).
Kingston Harbour, 4559 (iii).
Little Current Improvements, 4573 (iii).
Little Nation River, 6261 (iii).
Ottawa River, channel through Narrows, 4571 (iii).
Ottawa River, Gatineau Boom, 6261 (iii).
Owen Sound Harbour, 4565 (iii).
Rondeau Harbour, Repairs, 4583 (iii).
Sault Ste. Marie, 6254 (iii).
Southampton Breakwater, 1688 (i), 4573 (iii).
Toronto Harbour Works, 4572, 5438 (iii).

Prince Edward Island:

Miminigash Breakwater, 4532 (iii).
Negro Point Breakwater, 4533 (iii).
Repairs to Piers, &c., 4532 (iii).

Quebec:

Coteau Landing Pier, 4557 (iii).
General Repairs, 4557 (iii).
Lévis Graving Dock, 1687 (i), 4552 (iii).
River St. Louis Improvements, 4556 (iii).
Three Rivers Harbour, 1687 (i), 4552 (iii).

Miscellaneous Works, 4645 (iii).
National Art Gallery, 4663 (iii).
Surveys and Inspection, 4662 (iii).

Roads and Bridges:

Grand River, Iron Bridge, 4606 (iii).
Old Man's River, Fort Macleod, Free Bridge, 4607 (iii).

Slides and Booms, 4645* (iii).
Petewawa River, 4651 (iii).

Quarantine:

Cattle Diseases and Sheep Scab, 5336; conc., 5435 (iii).
Suppl. Vote, 1570 (i).
Tracadie Lazaretto, 3576 (ii).

* *See* "Collection of Revenues."

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Territorial Accounts:
Bergin, Dr., Surgeon General, balance of salary, 6280; conc., 6305 (iii).
Claims, clerical work *re* Settlement, 6280 (iii).
Railways and Canals—Capital:*
Canals:
Galops, 4107 (ii).
Grenville, 4141 (ii).
Goodwin, late Jas., Claims of Heirs, 6198, 6296 (iii).
Lachine, 4102 (ii).
Murray, 4125 (ii).
Rapide Plat, 4107 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie, 4102 (ii), 5210 (iii).
St. Lawrence River and Canals, 4107 (ii).
Tay, 4144 (ii), 5219 (iii).
Trent, 4126 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers:
Cape Tormentine Harbour, 4522 (ii).
Kaministiquia River, Turning Basin, 4523.
St. Lawrence River Ship Channel, 4523 (ii).
Railways:
Annapolis and Digby Ry.:
Construction, 1659 (i),
Canadian Pacific Ry.:
Construction, 1652 (i), 3821 (ii).
Cape Breton Ry.:
Construction and Equipment, 1656 (i), 3898.
Grand Narrows Bridge, 1658 (i).
Train Ferry, Mulgrave and Point Tupper, 3898 (ii).
Intercolonial Ry.:
General Vote, 1736; conc., 1758 (i).
Halifax, increased accommodation, 3857 (ii).
—— sufferance warehouse, 3894 (ii).
Indiantown Branch, 3884 (ii).
Moncton, increased accommodation, 1653 (i), 3882 (ii).
New Glasgow, increased accommodation, 3882 (ii), 6197 (iii).
Rolling Stock, 1654 (i), 3882 (ii).
St. Charles Branch, 1655 (i), 3884 (ii).
St. John, increased accommodation, 1655 (i).
—— additional property, 3884 (ii).
—— extension on front of city, 3883 (ii).
"Y" at Truro, 1655 (i).
Oxford and New Glasgow Ry.:
Construction and Equipment, 1658 (i).
Revote, 6197 (iii).
Prince Edward Island Ry.:
Cape Traverse Wharf, extension, 1758 (i).
Smith, Ronald, Expropriation of Land, 6198.
Summerside Station, removal, 3898 (ii).
Short Line Ry.:
Judgment of Court, 1658 (i).
Railways and Canals—Income:
Canals:
Carillon and Grenville, 4150 (ii), 5222 (iii).
Chambly:
Raising Banks, lowering bottom, &c., 4146.
Lamoureaux Bros.' Claim, 4147 (ii).
Rebuilding part of East Wall, Lock No. 7, 6200 (iii).
Yule Estate Claim, 4148 (ii).
Miscellaneous:
Gratuities, 1667 (j).

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Railways and Canals—Income—Continued.
Canals—*Continued.*
Rideau Canal:
Bridge at Merrickville, conc., 6304 (iii).
Deepening Basin at Ottawa, 1666 (i), 5222.
Dredging plant, 5222 (iii).
Land Damages, 1666 (i), 5223 (iii).
Survey above Kingston Mills, 1666 (i).
Ste. Anne's Lock:
Strengthening old Pier, 4149 (ii).
St. Ours Lock:
Overhauling Foundation, 4148 (ii).
St. Peter's Canal, 5223 (iii).
Trent Valley Canal:
Hall, W. H., Claim, 4151 (ii).
Swing Bridge, &c., at Hastings, 1665 (i).
Welland Canal:
Filling pond at St. Catharines, 1666 (i).
Port Dalhousie, overhauling superstructure, 4145 (ii).
St. Catharines Water Power Co., 4145 (ii).
Stromness culvert and bridge, 4145 (ii).
Statistics. See "Arts," "Agriculture."
Steamship Subventions. See "Mail Subsidies."
Superannuation:
Wallace, W., extra allowance, 3670 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection:
General Vote, 3513 (ii).
Unprovided Items:
Per Auditor Gen.'s Rep., 1889-90, 1745 (i).
CONCURRENCE:
Canada Gazette, 5417 (iii).
Cattle Quarantine, 5435 (iii).
Commercial Agencies, 5427 (iii).
Customs, P.E.I., 5418 (iii).
Fabre, Mr., salary, &c., 5427 (iii).
Geological Survey, 5411 (iii).
Govt. of N.W.T., 5424 (iii).
Homestead Inspectors' salaries, 5433 (iii).
Indians, 5411, 5419 (iii).
Intercolonial Ry., 1758 (i).
Justice, Miscellaneous, 6303 (iii).
Mounted Police, 5416, 5427 (iii).
Printing, Miscellaneous, 5418 (iii).
Rideau Canal, Bridge at Merrickville, 6304 (iii).
Surgeon General's salary, balance, 6301 (iii).
Victoria, B.C., Military Buildings, 6304 (iii).
Winnipeg General Hospital, 6304 (iii).

Supply B. No. 127 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. in Com., rep., conc. in and 1°*, 2°* and 3°*, 1853 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 1.)

Supply B. No. 167 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. prop., in Com. and 1°* of B., 4297; 2°* and 3°*, 4373 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 2.)

Supply B. No. 177 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. in Com., rep., conc. in and 1°*, 2°* and 3°* of B., 6307 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 3.)

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act (*Chap.* 135 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 138** (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 1990 (i); 2°, 3584; in Com., 3588; 3° m., 3649; 3°*, 3984 (ii); M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 5079; conc. in, 5590 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 25.)

SURGEON GENERAL'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 6280; conc., 6305 (iii).
SURVEYS AND INSPECTION, PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 4662 (iii).
SUTTON WEST, INDIAN AGENT, COST OF INVESTIGATION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mulock*) 145 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 961 (i).
Tapley, Isabel. *See* "DIVORCE."
TARIFF, THE. *See* "WAYS AND MEANS."
TARTE-MCGREEVY INVESTIGATION, COUNSEL: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1575, 1930 (i).
——— ENQUIRY *re* PAPERS: Remarks (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 393 (i).
TAY CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3738 (ii); neg. (Y. 82, N. 100) 3779 (ii).
Deb. (Mr. *Bowell*) 3745; (Mr. *Gibson*) 3750; (Mr. *Watson*) 3751; (Mr. *Macdonell, Algoma*) 3755; (Mr. *Fraser*) 3756; (Mr. *Haggart*) 3759; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3763; (Mr. *Mulock*) 3769; (Mr. *Campbell*) 3773; (Mr. *McMullen*) 3776 (ii).
——— *See* "CANALS."
TELEGRAPH AND SIGNAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4669 (iii).
TELEGRAPH COMPANIES, LEGISLATION *re* DIRECTORS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 144 (i).
Telegraph Lines. *See* "C.P.R."
TELEGRAPH LINES, LAND AND CABLE: in Com., of Sup., 4668 (iii).
TELEPHONE SERVICE, OTTAWA BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 4517 (iii).
TENDER FOR CAISSON, ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK, ADVTS.: M. for copies (Mr. *Tarte*) 1932 (i).
TERRITORIAL ACCOUNTS: in Com. of Sup., 6280 (iii).
TESTIMONIALS TO MINISTERS: Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3827; agreed to, 3853 (ii).
THAMES RIVER, REMOVAL OF BAR: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 1268 (i).
THREE RIVERS HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1687 (i), 4552 (iii).
——— PIER, TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 5776 (iii).
THURBER, LIEUT-COL., RESIGNATION AS LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER: M. for O.C.'s (Mr. *Rinfret*) 173 (i).
TIDAL OBSERVATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 3508 (ii).
TIGNISH BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 130 (i).
——— WHARFAGE DUES: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 708 (i).
——— HARBOUR MASTER, REFUND OF MONEYS COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3259 (ii).
——— MONEYS COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 4673.
TIMBER LICENSES, &C.: Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3428; neg. (Y. 81, N. 100) 3507.
Deb. on Amt. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 3438; (Mr. *Barron*) 3439; (Mr. *Robillard*) 3445; (Mr. *Casey*) 3446; (Mr. *Tisdale*) 3447; (Mr. *McMullen*) 3452; (Mr. *Davin*) 3455; (Mr. *Mackintosh*) 3458; (Mr. *Sproule*) 3461; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3472; (Mr. *Macdowall*) 3477; (Mr. *Wallace*) 3480; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 3484; (Sir *John Thompson*) 3488; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3497; (Mr. *Bowell*) 3501; (Mr. *Watson*) 3505 (ii).
TIMBER CUT, &C., IN DISPUTED TERRITORY: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barron*) 128 (i).
——— ON INDIAN RESERVE NO. 6: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 111 (i).
TOBACCO AND CIGARS, LAW *re* CULTIVATORS: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 194 (i).
TOBIQUE VALLEY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033; in Com., 6139 (iii).
TORONTO DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 4372 (iii).
——— CONTRACTS FOR ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 964 (i).
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co,'s B. No. 80 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 524; 2°*, 579; in Com. and 3°*, 1761 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 86.)
TORONTO HARBOUR WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 4572, 5438 (iii).
TRACADIE LAZARETTO: in Com. of Sup., 3576 (iii).
TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETURNS: Presented (Mr. *Bowell*) 104 (i).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. No. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*). 1°, 142; 2° m., 2552; 2°, 2576; in Com., 2577 (ii).
Trade Marks and Industrial Designs Act Amt. B. No. 101 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 807; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1099 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 35.)
TRADE POLICY OF THE GOVT.: Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3309; agreed to (Y. 99, N. 77) 3425 (ii).
Deb. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3313; (Mr. *Tupper*) 3333; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3358; (Mr. *Foster*) 3376; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3401; (Mr. *Casey*) 3413; (Mr. *Scriver*) 3424 (ii).
TRADE RELATIONS WITH THE EMPIRE: M. (Mr. *Foster*) Address to Her Majesty, 6309 (iii).
TRAIN SERVICE, P.E.I. RY.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1274.
TRANS-ATLANTIC STEAMERS, MEDICAL INSPECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 2906 (ii).
TRANSLATING N.W.T. "GAZETTE": in Com. of Sup., 1710 (i).
TREATIES, &C.:
COMMERCIAL TREATY, ENGLAND AND FRANCE: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 3950 (ii), 4670 (iii).
SPANISH AMERICAN TREATY COR.: Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 5852 (iii).
TRADE RELATIONS WITH THE EMPIRE: Mess. from the Senate read (Mr. *Speaker*) 6216 (iii).
——— M. (Mr. *Foster*) Address to Her Majesty, 6309 (iii).
——— WITH U.S.: Mess. from His Ex.: Presented (Sir *John Thompson*) 1199 (i).
——— WITH WEST INDIES: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 2289 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 4608 (iii).
TREATY PAPERS: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 238, 906 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 600 (i).
——— Remarks (Sir *John Thompson*) 550 (i).
——— Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 238, 906 (i).
U.S. TREATY WITH CUBA: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4008 (ii).
WASHINGTON CONFERENCE: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 2375 (ii).

TRENT VALLEY CANAL. *See* "CANALS."

Trinity House. *See* "MONTREAL HARBOUR."

TUNNEL, P. E. I. AND MAINLAND RET.: Remarks (Mr. *Perry*) 1413 (i).

——— SIR DOUGLAS FOX'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 4294 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 208, 227 (i).

——— Explanation (Mr. *Foster*) 227 (i).

——— M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 1277.

Deb. (Mr. *Haggart*) 1290; (Mr. *Cockburn*) 1291, 1645; (Mr. *McLean*) 1605; (Mr. *Perry*) 1618; (Mr. *Kenny*) 1629; (Mr. *Choquette*) 1632; (Mr. *McMullen*) 1633; (Mr. *Yeo*) 1634; (Mr. *Welsh*) 1638; (Mr. *Macdonald, P. E. I.*) 1644; (Mr. *Foster*) 1647 (i).

TURNING BASIN, WELLAND CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Gibson*) 270 (i).

TWO-CENT LETTER POSTAGE, UNIFORM RATE: Ques. (Mr. *Denison*) 131 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 129 (i).

TYPE-SETTING MACHINES, COST: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 271 (i).

U.S. Fishing Vessels B. No. 10 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 108; 2° and in Com., 206; 3°, 232 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 4.)

U.S. QUARANTINE REGULATIONS *re* LAMBS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 960 (i).

U.S. TREATY WITH CUBA: Remarks (Messrs. *Borden, Foster, &c.*) on M. for Com. of Sup,, 4008 (ii).

UNPROVIDED ITEMS: in Com. of Sup., 1745 (i).

VACUUM OIL CO., REFUND, LAW COSTS, &C.: in Com. Sup., 1714, 1721 (i).

Vancouver Dock and Ship Building Co.'s incorp. B. No. 51 (Mr. *Mara*). 1°*, 266; 2°*, 412; in Com. and 3°*, 1087 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 129.)

VANCOUVER ISLAND RY. RESERVE, REPS., &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 1051 (i).

VANCOUVER P. O., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4451 (ii).

VAUDREUIL AND BOUCHERVILLE WHARVES, EXPENDITURE, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 2548 (ii).

——— COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Harwood*) 335 (i).

VAULT IN FINANCE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 1686 (i).

VENTILATION AND LIGHTING, OTTAWA BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 4521 (iii).

VETERANS OF 1812, PENSIONS: in Com. of Sup., 3661 (ii).

——— 1837-38, RECOGNITION OF SERVICES: prop. Res. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 2923; deb. rsmd., 3287 (ii).

VICE-ADMIRALTY AND MARITIME COURTS: in Com. of Sup., 510 (i).

Victoria and North American Ry. Co.'s Ferry B. No. 62 (Mr. *Earle*). 1°*, 387; 2°*, 547; in Com. and 3°*, 1087 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 101.)

VICTORIA, B.C., DRILL HALL: M. for Reps.* (Mr. *Prior*) 736 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 4453 (iii).

——— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 4592 (iii).

——— MILITARY BUILDINGS; conc., 6304 (iii).

Victoria, Saanich and New Westminster Ry. Co.'s B. No. 67 (Mr. *Prior*). 1°*, 387; 2°*, 547; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 75.)

VICTORIA, N.S., APPOINTMENT OF RETURNING OFFICER: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Flint*) 2935 (ii).

Volunteers. *See* "LAND GRANTS."

VOLUNTEERS OF 1837-38, GRANT OF LAND: Ques. (Mr. *Allison*) 961 (i).

VOTES ACCORDING TO CENSUS OF 1881 AND 1891: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Landerkin*) 128 (i).

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS, TRANSLATION: Remarks (Mr. *Chapleau*) 389 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Lavergne*) 199, 391 (i).

VOTES POLLED AT ELECTION, 1891, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 128 (i).

Voting. *See* "COMPULSORY."

VOTERS' LISTS, REVISION, PRINTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 946, 1559, 1734 (i).

——— REVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 143 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 268 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 2912 (ii).

VOTERS, PROVINCE OF QUE., TOTAL NUMBERS: Ques (Mr. *Choquette*) 2910 (i).

WALKER, DR., CLAIM: M. for O. C.'s, &c. (Mr. *Bain*) 1058 (i).

WALKERTON PUBLIC BUILDINGS, CARETAKER: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 1271 (i).

——— CLERK OF WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 2151.

——— CONTRACT FOR FITTING: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 962 (i).

——— HEATING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 335 (i).

——— P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 1686 (i), 4372 (ii).

——— TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 267 (i).

——— CUSTOMS SEIZURES: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 3266.

——— SEIZURE OF IRON BRIDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 3619 (ii).

——— SHARE OF CLAIM: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 3959.

——— SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 3266 (ii).

WALLACE, W., EXTRA ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 3670 (ii).

WALLS OF QUEBEC, EXTENSION OF STREETS: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 3957 (ii).

WALROND RANCHE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Flint*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 6148 (iii).

WASHINGTON CONFERENCE: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 2375 (ii).

WATER, PUBLIC BUILDINGS, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 4514 (ii).

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET: Annual Stmnt. (Mr. *Foster*) 1200; Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1252 (i); neg. (Y. 88, N. 114) 3081.

Deb. (Mr. *Weldon*) 1435; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 1458; (Mr. *Montague*) 1854; (Mr. *Charlton*) 1892; (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) 1995; Amt. to Amt., 2020 (i).

Deb. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2021, 2664; (Mr. *Foster*) 2021, 2065; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2023; (Sir *John Thompson*) 2023, 2063; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 2025, 2067; (Mr. *Bowell*) 2027: (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2029; (Mr. *Edgar*) 2031; (Mr. *Curran*) 2032; (Mr. *Mulock*) 2033; (Mr. *Tisdale*) 2034; (Mr. *Casey*) 2037; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 2039; (Mr. *Stairs*) 2040; (Mr. *Amyot*) 2060; (Mr. *Ouimet*) 2061; wthdn., 2069.

WAYS AND MEANS—*Continued.*

Deb. on Amt. rsmd. (Mr. *McDonald, Huron*) 2070; (Mr. *Wallace*) 2107; (Mr. *King*) 2122; (Mr. *Wood, Westmoreland*) 2260; (Mr. *Borden*) 2290; (Mr. *Masson*) 2305; (Mr. *McMullen*) 2336; (Mr. *Ives*) 2376; (Mr. *McMillan*) 2400; (Mr. *Corby*) 2421; (Mr. *Campbell*) 2425; (Mr. *McLennan*) 2438; (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2461; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 2479; (Mr. *Dawson*) 2485; (Mr. *Moncrieff*) 2497; (Mr. *Hyman*) 2581; (Mr. *Ross, Lisgar*) 2596; (Mr. *Rider*) 2610; (Mr. *Craig*) 2617; (Mr. *Flint*) 2626; (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 2669; (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2680; (Mr. *Sproule*) 2687; (Mr. *Lavergne*) 2713; (Mr. *Davin*) 2719; (Mr. *Semple*) 2731; (Mr. *Adams*) 2743; (Mr. *Devlin*) 2763; (Mr. *Desjardins, Hochelaga*) 2773; (Mr. *Bowers*) 2781; (Mr. *McDonald, Victoria*) 2787: (Mr. *Béchard*) 2792; (Mr. *McNeill*) 2802; (Mr. *Edwards*) 2813; (Mr. *Kenny*) 2822; (Mr. *Fraser*) 2842; (Mr. *Skinner*) 2860; (Mr. *Monet*) 2872; (Mr. *Leduc*) 2875; (Mr. *Brown, Chateauguay*) 2880; (Mr. *Ryckman*) 2882; (Mr. *Forbes*) 2884; (Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*) 2896; (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 2965; (Mr. *Allan*) 2981; (Mr. *Spohn*) 3002; (Mr. *Henderson*) 3013; (Mr. *Murray*) 3030; (Mr. *Macdonell, Algoma*) 3040; (Mr. *Legris*) 3051; (Mr. *Watson*) 3057; (Mr. *Fréchette*) 3070; (Mr. *Proulx*) 3076 (ii).

——— prop. Res. for Com. (Mr. *Foster*) 103; in Com., 1853 (i), 4297 (ii).

——— M. (Mr. *Foster*) further consdn. of Res., 3201.

——— Res. (Ale, Beer, &c.) in Com., 4001 (ii).

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES AND GAS, REP.: Presented (Mr. *Costigan*) 103 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 1725 (i), 5161 (iii).

——— FEES: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 194 (i).

Weighers of Grain Provision B. No. 164 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 3983 (ii); 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4307 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 47.)

WELLAND CANAL. *See* "CANALS."

WELDFORD, N.B., P. O., COMPLAINTS *re* MANAGEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Gillmor*) 2151 (ii).

WELL-BORING MACHINES: in Com. of Sup., 5073; conc., 5424 (iii).

WELLINGTON, B.C., MILITARY AID TO CIVIL AUTHORITIES: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Gordon*) 146 (i).

——— PAYMENTS FOR ACTIVE SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 2146 (ii).

WELLINGTON ST. BUILDING, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 4522 (ii).

Western Life Ass. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 48 (Mr. *Macdonald Winnipeg*). 1°*, 238; 2°, 295; in Com. and 3°*, 1434 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 115.)

WEST FARNHAM P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 6201, 6239.

WEST INDIES SS. SERVICE: Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4373; neg. (Y. 82, N. 107) 4427 (ii).

——— SUBSIDY: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 205 (i).

——— SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 195 (i).

WEST POINT WHARF, ENGINEER'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 269 (i).

Whirlpool Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 58 (Mr. *German*). 1°*, 334; 2°*, 413; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i).

WHITE, MR. FRED., REP. *re* COMMISSIONER HERCHMER: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1574 (i).

WHITE, PETER, ESQ., ELECTION AS SPEAKER: M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1 (i).

WHITMAN, CAPT., C. W. S., APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 268 (i).

WIARTON HARBOUR WORKS, CONTRACTOR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 226 (i).

WILD FOWL, PROHIBITION OF EXPORT: Ques. (Mr. *McKay*) 1769 (i).

WILLIAMSBURG CANAL STAFF: in Com. of Sup., 1728.

WILSON, JAS., POSTMASTER AT KINMOUNT: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Barron*) 736 (i).

Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*). Res. prop., 549; Order for Com. read, 1253; in Com., 1347; conc. in and 1°* of B., 1414; 2° m., 1994 (i); 2°*, and in Com., 2205; Amts. conc. in and 3°*, 2289; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 3984 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 81.)

Deb. in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 1347, 1398; (Mr. *Spohn*) 1349; (Mr. *Daly*) 1363, 1379; (Mr. *Armstrong*) 1368 (i), 2238, 2253 (ii); (Mr. *Watson*) 1371 (i), 2221 (ii); (Mr. *Ross, Lisgar*) 1374; (Mr. *McMullen*) 1375 (i), 2215, 2250 (ii); (Mr. *Sproule*) 1380; (Mr. *Denison*) 1381; (Mr. *Macdonell, Algoma*) 1383; (Mr. *Forbes*) 1384; (Mr. *Davin*) 1386; (Mr. *Fraser*) 1390; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1392 (i), 2225 (ii); (Mr. *Welsh*) 1397; (Mr. *Dewdney*) 1398; (Mr. *Macdonald, Winnipeg*) 1400 (i); (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 2206; (Mr. *Casey*) 2209, 2245, 2252; (Mr. *Macdowall*) 2218; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2229; (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2235; (Mr. *McMillan*) 2242; (Mr. *Lister*) 2252; (Mr. *Campbell*) 2255 (ii).

WINNIPEG AND H. B. CO.'S SHAREHOLDERS: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1852 (i).

WINNIPEG GENERAL HOSPITAL: conc., 6304 (iii).

——— IMMIGRANT BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 1687 (i), 4441 (iii).

Winnipeg Water Power Act Amt. B. No. 91 (Mr. *Macdonald, Winnipeg*). 1°*, 549; 2°*, 983; in Com. and 3°*, 1761 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 108.)

WINTER COMMUNICATION WITH P.E.I.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 158 (i).

WOOD ISLANDS BREAKWATER, P.E.I., REPAIRS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 121 (i).

——— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 226 (i).

WOOD SUPPLY, PUBLIC BUILDINGS, JOHN HENEY'S CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4295 (iii).

YAMASKA, EAST, P.O., CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 2153 (ii).

"Y" AT TRURO: in Com. of Sup., 1655 (i).

YULE ESTATE CLAIM: in Com. of Sup., 4148 (ii).